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Terms of Reference

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

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

Powers
(i) All powers necessary to perform the committee’s responsibilities, including:
   (a) approval of a submission to an external body
   (b) establishment of working parties or steering groups.
(ii) The committee has the powers to perform the responsibilities of another committee, where it is necessary to make a decision prior to the next meeting of that other committee.
(iii) The committee does not have:
   (a) the power to establish subcommittees
   (b) powers that the Governing Body cannot delegate or has retained to itself (section 2)
Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting

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

Those who are not members of the public

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

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

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

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

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

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

Apologies from Cr C Fletcher and Cr E Collins have been received.

2 Declaration of Interest

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

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 12 June 2018, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

4 Petitions

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

5 Public Input

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

5.1 Public Input: Sediment effects on the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve - Long Bay Okura Great Park Society

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Representatives of the Long Bay Okura Great Park Society will present their findings in relation to sediment in the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve,

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the public input presentation from the Long Bay Okura Great Park Society regarding sediment in the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve and thank them for attending.

Attachments

A Long Bay Okura Great Park Society, information about sediment effects on the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve ................................................. 135
6 **Local Board Input**

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

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

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

7 **Extraordinary Business**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”
Proposed land exchange at Harlow Place, Glen Innes and Taniwha Reserve

File No.: CP2018/10643

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval of the proposed exchange of 130m² of Taniwha Reserve with 364m² of land at 4 and 6-8 Harlow Place, Glen Innes held by the Tāmaki Regeneration Company.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. To enable decision-making about whether to approve the land exchange, staff called for objections in accordance with section 15 of the Reserves Act 1977.

3. Only two objections, out of a total of 19 submissions, were assessed to be within the scope of the Reserves Act 1977. These objections relate to concerns about access through the reserve and the validity of the reasons provided to enter into the land exchange. These concerns are fully addressed by the land exchange, which will:
   • improve sightlines and physical access into Taniwha Reserve
   • improve the safety of users accessing the Reserve by removing the existing narrow accessway
   • provide better connectivity with the open space network in the area
   • increase the area of Taniwha Reserve by 234m².

4. Staff recommend that the committee approve the proposed land exchange. It is deemed to be a high priority when assessed against council policy.

5. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board supports the proposed land exchange.

6. There is a low risk of a judicial review of council decision-making processes if the council proceeds with the land exchange. This will be mitigated by clear communication by council about the reasons for the land exchange.

7. The Finance and Performance Committee will need to approve the disposal of part of Taniwha Reserve to complete the land exchange.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) note that Auckland Council has met the requirements of section 15 of the Reserves Act 1977, including calling for objections, and considering all such objections, as well as consultation with mana whenua to enable the exchange of part of Taniwha reserve with other land.

b) approve the exchange of 130m² of Taniwha Reserve, Glen Innes (subject to survey) with 364m² of land at 4 Harlow Place, Glen Innes and 6-8 Harlow Place, Glen Innes (subject to survey) to be implemented by:
   i) approval of the acquisition of portions of LOT 4 DP 39662 and LOT 121 DP 39662 (refer Attachment B of the agenda report)
   ii) recommend that the Finance and Performance Committee dispose of a portion of PART LOT 142 DP 42356 (refer Attachment B of the agenda report).

c) agree that the General Manager, Community and Social Policy, under delegation from the Chief Executive, approve the final location, configuration and size of the land exchange as part of the consent processes for the Line Epping Stage One development.
Horopaki / Context

Background

8. The Tāmaki Regeneration Company is undertaking the redevelopment of approximately 1,000 properties throughout northern Tāmaki.

9. Line Epping Stage One is the first area for redevelopment. The land area concerned is approximately 2.3 hectares.

10. The Tāmaki Regeneration Company proposes to demolish 29 of the 32 existing dwellings on the site. The three remaining dwellings will be relocated and renovated and 117 new dwellings will be constructed. The development will involve creating three new road connections and revising the current open space layout (refer Attachment A).

11. To enable efficient use of the site and improve access to Taniwha Reserve, the Tāmaki Regeneration Company seeks to exchange 130m² of Taniwha Reserve with land totalling 364m² at 4 and 6-8 Harlow Place, Glen Innes (refer Attachment B).


13. After approval to undertake public notification, a small change was made by the developer at the resource consenting stage. The expected land area resulting from the proposed land exchange was reduced from 243m² to 234m². This was deemed as not having a material impact on the proposed land exchange.

The land exchange process is set-out in the Reserves Act 1977

14. Section 15 of the Reserves Act prescribes the process for a land exchange between reserves and other land. The process has four key steps.

Table 1: Requirements of the Reserve Act 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key steps</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The administering body (in this case the Auckland Council) publicly notifies its intention to undertake the land exchange and calls for objections in writing, allowing a period of at least one month for objections to be received</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. After a period of at least one month following public notification the administering body considers all received objections to the proposed land exchange

The objections are outlined in this report.

3. The administering body passes a resolution supporting the land exchange if it considers it appropriate to do so in light of all objections received

- This is the purpose of the report.
- A land exchange is a simultaneous acquisition and disposal of land. There are split decision-making delegations for land exchanges.
- The Environment and Community Committee determines whether to proceed with the land exchange and has delegated decision-making for the acquisition of open space.
- The Finance and Performance Committee has delegated decision-making for the disposal of all council assets.
Key steps | Comment
--- | ---
4. A copy of the resolution supporting the land exchange is forwarded to the Department of Conservation along with all the objections for authorisation under delegation from the Minister of Conservation for land derived from the Crown. | • The council has delegation from the Minister of Conservation to authorise or decline the exchange of any reserve or any part(s) of a reserve for any other land under 15(1) of the Reserves Act 1977 where the title was not deemed to have been derived from the Crown.
• The title has not deemed to have derived from the Crown because the reserve was created upon subdivision for residential purposes.

15. Relevant mana whenua must also be consulted.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

*Only two objections were deemed to be within scope of the Reserves Act 1977*

16. A total of 19 submissions (including 4 objections) were received during the public notification period between 9 March and 9 April 2018. A summary of the objections is set out in Attachment C.

17. Two objections were assessed as being within the scope of the Reserves Act 1977 and directly related to the land exchange. These related to access through the reserve and the validity of the reasons provided to enter into the land exchange, which are outlined in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Specific objections to the land exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| One objection raised concerns about poor access across the Reserve to the shopping centre from the removal of the accessway. | • The accessway is not being removed. The public will still be able to access the Reserve at the end of a new proposed road located slightly to the west of the current accessway.
• Further information will be provided to the submitter to address their concerns. |
| One objection stated that the reasons for entering the exchange are not valid and asked further questions about the land exchange. | • The decision to proceed with processing a land exchange is based on an assessment against the Open Space Provision Policy 2016. This assessment was undertaken by staff and a summary was provided in the report approving public notification (Resolution number ENV/2017/146).
• Further information cannot be provided directly to the submitter because they have not provided a physical address or email. |

18. The two remaining objections do not relate to the land exchange and are outside the scope of the Reserves Act 1977. These were concerns about issues in the wider Tāmaki area.

*lwi did not object to the land exchange*

19. Thirteen iwi groups that were identified as having mana whenua association with Taniwha Reserve were consulted.

20. None of the 13 iwi groups objected to the proposed land exchange.
Table 3: Summary of iwi feedback on the proposed land exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not opposed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no issue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response provided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed land exchange is deemed to be a high priority when assessed against council policy

21. Land exchanges are assessed against the criteria in the council’s Parks and Open Space Provision Policy 2016. Proposed land exchanges are prioritised according to the highest rating achieved.

22. Table 4 provides a summary of the assessment of the proposed land exchange.

Table 4: Assessment of proposed land exchange – Taniwha Reserve, Glen Innes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park type: Park accessway</th>
<th>Number of new lots (net): 88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density: Medium-high</td>
<td>Number of new residents¹: 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitary plan zone: Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone</td>
<td>Proposed additional reserve area: 234m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation: N/A</td>
<td>Settlement: Development commencing 2018/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential future features:
- Walking connections
- Informal recreation facilities
- Playground

Criteria | Comment | Overall rating
---|---|---
Meeting community needs, now and in the future | High priority: the proposed land exchange would improve physical access into Taniwha Reserve and would lead to improved safety outcomes as the current accessway is only three meters wide. | High priority for exchange |
Connecting parks and open spaces | High priority: the proposed land exchange would improve the connectivity of the network of open space walkways throughout the area. | |
Protecting and restoring Auckland’s unique features and meanings | Not a priority: there are no known heritage, cultural or natural values of significance located within the areas proposed for exchange. | |
Improving the parks and open spaces we already have | High priority: the proposed new access would provide high quality access and improve the functionality of Taniwha Reserve. | |

¹ Based on the average household size of 3.0 in Auckland at Census 2013.
23. Staff recommend the proposed land exchange. It is a high priority when assessed against council policy.

24. The proposed land exchange is expected to have positive benefits to the community including:
   - improved sightlines and physical access into Taniwha Reserve
   - improved safety of users accessing the Reserve by removing the existing accessway
   - better connectivity with the open space network in the area
   - increasing the area of Taniwha Reserve by 234m².

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

25. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board supports the proposed land exchange, resolving at its meeting on 26 June 2018 (Resolution number MT/2018/103) that it:
   a) recommends that the Environment and Community Committee approve the proposed land exchange of 130m² (subject to survey) of Taniwha Reserve, Glen Innes with 364m² (subject to survey) of land at 4 Harlow Place, Glen Innes and 6-8 Harlow Place, Glen Innes.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

26. Consultation was undertaken with 13 iwi identified as having mana whenua association with Taniwha Reserve. None of the iwi groups objected to the proposed land exchange. The provision of quality parks and open spaces facilitates Māori participation in outdoor recreational activity. Additional benefits include:
   - demonstrating Auckland Council’s commitment to the Active Protection (Tautiaki Ngangahau) Principle of the Treaty of Waitangi
   - helping make Auckland a green, resilient and healthy environment consistent with the Māori world view and their role as kaitiaki of the natural environment.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

27. The land exchange will increase land assets at Taniwha Reserve by 234m².

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

28. There is a low risk of a judicial review of council decision-making processes. This will be mitigated by clear communication about the reasons for the decision.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

29. The Finance and Performance Committee will need to approve the disposal of part of Taniwha Reserve to complete the land exchange.

30. Subject to the approval of the Finance and Performance Committee, council staff will work with the Tāmaki Regeneration Company to undertake the processes required to exchange the land. This will include engaging a surveyor to prepare the new land transfer plans, publishing a notice in the New Zealand Gazette and registering a notice with Land Information New Zealand.
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Attachment A. The layout plan of the Line Epping Stage One development.
Proposed land exchange at Harlow Place, Glen Innes and Taniwha Reserve
10 May 2018

Auckland Council
Private Bag 92300
Auckland 1142

Attention: Jordan Hamilton

Dear Jordan

Proposed Taniwha Reserve Exchange, Glen Innes.

Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to bring the results of the public and iwi notification of the proposed land exchange between Tamaki Regeneration Company and Auckland Council to the Board/Council’s consideration.

Background

Tamaki Regeneration Company have approached Auckland Council wishing to exchange a portion of the Taniwha Reserve, Glen Innes, with land that they own at Harlow Place.

Tamaki Regeneration Company is undertaking a development in northern Tamaki area, known as Line Epping Stage One, creating three new road connections and revising the current open space layout. Line Epping Stage One is the first area for re-development which involves the construction of 117 new dwellings on 2.3 hectares of land, the demolition of 29 of 32 existing dwellings and the relocation of 3 remaining dwellings.

The land proposed for development is located adjacent to Taniwha Reserve. To enable efficient use of the reserve and improve the configuration of Taniwha Reserve, Tamaki Regeneration Company seeks to exchange 130 m² portion of Taniwha Reserve with a 364 m² portion of their land situated at 4 and 6 to 8 Harlow Place (refer attached flyer/feedback form). The proposed land exchange is expected to have positive benefits to the community.

The Environment and Community Committee at its meeting of 17 October 2017 (CP/2017/21181) resolved to support the public notification under section 15(2) of the Reserves Act 1977 for the proposed exchange. Under provisions contained section 15(2) of the Reserves Act 1977, the administering body of the Taniwha Reserve needs to consider any objections received prior to passing a resolution to proceed.

Aims of the Proposal

To achieve the stated aims of the proposal, it will involve:

1
• the proposed exchange will improve physical access to the Taniwha Reserve and will lead to improved safety outcomes as the current access to the reserve is only three metres wide;

• the proposed land exchange will improve the connectivity of the network of open space walkways throughout the area and improve the functionality of the Taniwha Reserve.

The objectives of the proposed land exchange are to:

• increase public open space;

• improve sightlines and physical access into Taniwha Reserve;

• improve the safety of users accessing the reserve by removing the existing narrow accessway;

• provide better connectivity with the open space network in the area.

Reserve Delegations

Territorial authorities have been given delegation under section 13(1) of the Reserves Act 1977 to authorise or decline the exchange of any reserve or any part(s) of a reserve for any other land. This delegation can only be exercised where the territorial authority did not derive title from the Crown, or title would be deemed not to be derived from the Crown if the reserve was going through a revocation process under section 25 of the Reserves Act 1977.

The area of reserve land forming part of Taniwha Reserve is currently held by the Auckland Council, in trust, as a recreation reserve subject to the Reserves Act 1977. Historical research has revealed that the reserve was created as a result of subdivisions undertaken by the Housing Division in 1956. As the reserve was created upon subdivision for residential purposes therefore, Council's title has not deemed to have been derived from the Crown due to the provisions contained in section 25(5) of the Reserves Act 1977.

The proposal involves the following reserve to be exchanged - (193-195 Taniwha Street):

A small portion of Part Lot 112 DP 42356 comprising approximately 130 m² (subject to survey) coloured green on the attached Spatial Map and flyer/feedback form - classified as recreation reserve by NZ Gazette 1992 p 2024 (GN 8099646-1).

Land owned by Tamaki Regeneration Ltd to be added to Taniwha Reserve - (4, 6 to 8 Harlow Place).

Portions of Lots 121 and 122 DP 39962 comprising approximately 364 m² (subject to survey) coloured orange on the attached Spatial Map and flyer/feedback form.

Public Notification

In accordance with section 13(2) of the Reserves Act 1977, public notices advising of Council's intention to exchange the reserve land were placed in the NZ Herald and on Council's website calling for any objections to the proposal to be made to Council by 9 April 2018.
Council received a total of 19 submissions to the proposal. The submissions received are in four distinct categories as follows:

- 4 submissions received objected to the proposal as identified in Appendix A;
- 5 submissions are of support as identified in Appendix B;
- 9 submissions received expressed no objection or provided any comments as identified in Appendix C;
- 1 submission received expressed no objection, however mentioned that Council needs to be careful into entering into exchange to ensure no loss of public space and requesting developers to make contribution to develop community facilities as identified in Appendix D.

Analysis of Appendix A Objectors

Four submitters have given detailed reasons to their objections as summarised below:

- **[Redacted]** - opposed the proposal on the grounds that the reserve is close to the shopping centre and therefore easily accessible for the public to walk from their homes to the shopping centre.
  
  **Comment for Consideration** - the stated aims of the proposed exchange will achieve the very issues that this objector is concerned about. It is recommended that the Parks staff provide information showing that as part of the Tamaki Regeneration Company’s plan to redevelop the area, a road will be provided linking the 136 m² of land that is to be added to the existing Taniwha Reserve, thus maintaining continuous access for the general public much the same as currently exists although it will be located approximately 18 metres to west of the current access.

- **[Redacted]** - opposed the proposal on the grounds that the reasons stated are not valid. Additionally, a number of questions were asked, i.e. what assurance does the public have that the reserve will be safe, will the reserve have/get better lighting, or paved pathway, family friendly?
  
  **Comment for Consideration** - the stated aims of the proposed exchange will achieve the very issues that this objector is concerned about. It is recommended that the Parks staff provide more detailed information concerning the proposal which address the issues raised.

- **[Redacted]** - opposed the proposal on the grounds that he was not happy that the Government is taking PI England Reserve for housing and does not wish the same to occur to Taniwha Reserve.
  
  **Comment for Consideration** - that the taking of PI England Reserve by the NZ Government, if in fact that this is the case, cannot not be dealt with as the invitation to lodge an objection relates to the public notice to Taniwha Reserve exchange and not the taking of PI England Reserve. Whilst that a 130 m² portion of Taniwha Reserve will be lost to housing, it appears that objector does not seem to appreciate that there will be the addition of 364 m² of land being added to the existing Taniwha Reserves. Additionally, the objector has not made any specific objection as the objection has made in the nature of a question i.e. “How do we know Taniwha Reserve won’t be taken for Houses”. It is clear from the flyer/feedback form that there is no intention take any land, rather it is a proposal to exchange land. The objector has not supplied any specifics, in reality the submitter’s objection seems to have little merit and unable to be considered.

- **[Redacted]** - opposed the proposal on the grounds that his Congregation had been using the Scout Hall which is located 185 Taniwha Road and have been requested to vacate the building by June 2018 by the Department of
Conservation and Housing New Zealand. The objector further explains that the reason given to vacate is due to the age of the building and they were promised a new building to move into, however the Reverend believes he has been misled as the Tamaki Housing Development plans came into fruition prior to being told to vacate. Additionally, the Reverend explained that he and his wife have been living in a house belonging to Housing New Zealand for about 45 years in the general vicinity and have been advised by the Director of Housing New Zealand that this house has been identified as one of the houses that will be removed. The Reverend has concerns that they will be forced to move to another place which they have no knowledge of and the main reason they wish to remain in their current address as it is in close proximity to the Scout Hall and other public amenities in the area. Whilst the Tamaki Regeneration Company plans are understandably stressful to the Reverend, the exchange proposal does not involve any land associated with the Scout Hall or the Reverend’s current abode and therefore the objection lacks any merit and unable to be considered.

Iwi Consultation

Thirteen iwi groups who have mana whenua over the Taniwha Reserve have been consulted over the proposed reserve exchange. None of the thirteen iwi groups that were consulted made an objection to the proposed reserve exchange. Six of the thirteen iwi groups that did provide a written response were either not opposed or had no issue with the proposed reserve exchange. A summary of iwi consultation undertaken is identified in Appendix E to this report.

A rating summary of iwi position on this matter is shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not opposed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no issue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response provided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Section 15(2) of the Reserves Act 1977 requires the administering body of the reserve to consider all objections received as consequence of the public notice advising of its intention to pass a resolution to exchange reserve land. Note; under the provisions contained in section 15(2) of the Reserves Act 1977 there is no ability to consider submitters who indicated support to the proposal, only those submitters who have objected to the proposal.

The public notice period has ended and it is therefore recommended that the appropriate Committee now consider all objections received.

Yours Sincerely

Steven Schwarz
Property Consultant
s.schwarz@atra.co.nz
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To seek a decision on whether to join the World Health Organisation (WHO) Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities (the Network).

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Auckland Council has previously declined to seek membership of the Network. On 8 May 2018 council decided to reconsider this decision following a recent recommendation from the Seniors Advisory Panel.

3. The purpose of the Network is to support and foster the exchange of experience and learning between cities and communities worldwide to become more age-friendly.

4. There are no major process or financial obstacles to join the Network. There is no accreditation or joining fee. It does require development, implementation, and monitoring of a region-wide cross-sector action plan. This has a resource cost.

5. There are two options for consideration:
   - Option 1: Status quo – the council continues to use its existing strategic, delivery, monitoring and reporting frameworks and processes to become a friendlier, more inclusive city, with a focus on those in most need, or;
   - Option 2: The council maintains existing approach and invests some resources to seek membership of the WHO Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities.

6. Making a decision between the two options depends on what outcome is sought.

7. On balance, staff recommend Option 1 as it best meets the assessment criteria. It could achieve many of the same benefits as Option 2, at less cost and more closely aligns with the Auckland Plan. The key trade-off is a perceived lack of visible leadership to improve outcomes for older Aucklanders.

8. If council wants its commitment to older Aucklanders to be more visible and raise greater awareness of their needs, then Option 2 would better achieve this. The key trade-off with Option 2 is the cost to develop, implement and monitor the action plan required as part of the joining the Network.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

EITHER

a) agree Option 1: the council continues with the status quo, using existing strategic, delivery, monitoring and reporting frameworks to become a friendlier, more inclusive city, with a focus on those in most need (recommended).

OR

b) agree Option 2: the council maintains existing approach and invests some resources to seek membership of the WHO Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities. Noting that all future implementation actions requiring financial decisions will be subject to Annual and Long-term Plan processes.
Horopaki / Context

Background

Previous decision–making

9. In 2016 the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee considered a proposal to join the Network, but instead resolved to seek ways to become a friendlier and more inclusive city for all residents (Resolution number REG/2016/92).

10. On 19 March 2018, the Seniors Advisory Panel recommended to the Governing Body that it reconsider its position and that Auckland become an age-friendly city as soon as possible. The panel is a strong advocate for joining the Network.

11. In response, on 8 May 2018, the Environment and Community Committee requested a report on the advantages and any obstacles to Auckland Council becoming a member of the Network (Resolution number ENV/2018/56). The previous requests and decisions on membership of the Network are in Attachment A.

12. The Panel’s advice to council about becoming an age-friendly city was recently presented to councillors as part of the Long-term plan process. Refer Attachment B.

No major obstacles to joining the Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities

13. There are no major process or financial obstacles that prevent council joining the Network.

14. There is no accreditation process or certification of age-friendliness and no membership fee to join the Network.

15. Membership to the Network requires a commitment to a continuous improvement process for creating age-friendly environments. This will require allocating resources to develop, implement and monitor a region-wide action plan to improve outcomes for older people.

16. The Network’s purpose is to foster information sharing between cities and communities worldwide to become more age-friendly. Member cities have increased from 302 to 600 since 2016.

17. Hamilton City Council is currently the only New Zealand member city. New Plymouth District Council has resolved to join the Network. Several other cities such as Napier and Tauranga have age-friendly plans.

18. Age-friendly practices, resources and research are available on the World Health Organisation website. Further details on the process and membership requirements are included in Attachment C.

Central government - affiliate member of age-friendly network

19. The Office for Seniors has successfully applied for membership of the Network’s Cities and Communities affiliate programme.

20. The Office of Seniors is seeking submissions on a discussion document for a new Positive Ageing Strategy that will shape policies to help older New Zealanders live well. The council will make a submission on this.

21. New Zealand’s affiliate status means that the Office for Seniors can design a process for New Zealand cities to join the Network, as well as provide support, information and training on age-friendly practices.

Problem Definition

There are a range of issues relating to older Aucklanders

22. Auckland will be home to substantially larger numbers and greater proportions of ethnically and culturally diverse older people over the next few decades. The older population is growing faster than any other age-group and is predicted to increase from 11 per cent in 2013 to 19 per cent by 2046.
23. This will create greater and more complex demand for services and infrastructure to meet their needs. Insufficient planning for this could mean the challenges worsen as the number of older people grows significantly over the next 20 years. There are more people entering old age with fewer means, such as secure home ownership.

24. Based on national and international research key issues for older people include:
   - a lack of visibility, positive imaging and attitudes - which undermine wellbeing
   - health and wellbeing - with health and disability increasing with age
   - mobility, accessibility and transport - impacting on participation and safety
   - social isolation and loneliness – this a key public health issue for older people worldwide.

2017 Quality of life research shows most older Aucklanders are doing well

25. Following the 2016 resolution staff completed research on the quality of life of older Aucklanders.

26. The research confirms that Auckland is a great place to live for older people; however there are some who face greater challenges. Those in the “older-old” age groups and of lower socio-economic status are likely to be more socially excluded.

Improving outcomes for older Aucklanders and a range of other populations in need

27. In line with the 2016 resolution work has also been undertaken that aims to make Auckland a friendlier and more inclusive city for a range of populations, including older people.

28. While the number of older people is growing fast, Auckland remains a youthful city compared to many other places in New Zealand. Young people (0-24 years old) make-up a third of the population.

29. Children and young people, Māori, Pacific, migrants, people with disabilities the rainbow community and people with lower economic status share similar or worse health and wellbeing outcomes to those over 65.

30. Council initiatives (refer Attachment D) to help make Auckland a friendlier and more inclusive city for a range of populations include:
   - Auckland Plan outcomes for belonging and participation, and its focus on those most in need
   - the research on older Aucklanders quality of life – which has created a baseline for monitoring progress
   - the “Investing in Aucklanders” project to make Auckland a more inclusive city for all
   - delivery of a range of activities that target older Aucklanders’ needs.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

31. There are two options for consideration:

   **Option 1**: Status quo – the council continues to use its existing strategic, delivery, monitoring and reporting frameworks and processes to become a friendlier, more inclusive city, with a focus on those in most need.

   **Option 2**: The council maintains existing approach and invests some resources to seek membership of the WHO Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities.

32. A description of the advantages, disadvantages, risk and costs associated with each option is provided in Attachment E.
Assessment against criteria

33. Council has no formal policy on requests for membership of groups such as the Network. Memberships are considered on a case by case basis based on value and impact.

34. The following table assesses each option against criteria based on strategic alignment, cost and impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 (Status Quo)</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alignment:</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Auckland Plan – focus on improving outcomes for those most in need</em></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact:</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Values and makes visible commitment to older people</em></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact:</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Raises awareness of needs of older people for improved outcomes</em></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings scale key

✓ Low ✓ ✓ Fair ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ High

Key trade-offs and summary

35. On balance, staff recommend Option 1 as it best meets the assessment criteria. However making a decision between the two options depends on what outcome is sought. The two options also have different trade-offs:

- If council seeks the least cost option, then Option 1 would achieve this. It could achieve many of the same benefits as Option 2 and more closely aligns with the Auckland Plan. The key trade-off is that it may be perceived as demonstrating a lack of visible leadership to improve outcomes for older Aucklanders.
- If council wants its commitment to older Aucklanders to be more visible and raise greater awareness of their needs, then Option 2 would achieve this. The key trade-off is the additional time and cost to develop, implement and monitor the action plan required as part of membership to the Network.

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

36. If Auckland Council joins the Network, local boards will need to be involved in the development and delivery of an age-friendly Auckland action plan as much of the activity will need to happen in local communities.

37. While there would be some flexibility, for some boards this may require diverting resources from other priority areas.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
38. In the 2013 Census older Māori made up four per cent of the Auckland over 65 population. The Māori population is projected to remain youthful, although the actual numbers of older Māori will increase.
39. Focusing efforts on the wellbeing of older Māori could make a positive impact. Older Māori have lower levels of equity, income and rely heavily on superannuation.
40. However, as Māori are a relatively small proportion of the older population, focusing on older people may deliver less overall impact for Māori than other approaches considering the health and socio-economic disparities faced by Māori across all age groups.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
41. Option 1 – would require no additional investment or reprioritisation.
42. Option 2 – would require up to two full time equivalent staff and funding of $75,000-$100,000 to cover developing the action plan and seeking membership. This could be met through reprioritisation within existing baselines. The cost of implementing and monitoring the action plan cannot be estimated at this point. Any new funding requirements would need to be reallocated and/or reprioritised through existing budgets or sought through annual and long-term plan processes.
43. The Government is providing contestable funding of up to $15,000 to support the development of age-friendly plans, or implementation of age-friendly projects and it may be possible to access this to offset some of the costs under Option 2.
44. If Option 2 is supported staff will seek to access this funding in the next funding round in November 2018.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
45. The key risk with Option 1 is reputational, it may be perceived as the council lacking visible leadership commitment to improving outcomes for older Aucklanders.
46. This risk could be mitigated by taking steps to reinforce council’s existing commitment to older Aucklanders by making a more visible public statement. Leadership could be further reinforced by setting clear expectations that the council family proactively consider the needs of older people in the way it plans and delivers services (e.g. through Statements of Intent with Council-Controlled Organisations). Ensuring monitoring and reporting to the appropriate committee would also increase visibility of actions being undertaken.
47. Key risks with Option 2 are that the full cost implications of implementation are unknown, and it may raise expectations of new investment and improved outcomes that are not easily achieved.
48. This risk could be mitigated by prioritising implementation actions within the plan, and communicating that all future implementation actions requiring financial decisions will be subject to annual and long-term plan decision-making processes.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
49. Existing strategic, delivery and monitoring and reporting initiatives will continue. Staff will also continue to monitor the quality of life of older Aucklanders and use this to inform policy, planning and services.
50. If Option 2 is supported, staff will prioritise the work to be done to seek membership of the Network. This work will be done within existing baselines. Staff will work with the Seniors Panel and others to develop the action plan.
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Attachment A – Previous requests and decisions on membership to the World Health Organisation Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and meeting</th>
<th>Request and decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee The committee requested a report on the advantages and any obstacles to Auckland Council becoming a member of the World Health Organisation Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities (ENV/2018/56).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 March 2018</td>
<td>Seniors Advisory Panel At this meeting the Seniors Advisory Panel recommended to the Governing Body that Auckland becomes an age-friendly city as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 September 2016</td>
<td>Regional Strategy and Policy Committee The committee resolved to not join the World Health Organisation Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities. Instead directed staff to progress the intent of the framework to become a friendlier city for a range of populations (REG/2016/92).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 June 2016</td>
<td>Regional Strategy and Policy Committee Committee supported the recommendation in principle for Auckland to become a WHO Age-friendly City. Directed staff investigate and report back on the merits and implications of Auckland becoming a WHO Age-friendly City (REG/2016/35).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2016</td>
<td>Community Development and Safety Committee This committee recommended that the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee proceed with accreditation of Auckland as an age-friendly city (COM/2016/28).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 October 2015</td>
<td>Community Development and Safety Committee The committee requested advice from staff on the process and cost of becoming an age-friendly city (COM/2015/57).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B - Seniors Advisory Panel: Advice to Finance and Planning Committee 21 March 2018

1. This report uses the WHO Age Friendly domains to summarise the Panel’s feedback on the Auckland Plan and 10 year plan. The Panel believes the Age Friendly domains provide a holistic assessment framework.

2. The Seniors Panel held its community engagement forum Focus on the future on Friday 16 March. The forum was attended by over 90 seniors from across the region representing over 50 organisations. Invites targeted a wide range of ethnicities and seniors who are not always included in engagement processes. Speakers included HW the Mayor, the Minister for Seniors, kaumatua, the Office for Seniors and futurist thinkers.

The following areas were identified as the top 5 priorities by participants:

1. Housing
2. Respect and social inclusion
3. Transport
4. Outdoor space and building; and Social participation.

Housing and transport are predominant concerns, however social isolation and investment in services, facilities, and solutions which enable fairness and equity, social participation and inclusion are of very high importance. In other words the focus should be as much on people as on infrastructure. The Panel has incorporated the priorities from the Forum in this feedback.

3. Specific feedback on themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Priorities and comments</th>
<th>Response to AP/10VB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (= Transport and access)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fuel tax supported in order to invest in public transport</td>
<td>Investment in transport is welcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transport infrastructure to include real accessibility for</td>
<td>Investment seems to be in hard rather than people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people, including: sufficient mobility parks at park and</td>
<td>focussed infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ride points; adequate and suitable seating in waiting areas;</td>
<td>Transport solutions not sufficently future focussed or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilets at stations and on trains; adequate shelter at train</td>
<td>creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stations and bus stops; adequate bicycle parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More creative future-focused transport solutions given the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speed of change in electric and self-drive solutions likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to occur prior to 2030. Could include flexible local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shuttles, Uber style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Older people more likely to use public transport when they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel safe – removal of train supervisors therefore a concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (= Homes and buildings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support introduction of intergenerational and mixed housing</td>
<td>Emphasis in Auckland Plan is supported, however suggest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions as these address many other social needs. There</td>
<td>different emphasis and more innovative responses required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are many excellent overseas examples and some in Auckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>already.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support exploring different ownership models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adapting existing family homes to become intergenerational,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessible and able to house more people should be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouraged, however regulatory barriers make this very hard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enforce and incentivise developers to apply the Universal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environment and cultural heritage
- Council should facilitate an increase in the number of suitable pensioner housing units (currently 1400 units) to address waiting lists and growth
- Support targeted rates for clean water, harbours etc
- Support option B to address kauri dieback and other environmental protection
- Plastic is a major concern. Council should work towards limiting use of plastics across the region, especially plastic bags
- Limited mention of heritage or protection of cultural heritage

### Social participation (= Belonging and participation, and Maori identity and wellbeing)
- Need for more community spaces/hubs where people can meet easily and at low cost; maximise existing spaces e.g., libraries, as well as growing the number and range available.
- Opportunity to support development and improvement of marae as significant community facilities/meeting places
- Ensuring that community venues are truly accessible including parking and public transport – Ellen Melville as an example of a facility that is not accessible for many seniors.
- Addressing these needs helps address social isolation

### Respect and social inclusion (= Belonging and participation; Maori identity and wellbeing)
- Growing problem of loneliness, social isolation and loss of connection is a high priority to be addressed. Improved focus on social participation will assist with this.
- Community and street signage should be improved to help people connect, know what is available and find their way around, especially newcomers to Auckland
- Importance of affordability as key to inclusion
- NZ Herald article 19 March 2018

### Community support and health services (= Belonging and participation, and Maori identity and wellbeing)
- Healthy environment, good housing and equitable solutions are an important factor
- Council could partner with DHB’s more to achieve shared outcomes

### Outdoor spaces and buildings (= Homes and places)
- Panel wishes to emphasise the importance of outdoor green spaces in relation to growth, as existing spaces are potentially impacted by housing developments, and to compensate for the lack of outdoor spaces in intensive housing developments

### Communication and information (= Opportunity and prosperity)
- Council and other agencies could make better use of different media to reach different ethnic communities, e.g., Chinese TV, to reach more citizens and keep them informed.
- This helps engagement and reduces social isolation

### Civic participation and engagement (= Opportunity and
Environment and Community Committee  
10 July 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prosperity)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Prescriptive engagement approach used by Council limits creative responses.  
• More creative culture-specific engagement activities should be encouraged  
• Concern that seniors are not visible in the Auckland Plan or 10 year budget – creates a sense that seniors are not valued | • Rates rebates will be increasingly crucial. These should be publicised more and easier to access, including that there is no shame involved  
• Suggest that Central government (Office for Seniors) should be asked to review Rates rebate eligibility criteria, especially noting that superannuation does not increase proportionately to rates | Support rates increases, however concern re equity and ability to pay |

4. **Conclusion**

The Seniors Advisory Panel believes that Auckland Council should become an Age Friendly City, on the basis that age friendly is inclusive and beneficial for everyone.

Janet Clews  
Chairwoman, Seniors Advisory Panel  
21 March 2018
Attachment C – Membership requirements for the World Health Organisation Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities

To become a member of the Network, cities must:

a) Share and promote the values and principles of the WHO age-friendly cities approach:
   a. Respect for diversity
   b. Equity
   c. Participation of older people and their contribution valued
   d. The rights of older people should be respected
   e. Co-design and co-creation
   f. Bottom-up participatory approach combined with top-down
   g. Life-course approach that encourages intergenerational relation, solidarity and mutual support.

b) Commit to and implement the four stages to create age-friendly local environments (outlined below and in figure 2).

c) Actively participate in the Network
   a. Contribute to the development of knowledge by sharing evidence with other members
   b. Share guidelines, tools and practices
   c. Ensure profile page remains updated.

d) Complete the application process
   a. Complete the online application form.
   b. Attach a letter from the Mayor indicating commitment to becoming more age-friendly and actively participating in the Network.
   c. Confirm agreement with the WHO values and approach to creating age-friendly cities and communities and have the human and financial resource to implement the approach and actively participate in the Network.
   d. Designation of a contact person for the Network to facilitate communication and exchange.

Steps to creating age-friendly environments

The age-friendly journey requires a continuous process of improvement. Members can join at any step. The different steps together take on average five years to execute.

1. Establishment of mechanisms to involve older people throughout the Age-friendly Cities and Communities process.
   - The establishment of an approved governance structure such as steering group made up of key stakeholders to oversee the delivery and implementation of the plan.
   - This can be appointed by the council, or delegated to an appropriate authority to establish.
   - Administration of the steering group will need to be resourced.
   - Cities and communities are also encouraged to build partnerships with government and civil society (including NGOs and academic institutions).
2. Development of a baseline assessment of the age-friendliness of the city/community.
   - This assessment can be flexible to consider the diversity of cities and communities, however at a minimum, it needs to consider each of the eight domains identified in the WHO Age-friendly Cities Guide:
   1) outdoor spaces and buildings
   2) transportation
   3) housing
   4) social participation
   5) respect and social inclusion
   6) civic participation and employment
   7) communication and information
   8) community support and health services.

   Please note this baseline assessment has been completed – Older Aucklanders: A Quality of Life Status Report 2017.

3. Development of a city-wise strategic action plan
   - The development of the plan will involve considerable consultation not only with older people themselves, but also with the various public and private organisations that deliver products or services to older people.

4. Identification of indicators to monitor progress against this plan.
   - It is essential to monitor and evaluate the work done to determine whether the city has advanced toward becoming age-friendly. This has cost implications.

Figure 2 Steps to creating age-friendly environments.
To note:

1. There is no membership fee associated with joining the Network.

2. New members will receive a membership certificate. The certificate indicates that the member has embarked on the process to become more age-friendly and not a certificate of achievement or recognition by the WHO.

3. Upon acceptance into the Network the city would be able to use the designation “Member of the WHO Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities”.

4. Each member is also entitled to a public profile page on the global network’s electronic portal on which activities, events and publications can be shared and age-friendly activities by the city described.

5. Feedback on the implementation is by regular updates on the profile pages. Member’s post their progress and evaluation reports. With at least one age-friendly practice posted per year.

6. Regular research, monitoring and evaluation would need to be carried out to assess Auckland’s progress on delivering age-friendly outcomes for older Aucklanders.

7. Applications to the Network are processed on an ongoing basis. An automatic message is sent on receipt of application. Applications are processed within three months of application.
Attachment D - Work underway that benefits older Aucklanders and supports greater inclusion

Auckland Plan
1. The Auckland Plan is based on improving the outcomes of Auckland’s diverse populations. The plan acknowledges the increased numbers and proportion of older Aucklanders and requirement for services and infrastructure that enable older people to fully participate in the community.

2. The Auckland Plan recognises that all Aucklanders must have the opportunity to belong, participate and succeed. The adoption of the plan shows that the council is committed to this outcome. The focus areas that benefit older people emphasise accessibility, community, equity and diversity.

Older Aucklanders: Quality of Life Status Report 2017
3. The report presents an overview of the social and economic status of older Aucklanders, defined as people aged 65 years and over and living in Auckland. This report was commissioned by the council to provide a baseline to guide future research and policy development.

4. Auckland is a great place to live for many older people. The majority of respondents rated their health as being good or excellent, belonging to one or more social groups and agreed they got on with people in their neighbourhood.

5. There are some areas of concern. Almost one in five respondents felt older people are not valued in society and did not think housing costs were affordable. These areas of concern may grow as the population increases and requires ongoing monitoring.

Investing in Aucklanders project
6. The Investing in Aucklanders project explores what could be done to make Auckland a more inclusive and friendly city for all. The project engaged with a wide range of Aucklanders including older people. The Seniors Advisory Panel have participated in the process and are supportive of the project.

7. Insights from this project and other research on Auckland’s diverse populations will be used to inform council’s policy, plans and service delivery. This will support positive outcomes for Auckland’s diverse communities and demographic groups including older people.

8. The next phase of the project is to design a series of pilots to test interventions to increase inclusion. This could include working with others on a pilot to address loneliness and social isolation which is a health issue for older people.

Services that benefit older people
9. Auckland Council also delivers a range of activities that support older Aucklanders:
   - strategies and plans such as the Disability Operational Action Plan
   - programmes and services such as the sport and recreation programme ‘Never too old’
   - Auckland Libraries mobile bus visits to pensioner housing and retirement villages
   - provision of housing for older people
   - Universal Design Manual ensuring universal access is built into developments for various life scenarios including older age
   - grants and funding to community organisations such as Age Concern.
# Attachment E – Advantages, Disadvantages, Costs and Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Option 1 (Status Quo)</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td>The council continues to use its existing strategies, delivery, monitoring and reporting frameworks and processes to become a friendlier, more inclusive city, with a focus on those in most need.</td>
<td>The council maintains existing approach and invests some resources to seek membership to the WHO Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
<td>Maintains momentum of existing programmes</td>
<td>Internationally recognised approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allows for a range of populations, with a focus on those most in need</td>
<td>Greater visibility of the council's response to the needs of older people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will deliver benefits for older people, particularly those in need</td>
<td>Demonstration of the council's commitment to improve outcomes for older Aucklanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can be delivered within existing resources.</td>
<td>Will deliver benefits for older people, with some secondary benefits for other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
<td>Lesser visibility of response to the needs of older people</td>
<td>Encourages collaboration with external agencies and partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited benefit for older people not in need</td>
<td>Access to information sharing and support from a global community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May not maximise the potential and contributions of older people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
<td>No additional investment or reprioritisation.</td>
<td>Stage 1: $75,000-$100,000 to seek membership of the Network and develop the action plan (funded through reprioritisation and reallocation of resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2: Unknown cost to implement and monitor actions and initiatives (funding source to be identified).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: it may be possible to access up to $15,000 of government funding to offset costs of the plan or initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risks</strong></td>
<td>Decision not to join has reputational risk as it may be perceived as the council lacking commitment to improve outcomes for older Aucklanders.</td>
<td>Costs of implementation and monitoring cannot be estimated at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk that joining the network would raise expectations of new investment and improved outcomes that may not be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation</strong></td>
<td>This risk could be mitigated by taking steps to reinforce council's existing commitment to older Aucklanders by making a more visible public statement</td>
<td>This risk could be mitigated by prioritising implementation actions within the plan, and communicating that all future implementation actions requiring financial decisions will be subject to Annual and Long-term Plan decision-making processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present the 2018/2019 Public Art capital work programme for approval.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This report seeks approval of the 2018/2019 Public Art capital work programme (Attachment A). Approval is required to mandate implementation of the programme.
3. The purpose of the work programme is to strategically plan for and manage the city’s collection of public art assets.
4. The work programme aligns to Auckland Council’s endorsed strategies, policies and plans and budget allocations are set by staff with these documents in mind. This includes the Auckland Plan and the long-term plan.
5. The work programme includes the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public art projects</td>
<td>$2,117,431</td>
<td>Capital expenditure (capex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections and asset management functions</td>
<td>$308,341</td>
<td>Capex for ongoing renewals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$709,934</td>
<td>Operational expenditure (opex) for maintenance and repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,135,706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Producing public art is complex and involves feasibility, developed and detailed design phases which could lead to changes to the work programme.
7. Any significant changes affecting the objectives and intent of the work programme will be presented to the committee for consideration.
8. Staff recommend the committee delegate authority to the Manager, Arts and Culture to approve minor changes to the work programme.

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

a) approve the 2018/2019 Arts, Community and Events Public Art regional work programme (Attachment A of the agenda report).

b) delegate authority to the Manager, Arts and Culture to approve changes to individual items on the work programme provided such changes do not significantly affect the intent of the programme, noting that significant changes will be presented to the committee for consideration.
Horopaki / Context

9. The regional public art capital work programme presents the projects to be undertaken in 2018/2019 and aligns these with budget allocations, timelines and staff resource.

10. The work programme includes the following areas of activity:
   - public art projects - $2,117,431 (capex)
   - collections and asset management functions - $308,341 (capex for ongoing public art renewals) and $709,934 (opex for public art maintenance and repairs).

11. Work programme budget allocations are set by staff in the context of Auckland Council endorsed strategies, policies and plans, as well as existing public art provision and scheduled significant development programmes.

12. The public art programme contributes to achieving multiple strategic outcomes and involves working across the council family to identify and leverage opportunities within other capital works projects; including town and city centre transformation and upgrade programmes.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

13. Council’s approach to investment in public art has shifted from a greater number of smaller works to fewer, large-scale projects that aim to have more transformative results. This can be seen in the installation of The Lighthouse by Michael Parekōwhai on Queens Wharf.

14. The identification of three large-scale projects in the Wynyard Quarter, as outlined in the Wynyard Quarter Public Art Strategy (2016), also demonstrates this approach.

15. The City Rail Link is also a significant opportunity to express the unique image of the city through integrated public art and design.

16. In 2015, staff completed an inventory of council’s public art collection.

17. The inventory provided staff with data regarding the geographic spread of the collection, type of work, artist ethnicity and/or iwi and genre. Staff have also been able to understand how well maintained works are, and regions that have a dominance of certain artists.

18. This data has been used to prioritise projects for 2018/2019 such as addressing the geographic spread of the collection.

19. Other prioritisation criteria which determine the work programme include:
   - delivery on Public Art Policy (2013) outcomes
   - contribution to Māori outcomes
   - the opportunity to leverage funding from other sources
   - the scale of the opportunity
   - achievability
   - staff resource required to deliver individual projects relative to budget allocation
   - long term impact
   - project lifespan
   - the relationship to and fit with city/town centre plans, and other growth and development programmes, such as those delivered by the council family (Panuku Development, Community Facilities, Parks, and Healthy Waters).

20. The prioritisation criteria define the objectives and intended outcomes of the resulting work programme.
Collections and asset management

21. Council manages both indoor and outdoor art collections, as well as assets that need to be maintained and repaired. The collections and asset management budget for 2017/2018 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capex budget for an on-going programme of renewals</td>
<td>$308,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opex budget for maintenance and repairs</td>
<td>$709,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. The long-term plan does not include a budget for new acquisitions for the indoor art collection.

Public art work programme strategic alignment

23. The work programme aligns to the Auckland Plan and endorsed strategies, policies and plans, including Toi Whītiki – Arts and Culture Strategic Action Plan and the Public Art Policy.

24. The work programme includes the development of 10-year area-based plans for public art.

25. The goal of these plans is to guide strategic investment in public art that is developed within a framework to significantly enhance user experience and contribute to place-making.

26. Plans have been developed for Wynyard Quarter and the city centre, and are underway for Northcote and Tāmaki Reserves.

27. Onehunga and Manukau plans will be developed in 2018/2019, working alongside Panuku’s framework plans for these areas.

28. The plans take into account analysis of existing and planned public art provision, policy and planning frameworks, known development programmes, and involve stakeholder and mana whenua input. They identify and prioritise opportunities for public art and articulate purpose for investment. They also provide transparency on where and when allocated funds for public art will be expended.

Working in partnership

29. The council’s public art team will work in partnership with Development Programmes Office, Auckland Design Office, Panuku Development and Auckland Transport to deliver work programme items.

30. The public art team will also work in partnership with mana whenua, private developers and philanthropic trusts.

31. Working in partnership aligns to the Empowered Communities approach which seeks to develop more effective and enabling ways to deliver council services, and supports more community led development.

Changes to the work programme during the year

32. The creative processes involved in producing public art projects is complex as many projects are connected to larger projects and involve feasibility, developed and detailed design phases.

33. Staff recommend that the committee delegate authority to the Manager, Arts and Culture to approve changes to individual items, provided such changes do not significantly affect the intent of the work programme.

34. Significant changes that could affect the intent of the approved work programme will be presented to the committee for consideration. Items of significant impact would include cancellation of projects in ‘build’ phase or addition of new projects.
**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views**

35. Local boards are key stakeholders in public art projects and in some cases contribute local funds to projects.

36. The inventory of the public art asset collection has identified geographic gaps in some local board areas and this information has been used to prioritise planning for future public art projects.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

37. Council’s Public Art Te Waka Angamua staff are developing an engagement process to define how council engages with mana whenua for all public art commissioned. An effective engagement process will help to clarify key issues, roles and responsibilities, interdependencies and milestones. This also includes defining the role of governance, operations and delivery.

38. Te Aranga Design principles have been incorporated in public art briefing documents following feedback from iwi cluster group meetings.

39. The Public Art Policy includes a focus on the production of public art that highlights Māori identity as a key point of difference for Auckland.

40. Through delivery of public art, outcomes for Māori include direct expressions of Te Ao Māori, and capability building for artists.

41. In developing public art as part of larger development projects, the public art team works with the parent project mana whenua forum to define desired outcomes.

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

42. Regional public art funding, as well as renewals and maintenance budgets for public art assets, are provided for in the long-term plan. Regional public art budget is allocated to projects based on priority/potential scale and impact of opportunity.

43. The 2018/2019 work programme does not advocate for new or increased funding.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

44. Risks associated with the work programme, and potential mitigations, have been identified here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interdependencies of public art projects with parent projects</td>
<td>The work programme is phased against known timeframes for parent projects (such as bridges, street scape upgrades and housing developments). Delays in parent projects directly impacts public art projects and can cause slippage.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Consistently monitor parent project schedules so any re-phasing can happen in a responsive manner. Ensure strong relationship management with project teams. Ensure division managers are kept informed and updated of progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhoc approach to forward planning.</td>
<td>No programme view of development with clear vision and organising principles at project level.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Continue to progress 10-year place-based plans for public art that are developed with full stakeholder input.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 10

Current state is a large number of individual projects both private and public being progressed simultaneously by different teams. Public art thought of at a stage in projects that is too late to have transformative impact.

Ensure the process for involving public art is embedded in planning documentation and includes public art in reference designs.

Ensure strong relationship management with project teams. Ensure division managers are kept informed and updated of progress.

Insufficient budgets through future long-term plan processes

Constrained fiscal environment. Aspirations of the work programme may not match investment in the future if budgets are reduced or cut.

Ensure appropriate decisions-makers and staff are kept informed and updated of progress.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

45. Staff will ensure the timely delivery of the projects in the work programme and their evaluation. Information and progress updates will be provided to the committee each six months.

46. The work programme will be implemented within the 2018/2019 budget.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
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<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>2018/2019 Public Art Programme</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Attachment A - 2018/2019 ACE Regional Public Art work programme

### Indicative public art projects with 2018/2019 regional public art budget contribution (total 2018/2019 capex budget: $2,117,431)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description/Key Activities</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated Delivery Timeframe</th>
<th>Regional Public Art Contribution (FY19)</th>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost (until FY21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>&quot;Boy Walking&quot; sculpture</td>
<td>&quot;Boy Walking&quot; is a large scale sculpture of a boy walking by Ronnie Van Hout. The artwork is proposed to be located on the corner of Potters Park at the intersection of Balmoral and Dominion Road.</td>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$565,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fearens and Harold Long Reserves linkage Stage 2</td>
<td>Design and delivery of an artwork by mana whenua artist Chris Bailey at the Fearens Avenue pedestrian entry point to the park.</td>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>Jun-19</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$59,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gift offers region wide</td>
<td>Assessment of gift proposals region wide. Implementation and instillation support for accepted gifts.</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$249,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heron Park sculpture</td>
<td>Design and delivery of Judy MilIar's standalone artwork for Heron Park, a priority action from the Heron Park Action Plan.</td>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$1,007,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jubilee Bridge</td>
<td>Parks project with contribution from Regional Public Art budget to allow for an artist team (Janina Williams and Shannon Novak) to collaborate with the bridge designers to create a unique integrated artwork within the bridge design.</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$749,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myers Park underpass</td>
<td>Delivery of an integrated artwork by mana whenua artist Graham Tipene in collaboration with Warren and Mahoney Architects.</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$649,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manukau Coastal Walkway Stage 2 (Barnfield Reserve to Tāyers Bay)</td>
<td>Implementation of an artist-led (Hennata Nicholas) coastal boardwalk integration, following Te Aranga design principles, linking Barnfield Reserve to Tāyers Bay.</td>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>Jun-19</td>
<td>$2,350</td>
<td>$99,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manurewa Train Station</td>
<td>Installation of arts integration into the existing bridge by installing faced mesh fence.</td>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massey Westgate Library and Community Facility</td>
<td>Delivery of Robin Rawstorne's artist-designed children's reading pod, integrated artwork within the library.</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$52,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oakley Creek (Fale) stormwater and outdoor classroom</td>
<td>Implementation of permanent art in conjunction with a major stormwater project, based on community consultation and being delivered over a three year period. The delivery of a Fale (community classroom) developed by artist Sopoimalama.</td>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$498,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O'Connell street</td>
<td>Installation of a suspended work by artist Catherine Griffiths based on the voxel O developed following on from O'Connell Street improvements.</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Jul-19</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$122,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ōtara Creek Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Parks project with contribution from Regional Public Art budget to allow for an artist to collaborate with the bridge designers to create a unique integrated artwork within the bridge design.</td>
<td>Ōtara-Papaitonga</td>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rainbow Machine</td>
<td>Implementation of a temporary artwork by collective Oh No Sumo for children and families in urban spaces.</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Sep-19</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$385,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Attachment A - 2018/2019 ACE Regional Public Art work programme

### Indicative public art projects with 2018/2019 regional public art budget contribution (total 2018/2019 capex budget: $2,117,431)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description/Key Activities</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated Delivery Timeframe</th>
<th>Regional Public Art Contribution (FY19)</th>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost (until FY21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffrage 125 Temporary Artworks</td>
<td>Installation of temporary artworks to mark the 125th anniversary of the Suffrage movement across four locations.</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Nov-19</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public art infrastructure</td>
<td>Development of public art infrastructure such as screens for digital art works and temporary creative placemaking public art assets to be used across multiple years over multiple sites.</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>determined annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project close-out</td>
<td>Cost related to project completion activities e.g. capitalisation, post implementation reviews, asset register updates, etc.</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>determined annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design programme</td>
<td>City Rail Link precinct plan including Lower Queen Street</td>
<td>Develop a comprehensive plan for the integration of public art within the new transit system and explore the opportunity for a public artwork around the newly developed Lower Queen Street plaza with the OBU team.</td>
<td>Wātamuatā</td>
<td>From FY19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takamidane conveyance channel</td>
<td>Identify opportunities, and develop a plan and concepts for the inclusion of permanent public art in conjunction with a Takamidane Stormwater project involving the conversion of flat farm land into a 2.1km open channel with planting/walkways/viewing areas. The wider development includes a new school.</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Street south streetscape upgrade</td>
<td>Design of an integrated artwork opportunity for the redevelopment of the south end of Federal Street, managed by Auckland Transport and the Development Programmes Office (DPCO).</td>
<td>Wātamuatā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central interceptor</td>
<td>Develop plans and designs for public art for the above ground plant rooms of the ‘Central interceptor’ project in collaboration with Parks. The ‘Central interceptor’ is a wastewater tunnel proposed to run between Western Springs and the Māngere wastewater treatment plant.</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td>$426,000</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barry Curtis Park</td>
<td>Building on the site-embedded elements of the design of the park, work with a named artist to develop an artwork for the park.</td>
<td>Howick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital and interactive artwork</td>
<td>Development of contemporary public art works in response to technological innovation.</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary artworks</td>
<td>Ongoing development of temporary public art works programme - a priority of the Public Art Policy implementation action plan.</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping programme</td>
<td>Research and forward planning to identify stand-alone and integrated public art opportunities. Aligned with strategic priorities identified for public art. This includes actively monitoring work programmes of other CCDOs and CCDOs and providing advice as required.</td>
<td>Current project opportunities under investigation include: Otahuhu flats facility, community facility, citywide greenways projects, Long Bay Reserve, regional parks, Marden / Dalby street, Western Corridor / Avondale SPA, Mt Albert town centre artwork, Devonport-Takapuna Local board area and others.</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>From FY19</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Attachment A - 2018/2019 ACE Regional Public Art work programme


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description/Key Activities</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated Delivery Timeframe</th>
<th>Regional Public Art Contribution (FY19)</th>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost (until FY21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategy development programme** | Identify opportunities and develop plans for permanent public art in conjunction with the Panuku transform and unlock projects, and DFO city and town centre upgrades. | Plans are underway for:  
- Manukau Transformation  
- Northcote town centre  
- Onehunga Transformation  
- Tāmaki Reserves | Multiple     | From FY19                      | TBC         | TBC                        | $ 2,117,350 | $ 5,126,014 |
| **Advisory programme**            | Provide advice and support to partners, CCOs and CCOs regarding permanent public art projects. |                                                                             | Multiple     | Ongoing                      | TRC         | TRC                        | |

---

**Public Art Capex Forecast FY18-FY20**

- FY19 Planned: 2.1
- FY20 Estimated: 2.4
- FY21 Estimated: 2.6

**Breakdown of Planned CAPEX Spend in FY19 ($2.1M)**

- Build: 1.53
- Design: 0.43
- Scope: 0.16
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## Attachment A - 2018/2019 ACE Regional Public Art Work Programme

### Arts and Culture Collections and Asset Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description/Key Activities</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Key Contact / Lead Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Collections - Renewals</td>
<td>An on-going programme of renewals for all outdoor and indoor art collections, pou, and some historic/memorial assets.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$306,341</td>
<td>Peter Tilley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Collections - Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td>An on-going programme of asset management (including database upkeep, storage, maintenance and repairs) for outdoor and indoor art collections, pou, and some historic/memorial assets.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$709,934</td>
<td>Peter Tilley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To propose the approval of the strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport & Recreation to deliver on prioritised initiatives in the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan (ASARSAP) for a three-year term (2018-2021).
2. To provide a progress report to the Environment and Community Committee as requested at its 5 December 2017 meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
3. Council’s region-wide investment programme in sport and recreation supports the implementation of the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan (ASARSAP) to encourage Aucklanders to be more active more often. The investment programme includes the strategic partnership grant.
4. Aktive - Auckland Sport & Recreation have received a strategic partnership grant to support the implementation of ASARSAP for the past three financial years.
5. Five priority initiatives were identified in partnership with Sport New Zealand and Aktive as a focus for the 2017/2018 grant. These initiatives included improved sector capability aligned to the development of communities of activity, shared school/community facilities, sector engagement in the Sports Facility Priorities Plan, strengthening and growing volunteers, as well as supporting a knowledgeable sector.
6. An interim accountability report has been received from Aktive confirming good progress has been made against the identified priorities.
7. This report recommends the approval of the strategic partnership grant to Aktive for a three-year term (2018-2021) to continue to deliver on priority initiatives from ASARSAP.

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

a) approve the strategic partnership grant of $552,000 per annum to Aktive Auckland Sport & Recreation to deliver on agreed priority initiatives from the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan for a three-year term (2018-2021).

Horopaki / Context
8. Aktive’s vision is for Auckland to be the world’s most active city. Aktive is committed to helping people and communities across Auckland to achieve sporting habits for life. As both Sport New Zealand’s and Auckland Council’s strategic partner in Auckland, this means investing in organisations and projects that will get more people recreating and playing sport, with focuses on young people and identified communities. With a region as large, as populated and as culturally and geographically diverse as Auckland, alignment is crucial to get the best for Auckland.
9. Aktive work with a number of national and regional partners to fund and deliver Community Sport in Auckland. This includes Sport New Zealand, Auckland Council, Foundation North, the NZCT, Lion Foundation, Sport Auckland, Harbour Sport, Sport Waitakere, CLM Community Sport-Counties Manukau and College Sport, as well as a number of commercial sponsors. Auckland Council’s investment makes up roughly 5 per cent of Aktive’s total funding.

10. Auckland Council aligns our sport and recreation regional investment to the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan (ASARSAP), supporting Aucklanders to be more active, more often. This support includes the provision of facilities and open space, delivering programmes and sector investment.

11. Aligned to outcomes sought in ASARSAP, Aktive has been working collaboratively with Sport NZ, Auckland Council, Regional Sports Trusts and others to co-create a delivery approach to address declining participation rates recognised as “The Auckland Approach to Community Sport”.

12. The Auckland Approach identifies Communities of Activity (CoA). These are prioritised neighbourhoods and suburbs where delivery can involve communities in shaping targeted participation options, and connect programmes (CoA) facilities with potential participants.

13. Twenty-two geographic CoAs have been established across Auckland. These are a result of local insights, community and stakeholder consultation. Each CoA has a specific delivery plan focusing on Sector Development, Spaces & Places, School & Community, Insights, Target Populations and Coaching.

Previous Aktive Investment

14. In 2015/2016 the ASARSAP - Senior Leaders Implementation Group identified priorities for years one to three of the plan. The key initiatives identified for the Auckland Council to drive through investment in Aktive were:

- volunteer development and retention
- sport sector engagement and buy in to develop the Sport Facility Network Plan (now known as the Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan)
- programmes and services that improve sport sector capability including multisport and facility partnerships and viable business operating models
- development of school/community clusters to increase utilisation of school sport and recreation facilities by the community.

15. In 2017/2018 the priorities were refined to:

- Develop the capability of recreation, sport and community organisations aligned to CoAs
- Facilitate partnerships to make the most of local facilities and resources with a focus on shared school/community facilities
- Sector engagement in the Sports Facility Priorities Plan
- Strengthening and growing volunteers
- Supporting a knowledgeable sector.

Rationale for supporting a 3-year funding term

16. Aktive directly contributes to Auckland Council’s strategic goals through delivery on key priorities identified in the ASARSAP. This Plan is a key delivery strategy for sport and recreation related elements of the Auckland Plan.

17. Aktive has received the Strategic Partnership Grant for the past 3 years and delivered on all Key Performance Indicators and Outcomes.
18. A three-year commitment would support Aktive and their community sport partners. It would give them the confidence to commit to longer term initiatives in community, staff contracts. It also sends the right message to other funders that Auckland Council supports these programmes.

19. Auckland Council will work with Aktive to update annual deliverables and receive six monthly reports enabling any poor delivery to be addressed promptly.

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

20. An interim report reflective of the past 11 months of delivery has been received from Aktive. The report demonstrates progress has been made against each of the 2017/2018 priorities. These outcomes were delivered by Aktive regionally and through coordinated investment into the local delivery network including Sport Auckland, North Harbour Sport, Sport Waitakere and CLM Community Sport.

21. Examples of tangible outcomes as a result of this partnership grant from the region included:

- The development and early implementation of 22 Communities of Activity (CoAs) delivery plans.
- Capability support in strategic planning and governance provided to 10 Auckland Regional Sports Organisations and 101 community clubs or groups.
- Later in the year, Local Boards will be surveyed (as part of the Sport New Zealand stakeholder survey) to measure their levels of satisfaction regarding sport and recreation delivery in their area. The outcome of the survey will be known by September 2018. Significant levels of engagement (formally and informally) have been carried out with local boards across the region.
- CLM Community Sport hosted a series of Community Open days engaging with local clubs and encouraging engagement around the future of local parks and the sporting and recreation options and opportunities. Over 4000 people attended and participated in the interactive community area to share feedback and ideas on the future.
- Sport Auckland worked with and have discussed school-club links with 77 primary, intermediate and secondary schools.
- CLM Community Sport are facilitating a partnership between Auckland Basketball Association, Auckland Dream, College Sport and Papatoetoe High School to scope and enable the delivery of basketball programmes and competition leagues at the school.
- Harbour Sport Regional Trust has brokered a relationship between a Pacific Island Group and Glenfield College to enable a weekly volleyball competition to be held at the college.
- Sport Auckland was approached by Glendowie Bowling Club (GBC) to assist them in securing their future. Sport Auckland are strongly influencing GBC to involve the tennis club, Local Board, other compatible sports codes and the community at large to create a multi-use sports hub in Glenadowie.
- Sport Waitakere are undertaking a ‘social innovation’ approach in Lincoln North which has three secondary schools, one intermediate and two primary schools to better engage them in sport and physical activity.
- The first stage and agreed plan of the Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan was completed and adopted by council (and One Voice – the independent advisory panel) in the first quarter of 2017-2018. Criteria for this plan and an assessment framework have been confirmed. The terms of reference for the assessment panel have been completed and membership confirmed.
- The Active Citizens World Wide Research was shared with Auckland Council by Aktive to provide an alternate lens to view sport and recreation needs. Benchmarking with other cities around the world will be possible in the next 12 months.
- Aktive submitted to the Auckland Plan and Long-term Plan through the use of an insight piece on the value and impact of sport in Auckland.
22. A summary of Aktive’s reporting is attached in Attachment A and a thematic report is found in Attachment B.

23. A full report including local reporting for each of the Aktive Group community sport providers has been provided in printed form in the councillor’s lounge.

Future Investment Recommendations

24. The key priority areas for 2017/2018 funding are longer-term strategic priorities and it is recommended that future funding is used to continue their development and implementation.

25. It is also recommended that the funding term be extended from annually to a three-year term. Funding will continue to deliver on agreed priority initiatives from ASARSAP and report to the Environment and Community Committee every six months. The investment will:
   • increase organisational capability of recreation, sport and community organisations through the delivery of the Auckland Approach to Community Sport and a focus on targeted communities of activity
   • support sustainable partnerships between the community and schools for access and use of recreation and sport facilities
   • support the implementation of the Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan
   • deliver on a high level strategic challenge to increase infrastructure and investment in personnel engaged in volunteer management.

26. It is recommended that agreed performance measures would remain subject to annual revision and the Sport and Recreation team would continue to support and be involved in monitoring Aktive’s progress.

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

27. Local boards were consulted during the development of ASARSAP. The sport and recreation investment programme supports the implementation of ASARSAP.

28. Auckland Approach to Community Sport delivery partners continue to collaborate with local boards that contain communities of activity. This collaboration ensures a more connected and cohesive approach to community led delivery.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

29. The ASARSAP recognises the critical importance of connection with Māori, and includes key initiatives focussing on improving the health and well-being of Māori. ASARSAP Initiative 3.2 is to develop Te Whai Oranga – Māori Sport and Recreation Framework which identifies how to support improved health and wellbeing for Māori. ASARSAP 7.2 is to develop and support marae based sport and recreation facilities in response to evidence of demand.

30. In the development of Communities of Activity partners are seeking opportunity to work with Māori, prioritising outcomes in these communities.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

31. The strategic partnership grant is part of the sport and recreation investment programme identified in the long-term plan budget.

32. The level of funding will remain the same ($552,000 per annum) with the total commitment over three years totalling $1,656,000.

33. The recommendation to extend the term of agreement does not give rise to any major financial risks.

34. It is likely that confirmed longer term funding will enable greater return on investment encouraged by business continuity.
Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
35. The allocation of the strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport and Recreation is considered by staff as low risk. Aktive is the only regional organisation with the ability to deliver a co-ordinated approach through varied delivery agents such as the Regional Sports Trusts and CLM Community Sport to deliver prioritised ASARSAP initiatives.
36. Risks surrounding Aktive’s performance by its contacted delivery agents can be mitigated by close monitoring of six monthly reports submitted to Auckland Council.
37. This grant is aligned to Sport New Zealand’s investment to Aktive (further reducing any risk to Auckland Council).

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
38. Following committee approval to release the strategic partnership grant for the confirmed period, a funding agreement will be prepared for Aktive that ensures clear accountability and KPIs for each of the four geographical areas (North, West, Central and Southern) for the investment.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
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<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Aktive group thematic reporting - interim</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

Aktive received a Strategic Partnership Grant of $552,000.00 from Auckland Council to support the implementation of the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan (ASARSAP), which is aligned to ‘The Auckland Approach to Community Sport’, Aktive’s strategic approach to community sport provision in Auckland. Whilst Aktive undertakes a level of work, most of the investment is deployed to our delivery partners: Sport Auckland, Harbour Sport, CLM-Community Sport (CLM) and Sport Waitakere for local delivery. A financial breakdown is contained within the report.

This Interim Report highlights the outcomes against key performance indicators aligned to five key areas: Organisational Capability, Facility Partnerships, Fit-for-Purpose Network of facilities, Skilled and Growing Volunteer Base and Knowledgeable Sector.
ASAR SAP 15.2: Organisational capability

Develop the capability of recreation, sport and community organisations

Initiatives and outcomes
- Review the alignment of sport organisations across Auckland to ensure effective delivery, maximising skills and use of resources.
- Investigate opportunities to maximise the skills and use of resources in recreation and sport organisations.

Description
It is acknowledged that the Auckland Approach to Community Sport through its focus on targeted communities of activity will deliver on organisational capability.

Measures
1. Satisfaction of local boards in areas where there are Communities of Activity under the Auckland Approach
   - As part of the Sport NZ Stakeholder Survey, which was deployed in April, local boards were included. Local boards were asked a range of questions regarding the work being deployed by RSTs and CLM, including levels of satisfaction. Dependant on the outcome of the report, which will be known by the end of August 2018, a follow up survey with local boards will be deployed in September 2018.

   - RSTs and CLM, have ongoing engagement with local boards, most meet as a minimum, quarterly.

2. Evidence of delivery agent consultation with community – including council staff, facilities, community groups and local boards.
   Community consultation driven by the four delivery agents has resulted in:
   - The establishment of 22 geographic Communities of Activity (CoAs) across Auckland is as a result of local insights, community and stakeholder consultation (Appendix1). Each CoA has a specific delivery plan. A summary of delivery examples across thematic areas including: Sector Development, Spaces & Places, School & Community, Insights, Target Populations and Coaching, can be found at Appendix 2. Council staff are members of the thematic actions groups leading this work.

   - As an example of community consultation, CLM-Community held five community open days in each local board area to engage and consult with the local community. The events were held in the following areas:
     - Bledisloe Park, Pukekohe
     - Pulman Park, Papakura
     - Mountford Park, Manurewa
     - Otamariki Park, Otara
3. Evidence of new community driven initiatives as a result of additional funding to COAs.
   - As an example, Harbour Sport have identified Helensville as a CoA, as a result they are working with the community in regard to the development of a ‘school community partnership hub’ involving Kaipara College and local clubs including; rugby, swimming, netball, football, tennis and rugby league.

4. Evidence of plans established and deliverables against these plans as a result of additional funding to COAs.
   - A Delivery Plan has been established for each of the 22 COAs. Each Plan highlights the target groups and primary services being deployed, applying locally-led and co-design approaches. (Appendix 2).

5. Evidence of additional funding into Communities of Activity as a result of Auckland Council investment
   - There are multiple funders; Council, Sport NZ, NZCT and Foundation North in particular, supporting deployment of services in each of the 22 CoAs. These funders also support general deployment of services across local regions. The number of CoAs would be reduced without the combined support from funders.

**ASARSAP 8.1: Facility Partnerships**
Facilitate partnerships to make the most of local facilities and resources

**Initiatives and outcomes**
Continue to work with the Ministry of Education to develop a framework and resources to support sustainable partnerships between the community and schools for access and use of recreation and sport facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of the project team and actively contributing towards the implementation of the project plan</td>
<td>Aktive continues to be a member of the project team and attends all meetings. Work has slowed this year; however, AG continue to work with MoE at a higher level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to the development of the framework, guidelines and resources for community/school partnerships (council-led)</td>
<td>Aktive’s Schools &amp; Community Manager supports Council in this area of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead the development of the primary and intermediate school survey.</td>
<td>The primary-intermediate survey remains to be actioned. A new Youth Adviser Role, funded by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the school stocktake results and working with the project team, develop opportunities to facilitate sharing relationships between sports/club/community and schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Agent</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Waitakere</td>
<td>Blockhouse Bay Int</td>
<td>Development of community use policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Waitakere</td>
<td>Waitakere College</td>
<td>Development of a multi-purpose facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Auckland</td>
<td>Mt Roskill Grammar</td>
<td>Development of community access policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Auckland</td>
<td>Wesley Int</td>
<td>Development of community access policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Harbour Sport</td>
<td>Glenfield College</td>
<td>Facilitating planning process between North Shore Table Tennis and school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Harbour Sport</td>
<td>Albany Junior High</td>
<td>Facilitating relationship between school and Harbour Volleyball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLM</td>
<td>Papatoetoe High</td>
<td>Development of basketball opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLM</td>
<td>Southern Cross</td>
<td>Facilitating community access to pool and recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. From the opportunities identified in the stocktake each Aktive delivery agent supports at least two schools to facilitate new community sharing relationships. Outcomes should include evidence of additional hours of community access.

2. Primary and intermediate school survey completed for distribution.
   - The Primary School Survey will be undertaken in July 2018.

3. Provide 1 qualitative case study on each new community sharing relationship per delivery agent.
   - Case Studies are attached at Appendix 4.
4. Four case studies have been provided in relation to Auckland Council investment. The case studies highlight initiatives/projects that are being led by Harbour Sport, Sport Waitakere, CLM and Sport Auckland in regard to community sharing relationships with schools. Each case study is a work in progress. Full impact details will be highlighted in the 2019 report.

- **Sport Waitakere** have chosen Lincoln North as an area of focus, which although a small area, it has 3 secondary, 1 intermediate and 2 primary schools. Furthermore, the area has 4 community clubs, and 2 nationally significant sports centres, located in a densely populated residential and commercial area. The initiative seeks to improve the understanding of needs within school and community settings and identify opportunities for collaboration.

- **Harbour Sport** focussed within the geographic area of Glenfield. Following community consultation, it was identified that an indoor facility was required to support demand for volleyball. Glenfield College have agreed to community use of their indoor facilities to support volleyball. Since the agreement has been in place, the number of participants have increased to 25-30 participants per session. The partnership between Harbour Sport and Glenfield College has lead to other community use of the College’s indoor and outdoor facilities by clubs.

- **CLM** have partnered with Auckland Basketball Services Limited, Auckland Dream and Papatoetoe High School regarding the use of the school’s facilities for basketball programmes and competition leagues. Whilst early days, good momentum is being achieved.

- **Sport Auckland** have partnered with Glendowie Bowling Club to assist in the securing of the club’s future, due to both a decline in membership and an aging membership. Sport Auckland, working with other codes, community groups, schools and the local board, are advocating for the development of a ‘sports hub’, which would support multiple codes and community organisations, including schools. At present Sacred Heart College and Glendowie College have been involved in discussions and planning. Good momentum is being achieved.

**ASARSAP 7.2: Fit-for-purpose network of facilities**

*Provide quality fit-for-purpose facilities at regional, sub-regional and local levels for informal recreation and sport*

**Initiatives and outcomes**

- Develop a plan for sport facility provision to establish priorities and identify opportunities for integration across sports.
- Prioritise innovative ways to address inequities amongst different recreation and sport activities, access to facilities, funding and participation costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the implementation of the Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priority Plan (ASS:FPP)</td>
<td>• The ASS: FPP first stage plan and agreed process was completed and adopted by Council and OneVoice in Q1 of 2017-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of the Facility Priorities Assessment Panel.</td>
<td>• Aktive will administer the Facilities Priorities Assessment Panel. The process for establishing the panel will be completed by end of June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 8 individual applications have been received for assessment by the panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The selection panel is to meet to appoint members to the panel. There is room to co-opt other members and a skills matrix is being prepared to guide any such further membership of the panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project synopses and supporting material has been received for 13 projects from 11 codes. Initial Council feedback will be provided to the assessment panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead an engaged sector committed to the philosophy and implementation of the ASSFPP process.</td>
<td>• The gathering of priority projects from codes and the assembling of the priorities assessment panel, has commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sector communications will be established, as agreed at June’s ASARSAP meeting, for distribution as a reminder of the ASS:FPP purpose and process for new staff in Council, codes and the Aktive/RST network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Membership of and chairing of Regional Facility Working Groups and Whole of Sport Plan Groups in a number of codes gives Aktive the direct platform to ensure ASS:FPP principles are in mind as discussions regarding facility development take place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures

1. Develop and administer the Facility Priorities Assessment Panel in line with the terms of reference for the group.
   
   - The Terms of reference for the Facility Priorities Assessment Panel, has been completed, panel membership will be confirmed by June 30th 2018.

2. Evidence of leadership enabling appropriate sector engagement through the implementation of the ASFPF to ensure sector ownership of the plan and its process.
   
   - Criteria has been established, with an assessment framework confirmed.
   - Senior and experienced members of the sector have come forward for the Assessment Panel.
   
   - Further communications online and direct to codes will reinforce the purpose and processes of the ASS:FPP.

ASARSAP 13.2 Skilled and growing volunteer base
Strengthen and grow the number and skills of volunteers supporting recreation and sport activities

Initiatives and outcomes
- Develop a Volunteer Action Plan for the sport and recreation sector.
- Develop tools to support recreation and sport organisations in governance, management and volunteer development.

Description
A high level strategic challenge to increase infrastructure and investment in personnel engaged in volunteer management has been completed.

Measures
1. Implementation opportunities identified and plan completed.
   
   - Following the development of the Volunteer Action Plan in 2017, a proposal was agreed by ASARSAP in June 2018, for further work to be undertaken in regard to the establishment of sector resources to support the attraction and retention of volunteers. This work will be completed by April 2019.

2. Evidence of best practice tools being used to support recreation and sport organisations in governance, management and volunteer development and outcomes being achieved.
   
   - On the 8th May, Aktive hosted its 4th Chairs Roundtable. Guest speakers included; Minister for Sport & Recreation-Honourable Grant Robertson;
Professional Director, Geoff Ricketts and Mai Chen, Director BNZ Board, Chair, Superdiversity Centre for Law, Policy & Business and author of the “Superdiversity Stocktake”. By invitation, 42 chairs attended from a variety of sports codes.

- Marketing & Communications Toolkit for the sector is nearing completion, due July.
- Good Sports, which aims to create a quality sporting experience for young people by supporting the key adult influencers of young people including; parents, caregivers, coaches and officials, has developed several tools and training opportunities to underpin this work. Sport NZ are currently considering a national rollout of Good Sports, due to its success.

**ASARSAP 18.1: Knowledgeable Sector**

Build knowledge in the sector to deliver improved outcomes by actively sharing insights, learnings and best practice

**Initiatives and outcomes**

Continue to:

- collate and disseminate insights relevant to the recreation and sport sector in Auckland
- build sector capability to monitor and evaluate recreation and sport programmes and initiatives

**Description**

It is acknowledged that the Auckland Approach to Community Sport through its focus on targeted communities of activity will have a focus on actively sharing insights, learnings and best practice

**Measures**

1. Evidence of insights shared with Auckland Council and impact these insights have had on local and regional decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insight</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Citizens World Wide Research</td>
<td>Provided an alternate lens for Council to view sport &amp; recreation. Benchmarking with other cities around the world will be possible in the next 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Auckland Together</td>
<td>Input into initiatives, such as monitoring report. Auckland Council and Auckland Transport also sit on this group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Evidence of insights shared with recreation, sport and community organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insight</th>
<th>Who it was shared with and impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value and impact of sport in Auckland provided as part of the</td>
<td>Shared with the sport and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submission process for the Auckland Council and Long-Term Plans</td>
<td>recreation sector within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of participant Auckland results</td>
<td>Shared with wider sport and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recreation sector within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland at Sector Workshop,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hosted by Auckland Council,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aktive and Sport NZ on 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 2017, at the Cloud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for sector on insights tool</td>
<td>Discussions with NZRU, Tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern &amp; Auckland Tennis, NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Golf and Football NZ on using</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the tool and linking in with their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other membership data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of an Auckland Insights discussion group</td>
<td>Group been piloted with NZ Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Football NZ to share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge about working in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changing Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insights and research information on Aktive website</td>
<td>A new resource has been added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onto the Aktive website (<a href="http://aktive.org.nz/our-">http://aktive.org.nz/our-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work/insightsresearch) to provide a ‘one-stop-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shop’ for the sector to access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relevant research documents and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Financial information relating to the resources contributed by Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding allocation summary for financial year ending June 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Funding Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Funding Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau / CLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Waitakere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aktive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $552,000
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Aktive’s Community Partners – How Much did you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Development</th>
<th>Spaces &amp; Places</th>
<th>Insights</th>
<th>Physical Literacy (School &amp; Community)</th>
<th>Leadership &amp; Advocacy</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Target Populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RST &amp; Partnerships</td>
<td>Spaces &amp; Places</td>
<td>Insights</td>
<td>Physical Literacy (School &amp; Community)</td>
<td>Leadership &amp; Advocacy</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Target Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport</td>
<td>Auckland Sport</td>
<td>Auckland Sport</td>
<td>Auckland Sport</td>
<td>Auckland Sport</td>
<td>Auckland Sport</td>
<td>Auckland Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 1</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 2</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 3</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 4</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 5</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 6</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 8</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 9</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 10</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 11</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 12</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 13</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 15</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 16</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 17</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 18</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 19</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 20</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 22</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 23</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 24</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 25</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 26</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 27</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 29</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 30</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 31</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 32</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 33</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 34</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 36</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 37</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 38</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 39</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 40</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 41</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 43</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 44</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 45</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 46</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 47</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 48</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 50</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 51</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 52</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 53</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 54</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 55</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 57</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 58</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 59</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 60</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 61</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 62</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 64</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 65</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 66</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 67</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 68</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 69</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 71</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 72</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 73</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 74</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 75</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 76</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport 78</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 79</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 80</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 81</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 82</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 83</td>
<td>Auckland Sport 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Auckland Approach to Community Sport (AA) has led to the identification of the following 22 geographies Community Sport (C) areas assessed using a mix of Sport 6 and COC to tackle the work being undertaken locally by RSTs and CLM.

To enhance the learning for students, teachers and coaches during KiwiSport delivery, and ensure quality experiences for all, Sport Auckland has undertaken a project which has created a KiwiSportPE Curriculum Overview and Resources. The project supports Sport NZ’s vision to enrich and inspire the lives of young people by creating a lifelong love of sport and being physically active.

As part of the Community Sport Engagement meetings, Ministers have been discussing ideas about using insights, and developing evaluation tools, to help understand the impact of our work.

Separately, some partners have been working on individual projects, for example:

- Sport Auckland have hosted a Co-op student for a project on ‘experiences affecting physical activity participation in a primary school setting’.
- Sport Auckland have worked with independent bodies to explore barriers to physical activity and possible solutions in the Lincoln North area. This work is expected to finish by the end of July 2018.
- Sport Waikato, through the TPG see sports project, have been working alongside Glen Eden bowling club to understand how they operate in order to offer additional activities.
- Sport Auckland have worked with local boards and clubs to include Auckland Sport’s ‘Ask Ask Ask’ in their specific Community of Activity Plans.

These successes are reported in the next section ‘How well did you do?’
Insights and information sharing on topics such as LTP, AHS, Plan, LTP Submissions, Council Income Generation Proposals and the Northern Corridor project.

Completions for secondary schools. Community events were held across CM withYP the focus. An extensive process around the appointment of a YP Lead has been undertaken, with an appointment being made; the candidate will start at the beginning of May 2018.

A number of events are coming up with a collaborative Papakura Whanau Day between CLM and Aktive-HERA on the 17th May and secondary schools Kikiti Tournament at Bruce Pulman Park on the 10th of April.

Planning the delivery of a Ripper Tag event in partnership James Cook Secondary School, RSA and Police.

A Heat Map attached has been developed to show impact against target groups from across primary services.

The remaining 36% of time has been allocated to supporting both local and regional people e.g. North Harbour Sports Council, CM’s Good Sports, with Dr. Ralph Pim, 200+ people in attendance or contributing to the regional advocacy. Sport Matters, regarding the LTP & Auckland Plan, advocating for increased investment for the future security of sport & rec in Auckland, e.g. examples.

E3T & CLM undertake locally significant Leadership & Advocacy campaigns, mobilising & assisting clubs, community agencies, tertiary, RSA’s & schools to have their say in regard to the LTP/Auckland Plan submission campaign.

TLC - Worked with Marae, Glenbowrie St Mary’s, St. Cuthbert’s and Onewaia schools, helping coaches and sports leaders utilise framework.

CLM
- Hosted public event for 200+ coaches, parents and sports leaders with speaker Dr. Ralph Pim (p. 1, 8, 2)
- E3T - Delivered to 45 coaches, teachers and sports leaders at three schools
- Facilitated three new KwikSport Coach Induction Courses for 26 participants

CLM Community Sport
- 8 TPG Family Fun Clubs - community driven, promoting wildlife participation, led by community centres, churches and Marae achieved.
- More projects in pipeline in 45 COA’s.
Sport and Recreation Strategic Partnership Grant to Aktive Auckland Sport & Recreation for 2018/2019

Attachment B
Item 11
New junior clubs were also established and supported in Takapuna, Nautilus, and Athletics in Glenfield. UA played a leadership, enabling and connecting role in Takapuna Touch, a community led group aiming to increase physical activity in Pacific and Māori.

CLM’s Club Connect programme sees Sport Compass as the initial assessment. To date over 25 clubs, plus 26 netball clubs in one centre, have been engaged in the package which includes support in governance, marketing, media and design, and sponsorship. Good feedback has been received from clubs.

“Too date we are impressed with the direction CLM have taken to engage suitable specialist contractors around marketing, media, design, governance, and leadership financial management.”

“Just to congratulate the team for getting it right!!! As volunteers it’s important to be heard and supported, and that’s definitely something CLM are doing!! Well done...”

See link to articles written as part of CLM work with clubs: http://www.cwm.co.nz/community klub-club-club-club-club-club-club-club.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment B</th>
<th>Item 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New junior clubs were also established and supported in Takapuna, Nautilus, and Athletics in Glenfield. UA played a leadership, enabling and connecting role in Takapuna Touch, a community led group aiming to increase physical activity in Pacific and Māori. CLM’s Club Connect programme sees Sport Compass as the initial assessment. To date over 25 clubs, plus 26 netball clubs in one centre, have been engaged in the package which includes support in governance, marketing, media and design, and sponsorship. Good feedback has been received from clubs. “Too date we are impressed with the direction CLM have taken to engage suitable specialist contractors around marketing, media, design, governance, and leadership financial management.” “Just to congratulate the team for getting it right!!! As volunteers it’s important to be heard and supported, and that’s definitely something CLM are doing!! Well done...” See link to articles written as part of CLM work with clubs: [<a href="http://www.cwm.co.nz/community">http://www.cwm.co.nz/community</a> klub-club-club-club-club-club-club-club](<a href="http://www.cwm.co.nz/community">http://www.cwm.co.nz/community</a> klub-club-club-club-club-club-club-club).</td>
<td>Table 11CLM – secondary schools have been encouraged to develop school social sport opportunities for YP. An extensive amount of time by the RSD has been spent in secondary schools building relationships and in some cases instating new relationships with staff. As a result, there has been a positive capability built around School Sports Plans. There has also been an emphasis on working with local RSO’s to engage more YP. The result of the campaign saw postcards being taken to various events for community groups to “have their say” easily, along with the use of social media as examples. RSDs &amp; CLM provide regular overviews to their communities, below are links to several newsletter examples. <strong>Harbour Sport:</strong> <a href="https://rmarchi.mgp87a1didd780/34097d219a53-66c3b7602359884de-190095571-251e2aeeb">https://rmarchi.mgp87a1didd780/34097d219a53-66c3b7602359884de-190095571-251e2aeeb</a> <strong>Harbour Sport:</strong> <a href="https://rmarchi.mgp87a1didd780/34097d219a53-66c3b7602359884de-190095571-251e2aeeb">https://rmarchi.mgp87a1didd780/34097d219a53-66c3b7602359884de-190095571-251e2aeeb</a> SW <a href="https://rmarchi.mgp87a1didd780/34097d219a53-66c3b7602359884de-190095571-251e2aeeb">https://rmarchi.mgp87a1didd780/34097d219a53-66c3b7602359884de-190095571-251e2aeeb</a> hockey could support their own clubs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aktive’s Community Partners – What impact did this have?

**Sector Development**

The impact of the building focus on insights and evaluation has meant a more nuanced and targeted approach to our work across the board.

**Spaces & Places**

RST/Partners as a neutral third-party bring people and groups together around multi-sport or large-scale projects is crucial to keeping projects on track over extended periods and as parties come and go. These are not facilitators of projects, they are very much people projects.

**Insights**

RST/Partners keep the end goal in sight - providing facilities for communities, enabling participation in sport and recreation and all the benefits that bring. Many of these projects would have foundered, or would do in the future, without that essential support and guidance.

**Physical Literacy**

The model has led to changes in structures within RST/CLM. It has facilitated a more joined-up thinking approach across the community delivery areas e.g. School & Community, Coaching, Sector Development etc. Several delivery partners have also appointed new Community Advisor roles, with responsibility for specific CoKa.

**Leadership & Advocacy**

RST/CLM have also spent time leading consultation within their CoKas. As a result, there is a sector-wide understanding of what specific community needs have been enhanced, as has their knowledge of new delivery partners. At the same time, the understanding of the AA locally has been improved, resulting in organisations seeking opportunities to become involved.

**Coaching**

By introducing a CoKa focus we are seeing candidates being put forward who are in position to support our partner teams. We also have anecdotal evidence to suggest this shift in the Aktive (trainer) and Regional Delivery Partner (coach developer) approach is building the capability and commitment of people and organisations to deliver quality sporting and physical activity experiences and promoting ongoing development.

**Target Populations**

We are already seeing improved collaboration and communication focused on TPQs from RSTs/CLM.

Successes emerging amongst participant level and professional capability and organisational level are:

- Increased numbers of opportunities
- 2 former volunteers getting full-time roles in Samani PA delivery
- 2 Participants in Family Fun Club taking on leadership roles in their clubs to run activities for their own
- Identification of leaders and groups needing capacity support
- New areas of focus emerging for organisations including ourselves, such as personal, professional and organisational cultural competency building.
- 2 new frontline staff from diverse cultures backgrounds across the Auckland/CLM network contributed by TPQ investment (Chinese, 2 Samoan and 1 Indian).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 11</th>
<th>Attachments B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opportunities, within a CoA approach. A market penetration of 15-20% needs to be higher, especially when some of that market self-identifies for help. The CoA approach is taking us to places who might not have asked for that help traditionally.</td>
<td>Play Sport project is producing interesting evidence around what is required to improve the teaching and learning experiences for VP in sport and PE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connector and enabler in their communities, but keep a watching brief after initial projects are established.</td>
<td>CLM – the strong alignment with RSD has had a positive impact on the successful implementation of a strategy to develop School Sports Plans and target the growth of extra-school social sport, within CoA areas. Tarrants 2-4 will see significant traction in these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been an increase in KS applications received in comparison to that achieved by CMS in previous rounds. The new KS deployment in CM, resulted in 27 applications received, in comparison to the 12 received in the previous round managed by CMS due to increased awareness.</td>
<td>The LTP &amp; Auckland Plan advocacy campaign was significant with advocacy for an extra $250million over the next 10 years to support sport &amp; rec facility development for both the refurbishment of existing &amp; the development of new facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of coaches coming through the QC programme. Student coaches have since been accredited with formal coaching qualifications from both RBOs and some have been offered paid employment, enabling more coaching opportunities.</td>
<td>The number of submissions made to Council as a result was significant. Arguably, one of the best campaigns deployed in NZ. (Attachments included).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aktive’s Community Partners – What did you learn?

**Spaces & Places**

You can’t be having local people connecting together, RST Partners had significant linkages in their own communities, building enduring relationships around projects, not just for the short term.

**Insights**

Local Boards are increasingly important part of Council processes. Building those relationships, for RST Partners themselves, and also with and on behalf of local community organisations and clubs, is crucial to success.

**Sports**

Sport Auckland has been undertaking a Wesley primary school research project with AUT to understand the motivation and participation rates in physical activity for 5-10-year-old children. Field day events are organised and Tauranga Boys College have contributed. Staff from the college will be involved in the project.

**Physical Literacy**

We have learned that there are certain times when engaging with schools isn’t possible, good planning is essential ahead of year and year ends.

**Leadership & Advocacy**

In developing how Aktive and the Regional Delivery Partnerships work together, it has given clarity around where to focus time and effort, and who is responsible for what.

**Coaching**

Feedback from the Regional Delivery Partners indicates that:

- Being able to collaborate with other areas of community sport (e.g. Young People’s Leaders, Regional Sports Directors) has improved their ability to connect with people and organisations, and achieve shared outcomes
- Shifting the focus to identify communities of activity has been a challenge as it requires relationship building – change management

**Target Populations**

- Key people are critical, when you find them, find ways to support and keep them
- Networking opportunities are valuable

**Capacity/capability of RST&CLM to work in local space is currently lower than that of Chinese and Samoan space**

- Minimize turnover of key staff
- Building management

**Health sector**

- Capacity and networks have been useful in connecting with and collaborating with other initiatives (e.g. Gov, Aktive Families, Healthy Families)

**Drive**

- Robust monitoring, reporting and evaluation capacity has been limited by lack of a fit for purpose TPG outcome frame
- In general capacity for data collection, analysis and practical use looks work well with RST&CLM
| Admin and governance volunteers. | NZ which focused on evaluation. The team also attended a developmental evaluation training course. We will continue to build an evaluation and learning focus into our work. | has more resonance. It's important to be able to demonstrate what it 'looks like' which varies for every provider/deliverer e.g. club, school, rec org, community group etc. 'Keeping it Simple' we have found to be the best approach. | TAC, has recently gone through such a change. The need for improved research across the AA, at local and regional levels, has led to TAC becoming the research arm of AA. The need for a comprehensive Marketing & Communications Plan locally. This has led to increased awareness, & therefore, ability to reach new organisations previously not known & engaged with. | Sharing information and working more collaboratively within each organisation offers greater insights into the impact we make. The Auckland Approach has provided a greater focus to help shape the way we work. |
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To approve the allocation of the $200,000 additional funding for the provision of Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB) services in Auckland.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. On 31 May 2018, the Finance and Performance Committee approved one-off funding for an additional $200,000 (Resolution number FIN 2018/81) to CAB noting that officers would give consideration to the distribution of funding in a future report to the Environment and Community Committee for approval.
3. The funding was approved in response to a submission from Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux Incorporated (ACABx) to the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 (LTP), that sought an increase in baseline funding to enable CAB to continue to provide services at 32 sites and extend their reach across Auckland.
4. Staff recommend that the funding is allocated in three parts: to maintain the current levels of service through a targeted allocation to bureaux, to develop and test new ways of providing services, and to fund ACABx to review the population-based funding model and regional network provision framework.
5. Staff have met with ACABx, who support the proposal for allocating the funding.

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

a) approve the allocation of the additional $200,000 for the provision of Citizens Advice Bureaux services to Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux Incorporated as follows:
   i) $100,000 distributed to local bureaux to maintain levels of services. Funding will be allocated on a targeted basis, taking into consideration:
      1) differences in the needs and circumstances of communities served, including degrees of deprivation, and impacts of growth or change
      2) capacity of particular bureaux to maintain services (e.g. viability and level of financial and staff resource).
   ii) $60,000 to develop and test new service models to improve provision of CAB services.
   iii) $40,000 to enable ACABx to work with council on the review of the population-based funding model and development of a regional network provision framework.
Horopaki / Context

6. Auckland Council provides regional funding for CAB services across the region by way of a grant to ACABx which then distributes the funds to bureaux.

7. On 10 April 2018 the Environment and Community Committee approved funding of $1.839 million for 2018/2019 (Resolution number ENV/2018/48), to ACABx conditional on:
   - a joint review of the population-based funding model between Auckland Council and ACABx to address the issues raised in the review of CAB services, and with changes for an updated funding model to be agreed by 1 April 2019
   - updating the strategic relationship agreement with ACABx that will support the development of a Regional Network Provision Framework
   - improved reporting and access to consistent data on the service provided at regional and site level
   - meeting the requirements of a local relationship framework to support strengthened and more strategic relationships between local boards and bureaux.

8. This decision follows a review of CAB services, the findings of which were reported to the Environment and Community Committee on 20 February 2018 and 10 April 2018.

9. ACABx made a submission to the LTP (Attachment A) requesting a minimum of $201,000 annually to sustain and develop CAB services.

10. On 30 May 2018 ACABx wrote a further letter to the mayor and councillors (Attachment B) supporting the request for funding of a baseline increase of $200,000 to maintain CAB services while the joint review of the population-based funding model is underway.

11. On 31 May 2018 the Finance and Performance Committee resolved to provide a one-off grant of $200,000 (Resolution number FIN 2018/81):

   xxix) agree to a one-off funding request for an additional $200,000 to the baseline for Citizens Advice Bureau, pending a review of the Citizens Advice Bureau funding model in April 2019 by the Environment and Community Committee noting that officers will give consideration to the distribution of the funding in a report to the committee.

12. Funding and strategic relationship agreements for 2018/2019 have been agreed, and council is awaiting receipt of the 2017/2018 accountability reports for review prior to releasing funding.

13. Staff and ACABx continue to meet and scope the joint review of the current population-based funding model that ACABx applies to distribute the funds to bureaux.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

14. Table 1 summarises the LTP submission from ACABx by outcome and proposes allocation options recommended by staff.

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>ACABx submission</th>
<th>ACABx cost range</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Proposed allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Increase funding to existing 32 sites</td>
<td>Additional funding across CABs to meet increased demands</td>
<td>$93,000 - $95,000</td>
<td>Some CABs and communities face different challenges and are more vulnerable than others</td>
<td>Target distribution to respond to particular needs rather than as a general top-up across all existing bureaux $100,000 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal for allocating the funding
15. Staff recommend the one-off funding of an additional $200,000 is allocated as follows:

- $100,000 distributed to local bureaux to maintain levels of services. Funding will be allocated on a targeted basis, taking into consideration:
  - differences in the needs and circumstances of communities served, including degrees of deprivation, and impacts of growth or change
  - capacity of particular bureaux to maintain services (e.g. viability and level of financial and staff resource).
- $60,000 to develop and test new service models to improve provision of CAB services. This could include extending services to new communities and new service arrangements through satellites, clinics with marae, retirement homes and other community organisations.
- $40,000 to enable ACABx to work with council on the review of the population-based funding model and development of a regional network provision framework.

16. This proposal is supported by ACABx.

17. ACABx have also requested funding for publicity and promotion of CAB services. Council staff have investigated the potential for promoting CAB services through ‘Our Auckland’ and other council communication channels that target particular communities and populations. This option achieves ACABx’ objective and maintains the focus of this funding on the delivery and development of CAB services.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
18. Local boards have been involved in the review of CAB services, and will be involved in the review of the population-based funding model and regional network provision framework. Local boards have not been consulted regarding the allocation of this one-off funding for an additional $200,000.
19. CABs service local areas across Auckland and the additional funding will maintain the CAB outputs and capacity while the current funding allocation model is reviewed.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

20. For 2016/2017, Māori comprised eight per cent of users of CAB services, ranging from 2.5 per cent of users in the central Auckland/Waiheke cluster to 13.2 per cent in south/east Auckland cluster.

21. The impact on Māori will be considered as part of the review of the population-based funding model and development of a regional network provision framework, for example how CAB services might be more accessible to Māori communities.

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

22. This funding is a one-off grant for an additional $200,000 in the 2018/2019 financial year. The total funding for ACABx for 2018/2019 is $2,038,606. This funding is included in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

23. The allocation of a portion of this grant to enable ACABx to participate in the review of the funding model mitigates the risk of ACABx not having the capacity to participate fully in the review of the population-based funding model and development of a regional network provision framework.

24. The effectiveness of this funding, and of the wider work with ACABx depends on a functional working relationship between the parties. Work over the past year has set the platform for a productive working relationship.

25. While ACABx supports this proposal for allocating the one-off funding, they want to ensure that a targeted approach to allocate the funding doesn’t compromise their principle of being accessible to all. The one-off additional funding will increase CAB capacity to provide services that may otherwise be at risk, while the core funding will maintain current funding levels.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

26. Staff will negotiate a funding agreement with ACABx, and release the funding to ACABx for distribution.

27. Staff and ACABx will establish a joint working group that will oversee the allocation of this funding, the review of the population-based funding model and the development of a regional network provision framework. This will be reported to the committee in April 2019.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux, Submission on the Draft Long-Term Plan 2018–2028 and the Auckland Plan</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux, Letter to Mayor and Councillors</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Prestidge - Community Development Programme Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Bodman - General Manager Arts, Community and Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Kimpton - Chief Operating Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A: ACABx submission to LTP 2018

Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux Incorporated

Summary of Budget Submission to Auckland Council on the Draft Long-Term Plan 2018–2028 and the Auckland Plan


The Auckland Plan offers a thirty-year strategy for the city with a focus on how it will grow. Of the six outcome areas in the Plan Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux (ACABx) have a specific interest in the following topics.

- Belonging and participation
- Maori identity and wellbeing
- Homes and places
- Opportunity and prosperity

ACABx are supportive of the main thrust of the Plan and as a public service providing free access to advice and information, are de facto part of its implementation.

The Long-Term Plan 2018–2028 provides information about Auckland’s growth. It describes a scenario that a population the size of the city of Tauranga will be added every three years, to reach two million people by 2028. ACABx have a significant involvement in this aspect namely how an increasing population will be supported by local Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB).

The Long-Term Plan highlights three significant challenges facing Auckland of which two are highly relevant to the work of ACABx.

1. Population growth that is outstripping the ability to provide enough housing and the infrastructure that supports that growth (transport, water, wastewater, libraries, parks etc.).

2. Inequalities across different communities meaning people do not share equally in the benefits of our increasing prosperity.

ACABx considers that there is a fourth challenge created by growth – that is pressures placed on Auckland’s social infrastructure. This is as important as the Plan proposals to invest in physical infrastructure. Houses can be built, water supplied, waste removed and access to transport created but these alone do not create communities. As the Auckland Plan highlights, people flourish in areas with social amenities and facilities.

The Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux (ACABx) oversees 32 bureaux providing advisory services to more than 300,000 Aucklanders a year across the region.
We help people to know and understand their rights and obligations and how to use this information to get the best outcomes, provide people with the confidence and support they need to take action, and work for positive social change within communities and wider society. It is a free and independent service to all.

We are, by any measures, an exceptionally lean and efficient organisation. We are volunteer-based, and we rely wholly on the goodwill of our volunteers to provide services to Aucklanders in need. Our volunteers provide a necessary service which could not be replicated without vastly increased spending.

While Auckland’s population has grown significantly over the past decade, funding for CAB services by Auckland Council has been frozen, in real terms, since the formation of Auckland Council in November 2010. Whilst there are annual CPI top-ups, the rate of growth of client enquiries through this period has averaged 5% per annum. This means that 7 years after the freeze was instituted, we are seeing 41% on the same funding. We are now doing much more for less.

Notwithstanding how stretched our services are, we are seen as a very reliable and trusted service provider in the community. Our services are hugely valued within the communities we operate. The people we assist are overwhelmingly from low income households and who cannot afford to pay for the advice and services we provide at no cost.

As a volunteer-based service provider, we rely on our volunteers’ goodwill. We are asking Auckland Council for a $200,000 budget increase. We have had no funding increase for the last seven years, yet we are now seeing over 40 percent more people than we were seven years ago. Given the level of service we provide, this is a miniscule request.

As the city’s population grows public services such as CAB also need to increase to meet the social infrastructure needs of Auckland. To achieve this additional resources are required, which cannot be provided within the current financial envelope.

Budget Request

To meet the growth ACAB is seeking at least an additional $201,000 per annum from Auckland Council. This would increase the current Long-Term Plan allocation to a minimum $2,039,307 plus continuation of the annual CPI adjustment.

Page three onwards provides the full submission to Auckland Council and sets out a number of outcomes, which ACAB considers necessary to continue providing Auckland’s growing population with free advice and information.

The cost to achieve the three critical outcomes is as follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adding value to existing centres of population</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the network of Citizens Advice Bureaux</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to provide services through 32 sites</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Funding Total</strong></td>
<td>$201,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following pages set out how ACABx can respond to growth with the support of Auckland Council. This will help continue to enhance Auckland’s social infrastructure and provide additional services to current and new communities. It also provides additional feedback on the Auckland Plan and Long-Term Plan 2018–2028.
Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux Incorporated

Summary of Budget Submission to Auckland Council on the Draft Long-Term Plan 2018–2028 and the Auckland Plan

1. Purpose

The purpose of this submission is to describe how Auckland’s Citizens Advice Bureaux can help achieve the objectives and outcomes of Auckland Council’s Draft Long Term Plan 2018–2028 and also the Auckland Plan.

Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux (ACABx), have an enduring partnership with Auckland local government, which has been in place since the 1970’s. Through these partnerships many communities, whanau, family and individuals have received free advice, support and assistance. This has helped and continues to create the social fabric Auckland needs to be a world class city. With additional support, ACABx can respond to population growth, the formation of new communities, meet increases in demand and at the same time extend services to more people living and working in Auckland.

ACABx seeks to secure additional funding from Auckland Council to enable the organisation to:

a. Add value to existing centres of population through extending reach, exploring new models of delivering and offering advice and increasing awareness and take up of the services.

b. Continue to provide services through 32 sites which have been used in 2016/17 by 301,246 (excludes Justice of the Peace Clinics).

c. Extend the network of Citizens Advice Bureaux to areas currently identified as requiring services and those being developed to meet the need of a growing population.

d. Support governance, reporting of information and analysis to inform decision making.

Strengthening the above four areas will enable ACABx to support Auckland Council’s intentions and objectives for CAB services, and Auckland as a whole.

To achieve the four outcomes, ACABx is seeking at least an additional $201,000 from Auckland Council. This would build on the current Long-Term Plan allocation in 2017/2018 of $1,838,606.

2. Summary

ACABx and Auckland Council have symbiotic relationship, which is mutually beneficial. It has served many who live and work in Auckland. As the city’s population grows ACABx needs additional resources to catch up with growing demand.
The allocation of the additional funds requested is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adding value to existing centres of population</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the network of Citizens Advice Bureaux</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to provide services through 32 sites</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Funding Total</td>
<td>$201,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “Target” amount indicates the funds required to fully implement the ACA8x plan to meet the region’s growing needs.

This submission excludes the cost of resources required to fund ACA8x to carry out the initiatives resulting from the recent Review of Local Board Services.

3. Citizens Advice Bureaux

Aims and structure

Citizens Advice Bureaux are a volunteer service, open to all providing free advice, information and guidance to enable people to make decisions on matters that affect their lives and wellbeing.

The aims of the organisation are to:

- Ensure that individuals are not adversely impacted through ignorance of their rights and responsibilities, or of the services available, or through an inability to express their views and needs effectively.
- Influence the development of social policies and services, both locally and nationally which impact on the population served.

The Citizens Advice Bureau collects data from serving individuals, whanau and family, and uses this aggregated information to advocate for improved policies and services in Auckland and Aotearoa.

Each Bureau is an incorporated not for profit organisation, operated by local community volunteers. Each Bureau has a Board of elected volunteers who plan, govern and promote their CAB. In Auckland there are 11 Bureaux, who operate 32 service sites with 36 part-time staff, supporting 1,200 volunteers.

People who use CAB services in Auckland

Almost one in five Aucklanders use CAB services each year. This includes whanau, new migrants, homeless seeking emergency shelter, beneficiaries, young people starting out in life and retirees.
Public service, access and funding

Prior to 2010 and the reorganisation of local government in Auckland ACABx were supported by the legacy councils. These councils had a variety of arrangements in place with CABs, allocating them funding and in-kind costs such as subsidised or free accommodation.

In 2017/18 funding from Auckland Council to ACABx was $1.838 million. In real terms since the formation of Auckland Council in 2010 the allocation through the Long-Term Plan to ACABx has remained static. The only increase has been through the annual Consumer Price Index adjustments. The following table shows the CPI adjustment since 2013/14. (ACABx Annual Report 2016-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst funding has been on a seven year plateau the number of people accessing CAB services in Auckland has steadily increased. ACAB is servicing 41% more people than seven years ago for the same real funding amount. Each year ACABx and its members have struggled to absorb the growth. Continuing with the funding cap is not a viable option as the point has been reached where it is increasingly problematic for existing services to meet current demand and the potential to grow or extended reach and access into communities. It also is stopping the organisation establish new Bureaux, or where appropriate, satellite services.

4. Maintaining and extending services, increasing access and supporting governance

ACABx wish to build on the long-term partnership with Auckland Council. The Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 and Auckland Plan set out challenges confronting Auckland and opportunities to create a better place to live. ACABx are part of Auckland social fabric, which in turn contributes to the area’s economic and social progress and as such already plays a role in helping achieve outcomes for the city. This role can be extended through the Long-Term Plan by providing additional support to that already being received from Auckland Council.

Outcome A: Adding value to existing centres of population

Awareness of the CAB service is high at 92% of the population (2013 Residents Survey Auckland Council). The uptake of services offered is around 19% of the population annually. Whilst face to face enquiries increase each year by over 5%, it is clear that greater penetration into communities would serve to increase the number of people using CAB. The funding from
Auckland Council does not allow ACABx to actively promote services beyond signage, letterbox drops and local posters undertaken by local Bureaux.

There are a number of initiatives, which would improve reach into and access by individuals to CAB.

1. The current funding model does not allow or enhance CAB testing out and exploring different models to improve access. Existing Bureaux could run satellites at locations used by specific groups. This would be particularly useful for Bureaux covering large geographical areas and populations. The range of locations for satellites would be informed by local knowledge and analysis of data and could include Marae, Early Childhood Education Centres, and Retirement villages. Satellite centres would be located in discussion with local boards and current Bureaux user data. Maximising technology to engage younger people is another initiative to be considered.

2. Partnering with Auckland Council through using their media communications with Aucklanders. Occasionally publications such as Our Auckland could highlight CAB and the services offered similar to coverage of Water Safety and Waste Minimisation. It is also a way of Auckland Council showing how ratepayer’s money is used in diverse ways to improve the wellbeing of individuals, whanau, and communities. The cost of highlighting CAB services in this manner would be marginal and add value to both organisations. Auckland Council could also use internal mailings to staff to highlight the work of ACABx similar to the support for “Movember”.

3. Auckland wide campaigns to promote CAB’s profile, would show how the services offered are more relevant than ever when there are increasing housing, financial and social pressures. These programmes would communicate the relevance of CAB services and increase service reach to a greater proportion of Auckland population.

**Outcome B. Continue to provide services through 32 sites**

ACABx and member Bureaux have absorbed the growth in people using services within the financial envelope provided by Auckland Council. With the next Long-Term Plan for 2018 -2028 being formulated ACABx is seeking a real increase to the previous financial support.

At present AC funding is on average $58,000 per local Bureau in Auckland. The average cost is provided as legacy council funding model's created variations between sites. For example; three Outer Auckland sites are funded on average $42,000 each, CAB Waitakere with five sites funded on average $57,883 per site whereas North Shore with five sites on average $59,876 rising in the South with seven sites to $72,614 a Bureau. Across Auckland there are over 1,200 volunteers working in Bureaux, speaking 25 different languages and providing advice and assistance to 19% of the population. There is also a desire, a need and a vision for the future to provide the organisation’s service to more people.
Population growth is a central feature in the Draft Long-Term Plan 2018 - 2028 and Auckland Plan. It is an issue confronting all public services and is one that all estimates and indicators identify as increasing. It has an impact on the environment, the amount of waste produced, the provision of housing, jobs and transport. Growth also adds a pressure to the fabric of communities and the individual’s and whanau who make up the population.

For example, over the past decade the median house price in Auckland rose 95% while average weekly incomes grew by just over 30% and CPI inflation ran at 20%. This in turn, has meant that rents are also increasing faster than incomes. Rents across New Zealand have risen by 15% to 20% between 2013 and 2017. There is a rental housing shortage, and a growing number seeking emergency housing assistance from the Ministry of Social Development.

The numbers of people receiving either New Zealand Superannuation or a Veteran’s Pension has grown by almost 700 per week for the past five years and reached almost 750,000 in December 2017. Such growth is predictable and will most likely continue at this or a similar rate for the next 10 to 15 years.

In 2016, The Salvation Army distributed 56,500 food parcels to 29,500 families or households. During 2017, the number of food parcels offered increased to almost 63,000, a 12% increase. These parcels were provided to 31,900 families or households with 47,300 children (Salvation Army – State of the Nation Report 2017). In Auckland the City Mission provided 13,714 food parcels last year.

These are just some examples of current social impacts on individuals and whanau of whom a significant percentage seek advice from CAB’s. The Bureaux provide a key social safety net and are now under significant pressure due to growth. There are limits to the organisations ability to continue absorbing growth and costs and at the same time deliver high annual productivity. Whilst services at Bureaux can be uplifted through the recruitment and training of additional volunteers there becomes a tipping point in managing the workforce. There are 36 part-time employees who manage this workforce.

ACABx and member Bureaux are of the view reached through their experience and knowledge that the limit to continue absorbing growth has been reached and to maintain high quality advice services through the existing network requires additional funding. Based on a 5% per annum growth in people using Bureaux services it is recommended that the Long-Term Plan 2018 to 2028 provides for a similar amount of additional funding across 32 local Bureaux. This would equate to $2,900 per site (based on $58,000) a total of $92,800 per annum from July 2018.

It is recognised and acknowledged that Auckland Council provides additional funding in kind through the provision of subsidised and free accommodation maintained by Auckland Council for Bureaux. It is anticipated that the Head Lease for these premises is held by ACABx. These associated costs would require additional funding.
Outcome C: Extend the network of Citizens Advice Bureaux

The Auckland Plan section on Belonging and Participation seeks to achieve an Auckland where all people will be part of and contribute to society, access opportunities, and have the chance to develop to their full potential. These are objectives which ACABx wishes to see realised and be an active partner in helping achieve. The more people that live in vibrant, well connected communities with the necessary physical and social infrastructure the greater is their opportunities to participate and contribute to both their own and the future of Auckland.

ACABx wishes to extend the network of local Bureaux not only predicated on the organisations own experience but also that evidenced as the main theme throughout the Draft Long-Term Plan 2018 - 2028 and Auckland Plan which is one of growth. It is seen as a major challenge for the city with population growth estimated to be 2.4 million by 2043. If such growth takes place the Auckland Plan suggest this could mean 320,000 more dwellings and 270,000 jobs.

The Development Strategy within the Auckland Plan pays particular attention to future growth areas. The Auckland Unitary Plan identifies areas already zoned as urban and the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy describes the approach for providing infrastructure.

The centres identified in the Auckland Plan range from Warkworth to Pukekohe and are seen as areas where maximising investment can be achieved by creating higher density clusters of employment and housing, supported by public transport and other critical services. The Strategy goes on to say the areas need to be vibrant places for the new communities who will live there. This requires a network of strong centres and neighbourhoods, integrated with good transport choices, and supported by a wide range of housing types and densities. These areas will also require employment other than that provided in centres, and services such as schools and hospitals, and amenities such as parks, sports fields and community facilities.

The Development Strategy describes a range of areas critical to supporting growth amongst which is the acknowledgement that centres are at the heart of neighbourhoods and are focal points for the surrounding community. They include a mix of activities and functions, such as retail, commercial and social services, as well as housing, recreation and community facilities.

The Auckland Plan also introduces the proposal of Multi Nodal Centre in Albany, Westgate, and Manukau rather than a single focus on the CBD. Increasing business growth and employment opportunities around Albany, Westgate and Manukau will help address several of Auckland’s current transport and employment challenges. As these areas grow, there will be more options for people to work or study closer to home, and for greater benefits from business clustering.

The Draft Long Term Plan and Auckland Plan both provide evidence of the need to increase the number of CAB sites as they form part of the fabric of Thriving Communities. In each area of growth ideally there should be a Bureau or at least a satellite from an existing site. Just as there would be planning for schools, recreation and libraries, transport hubs, medical and social services the provision of a CAB should be included in these plans.
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In 2011 a report to the 21 local boards entitled Auckland Council and Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux Relationship stated that at least seven new potential CAB locations have been identified along with potential rationalisation of some services. There are opportunities for future developments to respond innovatively to changing demographics and increasing diversity of communities. Increased availability and accessibility of services to targeted populations with limited mobility is also needed. None of which is possible within current capped funding.

If funding does not allow for new CABx to be established significant members of Auckland population will be denied access. If the formula is that to open a new Bureau one must close a Bureau this ignores the public service nature of CAB. It is clear from ACABx experience and information collated by Auckland Council that three new or satellite Bureaux are required in each of the next three years. To pilot these would cost at least $40,000 each with an average annual operational cost of up to $60,900.

**Outcome D: Governance, reporting, information and analysis**

On 5 April 2012 Auckland Council Regional Development and Operations Committee approved in principle an increase in the amount of funding provided to CAB in Auckland of $125,000, for the 2012/13 year only, to enable establishment of the Auckland CAB entity. Since this allocation of funding ceased in 2014/15 ACABx has been funded by a levy on member Bureaux which in 2015/16 was $50,162, in 2016/17 was $55,941 and in 2017/18 amounted to $36,129.

Having to levy member Bureaux at 2% of the funding grant from Auckland Council this year has reduced operational funds available locally at all sites. If this was removed and support costs for ACABx reinstated, this funding would be released back to local services.

The Board members of ACABx are drawn from member Bureaux are voluntary and receive no payment. The governance structure, board meetings decisions and communications, information analysis and administration are all undertaken by one part-time twenty hours a week employee. Acting as the Head Lease holder for premises accommodating local Bureaux creates a further burden of administration. Meeting the reporting and other Auckland Council demands places a heavy burden on ACABx.

To undertake essential activities such as annual audit, Annual General Meetings, travel and meeting costs accounts for approximately $8,000. The cost of part time staff support is $31,000. To enable paid staff to work on joint projects with Auckland, ACABx request that through the Draft Long-Term Plan 2018–2028 that Auckland Council reassess the requirement of a grant to support ACABx in line with that provided in 2012/13.
Conclusion of Submission

ACABx request a real increase in funding support for the first time in seven years to catch up with service demand which arises from Auckland’s growth.
Attachment B: Letter to Mayor and Councillors

Thursday, 30 May 2018

Auckland Council
Private Bag 92300
Victoria Street West
Auckland

Dear Mayor and Councillors

Citizens Advice Bureau Funding

On behalf of the Citizens Advice Bureau in the Auckland region, ACABs made a budget submission to Auckland Council’s Long Term Plan requesting additional funding for our services.

During the December Environment and Community Committee, Councillor Ross Clow invited us to make this submission, which we duly did. Unfortunately, we were not subsequently invited to one of the regional stakeholder workshops with the Finance and Performance Committee.

The reasons for our funding request are twofold. Both are aimed at making our service more accessible to the inhabitants of Auckland and will not happen without further funding.

Firstly, we need increased funding to enable more points of service in the Auckland area. Assessing this need is part of our 2017/2018 work programme. It could result in new bureaux, agencies or satellite services. The latter are particularly important for rural areas such as Franklin and Rodney, where population density is low. Without further funding, if additional outlets are required, existing bureaux would need to be closed.

Secondly there is a need to publicise our service. Many potential clients are losing out on their rights as they do not understand the depth and breadth of our service.

Unfortunately, we understand our request for a baseline funding increase of $200,000 has not been included in the Council’s LTP currently under consideration. This is exceptionally disappointing.

In 2017/18 funding from Auckland Council to ACABs was $1.838 million. In real terms since the formation of Auckland Council in 2010 the allocation through the Long-Term Plan to ACABs has remained static. The only increase has been through the annual Consumer Price Index adjustments.

This means that seven years after the funding cap was instigated we are servicing 41% more people than we were seven years ago for the same real funding amount. Each year ACABx and its members have struggled to absorb that growth. Continuing with the funding cap is no longer a viable option as the point has been reached where it is increasingly problematic for existing services to meet current demand and the potential to grow or extended reach and access into communities. It also is stopping the organisation establish new Bureaux, or where appropriate, satellites.

Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux Inc. (ACABx)
PO Box 26123, Epsom, Auckland
Telephone - 09 631 7212 | Email – admin@acabx.org.nz
We are, by any measures, an exceptionally lean and efficient organisation and serve as an example to others. We are volunteer-based, and we rely wholly on the goodwill of our volunteers to provide services to Aucklanders in need. Our volunteers provide a necessary service which could not be replicated without vastly increased spending.

Our baseline funding request should not be contingent on the discussions we and Council are having over a shift to a new funding model. That discussion has been extended, and will continue through this year. It is a separate issue relating to how the funding is allocated. The problem we face right now is that the funding we receive is inadequate. It has been frozen in real terms, and significantly lower in terms of funding for service provision than what we received seven years ago.

We are seen as a very reliable and trusted service provider in the community and hugely valued within the communities we operate. The people we assist are overwhelmingly from low income households and who cannot afford to pay for the advice and services we provide at no cost. They are who will benefit from this funding request.

We hope that you will look favourably on our submission.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Diane Taylor
Chairperson, ACABx
Zero Carbon Bill Submission

File No.: CP2018/10794

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To endorse Auckland Council’s submission to Ministry for the Environment on the Zero Carbon Bill.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Climate change affects all Aucklanders, especially our most vulnerable. The benefits of action are promising and put us on a path toward a cleaner, fairer and more prosperous Auckland. Inaction raises serious risks to infrastructure, economy and health.

3. Auckland is planning and responding to climate change. For example, we are making significant investments in public transport, green infrastructure and waste reduction. However, emissions are rising and the costs, risks and impacts of climate change are rising as well.

4. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee agreed to a full review of Low Carbon Auckland and committed Auckland Council to leading the development of an integrated climate change action plan, addressing both rising emissions in the region and impacts of our changing climate (Resolution number ENV/2018/11). Collaboration with Government has underpinned work on Auckland’s Climate Action Plan and on the Government’s Zero Carbon Bill, as both are being developed in tandem.

5. The Zero Carbon Bill aims to set the policy architecture in place to provide transparency and long-term certainty in the transition to a low-emissions, climate-resilient society. The main components of the Bill include the setting of a new 2050 emissions target and emissions budgets, establishment of a new independent Climate Change Commission and whether to include adaptation as part of the Bill.

6. A draft submission has been prepared (Attachment A). Main points include:
   - support for a national 2050 net zero emissions target for all greenhouse gases
   - preference for domestic reductions with international offsets used as a last resort
   - support for emissions budget cycles
   - support for establishing an independent Climate Change Commission
   - support for including adaptation in the Bill and a number of new associated functions
   - additional advice for consideration of land use and planning policy; a just and equitable transition; partnership with tangata whenua; as well as a close partnership and support for local government.

7. Consultation on the Zero Carbon Bill closes on 19 July 2018 and final legislation is expected in April 2019, concurrent to the intended release of Auckland’s climate action plan.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:
  a) endorse the draft Zero Carbon Bill submission
  b) authorise the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Environment and Community Committee and an Independent Māori Statutory Board Member to make minor revisions and approve the final submission.
Horopaki / Context

8. Climate change is a serious issue for all Aucklanders, with impacts to our most vulnerable. Taking action on climate change poses a range of co-benefits and put us on a path toward a cleaner, fairer and more prosperous Auckland. Inaction raises serious risks to infrastructure, economy and health.

9. Auckland is taking action to plan for and respond to climate change. For example, we are making significant investments in public transport, green infrastructure and waste reduction. However, emissions continue to rise and the costs, risks and impacts of climate change are rising as well.

10. A full review of Low Carbon Auckland was agreed by the Environment and Community Committee in February 2018. This included integrating climate adaptation alongside addressing rising emissions and committing to the development of an integrated climate change action plan (Resolution number ENV/2018/11). Development of this plan is being facilitated by Auckland Council, working with public, private and voluntary sectors, and drawing in expert advice as appropriate.

11. Collaboration with central government has underpinned this work, including:
   - an agreed selection of collaborative workstreams
   - a joint launch for engagement on both the Plan and the Zero Carbon Bill (7 June 2018) with Councillor Hulse and Minister Shaw
   - a Zero Carbon Bill event in Auckland that included participation and remarks from Auckland Council.

12. The Zero Carbon Bill seeks to provide a transparent transition to a low-emissions, climate-resilient society by establishing the policy architecture for long-term certainty. There are four main components of the Bill currently being consulted on:
   - A 2050 emissions target – setting a new target in line with Paris Agreement commitments, climate science and potential economic impacts and opportunities.
   - Emissions budgets – setting emissions budgets and considerations around the budgets, budget cycles and review.
   - A Climate Change Commission – the role, responsibilities and expertise of a new independent commission meant to advise Government and monitor progress.
   - Adapting to climate impacts – inclusion of climate adaptation as part of the Bill and a variety of proposed new mechanisms like a national climate change risk assessment, a national adaptation plan, an adaptation reporting power, and regular reviews.

13. Auckland’s approach for developing a climate plan align well with the Zero Carbon Bill approach. For instance:
   - a commitment to integrating climate adaptation and mitigation
   - an Independent Advisory Group to check and challenge our work
   - reviewing the target with an aim to align with zero carbon by 2050
   - intent to set targets and/or carbon budgets by sector to meet our target.

14. Consultation on the Zero Carbon Bill closes on 19 July 2018 and final legislation is expected in April 2019, concurrent to the intended release of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan. Staff have prepared a submission for endorsement (Attachment A).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

15. Our Climate Your Say: Consultation of the Zero Carbon Bill is available on the Ministry for the Environment website. Auckland Council’s submission focuses on five main points. A brief options assessment of each point was undertaken and is summarised as follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. New Zealand 2050 emissions target | Net zero carbon dioxide by 2050 | • Lowest modelled economic impact in the mid-term  
• Least impact on traditional agriculture (methane not included) | • Reduction of carbon dioxide only  
• Lowest contribution to temperature stabilisation  
• Credibility risk |
| | Net zero long-lived gases and stabilised short-term gases by 2050 | • Includes agriculture/ methane  
• Domestic emissions do not contribute to further increase in temperatures | • Reduction of carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide and stabilisation (but not full reduction) of methane |
| | Net zero emissions by 2050 | • Faster contribution to temperature stabilisation (than other options)  
• Major forest planting required  
• Highest ambition with no domestic impact on climate  
• Drives stronger innovation and associated economic opportunities/ benefits | • Slightly lower (modelled) GDP prediction ($373b v $381b)  
• Slightly lower annual growth rate (0.2 per cent)  
• Ability to meet ambitions |
| | Recommended | | |
| 2. Mix of domestic and international carbon credits | Majority international credits | • Cheaper in short term  
• Does not require as much change to processes, systems, technologies | • Little if any localised (NZ) co-benefits (like better air quality, transport choice, protection from impacts)  
• Dependency to keep purchasing over long-term – potentially higher overall costs |
| | Majority domestic emissions reductions | • More expensive in short term  
• Requires gradual but consistent change to systems, processes, technologies | • Co-benefits (like above) accrue to New Zealanders directly  
• Dependency on purchasing overseas credits (at potential escalating cost) |
| | Recommended | | |
| 3. Emissions budgets | Minor or zero adjustments allowed | • Provide adaptability but focus on action  
• High credibility to Government and process | • Puts pressure on meeting budgets  
• Credibility risks to Government |
| | Major adjustments allowed | • Lack of pressure on meeting budgets; potential slippage on meeting targets/ obligations | |
### Item 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. Inclusion of adaptation | Do not include | • Easier remit for Commission  
• Less complex final Bill | • Lack of joined-up approach and efficiencies  
• Confusion with separate processes  
• Inconsistent with Auckland’s agreed approach  
• Potential financial and legal risks |
| | Include | • Better joined-up approach resulting in efficiencies  
• Less confusion with one integrated process  
• Consistency with Auckland’s agreed approach  
• Reduced legal, financial risks | • Increase in complexity  
• Requirement for additional skill-sets in Commission members |
| | Recommended | | |

#### 16. The submission focuses on the following six key points. Additional analysis and advice is provided in the submission itself as rationale for stated policy positions:

- support for a 2050 net zero emissions target (for all greenhouse gases) in legislation
- preference for domestic reductions to invest now in New Zealand and provide local co-benefits with the use of international offsets only as a last resort
- support for a robust set of three five-year emissions budgets with only minor and careful adjustments allowed and consideration of a range of issues and obligations like Te Tiriti o Waitangi, a just and inclusive transition, a sustainable and circular economy, and the role and empowerment of local government
- support an independent Climate Change Commission to oversee New Zealand’s climate change commitments and advise and monitor on progress – but not to make decisions on for example, allocating emissions units of the Emissions Trading Scheme
- support for including adaptation in the Zero Carbon Bill, including new functions like a national climate change risk assessment, a national adaptation plan and an adaptation reporting power for mandatory climate risk reporting
- additional advice and support to embed climate change and emissions reduction in land use and planning policy. Ensure a just and equitable transition, especially regarding our most vulnerable populations. Partner with tangata whenua in development of the framework, as well as work in close partnership with and support local government to deliver real action and benefits in local communities.

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

#### 17. The submission timeline presents a challenge in gathering a complete understanding of local board views. However, the Chief Sustainability Office has held individual workshops with nearly all local boards on the development of Auckland’s climate action plan. As discussed earlier, the collaboration between central government and Auckland Council has woven these two processes together, helping to provide a clear line of sight between national context and local impacts and actions. The Zero Carbon Bill sets the national context which has framed the action plan workshops and discussions on local impacts.

#### 18. The Chief Sustainability Office highlighted key points from our local board engagement in connection with the Zero Carbon Bill and Auckland’s Climate Action Plan to the Environment and Community Committee at a workshop on 4 July 2018.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

19. Climate change will affect areas over which Māori have kaitiakitanga; impacting ecosystems, shaping community vulnerability and resilience, and linking to economic outcomes. Increasing water scarcity and temperatures will impact Māori communities and businesses, including fisheries and forestry. Cultural sites may also be at risk from rising seas and coastal inundation.

20. Given the diverse climate sensitivities that exist for Māori across Auckland and New Zealand there is a clear need to know more about the implications (and risks) of a variable and changing climate on different iwi/hapū/whānau. This underpins our support in the submission of including climate adaptation in the Zero Carbon Bill and in creating a new 2050 emissions target. Both are also part of our regional work in the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan and we aim to put Te Ao Māori at the centre of the plan.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

21. There are no direct financial implications on Auckland or Auckland Council as a result of making a submission on the Bill. The estimated financial cost for the related development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan (ACAP) is $140,000, covered in existing budgets. Part of ACAP will include a full review of financing opportunities and models, actions and implementation costs.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

22. The greatest long-term risk is maintaining the status quo. Not setting up the policy architecture to address climate change (in a pragmatic and predictable way) creates the potential for unpredictability and shocks to the economy. There are also various models noting financial, legal, infrastructure, health and other impacts associated with climate change.

23. Lack of substantive action (based on an ineffective policy framework) creates opportunity costs for New Zealand, as other nations/cities outperform and compete for a global share of innovation dollars in the development of clean tech and climate solutions. Also at risk is New Zealand’s “clean and green” reputation, especially if we do not take credible action on climate change consistent with our international/domestic obligations. A number of more specific risks are listed above as part of the options analysis.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

24. Consultation on the Bill closes on 19 July 2018. It is anticipated the Bill will be introduced to Parliament by October 2018. After the Select Committee process (October to March 2019), the Zero Carbon Act is expected to be in force by April 2019.

25. The development timeline of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan is intentionally woven into this larger national context. Following local board workshops in June, a committee workshop on 4 July 2018, and Kaitiaki Forum engagement on 5 July 2018, eight expert stakeholder workshops are being held in August and September to help prioritise actions alongside wider community engagement. A draft ready for consultation by the end of 2018 and implementation to begin around April 2019.
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Mihi

Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,  I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been
ki ngā pariwhakarongo tāi,  said of this place,
ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ēna manawhenua,  there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and
ēna mana ā-iwi tāketeke mai, tāuiwi atu.  flow of the tides of time,
Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini,  and the men that cleansed the forebears of all who
wenerau a te mano.  come those born of this land and the newcomers
Kēhore tō rite i te ao.  among us all.

Auckland – beloved of hundreds; famed among the
multitude, envy of thousands;
You are unique in the world.

Introduction

1. Auckland Council and its four largest Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs), including Auckland Transport, Watercare, Panuku Development Auckland and Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development (ATEED), thank the Ministry for the Environment for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Zero Carbon Bill Discussion Document (Discussion Document).

2. We have enjoyed a strong partnership with Government through the Ministry for the Environment and Transition Hub, agreeing a set of collaborative workstreams around the Zero Carbon Bill (ZCB) and Auckland’s Climate Action Plan (ACAP) as well as collaborative ways of working together including the sharing of team resources. This was enhanced by the joint engagement launch of the ZCB and ACAP on 7 June 2018 with Minister James Shaw and Environment and Community Committee Chair Penny Hulse. The launch helped cement the connections between our important collective work and provide clarity to the public about their relationship. We are eager to build off of this groundwork and identify additional opportunities in the future as we work toward a zero carbon, climate-resilient Auckland and New Zealand.

3. The transition to a climate resilient, low carbon economy and society is a priority for Auckland and Auckland Council. Such a transition presents a number of challenges to local and central governments as well as significant opportunities. For instance, funding the transition in the short term is likely to require additional capital spend – at least in the short term. Yet evidence and modelling support a direct connection between climate policy and economic

---

[Although such additional spend may be only a few percentage points of overall capital spend, oil price fluctuation can often be greater than those few percentage points and large-scale efficiency investments can provide a high average rate of return. See, for instance, McKinsey & Company (2008). The carbon productivity challenge: curbing climate change and sustaining economic growth.]
growth, where action on climate change results in greater growth, productivity and overall well-being\(^1\).

4. Moreover, a successful and productive Auckland, like any city, is predicated on a number of requirements with direct connections to the low emissions transition and to building resilience to climate change. These include transport choice, clean energy, public green space provision, and a high-quality and safe built environment. These have been shown to improve economic outcomes including agglomeration benefits, and lower and avoid costs.

5. While challenges exist to making the transition just and equitable, a low emissions and climate-ready transition done well is likely to help reduce the burden on our most vulnerable populations. A just transition can help to mitigate energy insecurity and projected cost escalation, reduce documented air quality and health costs associated with burning fossil fuels and from poor quality built environments, and help to reduce risk from the impacts of a changing climate like increased flooding, temperatures and sea level rise.

6. Auckland Council has long advocated for stronger leadership from central government to support New Zealand’s transition to a low emissions and climate-ready future, including advocating for a clear government mandate to provide businesses with confidence to make long-term investment decisions, policies and legally binding targets, financing mechanisms and monitoring of progress\(^3\).

7. More specifically, Auckland has called for sector-based leadership from Government including but not limited to:

   \textbf{Transport and land use}
   \begin{itemize}
   \item Targets and prioritised transport investment to reduce emissions, reflected in the Government Policy Statement (GPS) for Transport
   \item Integrated transport and land use outcomes across agencies through funding signals in the GPS and National Land Transport Plan (NLTP)
   \item Investigation and implementation of land value capture funding mechanisms to link infrastructure costs directly to the benefit/value created
   \item Acceleration and extension of low emission, rapid public transport and active transport networks
   \item Emissions standards and/or age limits for New Zealand’s vehicle fleet
   \end{itemize}

   \textbf{Built environment and energy}
   \begin{itemize}
   \item Addressing issues of competition in the building materials sector that impact on construction costs including for brownfield development
   \item Development of a social cost of carbon for inclusion in business cases across Government
   \item Review and update of the building code and allowing local governments to mandate higher standards
   \end{itemize}


• Requirement of a minimum energy efficiency standard
• Mandatory building energy ratings to raise awareness and drive market demand

Waste
• A substantial increase to the waste levy to facilitate movement toward a low emissions economy and better materials management, while creating employment and business opportunities from a more circular economy
• Targeted regulation to reduce commercial waste to landfill
• Product stewardship or ‘extended producer responsibility’ (EPR) to shift responsibility for recovery, recycling and disposal of products to the manufacturer
• Amendment of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 to either give greater control of waste reduction to councils or apply the same responsibilities to industry
• Regulatory changes and considerations such as a more ambitious renewable energy target (up to 100 per cent renewable)

8. Cities are a key part of the transition and play a critical role in helping countries meet and exceed emissions reduction targets of the Paris Agreement to avoid catastrophic climate change. Given its size, emissions, economic and social roles, and current and future climate impacts, Auckland’s success in a zero carbon, climate-resilient transition is critical to the Government’s success – and vice versa.

9. Auckland is taking action on a number of fronts to plan, fund and build climate solutions to help deliver on national targets, often in partnership with central government. Our existing regional target of 40 per cent reduction of 1990-level emissions by 2040 is ambitious but new evidence suggests that those targets may not be significant enough to align with the national and global ambitions of the Paris Agreement to which C40 Cities like Auckland are committed to locally.

10. Auckland Council has been reviewing existing strategies, targets and action plans and is currently undertaking the development of an integrated climate action plan that tackles both adaptation to climate change and emissions reductions. There are multiple opportunities to align with government direction, ambition and frameworks in the development of our approach locally and are optimistic about our collaboration, especially in light of our joint launch event on 7 June 2018 in Auckland and partnership agreement.

Discussion Document Questions

Emissions Targets (Questions 1-4)

11. The first four questions in the Discussion Document relate to emissions targets. We reiterate our previously-stated position that long-term predictability and transparency for all sectors is a prerequisite to a planned and smooth transition that minimises negative impacts on jobs, livelihoods and fairness. Furthermore, recent evidence suggests an urgency in developing pathways toward climate stabilisation – some accounts suggest such pathways need to be
locked in by 2020\(^4\). Therefore, **Auckland Council supports a 2050 target in legislation now instead of a goal to reach net zero by the second half of the century** – noting as well that the details for target setting and establishment of the Commission are vaster in the latter approach.

12. Evidence and current commitments suggest that the best target for New Zealand is the target of net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases by 2050 instead of simply net zero carbon dioxide or net zero long-lived gases and stabilised short-lived gases. Auckland Council has and continues to support including methane in the NZ Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS) as a matter of priority. Likewise, Auckland Council has previously supported net zero emissions from all long-lived climate pollutants by 2050 and sustained emissions reductions in methane and other short-lived climate pollutants. Recent evidence and reflections on our Paris Agreement commitments; consideration of broad co-benefits, innovation, opportunities and potential economic impacts; and deliberation on the different time scales to reach temperature stabilisation have influenced us to **support a more ambitious position of net zero emissions from all greenhouse gases by 2050**.

13. Meeting emissions targets should primarily come from domestic reductions including new forest planting. We consider this an “invest now in New Zealand” approach with short-term price implications but long-term benefits realisation. That said, we support a phased approach to using international carbon units (e.g., initially using international carbon units with a planned approach to phasing out their use). Using international units is less ideal given that the ancillary benefits accrue locally but we recognise that their use is likely realistic given the implications of an ambitious target. We **support stronger language in the Bill that international carbon units be used to offset residual emissions after all other means of reducing domestic emissions have been exhausted**. We also suggest better defining “strong environmental safeguards.”

14. **Auckland Council does not support revision of the target downward/later if circumstances change.** This would interfere with the predictability and transparency necessary to steer policy direction and likely result in slippage. However, we would support a more ambitious ratcheting of the target, including one to emissions positive or earlier delivery (e.g., net zero by 2040).

**Emissions Budgets (Questions 5-10)**

15. **Auckland Council supports having in place a series of three emissions budgets to help provide predictability and progress on reductions through political cycles.** Five year cycles help focus on action and provide adaptability and agility in meeting targets. The role of the Commission should be made explicitly clear in this process.

16. Any allowance for the Government to alter emissions budgets should be taken quite carefully, and done frugally given the perceived and actual risks and impacts. Adjusting the third/final budget in the sequence should be done sparingly and without pushing responsibility for

---

emissions reductions into the future. Allowing such careful modifications of the third/final budget may add some pragmatic flexibility but should only be done when the subsequent budget is set and with a high degree of caution and frugality. We do not support adjusting the second budget – even in ‘exceptional circumstances.’

17. Auckland Council generally supports the proposed considerations for the Government and Commission to take into account when advising on and setting budgets. Scientific knowledge about climate change, an awareness of technology relevant to climate change, and policies like energy policy underpin what a zero carbon transition requires and pathways to get to net zero. Economic, social and fiscal awareness of potential impacts on the economy, sectors, taxation, and public spending and borrowing will help mitigate unintended and undesirable economic and social consequences from the transition. Obligations to Te Tiriti o Waitangi are of critical consideration as is a commitment to integrate and reflect Te Ao Māori. Finally, as suggested in the Discussion Document, consideration of a sustainable and circular economy, global and local leadership (to which Auckland is committed) and creating a just and inclusive society are paramount.

18. Plans to meet emissions budgets should expediently follow within a set timeline from budget setting. We recommend that Government take into account a number of issues when setting plans, including but not limited to: consideration for a just and equitable transition, consideration of local government and urban needs, consideration of investing in New Zealand to gain a wide range of benefits beyond but associated with carbon reduction, and consideration of offshore impacts and leakage.

Climate Commission (Questions 11-13)

19. Auckland Council supports the role of an independent body to oversee New Zealand’s climate change commitments. We have previously stated support for the body to be given the right powers to enable domestic and international targets to be met against a carbon budget, that it is placed outside political cycles, that it has a clear remit to support the work of local government and that budget and plans are linked to required actions by local government, and that its work encompasses both mitigation and adaptation.

20. We therefore support the function of the Climate Change Commission to advise and monitor New Zealand’s progress toward emissions goals as stated in the Discussion Document. Specifically, we believe the Commission should advise on emissions budgets and monitor progress, provide independent advice on focus areas in the economy and related considerations, enable a periodic check-in on the target level (but not a regression), monitor progress toward addressing climate risks and help frame up a national climate adaptation plan, and advise on how/when we use international emissions reductions toward our target (more below). While we do not support a full decision-making role in setting policy under its own authority at arm’s length from Government, we suggest strong language in the final bill that urges Government to seriously and fully consider advice in its decision-making.

21. The Commission’s role regarding the NZ ETS should be carefully considered. Simply advising the Government on policy settings may place unnecessary weight on political cycles and dynamics, while providing full decision-making power, while pragmatic to achieve targets, may carry the weight of an unprecedented transfer of traditionally government decision-making. A hybrid approach is recommended, likely landing in the strength of the Bill’s final language in how the Government “should” or “must” “receive” or “act on” recommendations from the Commission on things like the number of units available in the NZ ETS. Concomitantly, we suggest careful selection of Commission members and clear transparency in the selection process. This includes ensuring a range and balance of domestic and international expertise and that there are no significant gaps.

22. Note that Auckland has taken a similar approach with the formal appointment by the Mayor and Councillors of an Independent Advisory Group to check and challenge Auckland’s climate action plan, targets, actions and our implementation progress. One recommendation that flows from our appointments is the recognition of public health as a crucial component to the expertise of the Commission. Such expertise is not recognised in the Discussion Document.

Adaptation (Questions 14-16)

23. We have supported and continue to support the inclusion of climate adaptation in the Zero Carbon Bill. This is an approach we have committed to as part of the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan and one taken as best practice by leading cities around the world. Simply put integrated solutions across both mitigation and adaptation can deliver smarter, better and multiple outcomes across well-beings.

24. Auckland Council broadly supports a number of proposed new functions to adapt to climate change. We support a national climate change risk assessment as necessary to better understand risk, provide a foundation for investment, allow for greater transparency and communication of risks, and help prioritise integrated and systematic actions across all sectors. As noted in the Discussion Document, future risk assessments would help stabilise the policy environment given a broad view of trends and continuity. Note that Auckland Council is currently undertaking a climate risk and vulnerability assessment for Auckland with social, environmental and economic lenses as we believe in its value in the decision-making process.

25. A national adaptation plan to identify actions, clarify roles, align with community resilience-building, encourage proactive planning and coordinate across government and sectors is crucial to our climate response as a nation. Again, Auckland Council is currently undertaking an integrated climate action plan that undertakes this task for the Auckland region. While we support development of a national adaptation plan now to address priority areas, we suggest in the long-term that the Commission and Government more fully integrate climate adaptation and mitigation so that they do not sit separately. Meanwhile, areas of obvious opportunity for integration should be addressed, such as forestry and green and blue infrastructure.
26. We support an adaptation reporting power and a requirement for mandatory climate risk reporting so that organisations are more prepared to manage climate risk. That organisations’ efforts are coordinated more effectively, and that Government can more holistically design policies and approaches to encourage adaptation. We consider it likely that any additional costs associated with such adaptation reporting will likely accrue as benefits given avoidance or mitigation of climate risks in the longer-term.

27. Learning from the UK model highlights how consistency and guidance must be applied in the implementation of the adaptation reporting power. This is essential to ensure that it provides sufficient information to Government for a clear understanding of the risks and vulnerabilities faced by New Zealand and for surety that these are being acted upon. Establishing clear guidance would require upfront resourcing from Government (in collaboration with the relevant sectors) but would deliver clearer outcomes.

28. Local Government in the UK does not currently fall into the remit of the adaptation reporting power leaving a significant gap in understanding of the true picture of risk. This decision was made due to perceived reporting burdens to Local Authorities. We recommend that Central Government work closely with Local Government in establishing an approach to identifying and reporting on current adaptation practices. The UK established a Local Adaptation Advisory Panel to support this and this could provide a potential model for New Zealand.

Additional Considerations

29. In addition to advising on emissions targets and budgets, the Commission should have a strong role in reporting on progress. Like the UK Committee on Climate Change does, the independent Commission would also hold the Government to account in ensuring budgets are met and advising where further progress or changes in approach may be necessary.

30. Related to the Zero Carbon Bill, Auckland Council strongly suggests embedding climate change and emissions reduction in land use and planning policy as part of a larger package to deliver co-benefits to New Zealanders. This is consistent with the recommendations previously made by the Productivity Commission in its 2017 Better Urban Planning Inquiry and aligns with Auckland Council submissions on the Productivity Commission’s inquiry to the transition to a low-emissions economy.

31. We underscore the critical importance of a just and equitable zero carbon, climate-resilient transition. This means prioritising actions and approaches that help reduce the burden on our most vulnerable populations and, thus, that mitigate, reduce or eliminate issues like energy insecurity/poverty, air quality impacts, poor quality housing and risks from climate impacts. We applaud the reintroduction of the four well-beings into the Local Government Act via the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill. Doing so will make it far clearer that local governments play a role beyond core services to maintain and restore a range of capitals (e.g., human, natural, social) and broader social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes. Likewise, we support NZ Treasury’s Living Standards Framework approach.

---

that considers the collective impact of policies, spending and interventions on intergenerational wellbeing.

32. Similarly, Auckland Council strongly supports partnering with tangata whenua in the development of a legislative framework around climate change. We strongly believe that this also applies at a local and regional level in our efforts described below to develop a Climate Action Plan for the Auckland region. A number of mechanisms are being used to ensure that mana whenua and mataaawaka are involved in advising, process development and decision-making.

33. As previously stated, adaptation to climate change should be included as a critical element of the Zero Carbon Bill. Measures to mitigate climate change are interconnected with other societal goals and can provide multiple co-benefits which could be maximised by integrating with climate adaptation and resilience.

34. We reiterate that in order to deliver on national and regional targets, central and local governments need to work in partnership. Auckland is currently developing an integrated climate action plan and has agreed a set of collaborative work streams with Government through the Ministry for the Environment and Transition Hub. Our approach and main pillars of the work align very well with the Zero Carbon Bill approach – namely, 1) we are committed to integrating adaptation and mitigation, 2) we have established an Independent Advisory Group to check and challenge our work, 3) we will be reviewing our target with an aim to align with zero carbon by 2050, and 4) our plan intends to set targets and/or carbon budgets by sector to meet our target.

35. Thus, we strongly suggest building on our partnership and continuing down the path of closer collaboration and nested approaches in the planning and delivery of a zero carbon and climate resilient Auckland and New Zealand. To those ends, we also suggest that the legislative and institutional package have a clear remit to support the work of local government on climate mitigation to deliver real emissions reduction and climate resilience in local communities.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To note progress on the forward work programme (Attachment A).
2. To provide a public record of memos, workshop or briefing papers that have been distributed for the Committee’s information since 12 June 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
3. This is regular information-only report which aims to provide public visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo or other means, where no decisions are required.
4. The following papers/memos were circulated to members:
   - 20180608_Memo re update on Auckland Council’s submission to the Productivity Commission’s ‘low emissions economy’ inquiry (Attachment B)
   - 20180628_Memo re Biocontrol submission (Attachment C)
   - 20180702_Global Engagement Activity update – June 2018 (Attachment D)

Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.
5. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/
   o at the top of the page, select meeting “Environment and Community Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
   o under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled “Extra Attachments”.
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## ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME 2018

This committee deals with strategy and policy decision-making that relates to the environmental, social, economic and cultural activities of Auckland as well as matters that are not the responsibility of another committee or the Governing Body.

### Priorities for 2018

1. Clearly demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
2. Enable green growth with a focus on improved water quality, pest eradication and ecological restoration.
3. Strengthen communities and enable Aucklanders to be active and connected.
4. Make measurable progress towards the social and community aspects of housing all Aucklanders in secure, healthy homes they can afford.
5. Grow skills and a local workforce to support economic growth in Auckland.

### The work of the committee will:

- Deliver on the outcomes in the Auckland Plan.
- Be focused on initiatives that have a high impact.
- Meet the Council’s statutory obligations, including funding allocation decisions.
- Increase the public’s trust and confidence in the organisation.

### Updated 29/06/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY17/18 FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar Apr-Jun Jul-Sep Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategic approach to Climate Change</td>
<td>To demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce emissions.</td>
<td>Strategic direction will be provided in the coming months.</td>
<td>Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A summary of activities to prepare for climate change was given in the presentation on 8/8/17 meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report was considered on 20/2/18, resolution ENV/2018/11 Dec 18 – approval for consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb – Mar 19 - targeted public engagement Apr 19 – feedback presented to elected members Jun 19 – final strategy for adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low carbon living</td>
<td>To deliver on Low Carbon Auckland Plan commitments by the design and implementation of awareness raising and incentives programmes to reduce household, community, business and schools carbon emissions by approximately 50% of current levels.</td>
<td>Strategic direction and endorse programmes as part of the Low Carbon Auckland Plan implementation.</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb) Q4 Q1 (Sept) Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group (IAG) was approved. Chairs Planning and Env &amp; Community Cttees, an IMSB member and the Mayor’s office to decide on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar FY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low Carbon Auckland / Climate Change Mitigation</td>
<td>Four-yearly review of strategic action plan due in 2018; increased engagement with and commitments via C40 Cities membership; development of proactive policy agenda to central government emerging</td>
<td>Decision and endorsement of strategic direction</td>
<td>Apr-Jun FY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep FY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-Dec FY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Climate Plan Workshop</td>
<td>Risks and vulnerabilities</td>
<td>Committee workshop on risks and vulnerabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication strategy for broader public engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mana whenua engagement (integrated throughout)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Climate Plan Workshop</td>
<td>Prioritisation criteria and identified actions</td>
<td>Cost benefit and total value analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree prioritisation criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review all actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Draft Climate Plan to Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft plan to committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation (linking to other plans, approach tbc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updates to action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of updated plan by council (Proposed December 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final Adoption of Climate Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision adopt Climate plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>Urban Forest Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic approach to delivering on the wider social, economic and environmental benefits of a growing urban forest in the context of rapid population growth and intensification.</td>
<td>Decision on strategic direction and endorsement of strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A workshop was held on 14/06/17. Report was considered on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/09/17 ENV/2017/16 a full draft of the strategy was considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20/02/18, res ENV/2018/12 with a report back on the results of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIDAR and an implementation plan on costs and benefits in Aug 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund</td>
<td>Decision making over medium and large funds from the Waste Minimisation and Innovation fund in line with the fund’s adopted policy. Funds to contribute towards</td>
<td>Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year.</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority #</td>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1         | Auckland’s water strategy           | Council’s aspirational goal of zero waste to landfill by 2040.                                                                                                                                                 | **Progress to date:**
Decision: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17 |
|           |                                     | The health of Auckland’s waters is a critical issue. Both freshwater and marine environments in Auckland are under pressure from historic under-investment, climate change and rapid growth. The draft Auckland Plan 2050 identifies the need to proactively adapt to a changing water future and develop long-term solutions. | **Progress to date:**
Decision and strategic direction and priorities as part of the Auckland Plan. Consider the development of an Auckland’s waters strategy to be adopted for consultation December 2018. |
| 2         | Regional Pest Management Plan review | Statutory obligations under the Biosecurity Act to control weeds and animal pests. To ensure that the plan is consistent with the national policy direction and up to date.                                         | **Progress to date:**
Decision and strategic direction on weed and plants that will be subject to statutory controls. Consider submissions received on the draft plan in mid 2018 and adopt the final plan by December 2018. |
| 1 & 2     | Inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan | To ensure the plan is consistent with Auckland Council’s: proposed Regional Pest Management Plan - current and future marine biosecurity programmes - response to SeaChange – Tai Timu Tai Pari Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan. | **Progress to date:**
Decision on the development of the discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan for public consultation. |

**Expected timeframes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter (month if known)</th>
<th>FY17/18</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar</td>
<td>20 Feb</td>
<td>13 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Jun</td>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>8 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Sep</td>
<td>10 July</td>
<td>14 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
<td>16 Oct</td>
<td>13 Nov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 14

#### Priority #
1 and 2

#### Area of work
- Allocation of the Regional Natural Heritage Grant
- National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management
- Food Policy Alliance
- Auckland Growing Greener

#### Reason for work
- Decision-making over regional environment fund as per the grants funding policy and fund guidelines
- The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management is being implemented, with periodic reporting to council committee on progress, and responding to ongoing central government refinement of the framework for achieving water outcomes.
- To consider food policy alliance
- Statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act, Biosecurity Act and Local Government Act. Consideration of items to give effect to the adopted commitment of Auckland Council to grow greener.

#### Environment and Community Committee role
(Decision or direction)
- The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management is being implemented, with periodic reporting to council committee on progress, and responding to ongoing central government refinement of the framework for achieving water outcomes.
- Decision on food policy alliance
- Strategic direction and oversight into council’s role to improve the natural environment, and to endorse proposed incentives. This may include endorsing:
  - a framework to ensure planning and growth decisions are underpinned by relevant environmental data
  - proposed incentives for green growth
  - recommendations arising from a current state statutory obligations review.

#### Expected timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Item 14</th>
<th>Item 15</th>
<th>Item 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar</td>
<td>20 Feb</td>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>20 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Jun</td>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>10 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Sep</td>
<td>12 June</td>
<td>14 Aug</td>
<td>11 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
<td>16 Oct</td>
<td>13 Nov</td>
<td>4 Dec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Progress to date

**Allocation of the Regional Natural Heritage Grant**
- Progress to date: Allocation of the Regional Environmental Natural Heritage Grant for the 2017-2018 financial year was made on 6 Dec 2016 (ENV/2016/11 Item 15)

**National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management**
- Progress to date: Council submission was approved on Central Govt. Clean Water Consultation 2017 process: Minutes of 4 April ENV/2017/54 Item 12. Follow up is required for resolution b) — a workshop held on 14 June. A supplementary submission on the Clean Water Consultation package was made on 25 May 2017, Item 14 13/06/17 (ENV/2018/14 on engagement approach for consultation on the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management in Feb 2018). In December 2018 further decisions will be sought under the national policy statement, including:
  - approve final targets for swim-ability of major rivers in the Auckland region
  - approve the updated Progressive Implementation Plan for the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management

**Food Policy Alliance**
- Decision on food policy alliance

**Auckland Growing Greener**
- Strategic direction and oversight into council’s role to improve the natural environment, and to endorse proposed incentives. This may include endorsing:
  - a framework to ensure planning and growth decisions are underpinned by relevant environmental data
  - proposed incentives for green growth
  - recommendations arising from a current state statutory obligations review.
## Environment and Community Committee

### 10 July 2018

**Summary of Environment and Community Committee information - updates, memos and briefings - 10 July 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hunua Aerial 1080 Operation</td>
<td>Provide information on outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation</td>
<td>To note outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation.</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1, Q2 (Nov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sport and Rec Strategic Partnership Grant to Aktive Auck Sports Rec</td>
<td>Approval of $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auck &amp; Sport to deliver on agreed priority initiatives.</td>
<td>To approve the $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport &amp; Recreation for 2017/2018. <strong>Progress to date:</strong> Report was considered 5/12/17 Resolution ENV/2017/186 – report back against KPI every six months.</td>
<td>Q1 (Jul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Te Motu a Hiaroa (Puketutu Island)</td>
<td>Status update on the Te Motu a Hiaroa Governance Trust</td>
<td>To note further update on progress of the governance trust.</td>
<td>Q1 (Jul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td>Status report on implementation plan</td>
<td>Direction on future options for sport and recreation.</td>
<td>Q3, Q1, Q2 (Nov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sports Investment Plan</td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports</td>
<td><strong>Decision on issues papers</strong> Draft Plan approval Finalise and adopt investment plan <strong>Progress to date:</strong> Evaluation of current sports facilities investments and proposed changes was adopted on 14 March, resolution ENV/2017/39 Item 12 with the final draft investment plan to be adopted prior to consultation. An outcome measurement tool to support the Sports Facilities Investment Plan was considered and agreed at the 4 April 2017 meeting. Resolution ENV/2017/50 Item 9. The findings of the pilot will be reported in mid-2019 seeking a decision on the roll-out model.</td>
<td>Q3, Q4 (2019), Q1, Q2 (Nov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Golf Investment Plan</td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in golf.</td>
<td><strong>Decision on issues papers</strong> Draft Plan approval Finalise and adopt investment plan <strong>Progress to date:</strong> Confidential workshop held 13/06/17 and 25/7/18 (what future for golf).</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1 (Sep), Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indoor Courts</td>
<td>Strategic business case for indoor courts investment</td>
<td><strong>Decision on investment approach</strong></td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1 (Aug), Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority #</td>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</td>
<td>Expected timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Western Springs Community School Partnership</td>
<td>Improve Community Access to school facilities</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on Business and Investment in indoor court facility at Western Springs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> The report was considered in May. Resolution <strong>ENV/2017/71</strong> A business case will be prepared to outline the opportunity to fully invest in the indoor court development and can consider as part of the LTP 2018-2028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Growth Programme</td>
<td>Update on proposed growth funding allocation for 2018-2020</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on growth funding allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regional Sports Grants</td>
<td>Improving monitoring and evaluation of sports grants</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on monitoring and evaluation framework</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional Sport and Recreation grants programme 2018/2020</td>
<td>Review of previous grants allocation and recommendation for next round</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on sport and recreation grants programme objectives and approach</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> Approved on 12 Sept the 2018/2019 grants programme to proceed in accordance with the Community Grants Policy suggested outcomes and assessment matrix. Applications open 30/10/17 close 8/12/17 <strong>ENV/2017/319</strong> Workshop in April 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012: TOR</td>
<td>The review will assess the efficacy of the guidelines in for the council to deliver the best possible outcomes for Auckland through community leases</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on the terms of reference for the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> The <strong>TOR</strong> was approved for the review to commence and will report back in May July 2018 subject to TLP. An update memo was circulated in August 2017 in response to feedback from the July 2017 meeting. Joint workshop with local board chairs held 20/6/18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Active Recreation Investment and Visitor Experience</td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcome, priorities and investment for active walking, cycling, waterways and visitor experience on open space, parks and regional parks</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on scope and phasing</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Takaro – Investing in Development of a play investment plan</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on approval for public release</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority #</td>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> Approved on 16/05/17 for public release the discussion document and will report to E&amp;C for approval in late 2017. Takaro was approved for release on 20 Feb 2018. A report back by August 18 for approval to initiate public consultation.</td>
<td>Q1 (Feb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Play discussion document</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on approval to a variation</td>
<td>Q1 (Aug)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Parks Management Plan 2010 – variation to incorporate land at Piha into the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td>To approve variation to incorporate land purchased at Piha to be known as Taitomo Special Management Zone as part of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> Approved on 20/2/2018 Res ENV/2018/15 report Manager, Regional Parks, will prepare an integrated vegetation management and fire-risk reduction plan in consultation with the local community and report back on the resourcing needs for its effective implementation.</td>
<td>Q1 (tbc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

1. **The Southern Initiative (TSI)**  
   - Provide an update on the TSI approach, priorities and achievements.  
   - **Strategic direction** of the TSI approach to social and community innovation in south Auckland  
   - Progress to date:  
     - Q3  
     - Q4  
     - Q1  
     - Q2

5. **Global Engagement Strategy**  
   - Provide an update and direction of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities. It has been three years since a new strategic direction was introduced, progress on this strategy will presented.  
   - **Strategic direction** of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities  
   - Progress to date:  
     - Monthly global engagement updates are published on each agenda  
   - Progress to date:  
     - Q3  
     - Q4  
     - Q1  
     - Q2

5. **International Education Framework**  
   - Provide strategic direction to ATEED through its consideration of options for growing the international education sector  
   - **Strategic direction** relating to international education. ATEED has responsibility for growing the international education market in Auckland.  
   - Progress to date:  
     - Workshop to be scheduled  
   - Progress to date:  
     - Q3  
     - Q4  
     - Q1  
     - Q2

5. **Local Economic Development Framework**  
   - Provide strategic direction to ATEED through its consideration of options for delivering local economic development  
   - **Strategic direction** relating to Local Economic Development. ATEED has responsibility for leading Local Economic development.  
   - Progress to date:  
     - Q3  
     - Q4  
     - Q1  
     - Q2 (tbc)

5. **Auckland Trade Programme**  
   - Provide strategic direction to ATEED through its consideration of options for growing Auckland’s trade and exports  
   - **Strategic direction** relating to trade and exports. ATEED has responsibility for supporting the increase of Auckland’s trade competitiveness.  
   - Progress to date:  
     - Q3  
     - Q4  
     - Q1  
     - Q2

3. **Options to expand**  
   - Provide strategic direction to expand revenue streams  
   - **Strategic direction** to expand revenue streams to fund future  
   - Progress to date:  
     - Q3  
     - Q4  
     - Q1  
     - Q2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>Revenue streams for sport facilities investment</td>
<td>To fund future sports facilities investment in the draft Sports Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td>Sports facilities investment in the draft Sports Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td>FY17/18: 20 Feb - 13 March; FY18/19: 10 April - 8 May, 12 June, 14 July - 11 Sept, 16 Oct - 4 Dec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL, COMMUNITY, CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment A</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Community Facilities Network Plan</td>
<td>Update on progress and report back on strategic business case for central west.</td>
<td>Decision on indicative business case for central west</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar) - Q4, Q1 (Jul) - Q2 (Sept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan</td>
<td>Develop and endorse the Sports Facilities Investment Plan to enable Auckland Council to take a more coordinated approach to its sports facilities investment.</td>
<td>Decision on the Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan. Decision on sector’s investment priorities and investigate potential funding options.</td>
<td>Q1 (Sept) - Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Implementing Regional Policy and Strategy resolution to progress work around Council’s strategic position on addressing homelessness (note this work will be informed by discussions at the Community Development and Safety Committee)</td>
<td>Decision on scope Decision on role and direction addressing homelessness</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb) - Q4 (Aug), Q1 (Aug) - Q2 (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Facilities Partnerships Policy</td>
<td>Identify the range of current council approaches to facility partnerships, issues, opportunities and agree next steps</td>
<td>Decision on facility partnership approach Decision to adopt Facility Partnership Framework in December 2017</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb) - Q4 (Aug), Q1 (Aug) - Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority #</td>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</td>
<td>Expected timeframes (Quarter/month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Citizens Advice Bureaux Services</td>
<td>Review of the Citizens Advice Bureaux Services RSP decision in April 2016 [REG/2016/22]</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb) Q4 Q1 Q2 (Feb/Mar 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social and Community Housing Strategy and initiatives</td>
<td>Strategic overview of social and community housing initiatives. Wider housing portfolio and spatial outcomes of council’s role in housing is led by the Planning Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Intervention</td>
<td>Understanding NZ and international interventions to address affordable housing</td>
<td>Decision on future Auckland Council approaches to affordable housing interventions</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Te Kauroa – Library Strategy</td>
<td>Libraries and Information is carrying out a change programme (Fit for the future) to accelerate the implementation of this 2013-2023 strategy (approved by the Governing Body)</td>
<td>Direction relating to priorities and to receive update on strategic direction and implementation progress Approve an expanded and improved regional mobile library service</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Sep) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Central library strategic review</td>
<td>A strategic review of the Central Library has been commissioned to understand how the current building can meet future need and demand for services, assess the Central Library’s current and potential future role in the region, and guide decision making about future investment and development opportunities</td>
<td>Decide direction and receive the strategic review</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Work around the integration with customer services</td>
<td>Decision on matters relating to regional aspects of the proposed integration (local boards will decide on local outcomes)</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intercultural Cities Network</td>
<td>Consideration of a proposal to join the Intercultural Cities Network to support implementation and monitoring of progress on ‘Inclusive Auckland’ actions.</td>
<td>Decide whether Auckland should be a member of the network</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (Jun) Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investing in Aucklanders (Age Friendly City)</td>
<td>Identify issues and opportunities for an inclusive friendly city (Regional Policy and Strategy resolution</td>
<td>Strategic direction on the approach to a friendly, inclusive, diverse city.</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A

**Item 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY17/18 FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG/2016/92</td>
<td>Social Enterprise approaches for youth and long term unemployed</td>
<td>Improved understanding of social enterprise reach, impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Progress to date: Update reports were circulated on 18 April 2018 and 14 Dec 2017. Staff report findings and the proposed next phase in 2018. A report on the Findings was considered on 12/06/18 meeting. Resolution ENV/2018/75 approval for up to five inclusion pilots. A report back on the advantages and any obstacles to Auckland becoming an Age Friendly City as part of the World Health Organisation’s Global Network.</td>
<td>Q1 (July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 5</td>
<td>Youth volunteer programmes</td>
<td>Intervention assessment of youth volunteer programmes on long term education and employment – understanding impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on interventions approach</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Jul) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 5</td>
<td>Events Policy</td>
<td>A review of what is working well and what isn’t</td>
<td>Strategic direction on councils approach to social enterprise.</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Sep) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grant Policy Monitoring</td>
<td>Audit of the application of the Grants Policy</td>
<td>Decision on audit results</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Toi Whitiki Strategy</td>
<td>Targeted analysis of social return on investment on specific art and culture investment</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>Review of the Public Arts Policy: what’s working what’s not. Decisions relating to major public arts</td>
<td>Direction Committee agreement to a council submission on the National Direction for Aquaculture</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGISLATION/CENTRAL GOVERNMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>National Environmental Standards</td>
<td>Council response on the National Direction for aquaculture expected following scheduled release of consultation document in April 2017. The National Direction is likely to address matters relating to re-consenting, bay-wide management, innovation and research, and biosecurity.</td>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND ACQUISITIONS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strategic acquisition issues and opportunities</td>
<td>Understanding current acquisition issues and options.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land acquisition for stormwater purposes</td>
<td>Delegated responsibility of the committee. To acquire land for stormwater management and development purposes, to either support a structure plan or ad-hoc development.</td>
<td>Decision to acquire land. Reports will come to committee as required. Next report will be in Feb 2018 seeking authority to carry out compulsory acquisition of land in the Henderson area for a flood prevention project.</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb) Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>Long-term Plan</td>
<td>Informing the development of the 2018-2028 Auckland Council Long-term Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am Auckland - Youth Strategy</td>
<td>Implementation of strategy. Identify areas of success and improvement opportunity</td>
<td>Approval for the development and an implementation plan was considered on 14 Feb 2017 Resolution ENV/2017/10 Item 16</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNESCO Auckland City of Music</td>
<td>Decide whether to commit to being a UNESCO City of Music (from Regional and Strategy and Policy resolution REG/2016/70)</td>
<td>Endorsement was given at 14 March Resolution ENV/2017/35 Item 10</td>
<td>Q3 (March) Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weed Management Policy Implementation</td>
<td>To ensure implementation of the Weed Management policy occurs, and that how it will be implemented is reported to elected members</td>
<td>Appointment by the Mayor to a Political Advisory Group - Committee agenda 14 Feb 2017 Item 23</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>One Voice Auckland Sport and Recreation</td>
<td>One Voice – sector wide advisory group for sport and recreation</td>
<td>Appointment of 3 Elected Members to One Voice: Crs Cooper, Filipaina &amp; W Walker on 4 April – Committee Resolution ENV/2017/53 Item 13</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regional Sport and Recreation Grant Programme</td>
<td>Contestable grant programmes</td>
<td>Allocation of the budget 2017/2018 was approved on 4 April Resolution ENV/2017/51 Item 10</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (Apr) Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community Access Scheme</td>
<td>Review of Council investment in third party facilities to increase community access</td>
<td>Allocation of funding of Community Access grants was approved on 16 May Resolution ENV/2017/73 Item 18</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (May) Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community School Partnerships</td>
<td>Improve Community Access to school facilities</td>
<td>Decision and direction on investment and development of partnerships with schools Update on Community and School Partnership project was provided 16 May 2017 Item 20 Approval for entering into a partnership agreement with Western Springs College and MOE to secure 4 additional indoor courts for school and community use was granted 15 May 2017 ENV/2017/71 Item 17</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (May) Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Waste assessment endorsement</td>
<td>The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 requires the committee to endorse the findings of the waste assessment</td>
<td>Endorse the findings of the waste assessment Endorsement of Waste Political Advisory Group to progress the implementation of a food waste at 16 May 2017 meeting Item 19 and resolution ENV/2017/74 Item 19 Will be notified alongside the draft waste management plan</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (May) Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pest Free Auckland</td>
<td>To eliminate weed and animal pests from Auckland</td>
<td>Strategic direction and oversight, and to endorse the programme. An update was provided at 14 March 2017 meeting: Bio News Item 16</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marine Biosecurity</td>
<td>Statutory obligations under the Biosecurity Act to develop and implement non-regulatory and regulatory programmes to manage marine pests.</td>
<td>Strategic direction and endorse new programmes – for input into Long-term Plan preparation. Included in the Regional Pest Management Plan report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implementation of Housing Taskforce</td>
<td>The Housing Taskforce is led by His Worship the Mayor. The taskforce is likely to recommend actions to council and some of these actions may fall under the Environment and Community Committee remit.</td>
<td>Strategic direction on interventions to pursue. Governing Body on 27 July 2017 adopted the Housing Taskforce report Item 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 and 5</td>
<td>Coastal Erosion Management Strategy</td>
<td>To agree to the actions and tools to improve coastal asset management and prioritised decision-making in respect of climate change, sea-level rise and Auckland’s projected growth.</td>
<td>Decision on the final strategy, approve next steps and the associated work programme(s). Progress to date: Decision 8 August meeting – adopt the coastal management framework approach for the Auckland Region report, Resolution ENV/2017/116. Staff to regularly report back on progress and issues arising from the coastal compartment plans work programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>Seachange – Tai Timu Tai Pari</td>
<td>The marine spatial plan for the Hauraki Gulf – Seachange Tai Timu Tai Pari – was completed by the independent stakeholder working group in November 2016. Staff will report on implications of the plan and options for Auckland Council implementation to the Planning Committee. The Environment and Community Committee will likely provide direction and oversee aspects of implementation.</td>
<td>Strategic direction on the spatial plan and implementation actions. Progress to date: The initial assessment was considered at the 2 May Planning Committee meeting, resolution PLA/2017/50 Item 9 Political Ref Group was established. Approval of TOR and work programme was considered in Sept ENV/2017/115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hauraki Gulf Forum</td>
<td>Possible consideration of recommendations from the Hauraki Gulf Forum arising from the completion of Seachange Tai Timu Tai Pari.</td>
<td>Decisions on governance and/or resourcing arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tripartite Economic Alliance</td>
<td>Provide direction on preparation for Guangzhou 2017 Tripartite summit and seek approval for the renewal of the Tripartite Economic Alliance 2017 Tripartite Summit funded out of Global Partnerships and Strategy budget, CCO’s budget and through sponsorship.</td>
<td>Direction and approval of the extension of the Tripartite Economic Alliance beyond its initial three year period. Progress to date: Update was provided at 14 March 2017 meeting – summit in Sept 2017 Item 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Smoke-free Policy</td>
<td>Improve policy and implementation</td>
<td>Decision on updated Smokefree policy. Progress to date: considered the report for adoption at the August meeting. Resolution ENV/2017/113 Approval of the policy on 17 Oct Resolution ENV/2017/142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>Productivity Commission – inquiry transition into low carbon economy</td>
<td>Council’s submission to the Productivity Commission’s low emissions economy issues paper</td>
<td>Decision to proposed key themes for submission to the Productivity Commission’s low emissions economy issues paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demographic Advisory Panels</td>
<td>Identifying Panels’ priorities for advice to the council for 2017/18</td>
<td>Decision Approving demographic advisory panels work programme</td>
<td>Progress to date: Disability and Seniors Advisory Panels work programme were approved in Sept. Ethnic Peoples and Youth Advisory Panels were approved in Oct. Pacific Peoples and Rainbow Panels were approved in Nov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open Space management: issues paper</td>
<td>Understanding open space management, issues and options</td>
<td>Decision on potential solutions and next steps</td>
<td>Progress to date: Staff have done some work on this item to identify the key issues impacting on open space, however, the final product does not require a decision from the governing body. Aspects of this work have also been superseded by the Governance Review and well as the current review of the Occupancy Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund</td>
<td>Decision making over medium and large funds from the Waste Minimisation and Innovation fund in line with the fund’s adopted policy. Funds to contribute towards council’s aspirational goal of zero waste to landfill by 2040.</td>
<td>Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2017-2018 financial year.</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>Kauri Dieback</td>
<td>To protect Auckland’s Kauri forests</td>
<td>Decision on options for management of Kauri dieback – for input into the Long-term Plan preparation.</td>
<td>A decision report was considered on 4 April 2018 Resolution ENV/2018/44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Approve action plan to help achieve compliance with the National Environment Strategy on Air Quality</td>
<td>Decision on air quality action.</td>
<td>A report was considered in Feb 2018 for an improved approach to managing Auckland’s compliance with national air quality standards. Staff will develop communications material about air quality that the public can undertake this winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Destination Auckland Strategy</td>
<td>Provide strategic direction to ATEED through its consideration of options for any new strategies relating to international visitors.</td>
<td>Strategic direction relating to tourism strategies. ATEED has responsibility for the provision of initiatives in the tourism sector in Auckland. Workshop held in Nov 2017. The destination strategy update was presented at the 13 March 2018. Public launch scheduled</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Safeswim</td>
<td>To consider best future options for the delivery of Safeswim</td>
<td>Decision on options for expansion of the Safeswim programme. Progress to date: Endorsed the recommended improvements by 1 Nov to the programme on 14/02/17 meeting Item 16. Requested a report on costs and benefits of “white box” model. A further update was provided on 14/03/17 on food safety for seafood gatherers Item 16. Progress was presented at Sept meeting – scheduled to go live on 1/11/17. An update was given in 14 Nov. A further update on activity over the summer period will be provided in March 2018 and a decision sought on next steps for Safeswim. This report was considered on 10 April on the findings of the review and endorsed the proposed future direction of Safeswim programme Res ENV/2018/47. Regular updates will be provided.</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar) Q4 (Apr) Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weed Management Policy</td>
<td>Governance group to oversee the implementation of the weed management policy. February 2017 item</td>
<td>Provide political direction to the Environment and Community Committee and staff in regards to weed management decisions. Report back to the Environment and Community Committee on progress within six months of establishment. An update report was presented in October. An update memo was attached to the 10/04/18 agenda. Public meetings of the Weed Management Advisory Political are scheduled on 4/7/18, 12/09/18 and 5/12/18.</td>
<td>Q4 (Apr) Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Child Poverty Reduction Bill</td>
<td>The purpose of the bill is “to encourage a focus on child poverty reduction, facilitate political accountability against published targets, require transparent reporting on child poverty levels, and create a greater commitment by Government to address child well-being.”</td>
<td>Direction The aims of the bill are aligned with those of the Auckland Plan and the I Am Auckland strategic action plan, specifically around ensuring equity of opportunity and outcomes for children and young people, and staff suggest a submission in broad support of the bill. Progress to date: A retrospective submission was approved at the 8 May 2018 meeting.</td>
<td>Q4 (May)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Waste Management and Minimisation Plan Review</td>
<td>To adopt a new Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.</td>
<td>Direction on the key issues that arise through consultation on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and the waste assessment. Adopt the final plan, after hearings have been held on the draft plan. Progress to date: Decision: A Waste Political Advisory Group was established Resolution ENV/2016/6 Item 11. The Plan was adopted for consultation on 5/12/17. Res ENV/2017/186. SCP process in April for June meeting.</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (Jun) Q1 Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thriving Communities Action Plan</td>
<td>Hearing Panel report was considered on 12/06/18. The Plan was approved ENV/2018/70. A report was considered on 12/06/18 on its key findings. Resolution ENV/2018/76 for endorsement and agreed to improvement areas. Annual status reports on progress will be provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Long Bay Okura Great Park Society
Sediment Issues in the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve
Background Information

Sediment Issues Affecting the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve

- The most serious threat the Marine Reserve is facing is the consistently extremely high levels of sediment coming off the land. These are often from consented sites which have no limitation on the amount of sediment they can discharge.

- This is having an accelerating effect on the destruction of the Marine Reserve because the Reserve is experiencing a significant increase in the amount of earthworks carried out in its catchments. These earthworks include the Long Bay and Wettie Land developments plus many others.

- The Society has commissioned Ecoast Marine Consulting and Research to carry out research into better ways silt can be managed to ensure that sediment pollution stops.

- Shaw Mead, Managing Director and Environmental Scientist of Ecoast will present his findings to the Committee.
The Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve

- The Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve is one of six marine reserves in the Hauraki Gulf area. Being in Auckland City, the Marine Reserve provides the chance to experience nature for people who might not normally have the opportunity.

- It is a very special area that until a short time ago, teemed with life, so much so you would see upwards of 20 mullets flying at one time and stingrays glide by as you waded or paddled through the clear waters. Baby snapper chased baby flounder around on the surface. Kingfish hunted in sprays of water. Acres of shellfish, cockle and pipis fed some of New Zealand’s rarest shore birds that live and breed here, such as the NZ Dotterel and the Variable Oystercatcher. It was a place of natural wonder.
What Makes the Marine Reserve Special

The Marine Reserve is bordered by amazing parks:

- The Long Bay Regional Park. It enjoys over one million visitors per annum and the expansion to the north west makes it a stunning resource for all.

- Department of Conservation’s Okura Bush Scenic Reserve. It is the last major stand of rare coastal forest containing kauri left on the eastern coast of Auckland. The reserve is visited by 35,000 people per year.

- Karepiro Bay Esplanade Reserve and Dacre cottage. A step back in time to the ancient Pa sites that overlook the beach and replanted foreshore with the 1850s cottage built by Captain Ranui Dacre.

The Area has been Awarded Important Status

- Significant Ecological Area (SEA) - The Auckland Council has acknowledged the uniqueness of the Marine Reserve by rating it as a Significant Ecological Area Category 1, the highest ecological rating. In addition, Okura Bush Scenic Reserve is also rated as a Significant Ecological Area.

- Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) - The Auckland Council has also determined that the Marine Reserve in the Okura Estuary, the Long Bay cliffs to the south, the Okura Bush Scenic Reserve and parts of the Regional Park together form a landscape that is exceptional, and rate it as an Outstanding Natural Landscape.
Legislation
Under the NZ Coastal Policy Statement, the Marine Reserves Act and the Resource Management Act we have a duty to protect our Marine Reserves and to ensure their continued preservation. At present, the Society considers that the resource consents issued by Council for works done in the catchments of the Marine Reserve do not provide adequate sediment controls as to fulfill the requirements of this legislation.

NZ Coastal Policy Statement
Policy 22 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement 2019’s section on sediment states:
(2) Require that subdivision, use, or development will not result in a significant increase in sedimentation in the coastal marine area, or other coastal water.

The Marine Reserves Act
The Marine Reserve Act 1971 states in Clause (2), Section 2
(a) they shall be preserved as far as possible in their natural state;
(b) the marine life of the reserves shall as far as possible be protected and preserved;
(c) the value of the marine reserves as the natural habitat of marine life shall as far as possible be maintained:

Resource Management Act
Under the Resource Management Act the Council has the duty to avoid adverse effects on the environment.

Points Covered in Presentation
- Analysis of Water Testing Results
- Review of Shellfish Mortality Reports
- Discussion of Declining Marine Life
- Analysis of Ecological Reports
- Evaluation of Compliance Inspections
- Extent of Uncontrolled Discharges
- Review of Resource Consents
- Recommendations

About the Long Bay Okura Great Park Society
- The Long Bay Okura Great Park Society was formed to expand and preserve the Long Bay Regional Park, and to protect and enhance the waters of the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve.
- The Society was involved in the Long Bay Environment Court Case where it focused on ensuring that the Regional Park and Marine Reserve was protected from the effects of the Long Bay development.
- In the last year the Society has gone to the Environment Court again, alongside the Auckland Council and Forest & Bird, to prevent the expansion of the urban limit to
include the southern shoreline of the Ōkura Estuary. The Environment Court has recently ruled that the urban limit cannot be moved.