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He mihi ki te kaahui tāpuna,
te taura-here mō tātou te muka tāngata,
ki ngā mana ātua, kia tau te mauri.

He kura tangihia, he maimai aroha,
rātou kua whetūrangitia ki a rātou
tātou te hunga mata-rerehua ki a tātou

E ngā mana, e ngā rea, e ngā karangatanga maha,
tēnā rā koutou katoa.

1. Overview

This is Auckland Council’s submission in response to the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19-2027/28.

The address for service is Auckland Council, Private Bag 92300, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142. Please direct any enquiries to Phil Haizelden, Team Leader Transport Strategy, Auckland Council.

This submission has been approved by the Planning Committee of Auckland Council.

2. Introduction and Summary


Since 2010 Auckland’s population has increased by over 250,000 to around 1.7 million. In recent years, annual growth has spiked to more than 40,000 people per year, one of the fastest growth rates in the developed world. While this very high rate of growth may tail off over time, Stats NZ projections suggest that over the next 30 years, up to a million more people may call Auckland home. Over the next decade, around 55% of New Zealand’s population growth is expected to occur in Auckland.

Ongoing growth brings great opportunities and much progress has been made over the past 10-15 years to support Auckland’s evolution into a modern, world-class city. This includes a
sustained increase in investment for transport and a willingness of Aucklanders to change the way they live and travel. Use of public transport has tripled since the mid-1990s, the city centre is New Zealand’s fastest growing residential neighbourhood and, most recently, Aucklanders are rapidly taking up cycling where quality infrastructure is provided.

However, a combination of the sheer scale and pace of growth, a longer history of under-investment and insufficient levels of housing construction means that despite this progress Auckland faces significant transport and housing challenges.

Our transport challenge is not just one of congestion, but also:

- Poor travel choice beyond private vehicles, especially in lower income areas
- A near doubling of deaths and serious injuries on our roads since 2012
- Growing recognition of the need to reduce the transport system’s environmental impact
- Enabling and supporting a rapid acceleration in the rate of housing construction
- The need for our streets to play a growing role in creating vibrant and inclusive places.

Through this Government Policy Statement on land transport and the Auckland Plan, the Government and Auckland Council have both recognised the critical role of transport in delivering a successful Auckland.

To unlock the benefits of this growth, Auckland needs a transport system that provides safe, reliable and sustainable access. This means:

- Easily connecting people, goods and services to where they need to go
- Providing high quality and affordable travel choices for people of all ages and abilities
- Seeking to eliminate harm to people and the environment
- Supporting and shaping Auckland’s growth
- Creating a prosperous, vibrant and inclusive city.

The role of transport in enabling, supporting and shaping the way Auckland grows is also critical to addressing our housing challenges.

The Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP)

Over the past three years, Auckland Council and the Government have worked together to develop an aligned strategic approach to the development of Auckland’s transport system over the next 30 years. In 2016 a recommended strategic approach was agreed, based on three integrated components:

- Making better use of existing networks
- Targeting new investment to the most significant challenges
- Maximising new opportunities to influence travel demand.

In late 2017 the new Government requested an update to the ATAP indicative package. Around the same time Auckland Council approved the draft Auckland Plan, which reflects...
the long-term strategic approach of the original ATAP, but with a greater and earlier focus on improving travel choices and reducing harm to people and the environment.

The ATAP update was released in April 2018 and includes a funded $28 billion “ATAP Package”. To enable the package’s implementation, ATAP will need to be reflected in statutory documents like the GPS.

Submission Summary:

Our key submission points are:

- **Support** for the GPS’s strategic direction, particularly the stronger focus on:
  - the safety of people
  - providing travel choices
  - enabling and supporting growth
  - the key role of streets in creating high quality public spaces
  - environmental outcomes
  - value for money

- **Support** for the GPS’s increased investment priority given to safety and demand management, public transport, walking and cycling, and local road improvements and local road maintenance, especially how this should translate into full co-funding for the Auckland Transport capital and renewals programme

- **Support** for the new activity class framework - especially the creation of a mass transit activity class and the commitment to a more sustainable funding source for rail (GPS stage 2) - and its flexibility to enable delivery of the ATAP indicative package

- **Support** the mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions

- **Request** the GPS enables the funding assumptions made in ATAP to be implemented, particularly around changes to activity class flexibility, funding assistance rates and enabling all transport investments to access NZTA funding (e.g. footpath renewals and road seal extensions).

- **Request** the early implementation of road safety improvements

- **Support** the increase in funding for “Road policing”

- **Request** an appropriate level of rapid transit funding and the need to establish clear, consistent and sustainable funding for these projects

- **Suggest** minor wording changes

These main submission wording points are expanded upon below.

3. **Strategic directions and priorities**

Council supports the GPS’s strategic direction and its closer alignment with the Auckland Plan, particularly the stronger focus on:
a. the safety of people

Council strongly supports the top-priority given to requiring a transport system that considers people’s safety and the greater focus on investment in safety improvements, particularly in improving the safety of vulnerable road users like people walking and cycling, and effective enforcement in promoting safe behavior by road users.

As recognised in the draft GPS, there is an urgent need to improve road safety outcomes and reverse the increase in deaths and serious injuries that has occurred in recent years. In Auckland the number of deaths and serious injuries has increased by 48% over the past four years, from a low of 421 in 2012 to 813 in 2017.

Auckland’s highly urbanised environment and the intense use of its transport networks by different users means that vulnerable road users (pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists) make up a higher proportion of deaths and serious injuries in Auckland (43%) than in the rest of New Zealand (33%). This suggests a need to tailor approaches to safety for large urban areas like Auckland. For example, lower speeds in urban areas dramatically reduce pedestrian harm if collisions occur.

Rural parts of Auckland also face significant safety challenges, requiring tailored solutions such as median and side barriers, rural intersection upgrades, improved skid resistance, signage, targeted seal widening and speed management. We support the specific mention of rural road safety in paragraph 35 of the draft GPS.

Reversing recent safety trends will require new approaches and interventions, particularly in Auckland. We support the proposed increase in investment in road safety promotion and road policing and the tilt in the balance towards safety when trade-offs are being made against travel-time.

b. travel choices

Council supports the priority given to Auckland in the GPS, particularly in relation to the “Access” strategic priority. Improving access to opportunities (particularly for people living in
the western and southern parts of Auckland) and supporting investment in measures that encourage mode shift from private vehicle travel to walking, cycling and public transport are key priorities in the Auckland Plan that align well with the GPS.

There are limited opportunities to substantially increase capacity on Auckland’s road network to accommodate growth. Therefore, we support the GPS’s recognition of the need for more people to walk, cycle or travel by public transport to reduce pressure on our roads and free up room for freight and commercial travel.

The growing use of public transport, walking and cycling in Auckland over the past 15 years has demonstrated a desire and willingness to use these options where they are efficient, reliable, safe, and attractive. However, many Aucklanders continue to lack quality travel choice, particularly for lower income households in western and southern parts of Auckland and in rural areas. This creates more pressure on household budgets due to the high cost of car dependency and means that travel in Auckland is often long and unreliable, with Aucklanders unable to avoid congestion that wastes precious time and reduces life quality.

c. enabling and supporting growth

Council supports prioritising the role of transport investment in enabling and supporting growth, including investment in modes such as public transport and walking and cycling in opening access to existing and new housing developments.

Transport infrastructure and services are important for enabling and supporting population and housing growth in new and existing urban areas, while the location of growth affects how well the transport system performs. Stronger integration between transport and land use decisions is required so that housing, business and employment growth occurs in areas with better travel options. Council supports prioritising investment in areas that supports intensification in the existing urban area, growth in new urban areas and improves connections between these newly developing areas and the rest of Auckland.

d. creating high quality public spaces

Council strongly supports the recognition of streets playing a key role in creating high quality public spaces – supporting investments that make streets more inviting places for people and promotes equitable access.

Roads and streets exert an immense influence upon Aucklanders’ lifestyle and travel behaviour. How we use and design our roads and streets directly influences place identity, accessibility, public health, social equity, inclusivity and local and regional economies, amongst other factors. Council, including our Local Boards, have an expectation that Auckland’s roads and streets need to deliver a wider range of benefits across the four well-beings (social, cultural, economic and environment) than has historically been provided for.

The scale and pace of growth in Auckland is placing increased pressure on an already constrained road and street network, resulting in a greater need to make conscious investments that balance the sometimes-competing demands of movement and place values. The recognition given to place making in the draft GPS is welcomed and will assist in the funding and delivery in regional and local projects of all scales.

e. environmental outcomes

Council supports the increased priority the draft GPS places on reducing environmental impacts from the transport system, including reducing transport’s negative effects on global climate, the local environment and public health. We also support the draft GPS’s
acknowledgement that the ‘second stage GPS’, informed by the Independent Climate Change Commission, will undertake further work on the steps needed to reduce transport emissions.

We also support the priority the GPS places on the role of transport investment in improving water quality through mitigating stormwater runoff. This may require different design standards and increased investment to ensure stormwater infrastructure that forms part of the transport network helps to protect or enhance the overall health of the environment and ecosystems.

Council is a signatory to the C40 Fossil Fuel Streets Declaration, which commits to transforming our streets into greener, healthier, and more prosperous places to live. Our streets must be safe and accessible for everybody and our air must be clean and free from harmful emissions. For example, there may be a need for additional investment in public transport services to help support our transition to an electric bus fleet.

f. value for money

Council supports the increased emphasis on delivering the right infrastructure and services to the right level, at the best cost. Transport is Council’s largest area of expenditure and it is therefore critical to ensure strong processes are in place to maximise the benefits of this investment.

4. Investment priorities

Council supports the Governments increased investment priority given to safety and demand management, public transport, walking and cycling, and local road improvements and local road maintenance, especially how this should translate into full co-funding for the Auckland Transport capital and renewals programme.

5. Activity class framework

Council supports the new activity class framework - especially the creation of a mass transit activity class and the commitment to a more sustainable funding source for rail (GPS stage 2) - and its flexibility to enable delivery of the ATAP indicative package.

Rapid transit forms the backbone of Auckland’s public transport network, providing fast, frequent, high capacity services operating along corridors separated from general traffic and unaffected by road congestion. Rapid transit can also have a particularly significant impact on shaping urban form and development. The speed and reliability of rapid transit delivers a long-lasting step-change in the accessibility of an area.

Auckland’s rapid transit network barely existed a decade ago, but sustained effort and investment has increased annual boardings on the Northern Busway and the rail network from 6.8 million in 2008 to 26 million today. However, major parts of Auckland are still not served by the rapid transit network, while existing parts of the network need substantial capacity improvements to meet current and future demand.

Through ATAP, Auckland has undertaken a comprehensive planning process with Government to agree the main transport challenges and to develop a strategic approach for addressing these challenges. This provides both parties with a higher level of assurance that investment will focus on the biggest transport challenges facing Auckland.
Because of this alignment, there are significant benefits from ensuring funds available for transport investment can be directed towards the area of highest priority. Council supports the GPS activity class structure having broader funding bands that enable greater flexibility to direct funding to the most important investments.

6. Mode neutral approach

Council supports the mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions. An important element of the Auckland Plan’s approach to transport is ensuring that planning and funding systems support using the “right tool for the job”, rather than privileging any particular mode.

7. Appropriate funding allocation for Auckland

Council requests that the GPS enables the funding assumptions made in ATAP to be implemented, particularly around changes to activity class flexibility, funding assistance rates and enabling all transport investments to access NZTA funding (e.g. footpath renewals and road seal extensions).

The Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) provides detail on transport funding in Auckland over the next decade. This includes an assumption of $16.3 billion from the National Land Transport Fund. Realising this level of funding may require changes to current funding approaches, including:

- Greater flexibility across activity classes
- Changes to funding assistance rates
- Ensuring all transport investment areas are eligible for co-funding (for example, footpath renewals and road seal extensions)

As noted earlier, over half of New Zealand’s population growth is expected to occur in Auckland over the next decade. Growth is a key driver of the need for many transport improvements, particularly those relating to network improvements (as opposed to maintenance, operations and renewals).

Because the draft GPS was prepared before ATAP was completed, the funding arrangements required to deliver ATAP are not yet detailed in the GPS. To ensure the GPS reflects ATAP, it would be helpful for it to reference ATAP’s NLTF assumptions and the potential changes to funding arrangements detailed above.

8. Early safety funding

Council supports the development of a new road safety strategy and action plan but request early implementation (rather than waiting 18 months to its completion) to address current pressing road safety issues.

Strong growth and changing travel patterns have exposed safety gaps on Auckland’s transport network. On average one person that is walking gets hit by a motor vehicle every day in Auckland and every third day that person dies or is seriously injured, resulting in $1.14 billion/year in social costs1. Council has a strong understanding of our most significant road safety risks; immediate funding would allow these risks to be addressed within the timeframe of the Road Safety Strategy being prepared.

---

1 AT RoadSafe Strategy 2018-2023
9. Road policing funding allocation

Council supports the increase in funding to the “Road policing” activity. Police road safety enforcement has an important role to play in reducing the levels of road fatalities and serious injuries.

10. Rapid Transit Funding

Council supports the inclusion of a new rapid transit category in the GPS and looks forward to participating in ongoing work relating to funding arrangements for rapid transit projects.

The ATAP Package includes around $8.4 billion of investment into Auckland’s rapid transit network through a combination of bus, rail and light-rail improvements. It is critical the GPS enables and supports the delivery of these projects.

While ATAP provides much greater funding certainty for rapid transit than has previously existed, there is still a need to ensure clear, consistent and sustainable funding arrangements for rapid transit improvements – including rail. This should form part of the follow-on work identified in ATAP that looks at funding arrangements.

11. Minor Wording Changes

In addition to these high-level points, we have identified several minor changes that we would like to see in the final version of the GPS 2018. These changes are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Paragraph</th>
<th>Suggested Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment in GPS 2018 Page 8</td>
<td>Inclusion of a bullet point acknowledging the localised negative impacts of transport infrastructure and transport activities – particularly air/water pollution and quality of life impacts (noise, light, vibration, severance, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2.2 – Safety Page 9</td>
<td>Inclusion of a clearer message regarding trade-offs – e.g. that historically we’ve traded vehicle delay against safety outcomes. Also, should give direction on how to better address these trade-offs – for example; safety improvement projects should have lower consideration of vehicle delay that may result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 9 Para 25</td>
<td>Insert new paragraph between para 25 and 26 that discusses issues around motorcycle safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 10 Para 35</td>
<td>Inclusion of additional sub-bullet point to the second bullet point that specifically identifies motorcycle travel as an area of high-risk and an area for increased investment in primary safe system treatments to reduce the risk of motorcycle crashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13 Para 62</td>
<td>Needs to include point regarding transport investment to support re-development, regeneration areas. Currently this para is weighted towards opening new serviced land for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13 Para 74</td>
<td>Remove “at-peak travelling hours” from the sentence. The first sentence over emphasises PT as a peak hour service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14</td>
<td>Replace “off peak public transport” with “all day public transport”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section/Paragraph</td>
<td>Suggested Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 76</td>
<td>Bullet point 3 should also cover regeneration/redevelopment areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14 Para 80</td>
<td>Rephrase bullet point one to be about matching capacity to demand rather than providing extra capacity. As an example, reallocation of existing road space to more efficient transport modes should be considered ahead of providing extra capacity through road widening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15 Section 2.3.2</td>
<td>Section 2.3.2 talks about transport choice and para 93 refers to walking and cycling but nothing related to PT. There needs to be a similar paragraph to cover off GPS investment in PT. Needs also to discuss reallocation of existing capacity to support more efficient transport modes (including freight) i.e. using what we have more efficiently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2.5 Value for money</td>
<td>Needs to discuss the value created by transport investment and how this can benefit others. For example, there is a case for supporting suboptimal transport investment where it supports other govt investments (such as housing developments) and provides better value overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 20 Para 129.</td>
<td>Should include route protection and cover funding consequential OPEX particularly when PT is a lead investment in growth areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 26 Safety</td>
<td>Add short term result of addressing key safety issues this year (not waiting for the new road safety strategy and action plan in the next 12-18 months). Add stronger wording regarding reducing speed limits in urban areas and rolling this out faster. Add specific reference to making motorcycling safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 27 Access:</td>
<td>Should include a bullet point about the number of people who have access to frequent all day public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 36 Para 192</td>
<td>Needs to include that NZTA investment supports and respects local authority land use planning and growth strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 38 Para 196</td>
<td>NZTA need to not just shape urban form, they need to support it (Auckland’s growth strategies) as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 38 Para 197</td>
<td>Replace reference to greenfield areas with “Auckland Council growth strategies”. Section should be amended to reflect updated ATAP priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Governance and Administration Committee on the

Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill

May 2018
Auckland Council Submission on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill

Introduction

1. This is Auckland Council’s submission in response to the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill (the Bill).

2. The address for service is Auckland Council, Private Bag 92300, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142.

3. Please direct any enquiries to Jim Quinn, Chief of Strategy. Phone (027) 592-6002 or email jim.quinn@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

4. Auckland Council wishes to appear before the Governance and Administration Committee to discuss this submission.

5. This submission has been approved by the governing body of Auckland Council. In addition, ten local boards have requested that their views on the Bill be included as appendices.

6. The submission is organised around the principal aspects of the Bill. The submission is set out as follows:

   - Summary
   - Recommendations
   - Purpose of local government
   - Development contributions
   - Community infrastructure definition – non-land-based infrastructure
   - Community infrastructure definition – partnership infrastructure
   - Minor proposed amendments:
     - Transitional funding arrangements
     - Minor modification of section 200, subsection (5)
     - Crown to pay development contributions

Summary

7. Auckland Council welcomes the opportunity to submit on the Bill and largely supports the proposed amendments to the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA).

8. The council also recommends a few additional modifications to strengthen the Bill, primarily regarding the community infrastructure definition, transitional funding arrangements and minor modifications to the development contributions section.

9. Auckland Council supports restoring the purpose of local government “to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, in the present and for the future” and broadening the ability of local authorities to collect development contributions.

10. Council agrees fully with clauses 1 through 10 and clause 12.

11. Auckland Council agrees with the principle in clause 11 of broadening the definition of community infrastructure in section 197 of the Act but proposes some further amendments
that take into consideration modern usage of community infrastructure. A slight broadening of
the definition will create a resilient and enduring definition that will respond to the needs of our
communities into the future.

12. There are five modifications that we suggest to strengthen the overall objectives of this Bill.
These are outlined in the recommendations.

Recommendations

13. Auckland Council makes these recommendations in relation to the proposed amendments to
the LGA:

- Expand the definition of community infrastructure to include community infrastructure
  (that can be capitalised) but is not land-based.
- Expand the definition of community infrastructure to include community assets that
  are developed in partnership with a third party to deliver long-term public amenities.
- Make a minor amendment to section 200, subsection (5) to include council-controlled
  organisations (CCOs), due to the governance structure in Auckland where CCOs may
  also enter into funding agreements with the New Zealand Transport Authority.
- Remove the transitional funding arrangements in subclause 3 of schedule 1AA that
  was inserted to address the previous change in the community infrastructure
  definition over the period between 2014 and 2018.
- Remove the Crown exemption from payment of development contributions.

Purpose of local government

14. Auckland Council supports reinstating the promotion of social, cultural, economic and
environmental well-being of communities into the statutory purpose of local authorities. The
current description of the purpose of local government is too limited and does not accurately
capture the entire role of local government in New Zealand.

15. The current purpose of local government frames local authorities as service delivery providers
for a very limited range of services, specifically, for “good-quality local infrastructure, local
public services, and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective
for households and businesses.” This narrow interpretation does not acknowledge that, for
local communities to thrive, local government needs to take a holistic planning and place-
making approach that recognises the intertwined nature of physical infrastructure, public
services and broader community wellbeing outcomes.

16. The proposed re-introduction of the four aspects of well-being and specifically the addition of
the sustainable development approach is in line with several other acts where the council has
a statutory responsibility for protecting and enhancing our natural environment (e.g. Resource
Management Act (1991), the Biosecurity Act (1993) and the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act
(2000)). These proposed changes to the purpose place emphasis on potential value in the
future rather than the current focus on reducing cost in the present. This is important for
achieving all aspects of well-being. Auckland Council supports the greater weight this revised
wording places on the long-term benefits of local government’s decisions.
17. The LGA sets the framework, roles and powers for local governance. Within this framework, local authorities decide what activities they will undertake and how they will best meet the needs of their local communities. Implicitly this suggests the local authorities are best placed to advocate for and deliver services in response to the needs of their local communities. Restoring the purpose of local government to include the four well-beings acknowledges local government’s larger responsibilities to residents’ quality of life.

18. In Auckland, both the governing body and the twenty-one local boards play a significant role in planning for and delivering on their local community priorities. Restoring the four well-beings to government’s purpose will provide certainty to council and local boards that they are empowered to consider how their decisions will impact on all four aspects of wellbeing. This will create greater clarity for the parameters of decision making in Auckland.

19. Section 79 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 sets out the purpose of the spatial plan (the Auckland Plan) “to contribute to Auckland’s social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being through a comprehensive and effective long term strategy for Auckland’s growth and development.” Furthermore, the spatial plan is also required to “set a strategic direction for Auckland and its communities that integrates social, economic, environmental and cultural objectives.” Auckland Council fully supports the legislative framework underpinning the Auckland Plan. The draft Auckland Plan 2050 has six interlocking outcomes and a development strategy that seek to address the four aspects of well-beings. This reinstatement of the four well-beings will resolve the current discord between the purpose of the LGA and these key facets of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009.

20. In Auckland, Independent Māori Statutory Board’s Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau sets a long-term strategic vision for achieving Māori wellbeing in Tāmaki Makaurau. The five Māori values outlined in the Māori Plan are important for Māori wellbeing. These are: whanaungatanga – relationships, rangatiratanga – autonomy and leadership, manaakitanga – to protect and look after, wairuatanga – spirituality and identity, and kaitiakitanga – guardianship. To strengthen the application of the four well-beings by local authorities, the council supports the recognition of these five values in the Bill.

21. Council agrees with removing the “cost-effective” language from the purpose statement. There are many sections of the LGA, particularly section 14, that reinforce the importance of effectiveness, sound business practices and prudent stewardship. Therefore, the use of ‘cost-effective’ in the purpose statement unnecessarily restricts local authorities, to consider financial wellbeing above others. An overemphasis of “cost-effectiveness” as a ‘purpose’ of local government limits decision makers to consider activities that have strong financial benefits and disregard the wider social, environmental or cultural impact. For example, the council has agreements with a wide variety of community groups to provide access to council-owned land and facilities at peppercorn rental rates because they provide a valued service that enhances overall community well-being. The early childhood education sector is one important beneficiary of this approach.

Development contributions

22. Auckland Council agrees with the second and third objectives of the Bill. These provide for the reintroduction of territorial authorities’ powers to collect development contributions for any
public amenities needed as a consequence of development such as libraries, swimming pools and sports grounds, and technical changes that allow for development contributions to be collected on initiatives that receive New Zealand Transport Agency advanced financial assistance.

23. The return of a broader ability to collect development contributions is welcome. Auckland continues to grow rapidly. Council facilities and services can be costly to deliver in a quickly intensifying city and there is a need for a range of funding mechanisms. The ability to recover costs related to development for community infrastructure is essential to provide residents with quality infrastructure and liveable communities.

24. Restricting the range of chargeable infrastructure pushes costs onto other sources or creates unintended consequences. When development contributions do not accurately reflect the full cost of growth-related infrastructure, there are significant impacts, such as a need for higher rates, deferred maintenance of existing facilities, increased demands or lower levels of services on existing community infrastructure. All of these impacts lead to lower quality of life for current and new residents.

25. In order to ensure that development contributions-funded community infrastructure meets the needs of the community, council supports requiring a robust economic, social, cultural and environmental case be undertaken for proposed new community infrastructure. A more explicit requirement in the Bill for this analysis will ensure that development contributions are not being charged for projects that are a net cost to residents. This will minimise risk that may eventuate from leaving the analysis at the discretion of territorial authorities.

26. Growth-related development is about place-making, not simply about building houses and infrastructure. Prospective home purchasers are interested in their potential neighbourhood. Public services and amenities are part of what makes a home or a city attractive.

27. This Bill removes a key barrier to funding important infrastructure in Auckland. If this objective is not adopted there will be further pressure to increase rates to build these public amenities or restrict infrastructure development.

Community infrastructure definition – non-land-based infrastructure

28. Auckland Council agrees with the principle of broadening the definition of community infrastructure in section 197 of the Act and considers this the appropriate time to reflect on the resilience of this definition for the future.

29. As Auckland grows and develops, the council is seriously considering the future facilities and services communities will require, and how people will access these resources. Already there are several cases of community infrastructure (that can be capitalised) but are not land-based that are growing in prominence and usage. Digital web-based library services and pop-up transportable facilities are two example of community infrastructure that do not have a physical location and do not fit within the proposed definition. Thus, these innovative efficient types of community infrastructure are not able to be funded by development contributions.

30. To fully bring into effect the objective of widening the definition of community infrastructure, taking into consideration current and future community needs, the council recommends a refinement of the definition to remove the requirement that the asset be “on land.” We acknowledge that to implement this change, amendments would need to be made across the
entire development contribution regime, including for example section 197AB that sets out the
development contributions principles. This would require further investigation to identify all the
areas where change may be required. Auckland Council staff offer to meet with government
officials to help to identify these changes.

**Community infrastructure definition – partnership infrastructure**

31. Another concern about the proposed definition is that it disincentivises council to work
collaboratively with third parties to develop community infrastructure. The proposed definition
would constrain the ability to collect development contributions for community infrastructure
projects located on land owned or controlled by councils.

32. There are several cases of proposed development partnerships with Crown agencies,
community entities or private sector providers. For example, projects where the council co-
funds a new swimming pool or community hall on Ministry of Education provided school
grounds. In these cases, the council may not own the land or lease the land, but we would
like to work in partnership to develop shared publicly available community infrastructure. In
the future, partnerships will be a more cost-effective way to build public amenities and reduce
duplication of infrastructure development.

33. In the case of these community facilities partnerships, the council’s share of funding should
be eligible for development contribution funding where the new community facility is directly
linked to growth (subject to the other development contribution provisions of the LGA and
appropriate provisions to ensure reasonable public access and long-term operation of the
facility).

34. A suggested amendment to the proposed community infrastructure definition is set out below
(deleted text is struck-through, added text is underlined):

> community infrastructure -

(a) means land, or development assets on land, which are either:

i. owned or controlled by a territorial authority for the purpose of
   providing public amenities, and or

ii. owned or controlled by another party in circumstances where a
territorial authority has agreed to work in partnership with that party
to deliver long-term public amenity

(b) includes land that the territorial authority or another party will acquire for
that purpose.

**Transitional funding arrangements**

35. As a result of the proposed reinstatement of the original definition of community infrastructure,
a question arises around the funding of capital expenditure for community infrastructure
undertaken by councils over the period between 2014 and 2018 when the more constraining
definition of community infrastructure prevailed. That definition constrained development
contribution funding specifically to:
- community centres or halls for the use of a local community or neighbourhood, and the land on which they are or will be situated
- play equipment that is located on a neighbourhood reserve
- toilets for use by the public.

36. Between 2014 and 2018 many councils have invested significant sums in public amenities like libraries and aquatic facilities utilising other funding sources, including debt. Auckland Council submits that where the costs of these facilities have been debt funded that the growth-related portion of this expenditure applicable to future growth may now be included into development contribution charges as if the proposed definition had always prevailed (and subject to the other relevant provisions of the LGA).

37. It should also be noted that separate transitional provisions already exist in Schedule 1AA of the LGA to deal with the previous change in the community infrastructure definition. In our view subclause 3 is no longer necessary and should be repeated due to the administrative burden that it places on councils.

Minor modification of Section 200, subsection (5)

38. Council agrees with the third objective of the Bill, the minor technical modification that allows for territorial authorities to collect development contributions for projects financed through financial advances from the New Zealand Transport Authority. However, we propose a minor amendment to add to Section 200, subsection (5), due to the governance structure in Auckland which includes Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs).

39. Clause 13 does not appear to recognise the unique CCO situation in Auckland. In Auckland, both Auckland Council and Auckland Transport enter into funding agreements with the New Zealand Transport Authority (NZTA). To acknowledge the direct relationship Auckland Transport has with NZTA in entering into funding agreements, we propose this minor amendment to section 200, subsection (5) (added text is underlined):

“Subsection (6) applies if a territorial authority or a council-controlled organisation has entered a funding agreement with the New Zealand Transport Agency under which—”

Crown payment of development contributions

40. Currently the Crown is exempt from paying development contributions. Crown developments such as new schools, tertiary education facilities, prisons and housing requires council-provided infrastructure and places significant demand on this infrastructure.

41. There is particular concern around the area of housing where the government and its various agencies are becoming more involved in the consenting and delivery of large scale housing developments. If these developments were considered to be exempt from payment of development contributions, there would be significant impacts for development contribution revenue streams going forward.

42. Auckland Council proposes the removal of the Crown exemption from payment of development contributions.
43. In the case where the Crown and council would enter into a partnership development project together, council supports the allowance for a Private Developers Agreement that would involve the provision of infrastructure by both parties in accordance with the council’s Contributions policy.

Conclusion

44. Auckland Council thanks the Committee for its time and effort in considering our submission. Please feel free to contact us to discuss our submission further.
Appendix one: Local Board views

The views of the following local boards are attached:

- Franklin Local Board
- Hibiscus and Bays Local Board
- Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
- Manurewa Local Board
- Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board
- Papakura Local Board
- Rodney Local Board
- Upper Harbour Local Board
- Waitākere Ranges Local Board
- Waitemata Local Board
Franklin Local Board

Summary

- The Franklin Local Board supports changes to the Local Government Act that will enable Council to develop new or enhanced local community amenity prompted by growth and that enables the procurement of local services locally.
- The Franklin Local Board are concerned that in amending the local government role to be to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, the potential for duplication in the leadership and delivery of well-being initiatives is increased.

Context/Background

1. The Franklin Local Board area, on Auckland’s south and east extremity is currently experiencing significant increases in population. This growth is anticipated to continue over the next 10 years, dramatically increasing demand on existing and requiring development of new services and facilities.

2. The Franklin Local Board have anticipated this demand within the Franklin Local Board plan 2017-2020, prioritising the need to build a local economy/local jobs and respond to growth by advocating for and investing in new and justified quality of life amenity.

3. The amendments to the Local Government Act propose restoring the purpose of local government to be to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities.

4. The consequence of the amendment is intended to restore territorial authorities’ power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed as a consequence of development.

5. A further consequence of the amendment is that “buy local first” procurement policies can be pursued by Local Government i.e. that Local Government will no longer be restricted to procurement policies that prioritise price over social or local economic development or social outcome.

Comment

6. The Franklin Local Board agrees,

   i. with the reintroduction of territorial authorities’ power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed as a consequence of development such as libraries, swimming pools and sports grounds where these amenities are justified.

   ii. with technical changes that allow for development contributions to be collected on initiatives that receive New Zealand Transport Agency advanced funding where this does not impede the delivery of transport enhancements.

   iii. with the principle of broadening the definition of community infrastructure in section 197 of the Act and considers this the appropriate time to reflect on the resilience of this definition for the future. (e.g. community infrastructure definition to include)

      a. community infrastructure (that can be capitalised) but are not land-based (i.e. digital web-based library services and pop-up transportable facilities)

      b. to include community assets that are developed in partnership a third party to deliver long-term public amenities.
7. The Franklin Local Board does not agree that a wholesale change in purpose is required to affect these outcomes i.e. that in changing the approach from “are we allowed to do this” to “should be do this” the scope of Local Government responsibility becomes too broad and creates potential for inefficiency and duplication.

8. The Franklin Local Board is concerned that by assigning responsibility for the promotion of the four well-beings to Council, Local Boards will experience increased pressure from local social service agencies to support social well-being outcomes without commensurate budget.

9. The Franklin Local Board suggests that the flexibility to plan for and manage development and demand on local amenity could be achieved by requiring investment to be “justifiable”. In doing so, the “how we do this” can be developed according to local need and priority e.g. procurement policies that support local economic development or application of developer contributions to community facilities not otherwise available.
Hibiscus and Bays Local Board

Resolution number HB/2018/86

MOVED by Chairperson J Parfitt, seconded by Member C Bettany:

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

a) provide formal feedback on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill as follows:

   i) supports restoring the purpose of local government to be to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, taking a sustainable development approach

   ii) supports restoring territorial authorities' power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed because of development

   iii) supports broadening the definition of community infrastructure and amending the definition of terms related to the wellbeing aspects of the Local Government Act 2002

   iv) supports making a minor technical modification to the development contributions power to allow territorial authorities to collect development contributions for projects financed through financial advances from the New Zealand Transport Authority

   v) endorses the retention of value for money as a key driver.
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

Resolution number MO/2018/84

MOVED by Member C Elliott, seconded by Member N Bakulich:

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) supports the amendments to the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill and the intent:
   
   - to reinstate the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities
   - to restore the power to collect development contributions for a wider group of infrastructure projects.
Manurewa Local Board

Manurewa Local Board feedback on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill

The Manurewa Local Board has not had the opportunity to formally resolve its position regarding the Local Government Community Well-being) Amendment Bill but the Chair can make the following comments following informal discussion with the members, and these comments will be ratified at the Board’s 7 June, 2018 meeting:

The Manurewa Local Board:

- Supports Auckland Council’s submission to reinstate the four well-beings in legislation to recognise the work to deliver social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes for communities.
- Supports the modification to development contributions, providing the ability to fund community infrastructure (ie swimming pools, libraries, sports fields etc) helping councils to support growth.
- Notes that the proposed restoration of the purpose of local government to include social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being aligns well with local boards planning for and delivering on issues of local importance, as defined in the Local Board Plans.
- Notes that the restoration of local government’s power to collect development contributions will allow for better access to funding of key local facilities that are of significant interest to local boards such as swimming pools and sports grounds.

Yours sincerely

Angela Dalton - Chair
Manurewa Local Board
Email: Angela.Dalton@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Ph: 0212833311
Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board

Resolution number OP/2018/82

MOVED by Chairperson L Fuli, seconded by Member D Trenberth:

That the Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a. supports the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill in restoring the purpose of local government to be “to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities”.
b. supports the Bill in restoring territorial authorities’ power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed as a consequence of development, to assist in the provision of facilities such as sports grounds, swimming pools, and libraries.
c. requests the Planning Committee to make a submission to Parliament on behalf of Auckland Council, including support on the above points.
Papakura Local Board

Resolution number PPK/2018/83

MOVED by Member K Winn, seconded by Member W McEntee:

That the Papakura Local Board:

a. supports the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill in restoring the purpose of local government to be “to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities”.

b. supports the Bill in restoring territorial authorities’ power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed as a consequence of development, to assist in the provision of facilities such as sports grounds, swimming pools, and libraries.

c. requests the Planning Committee to make a submission to Parliament on behalf of Auckland Council, including support on the above points.
Feedback on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill 2018 (Parliamentary Select Committee submission)

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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

Rodney Local Board Feedback:

The Rodney Local Board:

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

   General Comments
   i. note that council operates in a restrained funding environment where the demand for new infrastructure, which is the result of considerable growth, vastly exceeds the amount of funding available
   ii. broadly support the intention of the Bill which recognises the reality that new development requires appropriate council services and community facilities
   iii. agree that it is appropriate that a ‘developer’ generating additional demand for infrastructure contributes to meeting the capital costs that council must incur to support this increased demand

   Part 1: The Four Well-beings
   iv. does not support the re-introduction of the ‘four well-beings’ being the ‘social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of [a] district or region’ as proposed in sections 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 of the Bill
   v. note that there are no measures to assess the ‘four well-beings’ in the Bill and the definition of “social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being” will vary from territorial authority to territorial authority
   vi. if the ‘four well-beings’ are included, then recommend a definition be included in the Bill of what these are and how they can be measured, which will provide for a consistent, national approach
   vii. express concern that the re-introduction of the ‘four well-beings’ will require council’s to continually report on or give effect to the ‘four well-beings’ and this will require significant investment of resources
   viii. does not support section 6 of the Bill, being the repeal of section 10(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002, which would remove the requirement for local government to
perform its functions “…in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses”
ix. note that ratepayers expect local government to act in a cost-effective manner and the repeal of section 10(1)(b) is inconsistent with ratepayer expectations for their local council

Part 2: Other Amendments
x. supports section 11 of the Bill which expands the definition of “community infrastructure” and permits territorial authorities to collect development contributions for a much broader range of public amenities
xi. supports section 12 of the Bill, which repeals section 196A of the Local Government Act and will allow territorial authorities to require development contributions for reserves if a development is non-residential in nature
xii. supports section 13 of the Bill, as it will allow territorial authorities to collect development contributions to repay financial advances from the New Zealand Transport Agency necessary to provide reserves, network infrastructure, or community infrastructure

Authorisation

The Rodney Local Board members have been consulted and asked to provide feedback regarding the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill 2018. This feedback is informal feedback, subject to retrospective approval at a business meeting on 24 May 2018.

Beth Houlbrooke
Chairperson
Rodney Local Board
Date: 23 May 2018

Contact Details

Name: Rodney Local Board, Auckland Council
Postal Address: C/- Kathryn Martin, Senior Local Board Advisor, Rodney Local Board, Auckland Council, Orewa Service Centre, Private Bag 92300 Auckland
Phone number: Kathryn Martin, Senior Local Board Advisor
Email contact: Kathryn.aloene.martin@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Upper Harbour Local Board

The Upper Harbour Local Board submission below was adopted on 17 May 2018, moved by Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Member J McLean. The resolution number is UH/2018/51.

Upper Harbour Local Board – Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill

Thank you for the opportunity for the Upper Harbour Local Board (the board) to provide comment on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill (the Bill) which amends the Local Government Act 2002 (the principal Act).

The board wishes to make the following comments on the content of the Bill.

Part 1 Reinstatement of 4 aspects of community well-being

Local government works in a constrained funding environment. There are always more projects being requested by the community than there are funds available to provide for them. In areas of growth, such as Auckland, the cost of creating new infrastructure has pushed council’s ability to fund to its limits, and it is near to the caps in its financial management policies. Conversely areas of declining population, face the problem of maintaining services with a shrinking revenue base.

If councils cannot meet their core requirements, then issues such as the 2016 Havelock North water quality failure become more likely.

The board believes that it is unwise to re-introduce the requirement “for local authorities to play a broad role in promoting the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of their communities” and repeal the requirement for “local authorities to play a broad role in meeting the current and future needs of their communities for good-quality infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions”.

The amendments to the principal Act’s sections 3, 10, 11, 14, 101 and the repeal of section 11A will create an environment which will allow local government licence to undertake a far wider range of activities than it currently can. These amendments will dilute the focus on the provision of core services and risks creating an environment where pet projects and pork barrel politics lead to poor decisions and substantial liabilities being incurred.

In the board’s view it would be imprudent to repeal the requirement expressed in section 10(1)(b) for local government to perform its functions “…in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses”. The board recommends that this part of section 10(1)b not be repealed.

In announcing a Productivity Commission inquiry into local government funding the Minister of Local Government said “Local government is facing a number of funding challenges which if not met will have consequences for our local communities and our country as a whole.” This inquiry acknowledges the financial management challenges faced by all local authorities. The board believes it would be preferable to defer enactment of Part 1 of the Bill until the Productivity Commission’s inquiry is complete. Once the inquiry is complete it will provide a much more robust evidence base within which to consider the amendments, set out in part one of the Bill, to the principal Act.

Part 2 Other Amendments

The board welcomes and supports the amendments proposed to sections 197, 198A and 200 of the principal Act. The proposed changes recognise the reality that new development requires appropriate council infrastructure and community facilities. In the board’s view it is appropriate that the ‘developer’ generating this demand contributes to meeting the capital costs that council must incur to support this increased demand.
Waitākere Ranges Local Board

Waitākere Ranges Local Board feedback on Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill

The Waitākere Ranges Local Board supports the proposed amendments of the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill and the specific intents as outlined below:

Proposed amendments:

- to reinstate the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities
- to restore the power to collect development contributions for a wider group of infrastructure projects.

And intents to:

- restore the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, taking a sustainable development approach
- restore territorial authorities’ power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed as a consequence of development; particularly noting the need for new communities to have equitable access to community infrastructure such as sports grounds, swimming pools and libraries in addition to community halls and open space
- make a minor technical modification to the development contributions power to allow territorial authorities to collect development contributions for projects financed through financial advances from the New Zealand Transport Authority.
Waitematā Local Board

Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill – Waitematā Local Board
Feedback May 2018

Local Boards are responsible for decision-making on local issues, activities and services as well as providing input into regional strategies, policies and plans.

These local issues, activities and services include:

- Supporting local arts, culture, events, sport and recreation
- Providing grants and partnering with local organisations to deliver community services
- Maintaining and upgrading town centres and facilities including parks, libraries and halls
- Caring for the environment and preserving heritage
- Representing the views of our communities on issues of local importance, and
- Supporting an innovative, productive and resilient local economy

Waitematā is experiencing a significant increase in population which brings diversity and opportunities to the area but also places increasing pressure and demand on resources, infrastructure, community facilities and the environment. It is critical that the council can keep pace with these demands and provide infrastructure, services, activities and community facilities that are efficient, effective and respond to anticipated future circumstances.

The Waitematā Local Board strongly supports all aspects currently included in the Bill. This includes those related to restoring the power of general competence and the four well-beings as the purpose of local government; as well as the provisions to restore the scope of development contributions to help fund community infrastructure and transport infrastructure provided by public bodies such as the New Zealand Transport Authority.

In principle democratically elected and accountable local authorities should have the same general powers as private individuals and companies and not be unnecessarily restricted as at present. The purpose of local government ought to be a strategic one to advance the interests of the area/district that the particular council has responsibility for rather than the small grab bag of limited roles and activities now set out in the Local Government Act. The previous purpose covering the four well-beings worked well and reduced the opportunities for undesirable litigation. The Waitematā Local Board supports the restoration of the four well-beings.

The provision of community infrastructure including community centres and halls, recreation centres, swimming pools and sporting facilities are equally as vital to a decent quality of life and a coherent community for greenfield suburbs, towns and brownfield intensification as roads water and wastewater reticulation are. Therefore, the clauses related to development contribution are also strongly supported in principle by the local board.

The local board continues to support including a legislative change to this Bill to provide the ability to review the total number of Governing Body members, as all other councils, even the smallest, can do. As the Local Government Act allows a maximum of 24 Councillors for any other Council it is entirely inappropriate to limit Auckland Council to 20. This eliminates the flexibility for which there is a compelling case at present for Auckland.

One of the reasons for seeking this change arose from allowing the genuine option of establishing a Māori ward, in that if a Māori ward was established, there could then only be 19 general members. Reducing to 19 members would be hugely disruptive of existing ward boundaries whereas retaining 20 general members would mean little disruption. The Governing Body should have the ability to increase the number of members if it so wished, so that a member elected through a Māori ward was an additional member.

Secondly the removal of the cap will provide flexibility in boundary drawing. This is required due to the uneven population growth in Auckland, particularly the Waitematā and Gulf Ward. Currently the
population to Councillor ratio exceeds the average by 43%. If the total number of Councillors continue to be limited to 20 this will generate a flow on effect to the boundaries of many existing wards. If an additional Councillor is to be permitted that Councillor could be added to the Waitematā and Gulf Ward with only a smallish boundary change required that will limit impacts to the slightly oversize ward of Orakei. No other change would be needed to other Ward boundaries.

The third matter is related to the alignment of ward boundaries and local board boundaries. This issue is pertinent to note that due to the significant population increase that Auckland has experienced four wards, including Waitematā and Gulf, do not comply with the 10 per cent rule. Due to the cap in the number of Governing Body members the only option to ensure the ward complies with the 10 per cent rule is to change the boundary, and this currently needs to flow on into the boundaries for at least six councillors. The consequence of re-drawing the ward boundaries would lead to the undesirable situation of ward and local board boundaries becoming unaligned. The legislation does not provide a process for addressing boundaries becoming unaligned due to the required general review of representation arrangements.

In some cases, unalignment between local board and ward boundaries is acceptable as it enables the local board boundaries to better conform to communities of interest than the corresponding ward boundaries. This is due to the requirements of ward boundaries to conform to the plus or minus 10% population to councillor rule. In other cases, experience has shown that tweaks to a boundary would better conform to communities of interests than the current boundary of both a ward and a local board.

The removal of the limit to Auckland Council Governing Body members should be made as soon as possible so that better options for the current representation review can be considered.

In summary the Waitematā Local Board supports:

1. restoring the purpose of local government to be to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, taking a sustainable development approach
2. restoring territorial authorities’ power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed because of development
3. broadening the definition of community infrastructure and amending the definition of terms related to the wellbeing aspects of the Local Government Act 2002
4. making a minor technical modification to the development contributions power to allow territorial authorities to collect development contributions for projects financed through financial advances from the New Zealand Transport Authority.
5. reiterating to central government the position adopted by Council in 2015 supporting the need for legislative change to allow Auckland to determine the number of members on the Governing Body
Memo
7 May 2018

To: Councillor Chris Darby – Chair of the Planning Committee
Councillor Penny Hulse – Chair of the Environment and Community Committee
Councillor Bill Cashmore – Chair of the Rural Advisory Panel

cc: Chair of the Rodney Local Board
Chair of the Waitakere Ranges Local Board
Chair of the Franklin Local Board
Chair of the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board
Chair of the Upper Harbour Local Board
Chair of the Mangere Otahuhu Local Board
Chair of the Papakura Local Board

From: Phill Reid, Manager Planning – Auckland-wide

Subject: Plan Update to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) (AUP)

1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this memo is to advise you that the Plans and Places Department are undertaking a plan update to align the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP) with the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017 (NESPF) which came into force on 1 May 2018.

2.0 National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry

The Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017 (NESPF) provide a new set of rules for new and existing forestry activities. From the 1 May all forestry activities included in the NESPF must comply with both the NESPF regulations and the relevant provisions in the Auckland Unitary Plan - Operative in Part (AUP), and/or the Auckland District Council Hauraki and Gulf Islands section - Operative 2013 (HGI).

The NESPF regulates plantation forestry and ancillary activities with rules that apply nationally. These regulations apply only to plantation forestry over 1 hectare, and only in rural zones. Under the NESPF, many activities are permitted without the need for resource consent, as long as relevant controls are met.

Where needed, applications for resource consent to undertake forestry activities under the NESPF will continue to be made to Auckland Council as the Unitary Authority.
3.0 Plan Update

Where a rule in the AUP is in conflict with, or duplicates matters in the NESPF, council is required by the Resource Management Act (RMA) to amend the plan as soon as practicable, and without using the public notification and submission process ordinarily required by the RMA for plan changes.

The NESPF allows the AUP to have rules which are more restrictive than the NESPF if those rules are:

- giving effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management;
- giving effect to certain parts of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement;
- recognising and providing for certain matters in section 6 of the RMA (such as outstanding natural landscapes and outstanding natural features); or
- managing unique and sensitive environments (such as sources of drinking water).

Rules in the AUP which manage activities and effects which are not addressed in the NESPF (i.e. effects on cultural and historic heritage) are not required to be amended and can be retained as they are currently.

The Plans and Places Department are undertaking an update to the AUP to amend plan rules for forestry activities in accordance with the requirements of the RMA. This will insert a reference to the NESPF regulations in relevant chapters, and include a note to clarify where the AUP rules may be more stringent than the NESPF regulations.

Some rules in the AUP will continue to apply, such as controlling forestry activities within Outstanding Natural Character overlays, and other rules which give effect to the matters where Council may be more stringent (such as those listed above).

A further amendment to the NESPF regulations was gazetted on 26 April 2018, which has amended the situations where councils may apply more stringent rules than the NESPF. While this has affected the planning response taken by some other councils nationally, it is not considered to alter the approach taken to align the AUP.

A further plan update to the Auckland District Plan – Hauraki and Gulf Islands section – Operative 2018 will be undertaken separately.

4.0 Consultation

The NESPF requires an update to the AUP to be undertaken without a notification or submission process, as is normally required by the RMA. Only changes that are required or a direct consequence of the NESPF will be made to the AUP.
Briefings and presentations have been provided to the Rural Advisory Panel and the Forestry Liaison Group throughout the preparation of this plan update.

The Resource Consents Department are also working on detailed guidance material which will enable their staff to understand and explain the implications of the NESP and where the rules intersect with the provisions of the AUP.

5.0 Local Board Impacts

The NESP only applies to forestry activities within rural zones in the AUP. In some zones and in precincts which those zones exist, there are local, specialised rules relating to forestry activities. Where Council is not expressly enabled by the NESP to have more stringent rules in the AUP, these rules will be overridden by the NESP regulations.

Existing rules in the AUP which are more stringent than the NESP will be retained, where the NESP allows this to occur. Some zones and precincts will have one or more overlays which give effect to the matters listed in section 3.0 above. In these cases the more stringent rules than the NESP will be retained. However, this may not be the case for an entire zone or precinct, or for all zones and precincts.

7.0 Māori Impact Statement

Forestry activities, particularly harvesting and earthworks, have the potential to adversely affect coastal environments, sensitive waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity and areas and sites of cultural and historic heritage.

Existing rules in the AUP which are more stringent than the NESP will be retained, where the NESP allows this to occur. This means that rules for forestry within overlays such as Significant Ecological Areas overlay, or in close proximity to the coastal marine area will continue to apply.

The NESP does not address effects on heritage sites and places, and as such, the existing AUP rules relating to forestry activities in Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua will continue to apply.

The NESP only applies to forestry activities within rural zones in the AUP, and will not apply within special purpose zones, such as the Special Purpose – Māori zone.

8.0 Next Steps

The NESP came into force on 1 May, and the regulations have been in effect since that date. The update to the AUP will be implemented in mid-May to clarify alignment with the NESP.
If you have any questions or enquiries regarding the plan update, please email the Unitary Plan inbox: unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.

A further plan update to the Auckland District Plan – Hauraki and Gulf Islands section – Operative 2018 will be undertaken separately and a brief memo will be provided at that time.

Yours faithfully,

Phill Reid
Manager Planning – Auckland-wide
Plans & Places Department
Planning Committee Auckland Plan Refresh Workshop 23

MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the briefing held in the Reception Lounge, Level 2, Auckland Town Hall on Thursday 3 May 2018 at 1.39pm.

PRESENT
Chairperson Cr Chris Darby
Cr Cathy Casey
Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore
Cr Linda Cooper
Cr Christine Fletcher
Cr Richard Hills
Cr Penny Hulse
Cr Mike Lee
IMSB Member Liane Ngamane
Cr Desley Simpson
Cr Wayne Walker
Cr John Watson
IMSB Member Glenn Wilcox

APOLOGIES
Cr Josephine Bartley
Cr Ross Clow
Cr Efeso Collins
Cr Alf Filipaina
Mayor Phil Goff
Cr Dick Quax
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Sharon Stewart
Cr John Walker

ABSENT
Cr Daniel Newman

ALSO PRESENT
Viv Beck
Shirin Brown
Brent Catchpole
Janet Clews
Leaupepe Ralph Elika

Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Chair
Waiheke Local Board Member
Papakura Local Board Chair
Seniors Advisory Panel Chair
Pacific Panel Advisory Panel Chair
Note: No decisions or resolutions may be made by a workshop, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.
### Purpose of workshop
- To receive an analysis of the feedback received on the Auckland Plan during consultation and discuss the implications for the final Auckland Plan.

### Declarations of Interest
- There were no declarations of interest.

### Workshop notes
The following topics were discussed and a PowerPoint presentation and supporting briefing reports were provided.

- National Policy Statement requirements (Development Strategy)
- Arts and culture / Sport and recreation
- Built heritage
- Monitoring framework (Targets)
- Māori Identity and Wellbeing

The workshop closed at 4.38pm.
Consultation is complete

- High level of engagement:
  - 18,742 written submissions
  - 5,865 in-person comments
- All feedback has been processed and reviewed
- ATAP and central government discussions also progressed
- Briefing reports developed to support decisions to finalise plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission type</th>
<th>Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online form</td>
<td>11,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's panel online form</td>
<td>2,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard copy form</td>
<td>4,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non form*</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,742</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Letter, email, pro forma
## Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7,656</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8,422</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diverse</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,228</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Diverse</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 +</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,228</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>11,603</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha/NZ European</td>
<td>10,696</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3,054</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Middle Eastern/Latin</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander/Kiwi</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,293</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider yourself part of the following communities?  

| Disability | 599 |
| Rainbow    | 762 |
### May workshops - Consideration of feedback and implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Briefing reports on:</th>
<th>Key topic discussion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 May</td>
<td>Transport and access participation</td>
<td>Sport and recreation / Arts and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development strategy</td>
<td>Built heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>NPS requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(including targets)</td>
<td>Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 May</td>
<td>Belonging and</td>
<td>Maori identity and wellbeing – Briefing report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homes and places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment and cultural heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity and prosperity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finalising the Auckland Plan 2050

Planning Committee workshops

Local board meetings (1-10 May)

Auckland Plan updated

28 May
Planning Committee workshop
- Consider the final plan

5 June
Planning Committee meeting
- Refer to Governing Body for adoption

27 June
Governing Body meeting
- Adoption

By 31 July
- Digital plan (website) updated
- Print version developed
- Translations completed
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Item 3a:
Discussion - National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity
3 May
Planning Committee workshop
Context

- The Auckland Plan Development Strategy sets out how Auckland will grow and change over the next 30 years
- The NPS on Urban Development Capacity requires high-growth councils to prepare a Future Development Strategy
- For Auckland, this requirement will be met through the Development Strategy in the Auckland Plan
NPS: UDC requirements

- High-growth councils must prepare a Future Development Strategy demonstrating sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term
- Informed by the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (HBDCA) for Auckland
- Demonstrate how the minimum targets for housing development capacity will be met

- Since November 2017
  - Detailed guidance released for the NPS
  - Auckland’s HBDCA completed and published
  - Targets agreed
  - Public feedback received
MfE Guidance

The guidance is extensive. The key areas we need to focus on are:

- Set minimum targets for feasible development capacity
- Housing and business development capacity assessment to demonstrate how any identified development capacity is sufficient and feasible
- Maps and tables outlining the location, timing, and sequencing of development capacity
- Identification of infrastructure required to support future development capacity
New information - HBDCA and Targets

- HBDCA indicates feasible capacity for approximately 326,000 homes

- Targets for development capacity for housing
  - Medium term 189,800
  - Long term 408,300
Consultation feedback

- Does the Unitary Plan enable enough capacity given the revised capacity assessments? (Housing New Zealand)
- Concern over population and housing growth projections - consistency (Ben Ross and Greater Auckland)
- Specific recommendations relating to meeting NPS requirements and Future Development Strategy (MfE/MBIE)
Changes required for final plan

- Include clear reference to minimum targets
- Explain how targets will be met
- Clearer information about infrastructure and infrastructure constraints
- More detail on location, timing and capacity over the medium and long term - updated tables
Specific changes

- Long term target of feasible development capacity for 408,300 dwellings
- HBDCA indicates feasible capacity approx. 326,000 – Shortfall of 82,000 in long-term
- Shortfall can be addressed through committed programmes:
  - Housing New Zealand / HLC programme
  - KiwiBuild/Urban Development Corporation
  - Panuku (direct actions and land aggregation and sales)
  - Planning decisions
  - Identified and funded public transport projects
  - Town centre improvements
  - Over time trends towards denser urban living
Specific changes

- Updated table to show balance of growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre and City Fringe</td>
<td>92,173</td>
<td>58,430</td>
<td>32,895</td>
<td>25,239</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td>53,859</td>
<td>111,755</td>
<td>17,426</td>
<td>43,692</td>
<td>43,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development areas</td>
<td>543,898</td>
<td>196,785</td>
<td>171,851</td>
<td>80,474</td>
<td>50,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining urban</td>
<td>812,024</td>
<td>143,990</td>
<td>271,762</td>
<td>73,304</td>
<td>62,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future urban area</td>
<td>38,284</td>
<td>175,737</td>
<td>13,249</td>
<td>71,272</td>
<td>75,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>135,571</td>
<td>143,990</td>
<td>50,416</td>
<td>23,679</td>
<td>53,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,665,809</td>
<td>189,185</td>
<td>557,419</td>
<td>317,661</td>
<td>286,011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers to be finalised
Specific changes

- Updated table for Nodes, Development Areas and Future Urban Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development at scale</th>
<th>Expected dwelling growth</th>
<th>Feasible capacity 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decade 1 (2018-2027)</td>
<td>Decade 2 (2028-2037)</td>
<td>Decade 3 (2038-2047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre and City Fringe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnybank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takapuna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Atatu Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Atatu South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avondale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lynn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitvale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Eden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers to be finalised
What next...

- Above changes will be included in the Development Strategy briefing report to be considered by Planning Committee 14 May
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Item 3b:
Discussion – feedback relating to arts and culture and sports and recreation

3 May
Planning Committee workshop
Arts and culture and sports and recreation

Context

Feedback requested more emphasis on arts and culture and sports, recreation and physical activity

Recommendation

New ‘Quality of life’ focus area that recognises a range of elements important to improving Aucklanders’ quality of life, focusing on arts, culture, sport and recreation
Arts and culture feedback

- Addressing arts and culture feedback overall today
- Feedback cuts across a range of outcomes:
  - Belonging and participation
  - Homes and places
  - Opportunity and prosperity
- All other feedback on these outcomes will be discussed on 10 May
Arts and culture feedback
- Belonging and participation outcome

Main feedback themes:

• lack of focus on arts and culture as a priority
  – include promotion of and proactive support for arts and culture
  – provide diverse opportunities to participate in and experience arts and culture

• recognise contribution of arts and culture to a vibrant Auckland

• recognise contribution of participating in arts and culture to belonging including health and wellbeing

• include cultural infrastructure alongside social infrastructure
Arts and culture as a priority

Feedback
There was a large number of comments requesting a new focus area that recognises:

- arts and culture as a priority with appropriate promotion and proactive support
- role that participation in arts and culture plays in:
  - building social capital and connection
  - enabling cultural expression, exchange and sharing
  - celebrating and overcoming of difference within our communities

Comment
Draft plan refers to providing opportunities for cultural expression and participation including the arts, and outlines the importance of social infrastructure in making this possible:

- helping people learn, socialise and connect with each other as well as providing venues for arts and cultural events.

Recommended action
New ‘quality of life’ focus area that recognises the role that participation in arts and cultural initiatives plays in enhancing our sense of belonging.
Arts and culture for a vibrant Auckland

Feedback

- Arts and culture makes important contribution to Aucklanders’ quality of life
- Events, community celebrations and participatory activities are vital to a culturally rich city and thriving communities, making Auckland a great place to live for residents/visitors

Comment

Research indicates that arts and culture contributes to city vibrancy

Recommended action

- New ‘quality of life’ focus area that recognises the role that participation in arts and cultural initiatives plays in enhancing our sense of belonging
Arts and culture infrastructure

Feedback
Include cultural infrastructure (e.g. museum, art galleries, amenities and programmes) alongside social infrastructure

Comment
• Narrative already recognises role of cultural infrastructure in enabling participation and providing venues for events
• More explicit reference to importance of cultural infrastructure may help to highlight its importance

Recommended action
Consider including ‘social and cultural infrastructure’ in the heading of focus area 2 and updating narrative to reference cultural infrastructure
Arts and culture feedback
- Homes and places outcome

Main feedback theme:

• Acknowledge role of public art in reflecting cultures and identities of Aucklanders
Role of public art

Feedback
Need to acknowledge role public art (experiences, objects) plays in reflecting cultures and identities of Auckanders within their environment

Comment
- Narrative already discusses need to reflect local character and heritage in public places as well as our unique Māori cultural identity
- Also discussed as part of placemaking

Recommended action
- Additional emphasis in Focus Area 5 to recognise public art as a function of placemaking and as part of our identity in the built environment
Arts and culture feedback
- Opportunity and prosperity outcome

Main feedback themes:

- Importance of creative economy
- Thriving arts and culture as an attractor
- Developing creative skills
Importance of creative economy

Feedback
Comments requesting:
- reference to importance of creative economy
- recognition of arts sector and creative industries as vital source of innovation, talent and entrepreneurial strategy

Comment
- Though significant nationally, Auckland creative sector ranks behind several others, e.g. 13th in employment and 8th in GDP/employee
- Additional narrative on contribution of creative sector to innovation
- More explicitly acknowledge role of Auckland creative sector nationally

Recommended action
- Consider additional wording for emphasis in Direction 1
- Add a link to 2017 report on the creative sector
Thriving arts and culture as an attractor

Feedback
Comments suggesting stronger emphasis on the role a thriving arts and culture environment plays in attracting and retaining talent in the city

Comment
• Some reference to this in Direction 2
• Additional emphasis on how a strong arts and cultural environment with plentiful opportunities to participate creates a vibrant city that attracts people

Recommended action
Consider additional wording in Direction 2 to emphasise the role of arts and culture as an attractor
Developing creative skills

Feedback
1. Need to build skills and capability of Auckland’s creative talent
2. Provide better opportunities for young people to learn how to think and act creatively

Comment
1. Skill building and focus on young people is a fundamental component of this outcome. Could be additional emphasis in Direction 2 on growing creative skills and capacity to create a vibrant city
2. Opportunities for young people to develop their creative thinking skills already referenced in Focus Area 5

Recommended action
1. Consider additional wording for Direction 2 re growing creative skills and capacity to create a vibrant city
2. No change
Summary of proposed changes

Belonging and participation – new focus area
  • ‘Quality of life’ focus area recognising broader value of arts and culture to improving Aucklanders’ quality of life

Belonging and participation – within focus area 2.
  • include reference to cultural infrastructure in heading and narrative

Homes and places – additional wording (overview)
  • recognise public art as a function of place making and as part of our identity in the built environment

Opportunity and prosperity - Direction 1 - additional wording and hyperlink
  • acknowledge contribution of creative sector to innovation and link to sector report

Opportunity and prosperity - Direction 2 – revision and additional wording
  • clarify and emphasise how a strong arts and cultural environment with opportunities to participate creates a vibrant city that attracts people
  • include reference to growing creative skills and capacity to create a vibrant city
Sports and recreation feedback

- Addressing sports and recreation feedback overall today
  - Feedback cuts across two outcomes:
    - Belonging and participation
    - Homes and places
- All other feedback on these outcomes will be discussed on 10 May
Sports and recreation feedback

- Belonging and participation outcome

Main feedback themes:

- lack of focus on sports, recreation and physical activity as a priority
- recognise wider value of sport and recreation and multiple benefits it offers
- recognise vital role sport and recreation play in our communities and contribution it makes to social wellbeing and health of Aucklanders/communities
- need for more emphasis on access to high quality facilities to fulfil current and future needs
- sport and recreation are an important part of what makes Auckland a great place to live/imporant for a vibrant city
Sports and recreation as a priority

Feedback
A large number of comments requesting a new focus area that recognises the role of participation in sports, recreation and physical activity in supporting social cohesion and creating an inclusive Auckland

Comment
Draft plan recognises participation in sport brings people together and helps people connect but does not include a specific sports and recreation focus area

Recommended action
Consider new ‘quality of life’ focus area - provide accessible opportunities for current and future Aucklanders to participate in physical activities, sport and recreation
Sports and recreation facilities

Feedback
A large number of comments on the need for continued investment in sports and recreation facilities and sports grounds/parks/open spaces to fulfil current needs and those of a growing and diverse population

Comment
- Sports and recreation services and facilities included in definition of social infrastructure in focus area 2
- Participants noted collaboration across sports sector for efficient use of existing facilities and the need to prioritise investment
- A range of solutions proposed to implement current plans (LTP)

Recommended action
- Consider adding emphasis on fit for purpose facilities and spaces to enable Aucklanders to live active, healthy lives within proposed new focus area
Contribution of sports and recreation to a vibrant Auckland

Feedback
A range of comments on the contribution of sport, recreation and physical activity to Aucklanders’ social wellbeing and to healthy, vibrant, connected communities

Comment
Health is already recognised as an important aspect of quality of life and wellbeing, but the relationship to sport and recreation could be more explicit

Recommended action
• New ‘quality of life’ focus area that recognises importance of participation in sport and recreation
Sports and recreation feedback
– Homes and places outcome

Main feedback themes
• Provide more emphasis on the role of public spaces for sport and recreation
• Value of green spaces and outdoor activities in promoting physical activity

Comment
• Draft plan recognises sports fields, parks and greenways provide opportunities for Aucklanders to interact and connect (Direction 4, Focus Area 5)
• More emphasis could be given to sport and recreation in relation to green spaces

Recommended action:
Consider adding emphasis on sport and recreation in relation to green spaces
Summary of proposed changes

- **Belonging and participation – new focus area**
  - new ‘Quality of life’ focus area recognising broader value of sports, recreation and physical activity to improving Aucklanders’ quality of life

- **Homes and places - Direction 4 - additional emphasis**
  - recognising the role of public spaces for sport and recreation
What ‘quality of life’ focus area could include

- Direction 2 of Belonging and Participation encompasses health and wellbeing - quality of life is an important aspect

- Evidence that participating in arts, culture, sports and recreation improves self-esteem, confidence and perceived life satisfaction/quality of life

- Arts, culture, sports and recreation create strong and cohesive communities by fostering identity and pride, building social connection and increasing our sense of belonging

- Providing increased opportunities for all Aucklanders to access, participate and experience arts, culture, sport and recreation, as part of their everyday lives, enhances quality of life

- Being a culturally rich and active city is essential if Auckland is to continue to be a desirable place to live
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Item 3c:
Discussion – Built heritage

3 May
Planning Committee workshop
Environment and cultural heritage Feedback

Unprecedented growth has required Auckland to provide for essential development, which has had an impact on our environment and cultural heritage. The Auckland Plan proposes utilising every opportunity to protect and enhance Auckland’s environment as growth and development happens.

Do you think the six focus areas identified in Environment and Cultural Heritage will achieve this?
Environment and cultural heritage

Feedback

- Of the ~15,000 submissions received, only 30% of submitters (~4,500) provided additional comments on the Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome to inform specific revisions to the draft.
Environment and Cultural Heritage
Feedback

- Heritage-related submissions formed a relatively small proportion of comments on the Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome
- A number regional stakeholders held strong views on built heritage
- A small number of heritage-related submissions were identified in other outcomes and in the 10 Year Budget submissions
Environment and Cultural Heritage
Feedback

- ~300 heritage-related submissions were identified within the Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome submissions
- These submissions covered the breadth of submission responses (Yes, No, Partially Agree and Other)
Heritage-Related Submissions:
Key Themes

Built Heritage

~1/3 of heritage-related comments refer specifically to ‘built’ heritage. These comments however fall broadly into two distinct perspectives:

• Lack of protection for built heritage. Focus provided in previous Auckland Plan has been lost

• Heritage should not limit the construction of critical infrastructure or obstruct growth/intensification

Importance of Cultural Heritage

• Auckland’s cultural heritage (not just built heritage, but inclusive of broader aspects such as Māori heritage and natural heritage) is an important part of our identity and should be preserved

Too much focus on Heritage

• Too much focus on heritage, the outcome should be limited to the protection and restoration of the natural environment
Built Heritage

Feedback

- Lack of protection for built heritage. Focus provided in previous Auckland Plan has been lost
- Heritage should not limit the construction of critical infrastructure or obstruct growth/intensification

Comment

The Auckland Plan sets the vision for Auckland, the Unitary Plan provides protection for specific aspects such as heritage.

- Heritage and development can co-exist, and heritage buildings are an important contributor to a quality compact urban form
- The focus on built heritage sits best in the Homes and Places outcome

Recommended Action

- Provide additional focus on built heritage within Homes and Places outcome, as a contributor to a quality compact urban form
Importance of Cultural Heritage

Feedback

• Auckland’s cultural heritage (not just limited to buildings, but inclusive of broader aspects such as Māori heritage and natural heritage) is an important part of our identity and should be preserved.

Comment

• The link between the natural environment and our shared cultural heritage is an underpinning theme in the reshaping of the Auckland Plan 2050’s approach to environmental protection.

• This link is also recognised across other submissions on the outcome however clarity on the important connection between these aspects would be beneficial.

Recommended Actions

• Retain broad cultural heritage definition and focus of Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome.

• Provide further context on importance of cultural and built heritage within Belonging and Participation Outcome
Too much focus on Heritage

Feedback

• There is too much focus on heritage, the outcome should be limited to the protection and restoration of the natural environment.

• Submitters raised examples of degraded natural environments or environmental topics/issues they would like to see receive additional focus.

Comment

Placing the focus on ‘built heritage’ within the Homes and Places Outcome allows greater emphasis to be placed on the ‘natural’ environment in this outcome.

• Other feedback (both related specifically to heritage and for the outcome more broadly) suggests the environment-people link should remain core to this outcome.

Recommended Actions

• Emphasise the ‘natural’ (versus built) environment focus of this outcome.

• Provide further context on importance of cultural and built heritage (e.g. Heritage Festival) within Belonging and Participation Outcome.
Summary of Proposed Changes

Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcome
  • Retain current broad definition of ‘cultural heritage’
  • Provide clarity on ‘natural environment’ rather than ‘built environment’ focus.

Homes and Places Outcome
  • Provide additional focus on built heritage within Homes and Places outcome, as a contributor to a quality compact urban form

Belonging and Participation Outcome
  • Provide further context on importance of cultural and built heritage within Belonging and Participation Outcome.
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Item 3d: Discussion – Monitoring Framework

3 May Planning Committee workshop
Feedback

1. Supported the 33 measures with suggestions of additional measures
2. Need goals/targets to track progress
3. Need to set aspirational targets
Discussion

Option 1:
- 33 measures reported annually
- Use targets set outside the Plan as part of 3-yearly report

3-yearly deep dive report
Examples of targets set outside Auckland Plan that could measure rate of progress:
- LTP
- Central Government/Council joint targets (ATAP, NPSUDC)
- Strategies and Plans
- Benchmarks

Additional data sets used
33 measures
Annual Scorecard
Handout


Discussion

Option 2:
- Option 1, plus small set of aspirational targets
- Run process to determine targets and where they best sit
- Developed with key stakeholders responsible for delivery

Focus of targets:
- Housing
- Transport
- Environment

- Would need work with Central Government to agree
- Unlikely to achieve by end May
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Item 4: Discussion – Māori identity and wellbeing

3 May
Planning Committee workshop
Overview

- Strong engagement with the Māori identity and wellbeing outcome
- Māori participation rate (10%), a large increase from 2015 LTP
- Consultation question on advancing Māori wellbeing
  - 14,935 written submissions, 810 in person, 3 social media feedback
- CCO feedback – ATEED only
- Written submissions (14,935)
  - 45% agree
  - 26% partially agree
  - 25% no
  - 3% comment (no response)
  - Of the 14,935 submissions, 26% provided commentary
- In person (810)
  - 25% agree
  - 15% partially agree
  - 13% no
  - 47% comment (no categorisation)
Feedback – key themes

• General comments of support for the outcome/focus areas
  – Particularly focus areas 1, 3, 6 (children and young people doing well, use of te Reo and showcasing/celebrating Māori culture)

• Qualified support in the ‘partial’ category, as well as new themes (e.g. critical role of education in Māori advancement) and the importance of effective implementation of the focus areas

• Overarching theme that outcome was not reflecting an inclusive approach in Auckland as a multicultural and diverse city, and focusing on one ethnic group over others should not be supported

• Detail provided in Attachment 1
Other feedback

- Mana whenua submissions generally expressed good support for the outcome
  - Common theme being the importance of engagement, relationships and a partnership approach
- Regional stakeholder submissions generally expressed good support for the outcome
- CCO feedback – outcome aligns to ATEED’s strategy
- Detail provided in Attachments 2 and 3
Discussion

- Limited substantive changes to outcome recommended given:
  - general support expressed for outcome and focus areas (45%) and few specific suggested changes/amendments to focus areas
  - feedback theme is:
    - already adequately addressed within outcome, or elsewhere within the Plan itself
    - general across all outcome areas of the Plan and is being addressed through the Overview report
    - not in the scope of the Plan to resolve or address
    - out of the scope of the Plan itself, being broad-ranging project/operational/funding and implementation requests or commentary.
Proposed changes

- Overarching theme – not an inclusive approach
  - Propose new text in front section of the Plan which notes the diversity of Auckland, the recognition of Māori as the indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand, Treaty of Waitangi as the nation’s founding document and local government obligations which are specific to Māori

- Clarification of terms to make clearer/more consistent
  - Intergenerational wealth – write definition into text of focus area itself
  - Rangatira – proposed text amendments/updates to glossary

- Detail provided in Attachment 4
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MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the briefing held in the Reception Lounge, Level 2, Auckland Town Hall on Thursday 10 May 2018 at 1.33pm.

PRESENT
Chairperson Cr Chris Darby  
Cr Josephine Bartley  
Cr Cathy Casey  
Cr Ross Clow  
IMSB Member Tau Henare  
Cr Richard Hills  
Cr Mike Lee  
Cr Daniel Newman  
Cr Desley Simpson  
From 1.47pm (on council business)
From 1.58pm, until 4.07pm
Until 3.07pm
From 1.46pm
From 1.37pm

APOLOGIES
Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore  
Cr Efeso Collins  
Cr Linda Cooper  
Cr Alf Filipaina  
Mayor Phil Goff  
Cr Penny Hulse  
IMSB Member Liane Ngamane  
Cr Dick Quax  
Cr Greg Sayers  
Cr Sharon Stewart  
Cr Wayne Walker  
Cr John Watson  
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business
For leave of absence
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business

ABSENT
Cr Christine Fletcher  
Cr John Walker

ALSO PRESENT
Janet Clews  
Angela Fulljames  
Sally Hughes  
Veisinia Maka  
Amy Malcolm  
Seniors Advisory Panel Chair, until 4.22pm
Franklin Local Board Chair, until 3.02pm
Heritage Advisory Panel Deputy Chair
Youth Advisory Panel Chair, until 3.27pm
Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Member
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Northey</td>
<td>Waitemata Local Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan O'Connor</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Member, until 4.25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Patston</td>
<td>Disability Advisory Panel Chair, until 4.17pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Paul</td>
<td>Youth Advisory Panel Member, until 2.40pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
<td>Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board Chair, until 2.34pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** No decisions or resolutions may be made by a workshop, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.
### Purpose of workshop
- To receive an analysis of the feedback received on the Auckland Plan during consultation and discuss the implications for the final Auckland Plan.

### Declarations of Interest
- There were no declarations of interest.

### Workshop notes
The following topics were discussed and a PowerPoint presentation and supporting briefing reports were provided.
- Homes and places
- Environment and cultural heritage
- Opportunity and prosperity
- Transport and access

The workshop closed at 4.31pm.
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Auckland Plan 2050

10 May
Planning Committee workshop

Item 1: Discussion – Homes and Places
Homes and Places question

Lack of affordable housing is creating stress for many Aucklanders. It is driving some key workers out of Auckland and limiting our ability to attract and retain talent. The Auckland Plan proposes that all Aucklanders deserve healthy, affordable homes with secure tenure in well-designed places, whether they own or rent their homes.

Do you think the five focus areas identified in Homes and Places will achieve this?
Overview

- Overall numbers
  - 15,325 written submissions, 8,419 feedback points
  - 563 in person, 5 social media feedback
- CCO feedback – Panuku, RFA, ATEED, Auckland Transport
- Written submissions (15,325)
  - 38% agree
  - 40% partially agree
  - 20% no
  - 2% commentary, but a no response
- In person (563)
  - 50% agree
  - 16% partially agree
  - 11% no
  - 23% comment (no categorisation)
Feedback key themes

- Housing affordability
- Quality built environment/Placemaking
- Housing supply
- Quality of housing
- Renting
- Dwelling types
- Safe/Stable homes
- Tenure
- General
Feedback key themes

Housing affordability
- support for addressing housing affordability
- increasing housing stress, fewer able to buy or afford rentals
- households making trade-offs to live in and remain in Auckland

Housing supply
- support for quality development at scale
- more typologies – apartments, townhouses, inter-generational and communal housing
- quicker, more cost effective, innovative building approaches needed

Quality built environment
- well designed, accessible urban environments and public places
- support for placemaking and incorporating our unique histories and cultural identities in the built environment
Feedback key themes

Quality Housing
- current housing is of poor quality (damp, no insulation), especially rentals
- need better designed, accessible dwellings
- minimum quality standards for new housing and developments needed

Renting
- not a safe, secure, healthy housing option
- paradigm shift needed for renting as a viable choice
- support for warrant of fitness

Tenure
- greater range of tenure types and ownership models needed

Māori housing aspirations
- strong, polarised views
- opposition to elevating one group over another
- support for Māori housing aspirations, including papakāinga housing
Summary

- Overall support for Homes and Places outcome
- Consistent support for
  - FA1 accelerate quality development at scale that improves housing choice
  - FA5 create urban spaces for the future
- Mismatch between yes/no/partial response and comments
- Partial or no support
  - too late to fix the housing crisis
  - clarification of council and central government role
  - impact on rates
- Other feedback
  - general across all outcome areas of the plan
  - already adequately addressed
  - out of scope of the plan
Proposed changes to directions

D1: Develop a quality compact urban form to accommodate Auckland’s growth
  • add text about leveraging off existing infrastructure investments
  • add text about well designed, quality developments and new housing

D2: Accelerate the construction of homes that meet Aucklanders’ changing needs and preferences
  • add text about the need to consider a broader range of housing typologies
  • add text about accessible homes and developments
  • add text about good quality housing

D3: Shift to a housing system that ensures secure and affordable homes for all
  • further emphasise the impacts of the housing affordability crisis
  • explain how affordability is defined

D4: Provide sufficient public places and spaces that are inclusive, accessible and contribute to urban living
  • add text to highlight that quality of our public places play a role in our urban form
Proposed changes to focus areas

FA1: Accelerate quality development at scale that improves housing choices
- additional text about how quality refers to all development and housing, including new housing

FA4: Invest in and support Māori to meet their specific housing aspirations
- add text in the introduction regarding the purpose of the focus area
- add text regarding te ao Māori
- recognition of papakāinga and whānau oriented housing
- replace text “Interventions could include” with “Ways to address this could include”
Proposed changes to focus areas

FA5: Create urban spaces for the future, focusing investment in areas of highest population density and greatest need

- give more emphasis to public places and placemaking for all of Auckland
- remove the text “,focusing investment in areas of highest population density and greatest need” from the focus area title to clarify that the focus area is about urban spaces for all of Auckland
- add emphasis on sport and recreation in relation to green spaces
- add text about incorporating public art and built heritage into the built environment through placemaking to reflect our unique history and cultural identities
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10 May
Planning Committee workshop
Overview

- Environment and Cultural Heritage consultation question
  - 14,949 written submissions, 470 in person

- CCO feedback – ATEED and RFA

- Written submissions (14,949)
  - 54% agree
  - 34% partially agree
  - 11% no
  - 1% comment (no response)

- In person (810)
  - 40% agree
  - 9% partially agree
  - 10% no
  - 41% comment (no categorisation)
Overview

- Of the ~15,000 submissions received, only 30% of submitters (~4,500) provided additional comments on the Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome to inform specific revisions to the draft.
Feedback – key themes

- How?
- Other
- Education
- Green Spaces
- Costs
- Heritage
- Climate Change
- Trees
- Water
- Waste
Feedback – key themes

Three broad groupings:

- Implementation and delivery of the Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcome
- Specific topics of interest
- Challenges and opportunities to delivering the outcome
Feedback – key themes

• Implementation and delivery of the Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcome
  – How the outcome will be achieved; further detail needed on specific programmes and actions to support the focus areas and directions;
  – More specific and aspirational targets; and
  – How the actions would be funded.

• Specific topics of interest
  – Waste, including plastics, recycling and litter
  – Water, including the marine environment and harbours
  – Climate change
  – Trees and green space
  – Heritage
  – Green infrastructure/green technology
  – Tūpuna Maunga
Feedback – key themes

• Challenges and opportunities to delivering the outcome
  – The role of education in delivering the outcomes sought;
  – Acknowledgement that environmental protection needs to be the responsibility of all Aucklanders;
  – Concerns that environmental pressures will continue if Auckland’s population continues to rise;
  – Questions as to whether this is council’s core responsibility; and
  – A lack of confidence that Council will able to deliver this outcome as it has not proved it can do this previously.

• Detail provided in outcome briefing report.
Proposed changes

Targets and Measures

• Submissions seeking more specific and aspirational targets to be included in outcome.

• Updates to measures, targets and monitoring framework as discussed in previous workshop, also:

  R1. Provide additional reference and links from the strategic directions of this outcome to the measures section of the plan.
R3. Additional text proposed (see attachment)

Change and waste:
- Topics of concern raised in consultation, e.g., trees, climate
- Provide linkage of Auckland Plan Focus Areas/Directions to

R2. Amend the environmental risks and opportunities map to

- Respond to technical requests on map contents:

Specific Topic Areas

Proposed changes
Proposed changes

Climate Change

• Reinforce climate impacts and implications within Focus Areas and Directions:

  \textit{R4. – R6. Additional text proposed (see attachment)}

Population Growth

• Reiterate recognition of population growth as key challenge being addressed through the Plan:

  \textit{R7. – R9. Additional text proposed (see attachment)}
Proposed changes

Waste

- Highlight ongoing waste-related actions through linkage to Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, and via addition to relevant Focus Area:

  R10. Additional text proposed (see attachment)
Proposed changes

Heritage

• Clarify natural environment and cultural heritage focus of outcome:

**R11.** Where the term ‘environment’ appears in the outcome, be explicit on when the outcome is referring to the ‘natural environment’ or environments more broadly, e.g.:

*Focus Area 1: Encourage all Aucklanders to be stewards of the natural environment, and to make sustainable choices*

**R12.** Amend Direction 1 to better reflect and incorporate the cultural heritage component of the outcome, e.g.:

*Direction 1: Ensure Auckland’s natural environment and cultural heritage is valued and cared for*
Auckland Plan 2050
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10 May
Planning Committee workshop
Overview

- Strong engagement with the Opportunity and Prosperity outcome
- Consultation question on equipping people for future jobs
  - 14,279 written submissions, 885 in person
- CCO feedback: ATEED, RFA, AT and COMET Auckland
- Written submissions (14,279)
  - 49% agree
  - 33% partially agree
  - 16% no
  - 2% comment only
  - Of the 14,279 submissions, 25% provided commentary
- In person (885)
  - 16% agree
  - 7% partially agree
  - 5% no
  - 72% general comments
Feedback – key themes

- General support for the principles underpinning the outcome/focus areas except for Focus Area 3 – *Advance Māori employment and support Māori business and iwi organisations to be significant drivers of Auckland’s economy*

- Strong focus on the immediate challenges facing Auckland:
  - General impacts of growth on infrastructure
  - Effectiveness of the current education system
  - Current skill shortages
  - Impacts of housing costs, congestion on retaining and attracting workers

- What is Council’s role in addressing the big issues?

- Detail provided in Attachment 1 – Summary of public feedback
Other feedback

• Greater emphasis needs to be placed on the broader benefits of the creative sector

• People desire more local jobs in their local areas

• Focus Area 3 – Advance Māori employment……was perceived as being preferential to Māori

• CCO feedback – Generally supportive although greater emphasis on the visitor economy (ATEED) and the creative sector (RFA) should be considered

• Detail provided in Attachment 2 – Summary of CCO feedback
Summary

- Limited substantive changes to outcome recommended given:
  - feedback themes are:
    - already adequately addressed within outcome, or elsewhere within the Plan itself
    - general across all outcome areas of the Plan and is being addressed through the Overview report
    - not in the scope of the Plan to resolve or address
  - Changes to the outcome are primarily for clarification or expansion of an already identified theme
Proposed changes

- Skills and Training – Increased emphasis on current needs (FA5)
- Employment – Highlight the need for a more systems based approach (D3)
- Creative Sector – Highlight the broader benefits (D1, D2)
- Local jobs for local people – Clarification of how approach taken will increase access to jobs (D1)
- Focus on Māori – Clarify the win-win for Auckland as a result of the focus area (D3, FA3)
- Green-economy- Specifically reference importance (D1)
- Cyber security – Specifically reference (FA1)
- Visitor economy – Reference importance through AKL 2025 Destination Auckland (FA 4)
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Discussion – Transport and Access
10 May
Planning Committee workshop
Overview

- Strong engagement with the Transport and Access outcome, with a rich source of feedback

- Consultation question on *Moving Easily Around Auckland*
  - 15,821 written submissions and 530 in person feedback

  - Written submissions (15,821)
    - Nearly 12,000 provided commentary (75%)

  - In person (530)
    - 32% agree
    - 14% partially agree
    - 12% disagree
    - 41% comment (commentary only)

- CCO feedback
  - Auckland Transport, ATEED, Panuku, COMET Auckland
Feedback Summary

Public submissions

- A high level of support for the Transport and Access outcome, particularly around the shift from private cars to public transport, walking and cycling (“Yes”)
- A significant proportion wanted to see even more ambition in the shift towards public transport, walking and cycling (“Partial”)
- A small proportion felt we were being too ambitious and should instead focus on current reality (“No”)
- See Attachment One – Summary of public feedback received

Key stakeholder feedback

- Overall strong support, with specific focus on safety, equity, and congestion
- See Attachment Two – Summary of other public feedback received

CCO feedback

- Broad support overall, with most feedback from Auckland Transport
- See Attachment Three – Summary of CCO feedback received
ATAP and GPS

- Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) update
  - Greater weight on:
    - public transport (especially rapid transit),
    - walking and cycling
    - improving safety
    - realising environmental, health and growth outcomes.

- Government Policy Statement on land transport (GPS)
  - Four strategic directions:
    - safety
    - access
    - environment
    - value for money
Summary of recommended changes

There are no fundamental changes to the direction of the outcome:

- Overall strong support for the outcome
- Some key concerns from feedback will be:
  - Addressed through other reports (e.g. targets in Monitoring Framework report)
  - Sit outside the Auckland Plan’s scope (e.g. limiting population growth)
  - Not accepted as it contradicts the evidence base (e.g. not allocating road space to bus or cycle lanes)

However, we recommend a number of changes to improve the text:

- Reflecting feedback on a specific issues
  - PT affordability, park & ride, personal security, freight, congestion, parking
- Simplify and improve the readability of the text
  - Simplified Direction 1 & Focus Area 1 & 5 headings to remove jargon
  - General wording changes to improve readability
- Better align the Plan with ATAP and the GPS
  - Funding, network optimisation, mode neutrality, rapid transit
Overall transport vision

Feedback
1. Significant support for the overall transport vision.
2. Main concerns related to:
   - A desire for key projects to be built faster
   - A greater focus on improving existing networks before new projects are built
   - A range of feedback on road pricing (unfair vs necessary)
   - Whether value for money is being achieved from transport investment

Recommended changes
1. Update the “About Transport and Access” (front end) section:
   - Align transport funding text with updated ATAP (i.e. no longer a funding gap)
   - Make language improvements to improve clarity and readability of this section
Public transport

Feedback
1. Significant feedback on the public transport system, particularly around:
   - Making PT faster, cheaper, and more frequent, reliable and extensive
   - The need for more park and rides
2. Smaller number of comments showing preference for certain modes, e.g. ferries, feeder buses, light rail.

Recommended changes
1. Make changes to Focus Area 4:
   - Include references to PT affordability and park and rides
   - Place greater emphasis on the rapid transit network and show that it is supported by other PT networks, to better align with ATAP and the GPS
   - Explicitly highlight why there needs to be a focus on improving PT to major centres
   - Improve readability and clarity of the text
2. Make changes to Focus Area 2 to refer to the importance of mode neutrality (using the right tool for the job) as prioritised in the GPS.
3. Reflect ATAP’s focus on rapid transit by including supporting information text about Rapid Transit Network (expands existing text on the Northern Busway).
Roading

Feedback

Key submission points included:

- Build more roads and maximise traffic flow for cars (i.e. not allocating any more road space to other uses such as cycle lanes and bus lanes). This feedback generally came from the 14% of submissions not supporting the Plan's direction.
- Encourage behavioural changes on the road network to make better use of existing network.
- Make explicit references to freight and congestion management.

Recommended changes

1. Make changes to Focus Area 1:
   - Simplify heading to **Make better use of existing transport networks**
   - Provide more detail on how we might make better use of existing networks, i.e. greater emphasis on network optimisation as prioritised in ATAP.
   - Refer to travel planning, parking policies and more flexible working hours to reflect feedback received.

2. Update Focus Area 2 to clarify why we need to focus first on most severe transport challenges.

3. Elaborate on freight and congestion management throughout the text.
Cycling & Walking

Feedback
1. This theme included quite polarising feedback between:
   - Those who wanted safer and better connected cycling infrastructure
   - Those who felt too much was being spent on cycling, and that Auckland was too hilly / rainy / unsafe for cycling to be a viable option
2. A smaller amount of feedback was also received to:
   - Relax regulatory barriers to make cycling more attractive
   - Promote the health benefits of walking and cycling, including by putting quality infrastructure in areas of high deprivation

Recommended changes
1. Update Focus Area 6 to refer to the greater safety risks that cyclists and pedestrians face.
2. Update the supporting information text on “Equitable transport access across Auckland” and “Making Auckland more cycle friendly” to refer to the need to increase walking and cycling opportunities as low-cost travel options.
Environment & Safety

Feedback
1. Most of the comments around the environment support the move towards PT, walking and cycling as necessary to reduce transport emissions.
2. Feedback around safety was mixed and includes:
   - Those who believe Vision Zero was not practical
   - Others calling for Vision Zero to be implemented more quickly
   - Those calling for the Plan to refer to personal safety while travelling

Recommended changes
1. Update Direction 3 and Focus Area 6:
   - Place greater emphasis on safety to better align the Plan with the GPS
   - Expand the concept of safety to include personal safety while travelling, particularly to encourage the greater use of walking, cycling and public transport.

2. Stronger wording in Focus Area 7 (“...the need to progressively eliminate transport emissions”) to reflect the GPS’s stronger focus on carbon neutrality.
3. Update Transport and Access tagline to: Aucklanders will be able to get to where they want to go more easily, safely and sustainably to better align with ATAP and the GPS.
Access to opportunities

Feedback
Key submission points included:
– Reducing the need to travel in the first place, such as through better land use and transport integration
– Ensuring that required transport links are put in place before future urban areas are developed
– Focusing new housing around transport links, particularly public transport

Recommended changes
1. Simplify the heading of Direction 1 to: **Better connect people, places, goods, and services.**
2. Make changes to Focus Area 5:
   – Simplify heading to **Better integrate land use and transport**
   – Emphasise that good land use and transport integration can help to reduce travel distances
   – Showcase how unlocking growth around rapid transit corridors and stations can address Auckland’s housing and transport challenges, to reflect prioritisation in ATAP and the GPS
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MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the briefing held in Room 1, Level 26, 135 Albert Street, Auckland on Monday 14 May 2018 at 10.04am.

PRESENT
Chairperson Cr Chris Darby
Cr Cathy Casey
Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore
Cr Ross Clow
Cr Linda Cooper
Cr Alf Filipaina
Cr Penny Hulse
Cr Desley Simpson
Cr John Walker
From 10.13am, until 11.30am
From 10.54am
Until 12pm
From 10.17am

APOLOGIES
Cr Josephine Bartley
Cr Efeso Collins
Cr Christine Fletcher
IMSB Member Tau Henare
Cr Richard Hills
Mayor Phil Goff
Cr Mike Lee
IMSB Member Liane Ngamane
Cr Dick Quax
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Sharon Stewart
Cr Wayne Walker
Cr John Watson
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business
On council business

ABSENT
Cr Daniel Newman

ALSO PRESENT
Viv Beck
Janet Clews
Ralph Elika
Julie Fairley
Angela Fulljames
Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Chair
Seniors Advisory Panel Chair
Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel Chair
Puketapapa Local Board Deputy Chair
Franklin Local Board Chair
Cath Handley  Waiheke Local Board Chair
Veisinia Maka    Youth Advisory Panel Chair
Richard Northe   Waitemata Local Board Member
Julie Radford-Poupard Rainbow Advisory Panel Co-Chair
Jade Tang-Taylor Ethnic Advisory Panel Deputy Chair

Note: No decisions or resolutions may be made by a workshop, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.
**Purpose of workshop**
- To receive an analysis of the feedback received on the Auckland Plan during consultation and discuss the implications for the final Auckland Plan.

**Declarations of Interest**
- There were no declarations of interest.

**Workshop notes**
The following topics were discussed and a PowerPoint presentation and supporting briefing reports were provided.
- Belonging and participation
- Development strategy

It was agreed changes and amendments to the plan incorporating feedback from Local boards and workshops on 3 May, 10 May and 14 May will be discussed at the planning committee workshop on 28 May. Due to time, the Other feedback (including targets) was not discussed. This material will now be incorporated into the discussion on the whole plan at the 28 May workshop.

The workshop closed at 12.06pm.
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Item 2: Development strategy
Item 3: Other feedback (including targets)
Item 4: Next steps
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Item 1: Belonging and Participation

14 May
Planning Committee workshop
Belonging and Participation question

In a fast-growing city of increasing diversity and social change, people may or may not feel included or enjoy positive life experiences. The Auckland Plan proposes an inclusive Auckland where people live together with trust and mutual respect and everyone has the opportunity to participate to their full potential.

Do you think the five focus areas identified in Homes and Places will achieve this?
Overview

- Overall numbers
  - 14,855 written submissions, 3,354 feedback points
  - 1,145 in person, 1 social media feedback
- CCO feedback – RFA, ATEED
- Written submissions
  - 51% agree
  - 32% partially agree
  - 15% no
  - 2% comment only
- In person
  - 55% agree
  - 8% partially agree
  - 5% no
  - 32% comment only
Feedback key themes

General

• Support need to address inclusion and sense of belonging
• Important given Auckland’s multi-cultural nature
• Other more important issues to address
• Too high level - implementation
Feedback key themes

Health

- More focus on public health, mental health, physical wellbeing and community safety
- Investment required across the health sector

Arts and culture

- Arts and culture as a gap in the plan
- Social infrastructure must include cultural infrastructure
- Access to free or affordable social infrastructure

Physical activity, sports and recreation

- Physical activity, sport and recreation as a gap in the plan
- Access to free or affordable social infrastructure
- Maintain a network of fit for purpose facilities
- Value community sport and role of volunteers
New ‘quality of life’ focus area

- Being a culturally rich and active city is essential if Auckland is to continue to be a desirable place to live

- Direction 2 encompasses health and wellbeing - quality of life is an important aspect

- Evidence that participating in arts, culture, sports and recreation improves self-esteem, confidence and perceived life satisfaction/quality of life

- Arts, culture, sports and recreation create strong and cohesive communities by fostering identity and pride, building social connection and increasing our sense of belonging

- Providing increased opportunities for all Aucklanders to access, participate and experience arts, culture, sport and recreation, as part of their everyday lives, enhances quality of life
Feedback key themes

Safe opportunities for people to meet and connect (FA 1)

• Support investing in accessible, safe and clean public places and open spaces
• Well-activated spaces enable people to share in each other’s cultures, histories and experiences
• Historic places contribute to cultural identity
• Universal design helps meet the needs of everyone
• Protect existing open spaces from development

Accessible services and social infrastructure (FA 2)

• Support investing in affordable, inclusive services and social infrastructure regionally/locally
• Strong support for maintenance and further investment in local parks and facilities
• Work with communities to co-design targeted and responsive services
• Transport system should facilitate access
Feedback key themes

Supporting and working with communities (FA 3)
- Support local communities with their own plans/identity
- Opportunities for skills-sharing across age groups
- Support neighbourhood support groups and minimise crime

Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi as the bicultural foundation for a multi-cultural Auckland (FA 4)
- Te Tiriti o Waitangi is vital to recognising bi-cultural foundation of NZ
- “recognising” te Tiriti does not provide strong enough direction
- te Tiriti provides a platform for partnership and importance of applying Te Tiriti
- Confusion over the status of te Tiriti and council’s legal obligations
- Balance significance of Treaty with reality of a more multi-cultural Auckland
- Build on a foundation of inclusion, equality, dignity, mutual care and respect
- Embrace our history, promote wider understanding of Māori culture and te reo Māori and protect indigenous peoples’ rights
Feedback - key themes

Recognise, value and celebrate Aucklanders’ differences as a strength (FA 5)

- Support increasingly multi-cultural and inclusive Auckland and need for Aucklanders to embrace diversity and inclusion
- Need for opportunities to connect and build relationships with other cultures
- Support communities facing barriers or discrimination
- Specific groups excluded
- Different cultures don’t want to mix with each other

Address disparities and serve communities of greatest need (FA 6)

- Support for addressing inequity and focusing on communities of greatest need
- Broad recognition of growing inequalities and impacts
- Targets most at risk groups and communities and geographic areas with high socio-economic deprivation
- Everyone should have equitable access and opportunity to enjoy our city
- Impact of poverty and housing affordability on successive generations
- Limited ability to address drivers of disparity
Summary

- Overall support for Belonging and Participation outcome
- Consistent support for
  - FA1 safe opportunities for people to meet and connect
  - FA2 accessible services and social infrastructure
  - FA3 support and work with communities
  - FA6 address disparities and communities of greatest need
- Mismatch between yes/no/partial response and comments
- Partial or no support
  - Other more important issues to address
  - Significance of the Treaty and reality of a more multi-cultural Auckland
  - Different cultures don’t want to mix with each other
- Other feedback
  - General across all outcome areas of the plan
  - Already adequately addressed
  - Implementation of the plan
Proposed changes

Health
D2: Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities
• Include reference to physical and mental health in the narrative

Arts and culture
• New focus area on quality of life incorporating the value of arts and culture
• Note that cultural expression reinforces our distinctive identity in text
• Update evidence report

Physical activity, sports and recreation
• New focus area on quality of life incorporating the value of physical activity, sports and recreation
• Update evidence report
Proposed changes

FA1: Safe opportunities for people to meet and connect
- Reference role/value of cultural heritage in reinforcing sense of history and place
- Reference role of quality public spaces and places in creating inclusive and accessible places and distinctive character of communities
- Encourage universal access under “how this can be done” and link to ADM

FA2: Accessible services and social infrastructure
- Amend heading of existing focus area to include ‘cultural infrastructure’
- Reference location and distribution of services/infrastructure and role of transport in enabling access

FA3: Supporting and working with communities
- Provide more clarity in narrative on developing local leadership and the need to build on local communities’ existing strengths and assets
- Emphasise importance of community-led initiatives
Proposed changes

FA4: Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi as the bicultural foundation for a multi-cultural Auckland

- More clarity on status of te Tiriti/council’s legal obligations in front section of plan
- Reword to provide stronger direction - “Recognise Value and provide for te Tiriti o Waitangi as the bicultural foundation for a multi-cultural Auckland”.
- Affirm that te Tiriti recognises rights of both Māori and all Aucklanders

FA5: Recognise, value and celebrate Aucklanders’ differences as a strength

- Introduce intercultural approach to address the limitations of multi-culturalism in the narrative and include new graphic
Proposed changes

FA6: Address disparities and serve communities of greatest need

- Clarify the difference between equality and equity in the narrative
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Item 2: Development strategy

14 May
Planning Committee workshop
What we will cover today

1. Process
   • Who – Public, central government, CCOs
   • How – Written feedback, workshops

2. Themes from all feedback

3. Key recommendations
1. Process overview - Who

Three sources of feedback / new information have been considered:

a) Public feedback
b) Central government workshops
c) Council Controlled Organisation feedback
a) Public feedback – Consultation question

Auckland has to provide for around 740,000 more people in the next 30 years, which would mean another 320,000 dwellings and up to 270,000 extra jobs.

The Auckland Plan proposes to manage long-term population growth by prioritising development in existing urban areas and establishing new communities and new business land in future urban areas. Investment in Auckland’s infrastructure will need to keep up with the pace and scale of growth.

Do you think the proposed approach for enabling growth will effectively provide for Auckland’s future?
a) Public feedback - Overview

- Overall feedback numbers
  - 14,613 written
  - 554 in person, 7 social media feedback

- Written feedback
  - 44% agree
  - 37% partially agree
  - 17% no
  - 2% commentary, but a no response

- In person
  - 26% agree
  - 13% partially agree
  - 12% no
  - 49% comment (no categorisation)
b) Central government workshops

- A series of workshops were held in March and April
- Purpose of workshops was to:
  - develop a shared understanding of the Auckland Development Strategy
  - identify areas of alignment
  - agree steps toward future partnerships and an on-going work programme
- Central government agencies:
- Auckland Council
  - including Panuku, Auckland Transport and Watercare
c) CCO feedback

Attended workshops:
- Auckland Transport
- Panuku
- Watercare

Formal feedback from:
- ATEED
- Auckland Transport
- Panuku
2. Key feedback themes

- Quality compact / balance of growth
  - strong support for approach
  - mixed feedback on the balance of growth (greenfield vs brownfield)
  - limiting rural growth

- Multi-nodal model
  - general support for model
  - general support for nodes identified
  - clarification and amendments to nodes and satellites

- Development areas
  - general support for development areas
  - changes to the timing and location
2. Key feedback themes

- Remaining existing urban area
  - Provide further information and clarification of how this area contributes

- National Policy Statement and growth capacity
  - meeting the requirements
  - ensuring adequate capacity
3. Recommendations – quality compact

Strong support for overall approach:

- confirms quality compact as basis for development strategy

with:
- some refinement to approach
- other changes
3. Recommendations

Some refinement to approach

- amendments to spatial elements – changes to areas and timings
  - nodes
  - development areas
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North – nodes and development areas
West - nodes and development areas
Central - nodes and development areas
South - nodes and development areas
3. Recommendations

National Policy Statement requirements

- reflecting estimated demand for housing and business land
- including clear reference to minimum targets
- demonstrating how minimum dwelling targets will be met
- showing how sufficient feasible development capacity will be provided
- providing clearer information about infrastructure and infrastructure constraints
- identifying the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity in the medium and long term in both future urban environments and through intensification opportunities.

See Briefing report pages 37-48
3. Recommendations

Bringing information together

- Text amendments to clarify and update information
- Tables updating to reflect new and amended areas and providing information on infrastructure projects
- Supporting information – standardised for each node, development area and the remaining existing urban area
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Remaining existing urban area
3. Recommendations

Other changes

a) Multi nodal – minor changes for clarification
b) Growth in development areas – minor changes for clarification
c) Business areas – changes to emphasise importance of nodes in providing ‘decentralised’ employment choices
d) Building strong urban centres and neighbourhoods – changes to highlight the importance of the centres network
e) Rural Auckland – changes to further explain and emphasise ‘limiting rural growth’
f) Auckland’s infrastructure – changes to align with other updates such as 2018 ATAP
g) Auckland’s capacity for growth – linkages to other areas of the development strategy
h) Implementing: Development Strategy – minor changes relating to multiple agencies’ involvement in implementation
Attachment H
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Item 3: Other feedback (including targets)

14 May
Planning Committee workshop
Overview - any other feedback

Feedback not directly related to an outcome or Development Strategy

• Overall numbers
  – 2,214 written submissions, 2,242 feedback points
  – 190 in person, 25 comments via digital plan website

• CCO feedback – ATEED, Auckland Transport
Feedback key themes

- Difficulty finding a print version of the plan, and locating detailed information
- Impact of consultation, processes, tools and documents
- Affirming population growth and implications as key challenges
- Need for effective implementation of the plan
- Confusion around council’s role, central government role
- High level nature of the plan
- Appropriate level of aspiration within the plan
- Suggested need to include targets in the plan to track progress
Proposed changes to the Plan

- Further clarification that:
  - the plan is a plan for all of Auckland to implement, and that Auckland Council has responsibility for preparing and adopting the plan
  - the purpose of the plan is to set a strategic direction for Auckland and its communities rather than set out a detailed plan of actions

- Enhancing print links – easily located throughout the plan

- Providing direct links to supporting information on focus area pages
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Developing targets

- Auckland Plan
  - 33 measures
  - 1 housing target

Core targets
- Housing
- Transport
- Environment
- Social / inclusion

Reporting framework
- Annual / 3-year deep dive
- Existing council targets
- Core targets
- Other relevant information

Developed and agreed with key stakeholders
Process will determine where these targets best sit
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Item 4: Next steps

14 May
Planning Committee workshop
Finalising the Auckland Plan 2050

- Planning Committee workshops
- Local board meetings (1-10 May)

Auckland Plan updated

28 May
Planning Committee workshop
- Consider the final plan

5 June
Planning Committee meeting
- Refer to Governing Body for adoption

27 June
Governing Body meeting
- Adoption

By 31 July
- Digital plan (website) updated
- Print version developed
- Translations completed