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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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apologies</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Declaration of Interest</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public Input</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Local Board Input</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 Local Board Input: Waitakere Local Board chair - Targeted rate for Natural Environment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Extraordinary Business</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Investigation into North-west Community Provision</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Auckland Council's draft submission on the Residential Tenancies Act 1986 discussion document</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Auckland Council's draft submission on Healthy Homes Standards</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Auckland Council's draft submission on the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Auckland Council's early position on the three waters review</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Water quality targeted rate – Quarter one 2018 update</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Natural environment targeted rate – Quarter one 2018 update</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>UNESCO Creative Cities Network update presentation</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Summary of Environment and Community Committee information - updates, memos and briefings - 16 October 2018</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Consideration of Extraordinary Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

| 18   | Procedural Motion to Exclude the Public                                                                                                              | 191  |
|      | C1 Acquisition of open space land - Three Kings                                                                                                       | 191  |
1 Apologies

Apologies from Chairperson Cr P Hulse and Cr C Casey 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, 11 September 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.

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

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.

6.1 Local Board Input: Waitakere Ranges Local Board chair - Targeted rate for Natural Environment

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Greg Presland, chair Waitakere Ranges Local Board wishes to speak regarding the targeted rate for the Environment. [Refer to Item 14 of the agenda].

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the presentation regarding the targeted rate for the environment and thank Greg Presland, Chair Waitakere Ranges Local Board for his attendance.
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."
Investigation into North-west Community Provision

File No.: CP2018/13532

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To endorse the findings of the North-west community facility provision investigation.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. In 2017/2018 staff investigated community facility provision across North-west Auckland. The purpose was to identify any current gaps in services or facilities, or if there are likely to be gaps in the future and when they might appear.

3. The key findings of the investigation are:
   - existing provision is sufficient to support current demand, but significant projected growth across the study area will place pressure on existing facilities and create demand for new facilities
   - the profile of the North-west is changing, the baseline population is aging but new developments are bringing in younger people, families and increasing ethnic diversity which will impact future service needs
   - there is disparity across the study area (economic and geographic), which restricts access and creates barriers to participation for some residents, particularly those in rural areas and in lower socio-economic areas such as parts of Westgate and Massey
   - a pool and additional sport and recreation space are priorities for many residents
   - there is some capacity within existing facilities and opportunities to better target services to increase participation in low user groups.

4. The recommended key moves to address the North-west investigation findings are:
   a. action to address condition issues at Kumeu Library to maintain service levels
   b. new aquatic provision from 2026 (ideally located near Westgate in Henderson-Massey)
   c. additional recreation/leisure space in Rodney by 2026 and further recreation space in the longer term (2036) in the Henderson-Massey or Upper Harbour area to support four additional courts across the study area
   d. potential additional multipurpose community space in Whenuapai from 2026 and Kumeu from 2036, subject to the impact of new provision in Westgate, the rate of growth across the area and the needs of emerging communities.

5. The next step is for staff to progress the key moves in line with the indicative business case process. The findings will be reported back to the Governing Body.

6. There is a risk that the actual rate of growth is different to projections, there are opportunities through the next phase of work to reassess and mitigate the impacts of this.

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

Kumeu Library
a) note the findings of the Auckland Council North-west community facility provision investigation, 2018 as follows:
   i) there are serious condition issues at Kumeu Library, and without intervention the library will close, creating a gap in the network
ii) the next steps to progress is that staff report back to the Rodney Local Board on options and a recommended approach to address condition issues at Kumeu Library by November 2018.

Aquatic Provision
b) agree the findings of the North-west community facility provision investigation for aquatic provision as follows:
   i) there is a future gap in aquatic provision in the North-west from 2026
   ii) the key move to address the future aquatic gap in provision is a new aquatic facility (ideally located near Westgate in sub-catchment 3 of the study area)
   iii) the next steps to progress the future aquatic gap in aquatic is to commence the strategic case for change and the development of investment options to implement the Indicative Business Case approved through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

Recreation and Leisure
c) agree the findings of the North-west community facility provision investigation for recreation and leisure provision as follows:
   i) there is a future gap in recreation and leisure provision in the North-west of at least four new indoor courts between 2026-2036
   ii) the key moves to address the future gap in recreation and leisure is the provision of one-to-two courts in the Rodney area by 2026 and at least two additional courts in the Massey/Upper Harbour part of the North-west by 2036
   iii) the next steps to progress the future gap in indoor court provision in the Rodney area and in the Massey/Upper Harbour area is to commence the strategic case for change and the development of investment options to implement the Indicative Business Case approved through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

Multipurpose Community Space
d) agree the findings of the North-west community facility provision investigation for provision of community space as follows:
   i) there is no current gap in multipurpose community space provision in the North-west, but one will emerge in future based on forecast population growth
   ii) the key moves to address this are additional multipurpose community space in Whenuapai from 2026 and Kumeu from 2036, subject to the impact of the new multipurpose facility in Westgate, the rate of growth across the area and the needs of emerging communities
   iii) the next step is to monitor population growth in the area and develop an Indicative Business Case when the population reaches 10,000.

Horopaki / Context

Background to the investigation into community provision
7. The Community Facilities Network Plan, which guides council’s investment in the provision of community facilities, identified a potential gap in aquatic provision in Auckland’s North-west and a priority action to investigate this.
8. Due to the high level of growth anticipated for the North-west, the action was expanded to incorporate a wider scope of community facilities including libraries, arts, community spaces and leisure and recreation.

9. The purpose of the North-west investigation is to determine if there are gaps in current services or facility provision or if there are likely to be gaps in the future and when they might appear.

10. The North-west study area is approximately 150km² and represents three per cent of Auckland’s geographic area. It includes parts of the Rodney Local Board, Upper Harbour Local Board and Henderson-Massey Local Board areas. Its estimated population in 2017 is 34,230.

11. The North-west is growing at a faster rate than the Auckland average. Over the next thirty years (to 2046) the population is projected to expand to over 150,000 people. This growth is likely to place pressure on existing community services and facilities and create demand for new community services.

The investigation is the first phase in a three-phase process for making investment decisions

To support the cost-effective delivery of community facilities, Auckland Council uses a three-stage process for investigating and investing in new or substantially changed community services or facilities. This is based on the NZ Treasury Better Business Case model.

**Methodology for investigation**

12. To complete the investigation four streams of research were conducted:

- **Community profile** - provides an overview of the current state and likely future state of the study area using census data, growth data and other primary research

- **Social research summary** - summarises the findings from recent social research, surveys community engagement to show how residents perceive and feel about their environment and their concerns and aspirations for the North-west

- **Community facility stocktake** - identifies the network of existing facilities (council and non-council) in the study area and analyses available data on the current state including what is on offer, how it is being used, who is using it, and its condition

- **Gap analysis** – analyses evidence from the community profile, social research and community facilities stocktake. It assesses if current provision is sufficient to support demand and how it aligns with provision guidelines and desired national, regional and local outcomes. It determines if demand for services and facilities is likely to exceed supply and where and when this might occur.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

13. The high-level findings of the North-west community provision facility investigation are provided in a summary report as Attachment A.

Growth and community profile

14. Significant growth over the next 30 years will create demand for new services/facilities:
   - current population in the study area is 34,230 but this is projected to increase to 150,556 by 2046 (4 times the current population)
   - the largest and fastest rate of growth is projected in sub-catchment 2 (the Whenuapai Hobsonville and Redhills area) which will have 50% of the population by 2046
   - the increased number of people living and working in the area will place pressure on existing services and create demand for the provision of new services and facilities.

15. The resident profile of the North-west is changing and services/facilities will need to respond:
   - the resident population base is older and aging - this trend will continue, however younger people with families are anticipated in areas of new development
   - ethnic diversity is increasing - while the majority of residents identify as New Zealand European, pockets of the study area have large Māori, Pacific and Asian population groups. Greater ethnic diversity is likely to accompany growth across the area
   - the changing demographics across the North-west creates opportunity to better target services particularly to increase participation in low user groups, and to locate new facilities in areas that create the greatest access to the most users.

16. Some disparity of opportunities due to socio-economic factors and geographical isolation:
   - most of the study area is relatively affluent; however, the part that falls within the Massey and Westgate areas have the lowest individual and family income, and highest percentage of people receiving a benefit
   - barriers to the use of community facilities are more likely to be felt by lower income households. Deprivation has been identified as a factor, which restricts participation and contributes to inactivity
   - where it is rural and geographically isolated, there are a significant number of older people living alone. Over time this trend is likely to increase
   - older people may be vulnerable to social and geographic isolation and require support through accessible community facilities.

17. Urbanisation of rural areas will result in changing needs for community services and facilities:
   - the study area is changing from mostly rural to future urban. Kumeu, Whenuapai and Hobsonville are zoned as town centres and Westgate identified as a metropolitan centre. This intensification will place pressure on existing facilities and create new demand
   - reduced lot sizes of residences in urban areas will increase demand for community facilities close to where people live
   - strategically locating facilities where population densities are increasing will support access and participation and reduce overcrowding of existing facilities
   - for those in rural areas, distance to a facility can create a barrier to participation. Locating facilities in rural areas where the population is under-served removes barriers to participation associated with travel.
### Gap Analysis

18. Provision in the North-west was analysed against the provision guidelines in the Community Facilities Network Plan, a review of existing facilities, population projections, social research and community profiling to assess likely future demand and gaps over time.

19. The following table summarises the key take-outs from this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Library, community, and arts** | - The profile of study area aligns with general users of these facilities creating a strong user base  
- Utilisation of libraries is increasing, although Māori and Pacific population groups are under-represented  
- There are significant condition issues with Kumeu Library  
- There is capacity in existing facilities to support growth  
- The new Westgate multipurpose library/community facility will provide additional provision. | - There are currently no gaps in provision  
- Should the Kumeu Library close there will be a gap in library services  
- As Kumeu and Whenuapai move from rural to urban centres additional spaces for community and arts services are likely to be required (threshold for new provision approximately 10,000-20,000 people). |
| **Leisure and recreation**  | - Court provision across the study area is relatively low in relation to population  
- Residents are travelling to facilities in other catchments to access services  
- Social research identified community aspiration for additional provision  
- Demand for indoor courts is increasing at Massey Leisure Centre  
- Māori, Pacific and Asian population groups are underrepresented at Massey Leisure Centre  
- Changes in the profile of the study area suggest demand for indoor courts will continue to increase over time. | - There is no current population requirement for additional indoor recreation space  
- By 2026 population projections will exceed the National Strategy ratio for indoor courts (1:9000 people)  
- To support growth in the long-term six courts may be required in the North-west (four more than currently provided)  
- One or two in the Rodney area by 2026  
- Two additional courts in the Henderson-Massey and/or Upper Harbour areas by 2036. |
| **Aquatic**                | - Lack of aquatic provision was referenced in all social research  
- General demand for aquatic provision is likely to increase over time as more families move into the area  
- Residents are travelling to facilities in other catchments to access services  
- Catchments for neighbouring aquatic facilities (e.g Westwave) are reaching capacity  
- Deprivation levels and distance to facilities is linked to lower swimming participation in parts of Henderson-Massey. | - The majority of residents fall outside a catchment for aquatic facility, and there is limited access to non-council facilities  
- The study area does not quite reach population thresholds for an aquatic facility (minimum threshold is 35-50,000 people)  
- By 2026 the population base will be approaching this threshold  
- If the area is extended to include those parts of Henderson-Massey that sit outside a 5km catchment of Westwave pool (which includes pockets of higher deprivation) then the population threshold is reached sooner  
- Locating a facility near Westgate in the Henderson-Massey area would serve the majority of the population within a 5km catchment  
- This location would provide better access to residents in Henderson-Massey living in areas of higher deprivation who have lower levels of swimming participation. |
Key moves to address the gaps

20. Based on the gap analysis, the investigation concludes that current provision is sufficient to support immediate demand, but additional facilities will be required to address growth and emerging gaps over the next ten years, including:
   
a) action to address condition issues and maintain service levels at Kumeu Library
b) new aquatic provision will be required in the North-west from 2026 (ideally located near Westgate in sub-catchment 3 of the study area)
c) additional recreation and leisure space to provide at least six courts across the study area (four more than is currently provided):
   i. one-to-two courts in the Rodney area by 2026
   ii. at least two additional courts in the Massey or Upper Harbour part of the study area by 2036.
d) potential additional multipurpose community space in Whenuapai from 2026 and Kumeu from 2036, subject to the impact of the new multipurpose facility in Westgate, the rate of growth across the area and the needs of emerging communities.

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

21. Two workshop sessions were held with each local board in the study area.

22. In March 2018, staff presented the key findings of the community profile. In June 2018, staff presented the draft findings of the investigation.

23. Local board member feedback from the workshops focussed on:
   - general support for location and timing of community space
   - concern over proposed timing of gaps for leisure and recreation provision
   - concern over the proposed location of future leisure and recreation provision
   - concern over the proposed timing of aquatic provision and that the study area did not reflect the wider population served by aquatic facility in the North-west, particularly residents of Henderson-Massey Local Board who live in areas of high deprivation and have low levels of swimming participation.

24. Additional research and analysis were undertaken in response to feedback from local board members. As a result, the following changes were made to the findings:
   - adjustment to where the local leisure and recreation space may be located
   - adjustment to when additional courts space may be required
   - consideration of a potential wider population base for aquatic provision, which adjusted the timing for a new facility.

25. In September 2018, updated findings were presented to business meetings in each local board in the study area. The following table outlines each of the local board’s response. The full local board resolutions are included in Attachment B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>Endorsed all recommended key moves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Endorsed the recommended key moves for aquatic provision and multipurpose community space. Rejected the recommended key moves for leisure and recreation on the basis that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the study area for the investigation did not include parts of the Upper Harbour Local Board area to the east of the Greenhithe Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- they did not agree with interpretation of the data and information provided by the sport and recreation sector regarding shortfall of indoor court provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The board noted their expectation that planning and investigation of the indicative business case for the Upper Harbour One Local Board Initiative would be done on a sub-regional basis rather than consideration of local provision which was the basis of the North-west investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Noted all recommended key moves. The board requested that staff progress the Rodney Local Board One Local Board Initiative for indoor court provision in Kumeu/Huapai as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

26. The social research used to inform this investigation gathered views from a variety of residents in the North-west, including Māori.

27. Pockets of the study area within the Henderson-Massey Local Board area have a high Māori population. Provision of facilities in these areas would benefit Māori as a significant proportion of the community.

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

28. The Long-term Plan 2018-2028 provided resource to develop three indicative business cases that align with the key moves outlined above, as follows:
   - aquatic provision in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area
   - recreation and leisure space in Rodney Local Board area
   - indoor court provision in the upper Harbour Local Board area.

29. The indicative business cases will clarify need, provide options to address provision gaps, analyse costs and benefits and recommend the preferred option(s) that deliver best value for money.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

30. The demographic and growth projections may change. This information may require updating when new growth modelling is produced and new census information becomes available. Any implications arising from this can be considered and mitigated as part of the next phase of indicative business case work.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

31. Staff will progress the key moves outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Recommended key move</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Commencement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Options for investment to ensure continued library services in Kumeu for 15 years.</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 1</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and recreation</td>
<td>Indicative business case for additional recreation and leisure services</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 1</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and arts</td>
<td>Development of indicative business case for multipurpose space in Kumeu</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 1</td>
<td>When population reaches at least 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and arts</td>
<td>Development of indicative business case for multipurpose community and arts spaces in Whenuapai</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 2</td>
<td>When population reaches at least 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and recreation</td>
<td>Indicative business case to identify land for additional recreation and leisure services</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 2/3</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Indicative business case for aquatic facility</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 3</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purpose of the investigation

- Stemming from action 48 in the Community Facilities Network Plan to investigate the need for pool and leisure space in the north-west.

- As the north-west is growing rapidly the investigation has expanded to include investigation of all community facility provision in the area (library, arts, community, venues for hire, pools, recreation and leisure).

- The purpose of the investigation is to determine if there are gaps in current services or facility provision across north-west Auckland or if there are likely to be gaps in the future and when they will appear.
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Process overview for investment in community services

The process for investigating and investing in new or substantially changed community services/facilities has three broad phases in line with the NZ Treasury Better Business Case model.

• **Phase 1: Investigation** (strategic needs assessment) - analyses the current state and considers future growth and community demand to see if there is a need for new or substantially changed services/facilities. Provides the evidence for the *strategic case* for investment.

• **Phase 2: Indicative Business Case** (IBC) - brings together the *strategic* and *economic* “case for change” when a need for new/changed services or facilities require new investment. Assesses the costs and benefits of options and identifies a preferred option that delivers best value for money. An IBC is required to secure indicative funding in the Long-term Plan.

• **Phase 3: Detailed Business Case** - this makes the commercial, financial and management case for investment in the “preferred option” and seeks approval to move to project delivery.
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Process overview for investment in community services

**Phase 1: Investigation**
(provision investigation and needs analysis)
- Reviews the “current state”
- Looks at how well the existing network of services/facilities delivering outcomes
- Looks at future demand based on growth and future community profile
- Identifies issues, problems and opportunities and community needs
- Identifies gaps in service or facility provision now or forecast in the future
- Proposes key moves to address gaps and needs
- Provides evidence to underpin the strategic case for investment

**Key deliverables of Phase 1:**
- Investigation Findings Report, including:
  - Current state and forecast future state
  - Key findings
  - Recommendations on next steps/key moves
- Report to delegated decision-maker(s)

**Phase 2: Indicative Business Case**
(strategic & economic case for change)
- Makes the “case for change” if a gap or need has been identified requiring new investment
- Identifies and assesses a range of options to address the need or gap
- Assess the costs and benefits of options
- Identifies the preferred option that best addresses the strategic need and delivers value for money
- Recommends the level of investment required to deliver the preferred option

**Key deliverables of Phase 2:**
- Indicative Business Case
- Report to delegated decision-maker(s)

**Phase 3: Detailed Business Case**
(commercial, financial, management case)
- Makes the commercial, financial, and management case for investment
- Undertakes detailed feasibility on the preferred option
- Details the preferred service delivery option and service delivery model
- Proposes service design that best meets needs of target customer/audience
- Identifies whole of life costs and funding streams to deliver sustainably

**Key deliverables of Phase 3:**
- Detailed Business Case
- Report to delegated decision-maker(s)
## Research and outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of research</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study area profile</td>
<td>Census, rental and housing data, quality of life survey, needs assessment</td>
<td>• Community profile summary report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social research summary report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future projections</td>
<td>Growth statistics, growth estimates, resident and planning surveys</td>
<td>• Community facility stocktake summary report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility review</td>
<td>Condition and financial management, management and operational summaries, usage data, facility feedback</td>
<td>• Gap analysis findings report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial analysis</td>
<td>GIS data, growth estimates, catchment data, user data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The north-west study area

North-west community provision investigation
North-west study area

The north-west study area is approximately 150km² and represents three per cent of Auckland’s geographic area. It includes parts of the Rodney Local Board, parts of the Upper Harbour Local Board and parts of the Henderson-Massey Local Board. Its estimated population for 2017 is **34,230**.

A large proportion of the existing population identifies as New Zealand European, is older than the Auckland average and has a higher individual or family income than the Auckland average. Residents are generally well established. Over the last three censuses there has been little change to the make-up of the area.

The profile of the north-west is changing. The study area is growing at a faster rate than the Auckland average. Over the next thirty years (to 2046) the population is projected to expand to over **150,000** people.
## Sub-catchment profiles and variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-catchment</th>
<th>Population (2017)</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sub-catchment 1 | 10,010 people | - Highest percentage of people 60 and over (20 per cent)  
- 80:20 born in New Zealand vs overseas  
- Predominance of people who identify as New Zealand European (92 per cent)  
- Highest per cent of single person households (18 per cent)  
- Highest per cent of people receiving superannuation or pension (18 per cent)  
- Predominantly single dwellings, no social housing |
| Sub-catchment 2 | 15,720 people (2017) | - Most even spread of each age group (between six and eight per cent for each group)  
- 60:40 born in New Zealand vs overseas  
- Highest percentage of people who identify as Asian (19 per cent)  
- 50 per cent of couples with children  
- Predominance of two children per family  
- Most even spread of incomes  
- Highest household income  
- Mixed housing across new developments, no social housing |
| Sub-catchment 3 | 7,510 people | - Younger population with more 0-9 year olds (19 per cent)  
- 60:40 born in New Zealand vs overseas  
- Highest representation of those who identify as Māori (17 per cent)  
- Highest representation of those who identify as Pacific (19 per cent)  
- Lowest median individual and household income  
- Highest percentage of people receiving a benefit (21 per cent)  
- Median score of seven on the deprivation index  
- Mixed housing, 35 per cent social housing |
Growth projections

Sub-catchment estimated population projections

Projected population of 150,556 by 2046 (4x the current population)

Currently 2.6 per cent of the population, expected to be 6.3 per cent of the Auckland population by 2046.

Fastest rate of growth occurring in sub-catchment 2. Sub-catchment 2 will have 50 per cent of the population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2036</th>
<th>2041</th>
<th>2046</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-catchment 1</td>
<td>11,696</td>
<td>12,138</td>
<td>14,726</td>
<td>17,353</td>
<td>25,085</td>
<td>32,550</td>
<td>32,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-catchment 2</td>
<td>14,076</td>
<td>30,595</td>
<td>46,953</td>
<td>60,101</td>
<td>71,090</td>
<td>79,934</td>
<td>86,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-catchment 3</td>
<td>5,998</td>
<td>7,357</td>
<td>13,853</td>
<td>19,996</td>
<td>25,788</td>
<td>31,306</td>
<td>31,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-west total</td>
<td>31,770</td>
<td>50,090</td>
<td>75,532</td>
<td>97,449</td>
<td>121,963</td>
<td>143,789</td>
<td>150,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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North-west growth heat map
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Community profile summary
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Age trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North-west now</th>
<th>North-west over time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The study area is older than the Auckland average with a higher percentage of people aged 44-65</td>
<td>• Continued trend of aging population with 20 per cent aged 65 or over by 2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 31 per cent aged over 50 in 2013 compared to 21 per cent in 2001</td>
<td>• Younger people with families anticipated in areas of new development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sub-catchment 1 has the oldest population base with 20 per cent aged 50 and over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sub-catchment 3, has a much younger population base (10 percent aged 0-10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How does this relate to community facilities?

Older people:
• make up a large proportion of visitors to arts and community centres
• are less likely to be active on a regular basis and less likely to use leisure facilities
• are a potential growth demographic for aquatics but have different expectations of facilities (i.e. pool temperature and amenities)
• 30.9 per cent of those aged between 65 and 75 are inactive
• 54.5 per cent of those aged over 75 are inactive.

Younger people with families:
• children and families are primary users of aquatic facilities
• younger families tend to participate in less formal sport and recreation.
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### Increasing ethnic diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North-west now</th>
<th>North-west over time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Study area has a 73:27 ratio of people born in New Zealand to born overseas</td>
<td>• Likely increase in those born overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More established immigrants than wider Auckland</td>
<td>• Increase in newer immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 77 per cent of residents identify as NZ European</td>
<td>• Likely continued high percentage of New Zealand European base population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing trend of those who identify as Asian, no increase in Pacific or Māori over last three census</td>
<td>• Greater diversity of residents across new developments (particularly in sub-catchments 2 and 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater diversity in sub-catchment 2 and 3 than sub-catchment 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How does this relate to community facilities?

- NZ Europeans are predominant visitors to community centres, arts facilities and venues for hire
- Māori usage of libraries and leisure facilities in the north-west is under-represented
- Pacific Peoples usage of libraries and leisure facilities in the north-west is under-represented
- Recreation and aquatic users are generally representative of Auckland’s demographic breakdown
- Users of Massey Leisure, are mainly NZ European. There is over-representation of women and older users
- Asian groups have lower participation rates in sport and recreation, but when participating it tends to be indoor sports
- Asian groups usage of leisure centres in the north-west is under-represented
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### Disparity of opportunity/incomes across the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North-west now</th>
<th>North-west over time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Sub-catchment 1 and 2 are relatively affluent*</td>
<td>* Trend in sub-catchment 1 of increased single person households*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sub-catchment 1 has the highest percentage of single person households*</td>
<td>* As the population ages the number of people receiving superannuation is likely to increase*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sub-catchment 1 has the highest percentage of people receiving superannuation or pension (12 per cent)*</td>
<td>* Single parent families projected to increase from six to nine per cent by 2046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sub-catchment 3 has the highest percentage of single parent households and highest percentage of families with four or more children*</td>
<td>* No social housing in sub-catchment 1 or 2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sub-catchment 3 has the lowest individual and household incomes and highest percentage of those receiving a benefit (21 per cent)*</td>
<td>* Market factors (like house prices) are likely to increase financial disparities across the study area*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How does this relate to community facilities?**

- People who live alone are more likely to feel lonely or isolated and may require more support through community services
- Barriers to use and participation such as transport and cost are more likely to be felt by larger households, single income households or those on a fixed income (sub-catchment 3 and parts of sub-catchment 1)
- Deprivation has been identified as a factor which contributes to inactivity and restricts participation in activities, but not necessarily participation in sport competitions or membership

---
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## Intensification (rural/urban divide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North-west now</th>
<th>North-west over time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Predominantly rural areas with small town centres</td>
<td>• Kumeu, Whenuapai and Hobsonville are future urban areas set to become town centres. Westgate is set to become a metropolitan town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Predominantly single dwelling housing</td>
<td>• Surrounding areas to retain their rural nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal transport opportunities, residents are car dependent</td>
<td>• Increased transport networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No increase between 2001 and 2013 in public transport or active transport use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How does this relate to community facilities?

- Increases in housing and employment will increase the number of people moving into the area and the number of people who may use facilities.
- It is anticipated that reducing lot sizes of residences will increase demand for community facilities close to where people live.
- Rural and urban areas are likely to have different expectations around access to facilities.
- Lack of public transport can act as a barrier to participation particularly for children and older people.
- The further a person has to travel the less likely they are to use a facility.

---
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Social research summary
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## Community feedback

*Sourced from social research, surveys and engagement conducted within the study area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Aspirations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Perception of quality of life is higher for Rodney and Upper Harbour than Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>• All areas reference the lack of aquatic provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents enjoy their rural lifestyle and express concern at the rate of change</td>
<td>• Hobsonville – indoor facilities for youth and indoor courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change is viewed as positive if it comes with new supporting infrastructure</td>
<td>• Kumeu – indoor recreation, community hub and expanded arts facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Whenuapai – community and arts and recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Westgate – services and facilities for youth, flexible community space and creative spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Community behaviour
(Sourced from social research, surveys and engagement conducted within the study area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Sport and recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 77 per cent believe a sense of community is important, but only 50 per cent feel a sense of community</td>
<td>• Adults in the Rodney and Henderson-Massey local board areas engage in physical activity at a comparable rate to the Auckland average. Those in the Upper Harbour Local Board area engage at a slightly higher frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social networks occur through a variety of ways. Those in more rural areas are more likely to have social networks online. Sports and school or work are also key areas for networks</td>
<td>• Across all demographics individual exercise like ‘walking for sport or leisure’, ‘gardening’, ‘individual workout’ and ‘playing games’ are the most popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive contact with neighbours is felt more in the Rodney Local Board area (87 per cent), than Upper Harbour (57 per cent) or Henderson-Massey (42 per cent)</td>
<td>• For children indoor sports such as swimming, netball, basketball and futsal are most popular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Investigation into North-west Community Provision

Attachment A

Community Facility Stocktake summary

Massey leisure centre
Community, arts and library facilities (15 minute walking and driving catchments)

Provision levels (CFNP)

Community centre – small
Located in local neighbourhoods, walking catchment of up to 15 minutes
30 minute drive of rural centre
Target population threshold 5,000 – 10,000.

Community centre – large
Serves a catchment of up to 15 minute driving time. Located in town centres and satellite towns
Target population of 20,000.

Libraries
41m² to 1000 population. Capacity of neighbouring libraries and up to 30 minutes travel.
Attachment A

Item 8

Provision (CFNP)

- Access to bookable space within 15 minute walk from local or town centres.
- Access to a bookable space within 30 minute drive from rural centre.

Venues for hire (15 minute walking and driving catchments)

North-west community provision investigation
Community, library, arts and venues for hire

- **Community-led provision** – approximately half of all services are delivered by non-council entities and half of community facilities are managed by non-council entities
- **Capacity for growth** – utilisation of council monitored facilities averages 40 per cent, meaning there is capacity for additional usage and services
- **Asset condition** – some assets are in poor condition (Kumeu Library) although most are in good or very good condition, despite much of the stock being over 40 years old
- **Fit-for-purpose** – the size and layout of some facilities limits the type of programmes or activities that can occur in them
- **Accessibility** – some facilities are only available at certain time i.e. after schools or weekends
Massey library catchment and user locations

Users travel much further than the immediate catchment to access the facility, but the majority of users come from sub-catchment 2 and 3.
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Kumeu library catchment and user locations

Users travel much further than the immediate catchment to access the facility. Majority of users are localised in sub-catchment 1
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Attachment A Item 8
## Community, library, arts and venues for hire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Community spaces</th>
<th>Venues for hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massey and Kumeu library serve distinct geographic population groups</td>
<td>Profile of the study area generally aligns with typical arts facility users</td>
<td>Profile of the study area aligns closely with typical community facility users</td>
<td>Venues are able to accommodate the profile of different user groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active membership and new registration is increasing</td>
<td>Arts services and facilities are delivered by community groups or private providers with Council support</td>
<td>Capacity to support growth as facilities are under utilised</td>
<td>Large number of venues per current population count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents have access to a library within 15 min drive. New facility in Westgate will have wider catchment and replace existing Massey library</td>
<td>With the new facility in Westgate there will be arts services in each sub-catchment</td>
<td>Residents have access to a community space within 15 min drive</td>
<td>Residents have access to venue for hire within 15 min drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Leisure and recreation facilities
(5km and 10km driving catchments)

Provision levels (CFNP)
Leisure – local facility
Service local catchment of 5km
Leisure target population thresholds of 18,000 to 40,000
Within 30 minute drive-time for rural areas.

Leisure – destination facility
Service catchment of 10km.

North-west community provision investigation
Massey Leisure Centre members and geographic location

Users travel from much further than the 5km catchment, but the majority of members are localised in sub-catchments 2 and 3.
Leisure, recreation and aquatic

Leisure and recreation

Massey Leisure Centre, the only council facility, caters to a current catchment of approximately 37,000 people (22,700 in the north-west study area). A condition report on the facility is pending

Profile of users is generally reflective of the study area, but not reflective of the population in its immediate catchment (5km)

Users travel much further than the identified catchment to use the facility

Total court visits are increasing, suggesting increased demand for court space (15 per cent between 2016-2018 FYE)

Non-council provision:
- One sports centre
- 13 school with courts in the study area (5 indoor courts)
- Two private fitness centres
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Aquatic facilities
(5km and 10km driving catchments)

Provision levels
(CFNP)
Aquatic – local facility
Service local catchment of 5km
Minimum population threshold of 35,000 to 50,000
Within a 30 minute drive-time for rural areas.
Aquatic – destination facility
Service catchment of 10km.
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Albany pool members and learn to swim users and geographic locations

Users travel from the study area to access Albany pool, with the greatest majority from sub-catchment 2
West Wave pool members and learn to swim users and geographic locations

Users travel from across the study area to access West Wave pool, with the greatest majority from sub-catchment 2 and 3
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Leisure, recreation and aquatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no public aquatic facilities within the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents are travelling to Albany Stadium Pool and West Wave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-council provision:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ten school pools in study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• one private pool at Whenuapai Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• one private learn to swim and a second learn to swim planned to open shortly in Hobsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently some (limited) community access to school pools:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• community summer access to Waimauku and Taupaki School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 25 hours a week community access to Massey High School indoor pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• negotiations are underway with community for access to Hobsonville Primary School pool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What is working well in the north-west?

- Despite building condition, library usage is increasing
- Community based services appear to be serving community needs
- Aging facility stock, but most is in average or good condition
- Capacity in existing community spaces to provide additional services/activities
- Venues for hire able to accommodate different user groups
- Massey Leisure Centre court use is increasing
- Some community use of school courts
- Residents are travelling to aquatic facilities in neighbouring catchments
- Some community use of school pools.
Gap analysis
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## Community, library, arts and venues for hire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Gap Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Library, community and arts space are viewed positively by the community and they would like greater access to them</td>
<td>• Kumeu library is the main facility in sub-catchment 1 and the only facility owned and manged by council that provides services to the community. Removal of the facility would create a gap for library services in the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The profile of the study area aligns with the general user profile of these facilities, creating a strong user base</td>
<td>• By 2036, the population within 5km of the library will be approximately 12,000, which places pressure on the size of the facility to deliver services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The profile of sub-catchment 3 does not align with the general profile of users</td>
<td>• There are no council managed services in Whenuapai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilisation of some community facilities is low, and averages 40 per cent</td>
<td>• By 2026 the projected population of sub-catchment 2 is 46,953. It is anticipated residents this sub-catchment will access library services in Westgate, however residents in Whenuapai may require local space for arts and community services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilisation of libraries across the area is increasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilisation of arts services in sub-catchment 1 is increasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kumeu library size is sufficient to cater to current population, by 2021 the size of the library will approach threshold for the population of sub-catchment 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some residents of sub-catchment 1, however access facilities in sub-catchment 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Westgate Multipurpose will provide $3000m^2$ of community, library and arts space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Populations served by existing and planned community, arts and library space.
Community, library, arts and venues for hire

North-west now:
- currently no gaps in community, library, arts or venues for hire
- additional capacity in existing facilities
- new multi-purpose facility in Westgate will provide additional provision
- immediate need in Kumeu to address library condition issues, if it closes there will be a gap in library services.

North-west over time:
- As Kumeu and Whenuapai move from rural to urban, additional spaces for arts, library and community services are likely to be required to service the residential population
- By 2026, Whenuapai population may reach threshold for new community space/services. What and when it may be required, needs to be monitored and will depend on:
  - how quickly growth actually occurs
  - resident behaviour and usage of existing/neighbouring facilities
  - impact of new multi-purpose facility in Westgate
- By 2036, Kumeu is likely to require additional arts, library and community space
- It is anticipated that the rural population, in sub-catchment 1, will access services between Westgate and Kumeu.
## Leisure and recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Gap Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Court provision is relatively low given the population and the National Strategy for Indoor Courts identified a shortfall</td>
<td>• Estimated there are currently 8 indoor courts across the study area, but only two provide consistent community access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation is reported as increasing in netball, basket and futsal, but lack of courts is restricting growth</td>
<td>• Should there be an increase in community access the number of courts should be able to cope with demand in the short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indoor court sports, such as netball, basketball and futsal are listed high in sports young people want to participate in</td>
<td>• By 2026, the population projection will exceed the National Strategy ratio of courts per person, regardless of access to school facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Targeted study in Kumeu identified lack of a community indoor recreation facility and the need for additional courts by 2031-2036</td>
<td>• By 2026, population projections for sub-catchment 1 will be approaching 9000, which is threshold for rural provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hobsonville study identified lack of indoor court provision</td>
<td>• Massey Leisure centre currently services a 5km catchment of 37,000 people, by 2026 the catchment will reach 60,000 and by 2036 the catchment will be close to 83,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of indoor courts are increasing at Massey Leisure Centre and people are travelling from outside the catchment to use the facility</td>
<td>• There is no community provision in sub-catchment 2, although access to courts is provided through Hobsonville Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in the community profile of the study area suggest demand for indoor courts will increase overtime</td>
<td>• By 2036 it is likely that demand will outstrip supply in sub-catchment 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### North-west community provision investigation
Attachment A

Item 8

Populations served by Massey Leisure Centre

Investigation into North-west Community Provision
Leisure and recreation

North-west now:
- no current population requirement for additional indoor recreation space in the study area
- taking all eight confirmed indoor courts into consideration there is a ratio of 4500:1 people per court
- considering only the Massey Leisure Centre and Kumeu Gym and Sport Centre provide certainty of public access the ratio adjusts to just above the National Strategy for Indoor Courts ratio of 9000:1.

North-west over time:
- current total number of courts (including school courts) could theoretically support demand until 2026. By this point population projections are likely to have reached threshold for an additional new facility (18,000-40,000), 9000 of which will be in sub-catchment 1
- Strategically locating facilities in sub-catchment 1 and sub-catchment 3 would provide the majority of residents access to local recreation space within 5kms
- To support growth in the long-term it is anticipated that at least six courts (four more than current) should be provided across the study area:
  - Two courts in sub-catchment 1 (1-2 additional to current provision)
  - Four courts in sub-catchment 2 or 3 (an additional two courts to what is provided by Massey Leisure centre)
## Aquatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Gap analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of aquatic provision was identified in all community engagement</td>
<td>• The majority of residents in the study area are outside an aquatic facility catchment, however the total population base is lower than the current threshold for an additional aquatic facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General demand for aquatic provision is likely to increase with population growth</td>
<td>• If additional residents in Henderson-Massey, that sit outside of West Wave’s 5km catchment are included then the population threshold is reached sooner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access is likely to become more limited as the catchment of neighbouring facilities increase with population growth</td>
<td>• Locating a facility in sub-catchment 3 would cater to the majority of residents within a 5km catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• West Wave and Albany pool visitor numbers increased by 12 per cent and 7 per cent last year</td>
<td>• Sub-catchment 3 has the additional benefit of providing improved access to residents in high deprivation areas with low swimming participation in the Henderson-Massey area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Although there is some school access most facilities are located outside so use is seasonal</td>
<td>• Catchments for neighbouring facilities are reaching extremely high numbers. It is estimated West Wave has a catchment of over 245,000 and Albany Pool a catchment of 171,073 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents just outside of the study area in the Henderson-Massey local board area also sit outside of the 5km catchment for local aquatic provision, they are in areas of high deprivation and exhibit low levels of swimming participation</td>
<td>• Provision of a facility in sub-catchment 3 by 2026 could reduce pressure on West Wave by up to 19 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North-west community provision investigation
Population of study area served by West Wave 10km catchment
Aquatic

North-west now
- The majority of the study area (98,300km²) sits outside of a catchment for aquatic provision (West Wave and Albany are the closest destination facilities)
- Study area does not quite reach the population threshold for a local facility (35,000 – 50,000). The current estimated population outside of an aquatic catchment (West Wave) is 16,711 and total population of the study area is estimated at 34,000

North-west over time
- By 2026, the population base of the north-west that fall outside of the West Wave catchment will be approaching 50,000
- Population growth in surrounding areas is likely to place increasing pressure on West Wave and Albany Stadium Pool limiting the access to those who fall within their catchment
- By 2026, West Wave 10km catchment will be approaching 293,000 and Albany pool will be approaching 186,000
- One aquatic facility, strategically located in sub-catchment 3, would capture the majority of the population of study area within a 5km catchment.
- If located in sub-catchment 3 the catchment for this facility would extend further into the Henderson-Massey Local Board, and the population would exceed the threshold for a new facility
- By 2026, extended catchment for a facility in sub-catchment three would be approximately 100,000

North-west community provision investigation
Gaps in service/facility provision
Potential benefits of investment

Increased participation

- As lot sizes decrease across the north-west, associated with intensified residential development, community spaces provide people a place to gather that they may not have at home.
- Indoors sports such as basketball, netball and futsal are sports that young people are particularly interested in. Provision of additional courts will cater to this demand, particularly in sub-catchment 3 where the population base has a high percentage of young people.
- People who live in high deprivation areas have below average levels of weekly participation in sport and recreation, improved access to provision may improve opportunities for participation of this group.
- Those who identify as Asian are high users of indoor sports facilities, and are a growing population group across the north-west. They currently however report higher levels of inactivity, but have a higher than average desire to participate. Provision of indoor courts is likely to increase participation in sport and recreation among this population group.
- Sport in the Lives of Young People survey found swimming to be one of the top activities that children would like to participate more in. The Sport and Active Recreation in the Lives of NZ Adults Survey found swimming is one of the most popular activities, along with walking, cycling and jogging.

North-west community provision investigation
Potential benefits continued

Improved health and wellbeing
- Aging population groups are more likely to be inactive, and those over 75 years are less likely to have a driver’s license. Locating facilities in places centralised for older people will increase access and improve the level of activity for this population group.

Increased sense of community and inclusion
- North-west growth is predicted to be rapid, and the emerging population is likely to have different characteristics to the existing population base, community spaces can create a place for people to connect, gather and develop a sense of community.
- Sense of community is important to residents of the north-west, but not felt to the same extent. Increased provision of community space may increase the sense of community felt across existing and new residents.

Improved access
- Cost and transportation are often a barrier to participation, provision of facilities in areas of high deprivation or geographic isolation can mitigate these barriers by providing localised access.
Potential benefits continued

Higher utilisation

- Older age groups and those receiving a benefit may not have lifestyles that conform to normal working days. Locating facilities where there is a high proportion of unemployed people or retired people may support facility usage at off peak times, maximising opportunities for utilisation.

- The north-west is an area where people are more active than the Auckland average. Provision of recreation and leisure spaces in this location has a higher likelihood of good utilisation in comparison to an area where residents are more inactive.

- As the population base of the north-west grows its resident profile is likely to align closely with the general profile of aquatic users creating a strong customer base, particularly in sub-catchment 3 and 2.

- The area has an ageing resident base that are a potential growth area for aquatics and have potential to use the facility at off peak times.
Key variables influencing services and facility provision

| Services                                           | Capacity reached earlier than predicted at existing facilities that service study area e.g. West Wave, Albany Stadium Pool, Massey Leisure Centre  
|                                                  | Impact of Westgate multipurpose facility on user behaviour and facility catchments |
| Infrastructure                                    | The need to address the condition of the Kumeu Library and potentially Massey Leisure Centre cost effectively to continue services  
|                                                  | Timing and extent of transport infrastructure delivery (limited funding for arterial roads in greenfield areas)  
|                                                  | Education facilities or private providers and their contribution to the network and services  
|                                                  | Land availability for an aquatic facility and additional courts |
| Community                                         | Rate of growth  
|                                                  | Demographic change as a result of growth  
|                                                  | Preferences and future community needs |
| Other                                             | Long-term plan funding/One local board initiative funding  
|                                                  | Changes in central government policy (Development contributions, immigration, transport)  
|                                                  | Partnership opportunities  
|                                                  | Employment market  
|                                                  | Construction market and type of houses being constructed  
|                                                  | Strategic approach to provision |
## Recommended key moves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Recommended key move</th>
<th>Next Step</th>
<th>Commencement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Investment to ensure continued library services in Kumeu for 15 years</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 1</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and recreation</td>
<td>Development of indicative business case for additional recreation and leisure services</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 1</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and arts</td>
<td>Development of indicative business case for multipurpose space in Kumeu</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 1</td>
<td>When population reaches at least 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and arts</td>
<td>Development of indicative business case for multipurpose community and arts spaces in Whenuapai</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 2</td>
<td>When population reaches at least 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and recreation</td>
<td>Development of indicative business case to identify land for additional local recreation and leisure services</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 2/3</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Development of indicative business case for aquatic facility</td>
<td>Sub-catchment 3</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Investigation into North-west Community Provision

Resolution number HM/2018/142
MOVED by Deputy Chairperson P Chan, seconded by Member M Grey:
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:
Kumeu Library
a) endorse the findings of the north-west community facility provision investigation as follows:
   i) there are serious condition issues at Kumeu Library, and without intervention the library will close, creating a gap in the network
   ii) the next steps to progress is that staff report back to the Rodney Local Board on options and a recommended approach to address condition issues at Kumeu Library by October 2018.

Aquatic Provision
b) endorse the findings of the north-west community facility provision investigation for aquatic provision as follows:
   i) there is a future gap in aquatic provision in the north-west from 2026
   ii) the key move to address the future aquatic gap in provision is a new aquatic facility (ideally located near Westgate in sub-catchment 3 of the study area)
   iii) the next steps to progress the future aquatic gap in provision is to commence the strategic case for change and the development of investment options to implement the Indicative Business Case approved through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

Recreation and Leisure
c) endorse the findings of the north-west community facility provision investigation for recreation and leisure provision as follows:
   i) there is a future gap in recreation and leisure provision in the north-west of at least four new indoor courts between 2026-2036
   ii) the key moves to address the future gap in recreation and leisure is the provision of one-two courts in the Rodney area by 2026 and at least two additional courts in the Massey/Upper Harbour part of the north-west by 2036
   iii) the next steps to progress the future gap in indoor court provision in the Rodney area and in the Massey/Upper Harbour area is to commence the strategic case for change and the development of investment options to implement the Indicative Business Case approved through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

Multipurpose Community Space
d) endorse the findings of the north-west community facility provision investigation for provision of community space as follows:
   i) there is no current gap in multipurpose community space provision in the north-west, but one will emerge in future based on forecast
population growth
ii) the key moves to address this are additional multipurpose community space in Whenuapai from 2026 and Kumeu from 2036, subject to the impact of the new multipurpose facility in Westgate, the rate of growth across the area and the needs of emerging communities

iii) the next step is to monitor population growth in the area and develop an Indicative Business Case when the population reaches 10,000.

CARRIED

MEETING: Rodney Local Board Meeting of 20/09/2018

RD/2018/116 Investigation of North-west Community Provision
CP2018/13539
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12 Investigation of North-west Community Provision

Antonia Butler, Principal Policy Analyst and Ben Brooks, Team Leader, Community Policy were in attendance.

Resolution number RD/2018/116

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson P Pirrie, seconded by Member A Roe:

That the Rodney Local Board:

Kumeu Library

a) note the findings of the Auckland Council North-west Community Facilities Provision Investigation, 2018 as follows:

i) there are serious condition issues at Kumeu Library, and without intervention the library will close, creating a gap in the network.

ii) the next steps to progress is that staff report back to the Rodney Local Board on options and a recommended approach to address condition issues at Kumeu Library by October 2018.

Aquatic Provision

b) note the findings of the north-west community facility provision investigation for aquatic provision as follows:

i) there is a future gap in aquatic provision in the north-west from 2026

ii) the key move to address the future aquatic gap in provision is a new aquatic facility (ideally located near Westgate in sub-catchment 3 of the study area)

iii) the next steps to progress the future aquatic gap in aquatic is to commence the strategic case for change and the development of investment options to implement the Indicative Business Case approved through the Long-term Plan- 2018-2028.

Recreation and Leisure

c) note the findings of the north-west community facility provision investigation for recreation and leisure provision as follows:

i) there is a future gap in recreation and leisure provision in the north-west of at least four new indoor courts between 2026-2036

ii) the key moves to address the future gap in recreation and leisure is the provision of one-to-two courts in the Rodney area by 2026 and at
least two additional courts in the Massey/Upper Harbour part of the north-west by 2036

iii) the next steps to progress the future gap in indoor court provision in the Rodney area and in the Massey/Upper Harbour area is to commence the strategic case for change and the development of investment options to implement the Indicative Business Case approved through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

Multipurpose Community Space

d) note the findings of the north-west community facility provision investigation for provision of community space as follows:

i) there is no current gap in multipurpose community space provision in the north-west, but one will emerge in future based on forecast population growth

ii) the key moves to address this are additional multipurpose community space in Whenuapai from 2026 and Kumeu from 2036, subject to the impact of the new multipurpose facility in Westgate, the rate of growth across the area and the needs of emerging communities

iii) the next step is to monitor population growth in the area and develop an Indicative Business Case when the population reaches 10,000.

CARRIED

---

MEETING: Upper Harbour Local Board Meeting of 20/09/2018

UH/2018/114 Investigation into north-west community facility provision
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15 Investigation into north-west community facility provision

The Principal Policy Analyst and the Team Leader Community Policy were in attendance to support the item.

Supporting information was tabled at the meeting. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number UH/2018/114

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Deputy Chairperson L Whyte:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) endorse the findings of the north-west community facility provision investigation for aquatic provision as follows:
i) there is a future gap in aquatic provision in the north-west from 2026

ii) the key move to address the future aquatic gap in provision is a new aquatic facility (ideally located near Westgate in sub-catchment 3 of the study area)

iii) the next steps to progress the future aquatic gap in provision are to commence the strategic case for change and the development of investment options to implement the indicative business case, approved through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

b) endorse the findings of the north-west community facility provision investigation for provision of multi-purpose community space as follows:

i) there is no current gap in multi-purpose community space provision in the north-west, but one will emerge in future based on forecast population growth

ii) the key moves to address this are additional multi-purpose community space in Whenuapai from 2026 and Kumeu from 2036, subject to the impact of the new multi-purpose facility in Westgate, the rate of growth across the area, and the needs of emerging communities.

c) do not support the definition of Auckland’s ‘north-west’ as defined within the investigation into north-west community facility provision, as it fails to account for the parts of the Upper Harbour Local Board area east of the Greenhithe bridge.

d) do not endorse the conclusions of the investigation in terms of recreation and leisure provision (particularly in relation to indoor facilities) for the following reasons:

i) the area included in the investigation is poorly defined for the Upper Harbour community as outlined in clause c) above

ii) the local board does not agree with the interpretation of the data and information provided by the sport and recreation sector regarding the existing and current shortfall in indoor court provision in the Auckland region (including the north-west).

e) recognise the merit and importance of data and information collected by the sport and recreation sector in relation to the historical, current and future need for indoor court provision, and request that such information is used (along with council-generated plans, policies and strategies) to directly inform the business case to support the local board’s ‘one local initiative’, which is the development of an indoor recreation facility within the Upper Harbour local board area.

f) expect that planning and indicative business case development for the Upper Harbour Local Board ‘one local initiative’ will be done on a sub-regional/regional basis rather than upon consideration of local provision, which was the basis of the investigation into north-west community facility provision.

g) forward the above resolutions to Henderson-Massey and Rodney Local Boards for their information.

CARRIED
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report


Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. The council is submitting on the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment’s (the Ministry) *Reform of the Residential Tenancies Act 1986* discussion document which proposes changes to existing legislation.

3. The submission is informed by feedback from elected members who were invited to respond to a draft submission and attend a drop-in session.

4. The council supports the intent of the reform to improve security of tenure, modernise the legislation, and improve the quality of boarding houses.

5. There is a risk that the introduction of a Warrant of Fitness scheme for boarding houses requires the council to be the “regulatory authority”. The associated annual costs could be $9.94 million. The council submission recommends charging operators a fee to fund this process.

6. The submission will be made to the Ministry by 19 October 2018.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the draft Auckland Council submission (Attachment A) on the *Reform of the Residential Tenancies Act 1986* discussion document, that will be lodged with the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment by 19 October 2018

b) delegate authority through the Chief Executive to the General Manager - Community and Social Policy to make amendments to the submission to correct errors, omissions or to reflect decisions made by the Environment and Community Committee.

Horopaki / Context

7. The Auckland Plan 2050, recognises that security of tenure, particularly for those who are most vulnerable. It is an important determinant of social, educational, health, employment and income outcomes.

8. As housing affordability and home ownership have declined, more Aucklanders are renting. In 2013, Auckland had the highest percentage of households who rented their home of any region in New Zealand at 35 per cent - an increase of 18 per cent since 2006. Māori and Pacific peoples had the lowest levels of home ownership at 40 per cent and 32 per cent respectively, and by implication, were most likely to be renting.
9. Renting is no longer a short term step towards homeownership. A growing proportion of the population will be lifelong renters, including families with children, seniors, and those living with disabilities.

10. Reform of the Residential Tenancies Act (the Act) provides an opportunity for the legislation to catch up with the changes that are occurring in the rental market. This will help to better meet the needs of tenants, and to contribute to the outcomes set out in the Auckland Plan.

11. The council supports the Ministry’s intent to reform the Act, and is submitting on the discussion document. Submissions will inform advice to the Government, which will lead to the introduction of a Bill to Parliament to change the law. There will be a second opportunity to comment on proposals when the Bill is considered by a Parliamentary Select Committee.

12. The Act is the main piece of legislation governing the contractual relationship and interactions between residential landlords and tenants in New Zealand. The Act:

- states the law relating to residential tenancies
- defines the rights and obligations of landlords and tenants of residential properties
- establishes a tribunal to determine tenancy disputes; and
- provides for a fund to hold tenants’ bonds.

13. The aim of the reform is to:

- improve tenants’ security and stability while maintaining adequate protection of landlords’ interests
- ensure the appropriate balancing of the rights and responsibilities of tenants and landlords to promote good faith tenancy relationships and help renters feel at home
- modernise the legislation to respond to the changing trends in rental markets; and to
- improve quality standards of boarding houses and the accountability of boarding house operators.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

14. Auckland Council supports a review of the existing legislation. The intent of the reforms aligns with the outcomes set out in the Auckland Plan 2050, and responds to changes in the Auckland rental market, particularly the increase in the number of people renting.

15. In response to the discussion document, council supports:

- **Notice**: Extending the notice periods landlords must give under a periodic tenancy from 42 to 90 days, and removing the ability for landlords to end periodic agreements without providing the tenant with a reason
- ** Modifications and pets**: Better equipping tenants and landlords to reach agreement about minor alterations and pets by (a) Landlords having 21 days to consider a request for modifications, after which, if they have not responded, they will be deemed to have agreed to the request; and (b) specifying the grounds on which landlords can decline a request to keep a pet, and provision for a pet bond
- **Setting and increasing rent**: Prohibiting rental bids, and limiting increases to annually
- **Boarding houses**: Improving the quality by introducing a compulsory Warrant of Fitness scheme, and (with notice) providing power of entry for government officials.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

16. Elected members and Local Boards were provided with a draft submission for feedback and comment. They were also invited to attend a drop-in session to comment on the draft submission.

17. Formal feedback was received from Great Barrier Island, Waiheke Island and Waitamata local boards. This feedback is reflected in the submission.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

18. The discussion document does not highlight issues for Māori. In Auckland, Māori have the second lowest level (after Pacific peoples) of home ownership at 40 per cent. Māori are more likely to be renting, they are likely to benefit from the proposed changes to the Act.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

19. There are no financial implications associated with making the submission.

20. If a Warrant of Fitness scheme is introduced for boarding houses, and council is the “regulatory authority”, the potential annual cost to council could be $9.94 million. This is based on estimates included in a cost benefit analysis commissioned by the Ministry as noted in the submission.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

21. The reform may lead to the introduction of a licensing scheme or warrant of fitness for boarding houses. If this is led by council, there could be associated costs. To mitigate costs the council submission recommends charging operators a fee to fund this process.

22. New legislation may bring additional enforcement responsibilities for council. Any associated costs are unknown.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

23. The submission will be made to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment by 19 October 2018. Staff will continue to engage with the Ministry through the Residential Tenancies Act reform.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
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</tr>
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Submission to the
Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment
Reform of the Residential Tenancies Act 1986

Auckland Council, October 2018
Mihimihi

Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,
ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,
ōna mana ā-īwi taketake mai, tauīwi atu.
Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini, wenerau a te mano.
Kāhore tō rite i te ao.

I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place,
there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and flow of the tides of time,
and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who came those born of this land
and the newcomers among us all.
Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the multitude, envy of thousands.
You are unique in the world.
Submission on the Reform of the Residential Tenancies Act 1986

Introduction

1. This submission is from Auckland Council (the council) and has been approved by the Environment and Community Committee.

Executive Summary

2. As housing has become less affordable, home ownership rates have declined, and renting has increased. Renting is no longer a short term step towards home ownership.

3. The council supports the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment’s intent to reform the Residential Tenancies Act 1986 (the Act) because:
   - the intent of the document aligns to the outcomes set out in the Auckland Plan 2050;
   - the Act seeks to balance the needs of tenants for stable and secure homes with the needs of maintaining adequate protection of landlords’ interests;
   - the number of households renting in Auckland is increasing as home ownership rates decline;
   - renting is no longer a short term step towards home ownership, and as it becomes a long term housing solution for many, the number of lifelong renters is likely to increase; and
   - legislation governing tenancies is in need of reform to reflect changes in housing tenure and to meet the needs of renting households, which include families with children, seniors and those with living with disabilities.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations

4. Auckland Council supports:
   a) Extending the notice period landlords must give under a periodic tenancy from 42 to 90 days.
b) Removing the ability for landlords to end periodic agreements without providing the tenant with a reason.

c) Modifications option one: A landlord has 21 days to consider a request, after which they are deemed to have agreed to reasonable modifications.

d) Pet ownership options one and three:
   i. Option 1: Specify in law when landlords could decline a request to keep a pet: prohibiting landlords from declining a pet request or from including a “no pets” clause in the tenancy agreement, unless doing so was aligned with specific grounds such as the suitability of the property; and
   ii. Option 3: Pet bond or carpet cleaning requirement: landlords could agree for the tenant to keep a pet and the tenant provides a pet bond lodged with tenancy services.

e) Rental bids option two: Prohibit the request and acceptance of rental bids

f) The government’s commitment to limiting rent increases to once every 12 months.

g) The Government’s objective to improve the quality of boarding housing and increase accountability for operators:
   i. Option one: Power of entry into boarding houses.
   ii. Option two: Introduce a compulsory Warrant of Fitness / licensing scheme for boarding houses and their operators.

5. Council also recommends that ambiguous or subjective terms (such as ‘substantially more than market rent’) be clarified so both tenant and landlord understand their rights.

Horopaki / Context

6. By international standards, the Act is weak and provides tenants with few rights in comparison with other OECD nations. Nations such as Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden have well developed rental sectors with high levels of legislative protection for tenants.\(^1\)

7. Reform of the Act provides an opportunity for legislation governing tenancies to catch up with the growing rental sector.

---

8. Auckland has some of the highest housing costs in New Zealand. Finding affordable housing for rent or purchase is increasingly challenging.

9. Home ownership rates are decreasing in Auckland. Renting is no longer a short term option and has become a life-long proposition for many households, not just those with lower incomes. The profile of renters has expanded to include higher income professionals, families with children, seniors and those with disabilities.

10. The 2013 census showed:
   a) The percentage of households who rented their home was higher in Auckland than in any other region of New Zealand, at 35 percent in 2013 (154,347 households), an 18 percent increase since 2006. The majority of renting households (81 percent) rented privately.\(^2\)
   b) That since 2001, home ownership has dropped significantly for Aucklanders aged in their thirties, forties and fifties. Māori and Pacific peoples have the lowest levels of home ownership in Auckland at 40 percent and 32 percent respectively.\(^3\)

11. The ability for life long renters to make a home of their own is usually restricted. Security of tenure and the quality of housing is typically poorer than that of owner-occupiers. Renting households are typically unable to make minor alternations, redecorate, hang pictures or have pets, which can all be important in creating a sense of home.

12. Housing is a basic need and poor housing outcomes undermine the aspirations of the Auckland Plan 2050. Lack of access to good quality, secure and affordable housing may impact on health, education, and employment outcomes, and create barriers for full participation in society. Improving housing outcomes help to address disparities, especially for those most in need.

### Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and Advice

**Renting Aucklanders need greater control and security of tenure**

13. The council supports the government’s proposals to modernise tenancy law to give tenants who are meeting their obligations more choice and control in their tenancy. In particular, it supports:

a) Extending the notice period landlords must give under a periodic tenancy from 42 to 90 days
b) Removing the ability for landlords to end periodic agreements without providing the tenant with a reason

14. The Auckland Plan 2050 includes tenure security, particularly for those most in need, as a focus area. Secure housing is crucial to people’s wellbeing providing stability, continuity and control over their living arrangements. Frequent moves affect people’s ability to build community connections and feel established.

15. Renting households in Auckland are more likely to have moved in the past year (35 percent) compared to owner occupied housing (14 percent)⁴.

16. There are particular challenges for seniors and children. For seniors, moving to new areas without connections can lead to isolation and security concerns. The ability to age in place is important. It allows people to feel safe in their surroundings, and to be part of a community. Declines in home ownership mean more older people are likely to retire in the private rental sector in coming decades. Finding new rental accommodation late in life can cause significant stress.

17. A lack of stable, affordable housing may disadvantage children. Of children in rented homes, 28 percent of five to nine year olds and 25 percent of 10 to 14 year olds had moved at least once in the last year⁵. Transience can make it more difficult for children to stay in the same school, build friendships and social relationships, which can impact on their sense of belonging and levels of participation and success in education⁶.

18. Fear of retaliatory action and eviction, combined with lengthy searches to find a new tenancy in desired locations, can mean tenants are unwilling to complain or raise maintenance issues with landlords.

Renters do not currently have the same opportunities to create a home of their own

19. Auckland Council endorses:
  a) option one relating to modifications: a landlord has 21 days to consider a request, after which they are deemed to have agreed to reasonable modifications.

---

b) options one and three relating to pet ownership: option one - specify in law when landlords could decline a request to keep a pet: prohibiting landlords from declining a pet request or from including a “no pets” clause in the tenancy agreement, unless doing so was aligned with specific grounds such as the suitability of the property; and option three - pet bond or carpet cleaning requirement: landlords could agree for the tenant to keep a pet and the tenant provides a pet bond lodged with tenancy services.

c) removing ambiguities by clarifying what the term “reasonable modifications” includes, with any further disputes being heard by the tenancy tribunal.

20. The Auckland Plan 2050 says secure, healthy and affordable housing is fundamental to the health and wellbeing of Aucklanders. As noted previously, insecure tenure restricts the ability for renters to make a home.

21. There is a shortage of rental properties suitable for people living with physical disabilities, or that can be modified to sustain or enable tenancies. Current regulations do not provide rights to make alterations to suit their needs, such as handrails or level access showers. Those living with disabilities and the elderly may experience higher levels of stress trying to find suitable properties or landlords which will allow such modifications to take place.

22. Where such modifications have been made, tenants look for greater levels of security and may not be able to secure a suitable alternative tenancy even with a 90 day notice period7.

23. Modifications which support a warmer, healthy home or help to mitigate climate change should be incentivised. At present, tenants are reluctant to make improvements they see as benefiting the landlord, and may require permission. The landlords may also be unwilling to make the investment in upgrades.

24. Reasonable modifications could include non-structural changes such as the right to decorate, secure furniture and make minor alterations for accessibility reasons, such as handrails. Structural changes would require landlord consent.

25. The tenant could be responsible for returning the property to a pre-modified state at the end of the tenancy unless by agreement with the landlord where they inherit the modification. Additionally, the tenant would be responsible rectifying any damage caused by pet ownership.

26. Pet ownership can have positive effects such as providing companionship and helping people to feel at home. Tenants have no current rights to keep a pet in their rental property and ownership is at the discretion of landlords. For tenants with pets, finding

---

new rental accommodation which allows pets at short notice can be challenging and many may be forced to give up their pets.

27. Auckland Council encourages responsible pet ownership and registering dogs with the council.

**Updating the Act is an opportunity to clarify rights and responsibilities to fit the modern renting environment**

28. The council welcomes changes to the Act which clarify the rights and responsibilities of landlord and tenant and help to address power imbalances.

29. The shortfall of housing, declining rental affordability and competition to secure housing can prevent tenants raising maintenance or other issues with landlords or the tenancy tribunal for fear of retaliatory action, including losing their home. The most vulnerable Aucklanders are more likely to be in poor quality or sub-standard housing.

30. There is evidence that exploitative landlord – tenant relationships exist in Auckland, visible in substandard accommodation such as unhealthy or derelict housing, illegal practices and informal arrangements⁸.

31. The property management sector impacts on private renters. Property managers are not currently required to register or to be licensed. At present, they can charge uncontrolled fees for services which may result in increased charges to the tenants and/or remove profits from landlords. With little regulation, property managers can also dictate terms such as timeframes for maintenance, repairs and even blacklist potential tenants at their discretion⁹.

**Aucklanders experience some of the highest housing costs in New Zealand - finding affordable housing is increasingly challenging**

32. The council:

   a) Supports option two: Prohibit the request and acceptance of rental bids
   b) Supports the government’s commitment to limiting rent increases to once every 12 months
   c) Recommends ambiguous or subjective terms (such as ‘substantially more than market rent’) be clarified so both tenant and landlord understand their rights.

---

33. Affordability of housing has important implications for Auckland. Attracting and retaining skilled workers, including key workers, are aspirations of the Auckland Plan 2050 which are challenged by unaffordable housing.

34. Those on the lowest income are the most affected by high housing costs. In a tight and competitive rental market, many lose out to higher income earners with greater ability to pay more and secure higher quality accommodation.

35. In a constrained housing market, landlords can be more selective about who they rent to, and at what cost. It is not uncommon for prospective tenants to be asked to state the maximum that they are prepared to pay. Additionally, competition among tenants means some may offer more rent to secure a tenancy.

36. In search of affordable housing, many are pushed to Auckland’s periphery with poorer transport connections and amenities. Many households may accept poor quality housing due to a lack of affordable alternatives.

37. Overcrowding is a common response to unaffordable housing and high rental costs. In 2013, over 36,000 households and 200,000 Aucklanders lived in crowded conditions.\(^\text{10}\)

38. Restricting rent increases to once a year may provide greater security and ability to plan ahead financially for both tenant and landlord.

39. The Residential Tenancies Act allows tenants to challenge rents which are ‘substantially more than market rent’ through the tenancy tribunal. What constitutes market rent, or its application in the tenancy tribunal, is not defined.

40. A clear formula or mechanism needs to be established in the Act to determine rent increases. To avoid an excessive, annual rate increase, the government could consider linking rent increases to the consumer price index (inflation) or median wage increase. A trusted source of rental information could be cited\(^\text{11}\) with market rent determined to be within a certain percent of this total based on similar typology, quality and the area.

**Greater oversight and improved accountability of boarding houses is needed to protect the most vulnerable residents**

41. The council supports the overall objective of improving the quality of boarding houses, and to increase accountability for operators. In particular, council supports:


\(^{11}\) Sources of data could include Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment's lodged rental bond data or core logic rental analysis data.
a) Option two: Introduce a Warrant of Fitness / licensing scheme for boarding houses and their operators, and charging operators a license fee to help cover administration costs

b) Option one: power of entry into boarding houses

42. Boarding houses provide essential tenancy services for vulnerable, low income people. The council recognises the difficulties people face to find accommodation when they are in tenuous or challenging circumstances. The council also acknowledges that the quality of boarding houses varies widely across Auckland, and that there are many examples of people living in very poor conditions.

43. The current Housing Improvement Regulations Part 3: Register of Houses provides for local authorities, if they deem fit, to prepare and maintain a register of all boarding houses in their districts. The council has not exercised this option but does maintain a register. This is difficult to verify and keep up to date without formal registration requirements.

44. A graduated enforcement model is used to work with owners to raise the boarding house standards to a practical solution and conduct regular monitoring visits.

45. Auckland Council is working with MBIE to monitor identified boarding houses. MBIE currently has no powers of entry to inspect boarding houses without the owner’s permission. They need to be accompanied by warranted council officers who have entry powers under the Health Act.

46. The council also works with the Ministry of Social Development to identify boarding houses in which vulnerable tenants who are supported by financial assistance reside.

47. The council can monitor the physical and environmental conditions of known boarding houses through powers granted under the Health Act, Building Code, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Resource Management Act, and Auckland Unitary Plan along with Residential Tenancies Amendment Act 2010. Non-compliance is assessed on the basis of significant risk and harm to tenants.

48. The definition of boarding houses across existing legislation should be clarified.

49. The council undertakes a programme of proactive boarding house inspections, which was implemented in July 2015.

50. Compliance has been achieved through issuance of statutory notices rather than prosecution. Observed breaches have included unauthorised changes to the use of buildings, unauthorised building work, safety issues, poor cleanliness, mould growth, overcrowding and poor maintenance.

51. The discussion document presents two options for improving the quality of boarding houses: self-certification and the Warrant of Fitness model. These are noted in Table
1 below. The discussion document does not specify the “relevant authority” which would be responsible for administration. Table 1 considers the potential role for council if it were the “relevant authority” and estimates the associated costs based on information set out in a report commissioned by MBIE: Sapere (2014) Cost benefit analysis for a minimum standard for rental housing.

Table 1: Options for improving the quality of boarding houses, with possible role and costs for council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Possible council role</th>
<th>Estimated enforcement costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-certification system</td>
<td>The “relevant authority” could (1) enforce penalties against boarding house operators who didn’t register or made false declarations; (2) ban an operator from certification for severe/persistent breaches.</td>
<td>Not included in Cost Benefit Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Warrant of fitness</td>
<td>The “regulatory authority” would assess premises and operators to determine if the standards were met. Costs would be partly/wholly off-set by charging licence fees.</td>
<td>Estimate of annual Auckland costs is $9.94 million less licence fees.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. The council supports the introduction of a Warrant of Fitness and licensing scheme for boarding houses and their operators. This approach allows for registration and monitoring of boarding houses including enforcement action if necessary. A regime of compulsory registration for boarding house operators recognises that operators of poorer quality houses are unlikely to participate in a voluntary self-certification scheme.

53. A risk based incentive approach should be considered for any licensing scheme, where compliant premises are inspected less frequently than non-compliant high risk, high harm premises.

54. Council supports provision of power for government officials power to enter common areas without invitation provided sufficient notice has been given to the landlord.

55. Gaining certification under a Warrant of Fitness programme should involve meeting minimum standards and a more rigorous application of the ‘fit and proper person’ operator requirement. For example people with a past conviction under the Residential

---

12 Based on Sapere’s Cost Benefit Analysis estimate of $27million annually and nationally. Pro rating the costs, based on the proportion of rental properties in Auckland in 2013, the estimated annual cost in Auckland would be approximately $9.94million.
Tenancies Act should be excluded from continuing to operate a boarding house business.

56. An appropriate funding mechanism for the monitoring of boarding houses could be an annual fee paid by the operators as part of the registering process. If council was the “relevant authority”, it would not be able to meet any residual costs through current baselines.

57. Should the Residential Tenancies Act require registration and a Warrant of Fitness, costs for these could be deducted from any Ministry of Social Development direct payments. Additionally, the Ministry of Social Development could sanction payments only to registered boarding houses that are fully compliant with a current Warrant of Fitness.

58. The council recommends that this process consider the recommendations of the Social Services Committee ‘Inquiry into boarding houses in New Zealand and briefing into long-term caravan park and motor camp accommodation’ August 2014.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

59. The council would like to remain connected to the reform of the Residential Tenancies Act 1986. We welcome discussion on our submission to enable reform that considers the impacts on local government and the communities we serve.

60. Council is committed to its leadership role in Auckland and as an employer and will continue to work with central government and others to improve the lives of Aucklanders.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To approve Auckland Council’s draft submission on proposed healthy homes standards for rental properties to be set under the Healthy Homes Guarantee Act 2017.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Development is consulting on proposed healthy homes standards for rental properties (see consultation document in Attachment A). The due date for submissions to the Ministry is 22 October 2018.
3. These standards will set minimum requirements for:
   - provision of heating devices
   - level of floor and ceiling insulation
   - ventilation through provision of windows and extractor fans
   - draught-stopping
   - moisture entry and drainage.
4. In each of these areas, the ministry is consulting on various options.
5. Depending on the options chosen, the standards have potential to impact significantly on local communities in Auckland. If higher standards are chosen, the 38.5 per cent of Aucklanders who live in rental properties will have the right to warmer, drier and more energy efficient homes. If the standards are effectively implemented this will improve their levels of health and wellbeing.
6. The discussion document also seeks feedback on two other questions:
   - when and how should the healthy homes standards be implemented?
   - when and how should the healthy homes standards be enforced?
7. Council staff have prepared a draft submission on this proposal (see Attachment B). The draft council submission responds to the options outlined for each area (such as heating). In general, it supports the highest option proposed for the standards for heating, insulation, ventilation, draught-stopping, and moisture.
8. In some areas the draft submission recommends additional improvements to enhance the wellbeing of tenants and improve energy efficiency, contributing to Auckland’s low carbon targets.
9. The draft submission also recommends that landlords should be required to make these upgrades either at the start of a new tenancy or, if the tenancy is not renewed in the next four years, by a specific end date of 2022.
10. The submission notes the requirement for effective enforcement of the standards to achieve desired outcomes. It requests that Auckland Council be included in discussions with the Ministry relating to how the standards be implemented, including through enforcement, education and incentivisation programmes.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approves the draft council submission on the proposed Healthy Homes Standards to the New Zealand Government.

b) supports Auckland Council being heard to speak to this submission should the opportunity be presented.

c) nominate an elected representative to speak to the submission.

d) delegate authority to the Chair of Environment and Community Committee to approve any minor changes necessary to the submission before it is provided to the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

Horopaki / Context

Consultation on Healthy Homes Standards

11. In December 2017 the New Zealand Government passed the Healthy Homes Guarantee Act (no 2). This Act enables the government to create regulations that set minimum standards to create warmer, drier rental homes: the Healthy Homes Standards.

12. A discussion document on the proposed Healthy Homes Standards is now available for feedback (shown in Attachment A).

13. This consultation was originally released by the Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment. However, during the consultation period this Ministry became part of the new Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

14. Feedback on the consultation is now due to the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development by Monday 22 October 2018.

15. The document seeks feedback on five healthy homes standards:

   • **Heating.** This includes questions such as ‘what minimum achievable indoor temperature should heating devices be sized for in rental homes’ and ‘where should heating be located’?

   • **Insulation:** What is an appropriate level of insulation for rental homes and how should the condition of insulation be assessed?

   • **Ventilation:** What is the appropriate level of ventilation to ensure rental homes have adequate airflow in areas of high moisture?

   • **Moisture ingress and drainage:** Are existing laws for rental homes sufficient to protect against moisture and inadequate drainage or could regulations better protect against moisture entering the home?

   • **Draught stopping:** What appropriate measures should landlords take to stop draughts in a rental home?

16. The discussion document also seeks responses to two other questions:

   • when and how should the healthy homes standards be implemented?

   • when and how should the healthy homes standards be enforced?

Auckland Plan direction

17. Improving the health of Aucklanders and the quality of rental housing in the Auckland region is a priority for Auckland Council. This is clearly demonstrated through the Auckland Plan 2050, whose relevant key directions and focus areas include:
18. These statements provide a clear direction for Auckland Council’s input into central government initiatives to improve the quality of rental housing in Auckland.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Overall position and rationale

19. The discussion document proposes options for feedback in relation to each of the five standards described above: heating, ventilation, insulation, moisture ingress and draught stopping.

20. Auckland Council’s draft submission (shown in Attachment B) recommends options in answer to each consultation question with a detailed analysis for each.

21. For each area, it is recommended that Auckland Council support the highest option proposed within the consultation document, as this will give the greatest opportunity to improve rental standards within Tāmaki Makaurau.

Rationale for recommending higher standards

17. Cold and damp rental homes affect a large proportion of New Zealanders, with 38.5 per cent of Aucklanders living in rental homes. Since 2001, there have been significant drops in home ownership for Aucklanders aged in their 30s, 40s and 50s.

18. Housing is one of the key modifiable determinants of health and inadequate, poor quality housing can have far reaching impacts on health outcomes. People who live in unhealthy homes are at increased risk of contracting serious and avoidable illnesses such as meningitis and rheumatic fever.

19. Ministry of Health data (2018) shows that there are approximately 10,800 children or 13,000 events with potential housing quality-related causes presented to NZ hospitals each year.

20. In Auckland, declining rental affordability and competition for good quality housing means the most vulnerable Aucklanders are more likely to be in sub-standard and poor quality housing. Low-income, older people, children, disabled people and Māori and Pasifika are more likely than other groups to live in, or feel the effects of, cold and damp rental homes.

21. This impact is particularly relevant to Auckland, where 14.2 per cent of the population identifies as Māori and 12 per cent as Pasifika. These groups are also more likely to be tenants living in rental properties. Māori and Pasifika have the lowest levels of home ownership in Auckland at 40 per cent and 32 per cent respectively.

22. If the highest standard recommendations proposed in the Healthy Homes consultation document are adopted, they have the potential to significantly improve the health and wellbeing of Aucklanders living in rental homes.

23. Increasing the energy efficiency of Auckland homes is also aligned with Auckland Council’s low carbon target of reducing our overall emissions by 40 per cent by 2040.

24. Meeting the standards will impose some costs on landlords - a high-end estimation of costs required for a landlord in Auckland to meet the standards (assuming they did not currently meet any of the requirements) would be approximately $11,000 to $12,000.

25. The Ministry’s consultation document includes a cost-benefit analysis for each option. In general, these are positive, with the cost of improvements being offset by the wider benefits.
**Options analysis – standards for healthy homes**

26. As noted above, the consultation document presents five standards for feedback, for the areas of heating, insulation, ventilation, draught-stopping and moisture ingress and drainage. It asks questions and presents different options in relation to each standard. For some areas, three or four questions have been asked.

27. For brevity, the draft submission’s response to each question has not been presented in this report. Examples are given below for two areas that are of high public interest – ventilation and insulation. The full list of questions and responses are shown in the draft submission in Attachment B.

**Example one – Options for ventilation standards and council recommendation**

28. For ventilation the consultation document asks if landlords should either be required to:
   - Option One: provide openable windows in all habitable rooms (the status quo), or
   - Option Two: provide extractor fans in rooms with a bath or shower and openable windows in living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens, or.
   - Option Three: provide extractor fans in all rooms with a bath or shower or indoor cooktop, and openable windows in living rooms, dining rooms, and bedrooms.

29. The council’s submission recommends that the Ministry choose option three and require landlords to provide extractor fans in both rooms used for cooking and bathing.

30. This is because bathrooms and kitchens without mechanical extractor fans or heating are twice as likely to have moderate or worse patches of mould compared to those with extractors or heating. A study by Jones and White in 2017 found that kitchens without any mechanical ventilation are three times as likely to have visible mould compared to those with mechanical ventilation.

**Example two – Options for insulation and council recommendation**

31. For some standards, the council has also recommended additional improvements to achieve energy efficiency outcomes or improve the wellbeing of tenants.

32. For example, the consultation document asks what level of insulation should be required in rental properties and offers three options:
   - Option one: the status quo (the lowest level of insulation – levels currently required under the Residential Tenancies (Smoke Alarms and Insulation) Regulations 2016)
   - Option two: moderate improvements to insulation: rentals required to reach the level of insulation that was required for new houses under the Building Code 2001
   - Option three: higher levels of insulation: rental properties required to reach the levels of insulation required for new houses under the Building Code 2008.

33. The draft council submission recommends option three: requiring rental properties to have the same level of insulation as houses built in New Zealand since 2008.

34. In addition, it recommends that landlords should be required to provide double lined curtains and retrofit secondary glazing. These changes will improve the warmth of rental properties and reduce the amount of power that tenants will need to use to heat their homes. Retrofit secondary glazing is recommended as it can provide an affordable and effective alternative to double glazing.

**Date for complying with standards**

35. The consultation document also requests feedback on how the date to comply with the higher standards should be set. Various options for this are proposed including:
   - Option one: Compliance at the start of a new or renewed tenancy. From July 2021 landlords would have to comply with the standards at 90 days after the time they sign or renew or vary a tenancy. All landlords would have to comply by July 2024.
• Option two: A single compliance date of July 2022 for all landlords to meet all standards
• Option three: staggered compliance dates over five years up until July 2024. This could be staggered either:
  o according to standard (i.e., compliance with some standards, like those for draught stopping would be required earlier than others like insulation)
  o by area of New Zealand (i.e., landlords in colder areas of New Zealand, like the South Island, would be required to comply with the standards earlier).

36. The council’s draft submission partially supports both option one and option three. In line with option one, it recommends that compliance be required at the start of a new or renewed tenancy. This is because making changes to a property has the least impact on tenants when done as part of a change to tenancy occupation. It is also a good time to include these with other repairs and maintenance that may be required as part of a tenancy changeover.

37. This option is also preferred because requiring the landlord to meet all the standards at one time means that suppliers may only need to make one visit. This will reduce the impact on tenants and also costs for suppliers. Requiring the upgrades at the start of a new tenancy will also stagger demand on suppliers.

38. Finally, council recommends that the end date for landlords to meet the standards should be 2022, not July 2024. This will give landlords four years to meet the standards while ensuring tenants experience health benefits earlier.

39. In addition to supporting option one, the council’s draft submission also partially supports option three, by recommending that if the requirement to meet the standards is staggered, this should be done based on deprivation levels. The schedule for this could be developed through analysis of statistical data, with the most deprived suburbs being expected to reach the standards first.

Enforcement
40. The discussion document also seeks feedback on when and how the healthy homes standards should be enforced. However, this question is solely focused on what information the landlord should be required to keep and how this should be provided to the Ministry for Housing and Urban development.

41. The consultation document does not discuss who should enforce the standards and how proactive this enforcement should be. These matters are regulated by the Residential Tenancy Act 1986, which is also being reviewed and consulted on by the government. A draft submission on this review is also on the Environment and Community Committee 16 October 2018 agenda.

42. Council’s draft submission on the Healthy Homes Standards states that the standards will not be effective unless they are supported by proactive enforcement. It states that council supports strengthening the enforcement powers of central or local government to ensure that healthy homes standards are met by all landlords in a timely fashion.

43. Creating a proactive enforcement system moves the onus away from tenants to make complaints, which they are often reluctant to do since this can impact on their relationship with their landlord and their right to a secure tenure.

44. It is unclear who will bear the funding burden for any enforcement of these home standards. These are not currently a responsibility of local government.

Information storage
45. In response to the specific consultation question relating to storage of information, the draft submission recommends that landlords be required to store and provide a range of information on the tenancy agreement relating to the warmth and ventilation of the property. This could include the insulation type and quality, heating and ventilation appliances available and barriers in place for ground moisture.
46. It also recommends that consideration be given to creating an easy-to-access and understand method of capturing and communicating information about the quality of rental properties.

Warrant of Fitness

47. This information could be included in a Warrant of Fitness for each property. Council’s draft submission supports the development of such a warrant of fitness system as this would clearly communicate to prospective tenants if a property meets the proposed standards.

48. The use of a nationally administered standard would set a clear expectation of what is required to meet the standard. Council would suggest a pass/fail system. The use of a rating system would also serve to educate the public about which housing features impact on creating warm, dry homes.

Education and incentives

49. The draft submission notes that the legislation is just one tool and must be supported by education and incentivisation. Many landlords want to improve the quality of their asset but lack access to good quality, independent information about how to do so.

50. Councils can play a key role in incentivisation and education programmes. Auckland Council runs a range of programmes to incentivise behaviour change in relation to energy efficiency and housing.

51. The draft submission states that Auckland Council would appreciate the opportunity to work with the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development to develop best practice guidelines and case studies for councils on this topic.

52. Finally, it asks that Auckland Council be involved in future discussions relating to development, implementation and enforcement of the proposed standards.

Impact on council programmes

53. The introduction of the standards will impact on several council programmes. Some of the likely impacts include:

- The Retrofit your Home programme will likely see a significant increase in applications and requests for loans to fund home improvements by landlords.
- Various local boards fund ‘Healthy Rentals’ projects, where an advisor visits a home and provides advice and education to tenants. This is likely to be in higher demand as tenants become more aware of standards required. It may require increased resources or a more strategic approach to properties in most need.
- The council’s Eco Design Advice service, a free, one-on-one advisory service on energy efficiency and healthy homes to home owners, will be in much greater demand. Council currently has two staff who can provide this service and is undertaking a review of the programme to assess how it can be scaled to reach more homes in a more efficient manner. Council is also upskilling local community organisations such as Habitat for Humanity and Ecomatters to deliver these services.

54. Overall, the impact on most of these programmes from the standards is likely to be positive – creating an increased demand for council services. However, this may also create funding pressures if demand exceeds the council’s ability to respond to requests.

Council in our role as landlord

55. The standards will also have some minor impacts on the council in our role as a landlord. Most of council’s housing stock is managed by Panuku. For these properties the implications are not expected to be significant as they already adhere to many of the proposed standards and insulate to the highest standard. Heat pumps are also provided in Panuku houses in most cases, particularly if there has been a tenant request for one and the house is cold.
56. The standards may require some upgrades to council owned properties to meet requirements for ventilation, damp or draught proofing.

57. The standards may also slightly reduce the volume of housing that Panuku puts on the rental market. This is because some of the houses that Panuku receives, which are purchased for future infrastructure projects, are often in a poor state on hand-over and require a significant outlay to be fit for renting out.

58. The creation of additional standards through this consultation will add to this initial outlay. If the feasibility (financial pay back on initial outlay from rents collected over the duration of the hold period) does not stack up, some properties may be demolished earlier than planned.

59. These impacts are expected to be fairly minor and will not create significant additional costs for the council.

**Recommended decision**

60. In summary, staff consider that the Healthy Homes Standards have the ability to significantly improve the health and wellbeing of Aucklanders. Setting higher standards for rental properties also has potential to improve energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions.

61. To achieve these outcomes, the draft submission recommends higher standards for rental properties across all of the five areas consulted on.

62. The draft submission is also well aligned to the overall direction of the Auckland Plan and current healthy homes programmes that the council is funding.

63. For these reasons it is recommended that the committee approve the draft submission shown in Attachment B on the Healthy Homes Standards consultation document.

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

64. Some local boards have demonstrated support for healthy homes standards through their local board plans and also their investment in healthy homes initiatives.

65. Puketāpapa, Whau and Waitemātā Local Boards identify initiatives in their Local Board Plans for 2017-2020 to provide healthy housing for residents of their board area.

66. In this financial year, eight local boards (Albert-Eden, Henderson-Massey, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Puketāpapa, Waitemātā, Waitākere Ranges and Whau) are funding Healthy Rentals, homewise or low carbon living projects. These support Aucklanders to achieve warmer homes and energy efficiency outcomes. Other local boards have funded similar projects in the past, such as Manurewa and Papakura.

67. Local boards have also been given an opportunity to provide feedback on these standards. They were sent a memo on 1 October 2018 outlining the content of the consultation paper and explaining the process for them to make their own submission on the proposal.

68. Any local board submissions received by 15 October 2018 will be tabled at the Environment and Community Committee meeting on 16 October 2018 for the committee’s consideration. Any local board submissions received by 19 October 2018 will be attached to Auckland Council’s response to the ministry.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

69. Māori have significantly lower levels of home ownership than other Auckland residents. Overall, only 40 per cent of Māori living in Auckland own their homes (compared to 61.5 per cent of all Aucklanders). Rates of home ownership for Māori are as low as 35 per cent in southern Auckland.

70. The government’s consultation document also states that Māori are more likely to ‘live in, or feel the effects of, cold and damp rental homes.’
71. As such, the introduction of higher healthy home standards is likely to have more positive impacts for Māori than other Aucklanders.

72. The proposed standards align to manaakitanga (nurturing relationships, looking after people, taonga and taiao and fostering mutual respect).

73. The draft submission is also aligned with the Auckland Plan’s direction to advance ‘Māori wellbeing through improving the specific needs of vulnerable tamariki and whānau, particularly whānau who are experiencing substandard housing.’

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

74. The direct financial costs of the healthy homes standards to Auckland Council are expected to be minimal. As noted above, the change in standards is not expected to have a significant impact on Auckland Council in our role as a landlord.

75. It is possible that the introduction of higher standards will increase demand for some council programmes, such as the Retrofit Your Home financial assistance scheme and the Eco Design Advice service. This may create funding pressures if demand exceeds the council’s ability to respond to requests.

76. If the council was required to become involved in enforcement of the standards in future, this could also have significant financial and resourcing implications. However, at this stage the consultation does not suggest the council will have any enforcement role. Any further discussions on potential enforcement by Auckland Council would need to include provision for funding.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

77. It is not considered that making a submission on the consultation will expose Auckland Council to any significant risks at this stage.

78. As noted above, implementation of the standards could have some resourcing implications for council, depending how effectively these are introduced and our role in the process. The council has requested to remain actively involved in discussions around how the standards are implemented and enforced to mitigate these risks.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

79. If the draft submission is approved, this will be provided to the Ministry by 22 October 2018. Any formal local board submissions will also be attached.

80. Auckland Council has requested to speak to its submission and remain actively engaged in the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development’s consultation process.
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Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tahi,
ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,
ōna mana ā-iwi taketake mai, tauiwi atu.
Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini,
wenerau a te mano.
Kāhore tō rite i te ao.

I greet the mountains, repository of all that
has been said of this place,
there I greet the cliffs that have heard the
ebb and flow of the tides of time,
and the rivers that cleansed the forebears
of all who came those born of this land
and the newcomers among us all.
Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed
among the multitude, envy of thousands.
You are unique in the world.
Ko te tāpaetanga o te Kaunihera o Tāmaki Makaurau

Auckland Council Submission

October 2018

Title: Submission on the Healthy Homes Standards

Introduction

This submission is from Auckland Council and was approved by the Environment and Community Committee of the council on 16 October 2018.

Submissions are also attached from the following local boards of Auckland Council:

Note – local board submissions will be added once these are provided to staff.

Auckland Council would like the opportunity to speak to this submission.

Role of council

Auckland Council delivers a range of programmes to achieve healthy housing outcomes. These include:

- an eco-design advisor service which employs qualified home performance specialists to advise landlords, tenants and homeowners on creating warm, dry and energy efficient homes
- the Retrofit Your Home funding assistance programme which provides loans to homeowners for heating and insulation solutions
- local board projects such as Healthy Rentals, which provides advice to landlords and tenants, as well as developing and implementing a rental housing warrant of fitness
- a train the trainer programme, building capability and capacity among community organisations, health service providers and community housing groups
- a co-design process to establish a sustainable supply of housing-related interventions to create warm, dry, healthy homes for Auckland’s Healthy Homes Initiatives through council’s ‘The Southern Initiative’
- development of energy efficient healthy homes through Panuku Development Auckland
- acting as a landlord through Panuku Development Auckland. In this role the council often upgrades properties that it has acquired for other purposes (e.g., for a future transport project) to a fit standard for tenants and then rents them until the land is required for construction.

Overall position

Auckland Council recognises that housing quality in New Zealand is generally poor, with 49 per cent of properties showing some visible mould. Rental properties are also in worse condition than owner-occupied properties: 44 per cent of rental properties and 25% of owner-occupied properties were rated as being of ‘poor’ quality in a recent BRANZ study.

Home ownership rates are decreasing in Auckland and the number of households in the rental sector is increasing. The 2013 census showed that since 2001 there have been significant drops in home ownership for Aucklanders aged in their thirties, forties and fifties.
Renting is becoming a long-term housing solution for many Aucklanders, and the number of lifelong renters is likely to increase.

Māori and Pacific peoples are particularly likely to rent and have the lowest levels of home ownership in Auckland at 40 percent and 32 percent respectively.

Because cold and damp homes are strongly associated with people experiencing health issues, including respiratory and cardiovascular conditions, improving the quality of rental housing is a priority for Auckland Council.

In line with our low carbon goals, higher indoor temperatures must be achieved in energy efficient and low emission ways. This will prevent such initiatives putting increased pressure on existing energy infrastructure and carbon emission targets.

**Auckland Plan direction**

The Auckland Plan 2050 calls for “bold action” on the area of housing quality, in particular for tenants. Key outcomes of the Auckland Plan that are aligned with these standards include:

- Improving the health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders
- Addressing disparities and serve communities in greatest need
- Advancing Māori wellbeing
- Moving to a housing system that ensures secure and affordable homes for all
- Improving the built quality of existing dwellings, particularly rental housing
- Encouraging all Aucklanders to make sustainable choices
- Reducing our greenhouse gas emissions by 40% by 2040
- Delivering a better standard of living for everyone.

**Response to proposal**

The council supports the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development’s intent to create standards for healthy homes because:

- It is aligned to the outcomes set out in the Auckland Plan 2050.
- The quality of houses in Auckland is poor and declining. Rental homes are twice as poor in quality as owner-occupied homes.
- To address inequalities and improve the health of our most vulnerable citizens, we need to set a high standard of quality for the increasing rental market

**Response to consultation questions**

The council recommends the following in response to the questions in the discussion document.

1. **Heating**

   1.1 *Where in the home should landlords be required to provide heating?*

   - Option one: heating in living room only
   - Option two: heating in living room and bedrooms

   Question: Do you support option one or two for the location of heating devices that landlords must provide in rental homes? Please explain your reason.
Response: Council recommends option two. Bedrooms are the coldest rooms in a home, have the longest usage period of any rooms in a dwelling and are primarily used by occupants for sleeping, which is when the human body is less active and prone to respiratory illness. It is also more likely that occupants will be in closer proximity to one another (e.g. sharing a bed or sleeping space) and are more likely to transmit airborne-based illnesses.

1.2 Online tool to determine adequate heating devices

Question: We propose to use the formula at Appendix 1 to determine the capacity required for heating devices for a room to achieve the appropriate indoor temperature.

We also propose that this formula will be used for a user-friendly online tool that will guide a landlord or tenant on the types of heating device that are capable of achieving the appropriate indoor temperature.

Response: Council recommends that the online tool should also consider energy efficiency and carbon emissions in making recommendations of appropriate appliances to achieving heating temperature targets. This is particularly important for properties with multiple rooms that, under the current calculation, would only require a plug-in heater capable of up to 2.4 kWs of heating.

For example, it should be specified that if an electrical heating appliance is being used to achieve a heating output, and that more than three plug-in heaters would be required, that the heating system must have a COP of at least 3.0 in heating mode. This will drive the market to more efficient, low emission, centrally ducted heating systems (such as whole of house heat pumps).

Council also recommends that over time, a carbon emission target equal to the national grid should be applied to encourage the move from higher carbon emission-based energy sources (such as gas) to lower emission forms (such as electricity).

1.3 What achievable indoor temperature should heating devices be sized for?

- Option one: Heaters must be capable of achieving an indoor temperature of at least 18 degrees
- Option two: Heaters must be capable of achieving an indoor temperature of at least 20 degrees

Question: Do you support option one or two above on whether landlords should provide heating devices that are capable of reaching 18 degrees or 20 degrees in room(s) covered by the heating standard? Please explain.

Response: Council supports option two. The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends elderly, young and infirm persons need a higher indoor room temperature (20 degrees) than the recommended minimum 18 degrees in option one.

Environmental Health Indicators New Zealand cite research that suggests temperatures below 16 degrees increase the risk of respiratory infections, and below 12 degrees stress the cardiovascular system.

Setting the achievable indoor temperature to 20°C would result in higher indoor temperatures and reduce adverse health outcomes, particularly for people with illness or disabilities and older and younger people, who are disproportionately represented as tenants of rental properties.
Setting a higher indoor temperature of 20 degrees will more likely result in the use of larger, more efficient and lower emission types of heating appliances, but will increase costs for some landlords.

1.4 Should landlords only be required to provide heating devices where portable electric heaters are insufficient to achieve the required indoor temperature?

- Option one: Landlords provide fixed heating devices only
- Option two: Landlords provide both fixed and portable heating devices

Question: Do you support option one or two for heating devices to be provided by a landlord in a rental home?

Response: Council supports option two with the caveat below. Tenants are less able to afford the purchase of heating devices and may not purchase an appliance if it is their responsibility or choice to do so. Tenants are more likely to purchase inefficient or unsuitable appliances such as LPG portable heaters, as they are perceived to be cheaper to run. Use of these appliances can create fire risk, excess moisture and noxious fumes.

Option two would be more effective if appropriate appliances (for example panel heaters with digital/analogue thermostat and timer) were specified as part of the standard. For example, thermostat-controlled panel heaters would assist in gaining energy efficient outcomes while also reducing the energy spend made by the tenant to achieve healthy temperatures.

1.5 Should we accept some heating devices, and not others?

Question: Do you agree that a class of acceptable heating devices is created for those devices that are efficient, healthy and affordable for the heating standard? Please explain.

Response: Yes. Appropriate systems within this class should provide a cost-effective, adequate level of heating required which will be energy efficient and low carbon emitting.

Question: Do you agree that the heating devices listed above (unflued heaters, open fires etc) should be not acceptable for the heating standard? Please explain.

Response: Yes. Unflued gas heaters are expensive to run, produce high levels of water vapour and noxious fumes, have a high carbon emission profile and present a fire risk.

Question: What other types of heating, if any, do you think should be acceptable or not acceptable in the heating standard? Why?

Response: Heating appliances should only be sized once the property has met the insulation and draught proofing standards. This is to prevent over-sizing and excess energy use in a property that has not already improved the thermal envelope.

To meet desired energy efficiency and carbon emission outcomes, and where the bedroom heating requirement would exceed three plug-in heaters, a test should be applied by which the landlord be required to install energy efficient appliances for the whole of house.

Ducted heat pumps should be considered for all-of-house heating, as an energy efficient, low emission way to achieve heating targets while reducing energy use.

Panel heaters that have a built-in thermostat and timer, and possibly a fan, should be required for bedrooms under a certain size. Panel heaters are more likely to remain with the property during tenure change and can be easily identified and monitored as a part of a tenancy contract.
LPG heaters should be banned as a form of heating in New Zealand homes, given the risks and costs mentioned previously.

Night store heaters, commonly used in Europe, should be investigated as an alternative form of property heating. An advantage of this type of system is the ability to utilise off-peak electricity, reduce costs for the household and reduce peak pressure energy demand on the grid. This type of appliance would be suitable for the proposed time-of-use pricing structure to be introduced by Vector and use of a night/day electricity pricing tariff.

2. Insulation

2.1 What minimum level of insulation should be required in rental homes

- Option one: Continue the status quo
- Option two: Landlords must replace or retrofit ceiling and underfloor insulation in their rental home if it is not in a reasonable condition (or better) and, when originally installed, did not have the R value of (at least): a) ceiling: 1.9 if located in zones 1 or 2 and 2.5 if located in zone 3 b) underfloor: 1.3.
- Option three: Landlords must replace, retrofit or ‘top up’ ceiling and underfloor insulation if it is not in reasonable condition (or better), is not in accordance with the relevant New Zealand Standard 801 and, when originally installed, did not have the R-value (at least) of: a) ceiling: 2.9 if the premises are located in zones 1 or 2 or 3.3 if the premises are located in zone 3 b) underfloor: 1.3.

Question: Which of the options (one, two or three) for the minimum level of insulation required do you support? Please explain.

Response: Council supports option three. Many New Zealand homes have substandard insulation. 51 per cent of rental properties have less than 100mm of ceiling insulation, and 25 per cent have 50mm or less. Insulation presents the most efficient way to reduce the energy required to reach target indoor temperatures. This solution is durable, low technology and low cost for ceiling and underfloor applications.

Insulating ceilings and underfloor are a cost-effective way of raising the overall insulation performance of a home compared with wall and glazing insulation, however wall and glazing options should be considered for future revisions to the standard.

Insulating to R2.9 in the ceiling and R1.3 underfloor, makes the rental standard consistent with the Building Code.

R2.9/1.3 presents a suitable standard that will provide increased energy savings over time and reduce tenant operating costs to heat a room to the same temperature compared to a lower standard.

There is a small additional cost for the material difference between option 2 and 3, but the labour cost is the same.

Given the cost and disruption of installing wall insulation, increasing the ceiling and underfloor standard presents a cheaper and less disruptive way to improve the overall thermal performance of the property.

In most cases, landlords who have insulated according to the Rental Tenancy Act in the last year will not be affected by this change to the standard.
Question: Do you agree that the exceptions set out in the 2016 regulations should continue under the proposed insulation standard (e.g. when it is not reasonably practicable to install insulation)? Please explain.

Response: Council does not agree. Many properties are currently exempt from proposed standards due to a lack of access. Access can often be achieved (such as making an access way in the ceiling or perimeter wall) for low cost, which should be made compulsory. Properties that cannot insulate the ceilings or subfloor should be required to insulate the walls to contribute to an overall equivalent increase in the level of thermal performance.

There should be a requirement to meet insulation standards during any major alteration to the home, such as replacing walls or roof.

Question: Do you think any other requirements for insulation should be included in the standard and, if so, what? Would any of the above options inhibit future innovation and/or flexibility? If so, how?

Response: Yes. Curtains and secondary glazing both offer cost effective, long term solutions to improved thermal performance. Curtains should be lined and closed on three sides. Well installed, lined curtains offer a similar thermal performance to double glazing, for significantly less cost. The main challenge with curtains is their susceptibility to mould damage in moist environments.

Retrofit secondary glazing has reduced in price in recent years and offers long term, low tech, ongoing thermal benefits. Modern systems are comprised of acrylic sheets which are more robust and opaque than traditional glass.

2.2 How should the degradation of insulation under "reasonable condition" be assessed?

- Option one: Status quo. Various criteria must be considered to determine whether any insulation is in a reasonable condition, including the extent of any dampness, damage, degradation or displacement. Ceiling insulation must not have excessively settled or compressed (defined as up to 30% of the insulation’s thickness).

- Option two: Insulation must meet the "reasonable condition" criteria described in option one above. However, for ceiling insulation, only a very minimal reduction in insulation thickness as a result of settlement or compression will be deemed acceptable in the assessment of reasonable condition.

Question: Do you support option one or two to assess a "reasonable condition" for insulation? Please explain.

Response: Council supports option two. The height of the ceiling joist which can be easily inspected and judged by visual inspection is 90 mm.

Regardless of the thickness, inspectors will have a tolerance above and below the thickness of what they consider acceptable. So, if the minimum thickness is 70mm it is likely that some properties will have 60mm and judged suitable following an inspection. Raising the minimum to 90mm decreases the likelihood thicknesses are below 70mm while also allowing for further compression of insulation over time.

Ceiling insulation presents the most cost-effective way to insulate a home compared with wall insulation, curtains or glazing.
Question: Do you think any other criteria for interpreting “reasonable condition” of insulation should be included and, if so, what?

Response: No.

2.3 How can landlords show compliance with the insulation standard?

Question: Do you agree landlords should show compliance with the insulation standard by retaining particular records? If so, which records should be retained? Please explain.

Response: Yes. Landlords should be required to keep evidence of either the installation conditions or hold a valid inspection certificate. Inspection certificates should be able to be issued by qualified insulation installers, suppliers, manufacturers, and local government.

This information should be included in the tenancy agreement and also be listed on the property file under the Land Information Memorandum (LIM). Including this detail on the LIM will educate the market about what acceptable standards are and give potential buyers a more accurate assessment of the state of the property if it will be used as a rental.

3. Ventilation

3.1 What level of ventilation is required in rental homes?

- Option one: (status quo) Under this option landlords must:
  - Ensure every bathroom has at least one window that directly opens to the outside air unless other adequate means of ventilation are provided to the satisfaction of the local authority.
  - Each habitable room must be constructed such that windows with an area amounting to not less than one twentieth part of the area of the floor of the room can be opened for the admission of air.
  - Every room which is not a habitable room shall be provided with such window or windows as the local authority may consider necessary for adequate ventilation.
- Option two: Provide operable windows and extractor fans in rooms with a bath or shower
- Option three: Provide operable windows and extractor fans in rooms with a bath, shower or indoor cooktop.

Question: Do you support option one, two or three to provide adequate ventilation in rental homes? Please explain.

Response: Council supports option three. Bathrooms without mechanical extractors or heating are twice as likely to have moderate or worse patches of mould compared to those with extractors or heating. Kitchens without any mechanical ventilation are three times as likely to have visible mould compared to those with mechanical ventilation. Mechanical ventilation greatly assists in removing moisture when correctly specified, installed and operated. Systems should be ducted to the exterior and meet a minimum flow rate (50 litres per second for bathrooms).

It is recommended that the standard go further in reducing the likelihood for the extractor fan not being used due to tenant behaviour. For example, the extractor fan in the bathroom should be linked to the light switch or hot water pipe in the shower and run for a min of 15 mins after turned off. Mechanical extractor fans in bathrooms are rated less than 50W and do not use a lot of energy (less than a standard, incandescent light bulb).
Exemptions may be required for some building typologies, for example apartments with no opportunity for external ducting without incurring significant cost.

**Question:** What other forms of ventilation should be considered acceptable, or not included in the standard as acceptable? Please explain.

**Response:** Shower covers should be considered as acceptable as they provide an effective, low tech, durable solution to moisture management in the shower. This solution also requires less intervention from the tenant and there are no running costs.

Balanced ventilation systems that remove moisture should also be considered. These systems can provide mechanical extraction at a whole-of-house level, while retaining most of the energy for re-circulation into the indoor environment.

Window hinge limiters and trickle vents should be further investigated as both provide an effective way to ventilate the home, particularly bedrooms, while addressing tenant concerns around security.

A covered, outdoor clothes line should be provided where possible.

**Question:** Do you agree that exemptions should be available for certain rental homes from requiring openable windows?

**Response:** Yes.

**Question:** Would any of the above proposed options for ventilation prevent future innovation and/or flexibility? If yes, how?

**Response:** No.

4. **Moisture ingress and drainage**

**4.1 How should landlords protect rental homes against moisture entering the home and inadequate drainage?**

- **Option one:** (status quo). Under this option, landlords are required to meet their existing legal obligations, including the Residential Tenancies Act and H1 Regulations set out above.
- **Option two:** Landlords install a ground moisture barrier if vents are not adequate and drainage must be efficient.

**Question:** Do you support option one or two above to address the problems identified with moisture ingress and inadequate drainage in New Zealand rental homes? Why/Why not?

**Response:** Council supports option two. Subfloor moisture entering the home is a major issue in many New Zealand homes, particularly if there is inadequate subfloor ventilation or ground moisture barrier. Ensuring adequate ventilation can be achieved is the cornerstone to a low humidity subfloor environment. Where this is inadequate or not possible, installing a ground moisture barrier is a low cost, low tech, durable solution that will provide reduced moisture ingress over time.

**Question:** Do you think other requirements for moisture ingress and drainage should be included in the standard? If so, what?

**Response:** No
Question: Do you agree with the proposed exemptions? Do you think there are other homes that should also be exempt?

Response: Council agrees.

Question: Would any of the above options inhibit future innovation and/or flexibility? How do you suggest this could be overcome?

Response: No

5. Draught stopping

5.1 What is the appropriate level of draught stopping to create warm and dry rental homes?

- Option one (status quo): Currently, regulation 17 of the H1 Regulations requires that the materials of which each house is constructed shall be sound, durable and where subject to the effects of the weather, weatherproof, and shall be maintained in such a condition. The walls and ceilings of every habitable room, bathroom, kitchen, kitchenette, hall and stairway shall be sheathed, plastered, rendered or otherwise treated and shall be maintained to the satisfaction of the local authority. Every floor shall be kept in a good state of repair free from crevices, holes and depressions.

- Option two: stop unnecessary gaps or holes that cause noticeable draughts. Option two requires the landlord to stop any unnecessary gaps or holes that cause noticeable draughts and a colder rental home, and:
  - are 3 millimetres or greater in and around windows and doors, walls, ceilings, floors and access hatches
  - block any decommissioned chimneys and fireplaces

Question: Do you support option one or two above to stop draughts and create warm and dry rental homes? Why?

Response: Council supports option two. Stopping draughts is a low cost, low tech, durable solution that will reduce heat loss over many years.

Question: Do you think other requirements for draught stopping should be included in the standard? If so, what?

Response: No

Question: Would any of the above options inhibit future innovation and/or flexibility? If so, how?

Response: No

Question: Should the regulations specify any exceptions to this standard? If so, what?

Response: No

6. Date to comply with the standards

6.1 When and how should the healthy homes standards be implemented?
The Healthy Homes Guarantee Act allows for phased implementation of the healthy homes standards between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2024.

- Option one: comply at start of a new or renewed tenancy
- Option two: a single compliance date
- Option three: staggered compliance dates over five years
  - Sub-option A: compliance date set by healthy homes standards
  - Sub-option B: compliance dates set by location of the rental home

Question: Do you support option one, two or three for the date that landlords need to comply with the standards for their rental homes? Why/why not?

Response: Council supports a mix of option one and three. Making changes to a property has the least impact on tenants when done as part of a change to tenancy occupation. It is also a good time to include these changes with other repairs and maintenance that may be required as part of a tenancy changeover. Having a single event when the property should meet the standards means that suppliers may only need to make one visit, reducing their costs for lead generation, sales and fulfilment of deliverables.

An end date is also recommended by which all properties must meet the standard, for example 2022.

A grace period of 90 days is adequate, given there will also be a notice period before this.

Question: For option one, do you think 1 July 2021 is the appropriate commencement date? Why/why not? Do you agree landlords should be given a grace period of 90 days between the start of a tenancy and when they need to comply?

Response: No, as per response above. Council agrees that a grace period of 90 days is adequate.

Question: For option two, do you think 1 July 2022 is an appropriate date to allow landlords, industry and government with sufficient time to comply with the standards? If not, which date do you think would be appropriate, and why?

Response: Yes.

Question: For option three, which approach do you think is an appropriate way to stagger implementation (by standard or location)? Do you have an alternative approach to staggering implementation that you think we should consider?

Response: Using a deprivation index would provide a way to ensure that those areas most in need received attention first, bringing forward the likely date that beneficial outcomes would take place.

Question: Is there a feasible compliance date option that has not been considered? Please explain

Response: Using the tenancy change date without waiting until July 2021 would stagger demand on suppliers.

Question: Do you agree with the assumptions and analysis in the document for the indicative costs and benefits, and our analysis of the advantages and disadvantages?
Response: Yes, council generally agrees with the assumptions and analysis, however the following areas warrant further investigation, or adjustment:

a) shower covers as a valid alternative to mechanical extraction
b) the potential impact on peak electricity loads, infrastructure and carbon emissions, of applying a heating standard, and how this might be mitigated.
c) We would recommend that some interventions may require greater detail in specification to meet the intended objective, for example automated extractor fans based on user activity, and thermostatic controllers on portable heating appliances.
d) It would be useful to have an intervention hierarchy that reflects the desired outcomes of the Standards. For example, this could be done by assessing the impact on creating a warm, dry, healthy home against the cost and ease of implementing the intervention (eg draught stopping, insulation, ventilation, moisture ingress and drainage and then heating).

7. Implementation

7.1 When and how should the healthy homes standards be enforced?

Question: What records should a landlord retain to show compliance with each healthy home standard (e.g. R-value certification for the insulation standard)?

Response: Recording state of the house, including mould, should be required to prevent tenants being held responsible for entrenched mould in materials prior to their occupancy.

Question: What could be included on the tenancy agreement to show the landlord has complied with each healthy home standard (e.g. a description of the mechanical ventilation supplied in the kitchen and bathroom for the ventilation standard)?

Response: Council believes the following could be included:

a. Insulation type, depth and R value
b. Heating appliances
c. Ventilation appliances
d. Ground moisture barrier

Question: What are the most important considerations in developing a tool to help tenants understand and landlords to comply with the heating standard.

Response: Given the lack of data, greater information sharing across central and local government, and within local government, would improve the ability to address non-compliant properties.

Consideration should also be given to creating an easy-to-access and understand method of capturing and communicating information about the state of a property in relation to the standards.

Warrant of Fitness

Council supports the development of a rating (warrant of fitness) that would clearly communicate if a property meets the proposed standard. This could be similar to a vehicle warrant of fitness, which prospective car owners, sellers, insurers and other entities use to assess compliance to the standard.
The use of a national standard would set a clear expectation of what is required to meet the standard. Council would suggest a pass/fail system. The focus should be on monitoring the condition of the property, not the landlord or tenant.

The use of a rating system would also serve to educate the public about which housing features impact on creating warm, dry homes. This system could be either centrally or locally managed.

**Enforcement**

Auckland Council notes that the Ministry is also currently consulting on reforms to the Residential Tenancies Act which discuss broadening and increasing the powers of the Ministry to enforce various standards for landlords. Council has provided a separate submission on this reform.

We also note that proactive enforcement will be essential to achieve the desired outcomes of the healthy homes standards. A recent study examining poor rental housing quality suggested that legislation alone was not a sufficient driver and some landlords will need to be “managed into compliance” to achieve improved outcomes for tenants.

It is important to recognise that New Zealand has had existing legislation since 1947 (the Housing Improvement regulations) which is intended to encourage warm dry homes, but this has not achieved the desired outcomes as it has lacked effective enforcement.

We support strengthening the enforcement powers of central government to ensure that healthy homes standards are met by all landlords in a timely fashion. Creating a proactive enforcement system also moves the onus away from tenants to make complaints, which they are often reluctant to do since this can impact on their relationship with their landlord and their right to a secure tenure.

**Education and incentivisation**

Legislation and enforcement is just one tool and must be supported by education. Many landlords want to improve the quality of their asset but lack access to good, independent information.

Modifications which support a warmer, healthy home or help to mitigate climate change should be incentivised. At present, tenants are reluctant to make improvements they see as benefiting the landlord and may require permission. Landlords may also be unwilling to make the investment in upgrades.

Local government authorities can play a key role in education and incentivisation programmes. As outlined at the beginning of this submission, Auckland Council runs a range of programmes to incentivise behaviour change. We welcome the opportunity to work with the Ministry to utilise these as best practice guidelines for other councils. Auckland Council would also like to learn from others and adapt our programmes to ensure they are best practice and fit for purpose.

**Conclusion and next steps**

In summary, throughout these standards we have recommended that the highest options be chosen to improve the quality of rental homes in this country and the wellbeing of renters. Auckland Council is committed to its leadership role in Auckland, both as a local government authority and landlord, and will continue to work with central government and others to improve the lives of Aucklanders. We welcome discussion on our submission to achieve better outcomes for the local communities we serve.

Going forward, the council would like to remain involved in the development and implementation of standards for the Healthy Homes Guarantees Act. The proposed standards will not achieve their desired outcomes without effective enforcement and
education programmes. We request to be involved in discussions relating to education, implementation and enforcement of the standards.
Auckland Council's draft submission on the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme

File No.: CP2018/19200

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To endorse Auckland Council’s submission to the Ministry for the Environment’s “Proposed Improvements to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme” document.

Whakarāpopototangata matua / Executive summary

2. All Aucklanders are affected by climate change, especially our most vulnerable. The benefits of action are promising and inaction raises serious risks to infrastructure, the economy and people’s health.


4. A market-based approach to price emissions, by placing a cap on overall emissions and trading ‘carbon credits’, can provide an economic incentive to reduce emissions. NZ can make intended and committed emissions reductions in line with the Paris Agreement’s frame for an international carbon market and within the bounds of the forthcoming Zero Carbon Bill.

5. The New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS) was established in 2008, aiming to meet (previous) international climate change targets by putting a price on emissions. The NZ ETS has a varied history and has had varied effectiveness at pricing emissions and incentivising reductions. There has been a range of NZ ETS reviews, most recently in 2015/16, to which Auckland Council made submissions.

6. Government’s current proposal aims to make the current scheme ‘fit-for-purpose’ by providing more predictability for the market and more flexibility to Government to collectively and ultimately deliver on New Zealand-wide emissions targets. Note that a decision on inclusion of agriculture is not part of this consultation and will be made next year.

7. The consultation document, Improvements to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme Submission, raises 37 questions, of which nine are most relevant to Auckland Council. A draft submission has been prepared (Attachment A). Main points include:
   - Support for modelling the abatement potential and cost of domestic emissions reductions.
   - Recommendation for a portion of proceeds to be earmarked for local government climate adaptation and mitigation programmes.
   - Suggestion that participants to free New Zealand Unit (NZU) allocation regularly justify their free yearly allocation and demonstrate carbon reduction actions and that the process be transparent and peer reviewed.
   - Support for public reporting and review of emissions data and supporting information.
   - Recommendation to provide adequate support to small-medium enterprises with limited resources to help comply with the scheme.
   - Support for an ambitious transition to a low carbon future, including curtailing use of coal as quickly as possible.

8. Consultation on the NZ ETS closed on 21 September 2018. Due to compressed time frames, an officer submission was lodged with the request that any additions or changes from full committee endorsement be allowed afterward.
9. The Ministry for the Environment will provide advice to Cabinet to consider policy and draft legislative amendments by mid-2019. It is expected that amendments will progress to Parliament in late-2019, followed by public consultation.

**Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s**

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) endorse Auckland Council’s submission to the “Proposed Improvements to the NZ Emissions Trading Scheme” document in Attachment A of the agenda report.

b) delegate authority to the Chair of the Environment and Community Committee to approve any minor changes necessary to the submission before it is provided to the Ministry for the Environment.

**Horopaki / Context**

10. Climate change is a serious issue for all Aucklanders, with particular impacts on our most vulnerable people and communities. Taking action on climate change poses a range of benefits and puts us on a path toward a cleaner, fairer and more prosperous Auckland. Inaction raises serious risks to infrastructure, the economy and people’s health.

11. 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.

12. The Environment and Community Committee agreed to a full review of Low Carbon Auckland in February 2018. This included development of a climate change action plan that integrates climate adaptation alongside addressing rising emissions (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.

13. New Zealand’s commitments to the Paris Agreement require a substantial reduction in emissions and Government’s forthcoming Zero Carbon Bill aims to set the policy architecture for the transition to a zero carbon society and economy for New Zealand. 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. The four main (proposed) components of the Bill include a 2050 emissions target, emission budgets, establishment of a Climate Change Commission and inclusion of climate adaptation.

14. Auckland formally supported the intent and proposed mechanisms of the Zero Carbon Bill (ENV/2018/93) and has committed to climate action and emissions reduction at a regional level. Auckland Council is currently collaborating with central government on how a regional approach to climate action aligns with the NZ-wide framework.

15. A market-based approach to price emissions by placing a cap on overall emissions and trading ‘carbon credits’ can provide an economic incentive to reduce emissions. The Paris Agreement is meant to set the frame for an international carbon market so countries like New Zealand can make intended and committed emissions reductions in line with that global agreement and within the bounds of the forthcoming Zero Carbon Bill.

16. The New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS) was established in 2008, aiming to meet (previous) international climate change targets by putting a price on emissions. The NZ ETS has a varied history and has had varied effectiveness at pricing emissions and incentivising reductions. A range of NZ ETS reviews have occurred, most recently in 2015/16, to which Auckland Council made submissions.
17. Government’s current proposal aims to make the current scheme ‘fit-for-purpose’ by providing more predictability for the market and more flexibility for the Government to collectively and ultimately deliver on New Zealand-wide emissions targets. The NZ ETS can be complemented by a wider set of flexible price and non-price policy instruments to achieve emissions reductions. Note that a decision on inclusion of agriculture is not part of this consultation and will be made next year.

18. Consultation on the NZ ETS closed on 21 September 2018. Due to compressed time frames, an officer submission was lodged with the request that any additions or changes from full committee endorsement be allowed after the deadline.

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

19. *Improvements to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme Submission* consultation document is available on the Ministry for the Environment website. Auckland Council’s submission focuses on nine of 37 main questions most relevant to Auckland. A brief options assessment of each point was undertaken and is summarised as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| What issues should the decision maker consider when making unit supply decisions? | No or little modelling of cost and abatement; low importance placed on data accuracy | • Low cost for analysis  
• No time requirements | • Action in the wrong areas or with wrong emphasis leading to low/no impact  
• Credibility risk to sectors and Government |
|               |        | Stringent modelling of abatement potential/cost of domestic emissions reductions | • Provides more accurate market signals  
• Helps to hone impact of actions  
• Better credibility to agencies and sector | • Cost and complexity  
• Potential for imprecision in modelling outputs due to assumptions in inputs |
|               |        | **Recommended** |       |

| Question 6:   |        |          |       |
| Do you think that the Government should use the proceeds gained from the auctioning of NZ Units for specific purposes? If so, please explain what those purposes would be. | No specific purpose | • Simpler, centralised and/or less-contested NZ-wide allocation of proceeds via central government | • Less impact from areas with greater emissions and reduction potential (like Auckland)  
• Potentially fewer localised (Auckland) benefits like better air quality, transport choice, protection from impacts |
|               |        | Portion of proceeds earmarked for local government programmes with consideration of vulnerable communities, biodiversity and clean technologies | • Greater and more efficient emissions reductions  
• Larger array of local benefits due to specific and geographically-prioritised funding stream | • Depending on funding allocation formula, potential concerns or perceptions around equity (e.g., rural vs. urban) |
<p>|               |        | <strong>Recommended</strong> |       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions 14 - 16: How do you think decisions on a phase-down of industrial allocation should be made?</td>
<td>Decision-making process. Participants to free allocation justify allocation, demonstrate reduction actions, compare to best practice.</td>
<td>• More flexibility for tailored approach per industry • Greater driver for change given requirement for transparency and benchmarking to best practice • Ability for regular adjustments</td>
<td>• More complex decision-making • Potentially open to outside interference/influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparent and peer reviewed free allocation process reviewed every 2-5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test or trigger to phase down or up-front decision Fewer factors considered Less transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Easier decision-making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No publishing</strong></td>
<td>Fewer requirements; less resource-intensive</td>
<td>No imperative to take action or make progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions 19 - 20: Do you think there would be benefits from publishing individual emissions data reported by NZ ETS participants? Do you think cases of non-compliance should be published?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Public reporting and review of emissions data and supporting information. Non-compliance information published.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Higher level of accountability and scrutiny</strong></td>
<td>Additional resourcing required for reporting <strong>Potential reputational impact for non-compliant business/organisations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 22: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce strict liability infringement offences for low-level non-compliance?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Drives change consistently across sector</strong></td>
<td>Sizeable impacts on small businesses for minimal gain in emissions reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes – but not without or before adequate support for SMEs with limited resources to comply with the scheme</td>
<td><strong>Allows/assists compliance while mitigating impacts to smaller businesses</strong></td>
<td>Potential lack of clarity on what 'small business' means and where the funding/resourcing comes from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. A draft submission has been prepared (Attachment A) based on the above. Main points include:
   - Support for modelling the abatement potential and cost of domestic emissions reductions, including close consideration of the accuracy of data, reporting and budget review.
   - Recommendation for a portion of proceeds from the NZ ETS be earmarked for local government climate adaptation and mitigation programmes, including a) consideration of more vulnerable people and communities, b) environmental programmes to maintain and help biodiversity to adapt to climate stresses and c) best practice technical innovation for clean technologies that create an equitable, healthy and resilient low carbon economy.
   - Suggestion that participants to free New Zealand Unit (NZU) allocation regularly justify their free yearly allocation, demonstrate carbon reduction projects and actions in line with a plan, and compare emissions intensity to international best practice. Further suggestion that the free allocation process be transparent, open to public scrutiny and be independently peer reviewed.
   - Recommendation that the amount of free allocated NZUs be considered every two to five years rather than a gradual phase out.
   - Support for public reporting and review of emissions data and supporting information, including emissions intensity of operations and associated reduction plans as well as Unique Emissions Factors for each industry. Also support for non-compliance information to be published.
   - Recommendation to provide adequate support to small-medium enterprises with limited resources to help comply with the scheme.
   - Support for an ambitious transition to a low carbon future, including curtailing use of coal as quickly as possible, in part by reporting all coal sales/use.

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

21. 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. The price of carbon/emissions did surface in those conversations and have been captured here.

22. 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 workshops on 4 July 2018 and 26 September 2018.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

23. 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.

24. 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/whanau as well as the impacts of pricing emissions. This underpins points in our submission relating to local allocation of proceeds, consideration of our most vulnerable people and communities and assistance to small-medium enterprises. These 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

25. There is likely to be some cost to council operations that generate emissions and these are currently being assessed within the context of the climate action plan. Our recent commitment to the Climate Leaders Coalition (alongside 60+ NZ businesses and organisations representing half of NZ’s GDP) reaffirms Council’s commitment to “get ahead of the curve” with innovations in emissions reductions that have lasting benefits.

26. There are no direct financial implications on Auckland Council as a result of making a submission on the NZ ETS. 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

27. The greatest long-term risk is maintaining the status quo. The lack of a credible price signal to the market to drive down emissions and 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.

28. Lack of proper price signals and subsequent action creates opportunity costs for NZ, 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. More specific risks are listed above as part of the options analysis.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

29. Any additions or changes from full committee endorsement of the officer submission will be lodged with Ministry for the Environment.

30. Ministry for the Environment will be providing advice to Cabinet to consider policy and draft amendments to the Climate Change Response Act by mid-2019. It is expected that amendments will progress to Parliament in late-2019 followed by public consultation.

31. 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 have been held to help prioritise actions alongside wider community engagement. A draft will be ready for consultation by the end of 2018 and implementation can begin around April 2019.
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Submission:

Improvements to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)

September 2018
Mihi

Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,
ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,
ōna mana ā-īwi take take mai, tauiwi atu.
Tāmaki – mākaa a te rau, murau a te tini,
wenerau a te mano.
Kāhore tō rite i te ao.

Introduction

1. Auckland Council would like to thank the Ministry of Environment for the opportunity to provide a submission on the Improvements to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS) consultation document (2018).

2. We commend the Government for providing this opportunity to address the issues of the current scheme. We reiterate our position in supporting the NZ ETS as the right mechanism to price carbon, albeit one within a wider set of complementary, flexible, price and non-price policy instruments to achieve a substantive reduction in emissions. The NZ ETS has a varied history, with recent developments impeding its effectiveness. The proposed improvements are an opportunity to update and renew the scheme according to international best practice considering the unique emissions profile and economy of New Zealand. It is important to implement the right framework and approach to ensure New Zealand’s transition to a prosperous and resilient low carbon economy and society.

3. Auckland Council’s submission is based on its several distinct roles. The council is an organisation affected by the NZ ETS through the operation of corporate and community facilities. Auckland Council also provides a regional policy and planning perspective based on the strategic goals and commitments of the Auckland Plan 2050 and Auckland’s Climate Action Plan (currently in development). Finally, Auckland Council represents the interests of households, communities and business of the Auckland community who are affected by the impacts of climate change.

4. This submission is focused on nine of the 37 consultation questions raised in the Improvements to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme Submission Form that the council deems most relevant.

---

1 For instance, see Haites, Erik (2018). Carbon taxes and greenhouse gas emissions trading systems: what have we learned? Climate Policy, 18:8, 955-966, DOI:10.1080/14693062.2018.1492897
5. This submission is being lodged as an officer submission without full political endorsement and will be discussed by the Environment and Community Committee on 16 October 2018. At that point, we request the ability to provide additional details or amended recommendations to you if and as necessary.

Discussion Questions (from Consultation Document)

Question 1: What issues should the decision maker consider when making unit supply decisions?

6. The number of New Zealand Units (NZUs) in the market is intended to reflect the carbon budgets that will be advised/determined by the Zero Carbon Commission. We support the modelling of the New Zealand domestic abatement potential and cost. We believe the abatement potential modelling should consider all the issues covered under question one.

7. Other issues to consider are the accuracy of the data informing the New Zealand emissions trend and the ongoing assessment of NZ ETS effectiveness.

Landfill operators

8. While the Council supports the establishment of carbon budgets, a meaningful carbon budget requires robust data to inform it. When making unit supply decisions, the decision-maker needs to consider the challenges to the waste sector in projecting emissions accurately year on year and the implications of that both for landfill operators and the scheme in general. Emissions from waste are not always measured and reported accurately. Methane is a potent greenhouse gas which is released from landfill sites prior to capping. While Auckland’s landfill operators report achieving a 95 per cent gas capture rate, analysis has demonstrated that traditional landfills achieve a 95 per cent efficiency only after around 16 years of operation. This may lead to the systemic under-reporting of emissions being produced at landfills. Therefore, emissions budgets for the waste sector must be reviewed and re-set regularly as monitoring technology improves.

Question 6: Do you think that the Government should use the proceeds gained from the auctioning of NZUs for specific purposes? If so, please explain what those purposes would be.

Purpose 1: Support Local Government to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while ensuring the communities are prepared for the impacts of climate change

9. Selecting specific purposes for the proceeds of NZU sales in the NZ ETS is critical. As stated throughout the NZ ETS consultation document, it is essential that government policy be consistent with a “just and fair transition” (p. 10) to a low carbon economy and a climate-ready New Zealand. Therefore, funds raised by the NZ ETS should be used to help New Zealand and major population centres with larger overall emissions, like Auckland, mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to expected climate impacts.

10. Climate change exacerbates existing inequity in that it affects society’s vulnerable “first and worst”. Furthermore, vulnerable groups are often those who have contributed least to the problem of climate change. Government policies can help reduce inequity by efficiently

---

reducing emissions and working to ameliorate climate impacts, including directing funds from the NZ ETS to local adaptation/mitigation initiatives like those to be part of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan (currently in development). Proceeds from the NZ ETS can therefore provide a “double dividend” of emissions reduction and public benefit. **We recommend some portion of proceeds from the NZ ETS be earmarked for local government climate adaptation and mitigation programmes.** Reinvesting proceeds from emissions trading schemes is not a new concept internationally. Indeed, it is standard practice in other countries with an ETS to reinvest funds into environmental and social programmes to address climate impacts. In Quebec, ETS revenue is allocated to the implementation of their Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP 2013–2020). This plan aims to reduce Quebec’s greenhouse gas emissions, adapt to climate change impacts and accelerate the shift towards a “strong, innovative and increasingly low-carbon economy”.\(^3\)

**Purpose 2: Support environmental biodiversity in the face of climate change**

11. To optimise environmental outcomes, **we recommend that NZ ETS proceeds be used for environmental programmes to maintain and help New Zealand biodiversity to adapt in the face of climate stresses.** This strategy is also employed around the world. As of 2014, about 70% of cap-and-trade ETS revenues around the world directed revenues towards environmental purposes.\(^4\)

**Purpose 3: Support technological innovation to increase climate adaptation and mitigation**

12. NZ ETS proceeds could also drive innovation for clean technologies that mitigate New Zealand emissions to support the transition to a “low-emissions and resilient economy” (p. 14). Innovation is particularly important for sectors that cannot easily or cost-efficiently reduce emissions (i.e. agriculture and aviation, both relatively high and important contributors to NZ emissions profile compared to other countries). Looking overseas, in the US approximately $2.7 billion has been produced in revenue from the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI). Between 2009 and 2014, RGGI states allocated 42% for energy efficiency programmes, 11% for bill assistance to low-income residents, 9% for GHG abatement, 8% for renewable energy development, 8% for state budget reductions, 4% for programme administration and 1% for RGGI management.\(^5\) The estimated a net employment effect of the RGGI between 2009 and 2025 is expected to be 30,200 jobs.\(^6\) According to the CCI (2017), California has raised $3.385 billion in revenue through 2017 which has provided funding for high speed rail, low carbon transit, weatherproofing of low income homes and environmental conservation efforts. **We therefore recommend that the NZ ETS incorporate international best practice to drive innovation for clean technologies that create an equitable, healthy and resilient low carbon economy.**

---


Question 14: How do you think decisions on a phase-down of industrial allocation should be made? Select all that apply.

Question 15: If a decision-making process for industrial allocation is implemented, which of the following factors should the decision-maker take into account?

13. Auckland Council suggests that a decision-making process be established to determine the allocation of free NZUs. Every industry has unique circumstances and technological challenges/opportunities and, while more complex and potentially more open to interference, a decision-making process allows for a more tailored industry-specific approach.

14. In addition to the factors listed in question 15, to assist the decision-making process we suggest all participants to free NZUs provide:

   a. a regular justification for its free yearly allocation

   b. demonstrated carbon reduction projects/actions undertaken with an emissions reductions plan

   c. the emission intensity of its process compared to international best practise

   We also recommend that the process should be transparent, open to public scrutiny and to be independently peer reviewed. The information above should be used to determine both the number of NZUs allocated for each period and emissions reductions for each industry.

Question 16: If a phase-down is initiated in future, which of the following rates for phasing-down industrial allocation should be considered?

15. Rather than a gradual phase out, we recommend that the amount of free NZUs allocated be considered every two to five years (see answers to questions 14 and 15). The phase out approach is not simple as it requires a mix of pricing signals and in some cases new technology to reduce emissions. It is industry specific and should be considered together with the allocation every two to five years.

Question 19: Do you think that there would be benefits from publishing individual emissions data reported by NZ ETS participants? (Please explain.)

16. Currently the industries that receive a free allocation of NZUs must provide information on emissions intensity test (tCO2e/ NZ$ 1 million of revenue) and trade exposure (international trade of the activity’s output and the viability of importing/exporting). Currently the information provided is not publicly available on the NZ ETS website. While the calculation used to determine allocation is available, the only information provided is the annual allocation of carbon units in each year.

17. To have a transparent and effective NZ ETS, we recommend that all participants to publicly report emissions data and supporting information. In addition, we suggest participants provide emissions intensity of operations and associated plans to reduce it. This would allow the performance of a company or process to be compared with international best practise and help unlock potential mitigation pathways.
18. Finally, *we recommend that information relating to the determination of Unique Emissions Factors (UEFs) for each industry* (e.g., waste composition and landfill capture rates) *be made public and open to scrutiny and that regular reviews* of UEFs should be undertaken.

**Question 20:** Do you think cases of non-compliance should be published? (Please explain.)

19. To ensure higher levels of accountability and scrutiny to help encourage emitters to reduce emissions, *we suggest that the release of non-compliance information be published.* If non-compliance cases are not published, an essential tenet of the scheme (accountability) will be missing, minimising the emissions reduction imperative for emitters, thereby undermining the scheme.

**Question 22:** Do you agree with the proposal to introduce strict liability infringement offences for low-level non-compliance? If not, why not?

20. It may be inappropriate to enforce strict liability for low level non-compliances for small-medium enterprises (SMEs). Before strict liability for low-level non-compliance is pursued, however, *we suggest that the government provide adequate support for SMEs with limited resources* to comply with the scheme. This is particularly pertinent in Auckland given that the majority of Auckland businesses are SMEs.

**Question 30:** Do you agree with the proposal that all coal sold or used from a stockpile be reported, regardless of whether the participant meets the threshold for coal importing or mining in the year the coal was sold or used? If not, why not?

21. *Given the myriad social, environmental and economic benefits, we believe that New Zealand should be ambitious in transitioning to a low carbon future.* Coal is one of the least efficient and most polluting fossil fuels, with significant impacts to air quality, emissions and human health. *We recommend coal be curtailed as quickly as possible, including ensuring all coal sales/use be reported and included as part of the ETS whether or not the sale/use reaches the ETS threshold.*
Auckland Council's early position on the three waters review

File No.: CP2018/18100

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To agree an early position on central government three waters reform, which informs a letter to the Minister of Local Government and the Minister for the Environment.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. In July 2018, the Minister of Local Government Hon Nanaia Mahuta announced the Government’s review of three waters, which is partly a response to the Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water.
3. Cabinet will decide on the scope of options in late October, with final decisions on regulation likely to follow in mid-2019 and service delivery in 2020.
4. We recommend that the mayor and the chair of the Environment and Community Committee send a letter to the Minister of Local Government Hon Nanaia Mahuta and the Minister for the Environment Hon David Parker setting out the council group’s early position on the three waters review. A draft letter is attached as Attachment B to this report.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:
   a) note that decisions on the scope of options in the government's review of three waters are likely to be made before the end of October, with final decisions to follow in 2019 and 2020
   b) agree that the mayor and chair of the Environment and Community Committee send a letter to the Minister of Local Government setting out Auckland Council’s early positions on the three waters review
   c) delegate to the mayor and chair of the Environment and Community Committee the authority to make minor changes to the letter to the Minister as contained in Attachment B of the agenda report.

Horopaki / Context
5. In July 2018, the Minister of Local Government Hon Nanaia Mahuta announced the government’s review of three waters at the Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) conference. The review is partly a response to the Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water. However, the government has expanded the scope of the review to include wastewater and stormwater. The review has two focus areas, regulation and service delivery.
6. The Minister has stated that she will take a proposal to cabinet in late October this year on the scope of the review, which we understand will confirm the scope of options to be assessed. The decisions on regulation are likely to follow in mid-2019, with service delivery decisions following in 2020.
7. The Environment and Community Committee held two workshops on the government’s problem definition and possible options in August and September, as well as a presentation from Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) officials at a joint Governing Body – Watercare Services Limited board workshop on 25 September 2018.

8. The presentation by DIA is provided as Attachment A, which sets out how it has defined the issues facing the water sector, and high-level descriptions of likely options under consideration.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

9. We recommend that the mayor and the chair of the Environment and Community Committee send a letter to the Minister of Local Government and the Minister for the Environment Hon David Parker setting out the council’s early position on the three waters review. A draft letter is attached to this report (Attachment B). The letter provides a brief description of the Auckland context, and sets out some key messages. We have consulted with Watercare Services Limited (Watercare) and Auckland Transport staff in preparing the letter.

Possible changes to three water regulation

10. The government’s review of water regulation covers three distinct areas: drinking water standards, environmental regulation and economic regulation. The government will focus initially on drinking water and environmental regulation.

- Drinking water standards: The Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water made a number of recommendations, which include making compliance with drinking water standards mandatory, and requiring water supplies to be treated with a residual disinfectant. These are not likely to be as material to Auckland as they are to other parts of New Zealand.

- Environmental regulation: This is likely to include changes to the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management and changes to compliance and monitoring of discharges. It may also mean changes to regional council functions, which would affect Auckland Council as a unitary authority.

- Economic regulation: In general terms, economic regulation aims to restrict monopoly power and protect the interests of consumers. The minister has noted that without it there is “no authoritative way of knowing whether there is value for money and providers are making sensible investments”. The term ‘economic regulation’ covers a range of different interventions, from compelling service providers to publicly disclose information, to setting prices.

Proposed key messages: water regulation

11. We recommend that the council adopts the following early positions, which have been incorporated into the draft letter.

- there is a case for change to drinking water regulations; having clear standards with effective monitoring and compliance would result in better outcomes from a national perspective (although this is not as material to Auckland as other areas)

- in-principle support for changes to environmental regulation, but advocating for a catchment-based approach which focuses on overall water quality outcomes rather than regulating a specific (point-source) discharge

- in-principle support for economic regulation to improve transparency and accountability for consumers, subject to more detail on what it would include.
Possible changes to service delivery

12. The service delivery options that have been presented by DIA officials are still at a very early stage. A high-level analysis of some of the impacts is set out in Table A (the status quo is not included). Currently, the scope of changes could cover three waters or may include water and wastewater only.

Table A: High-level analysis of central government options for three waters service delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A water services provider for each region in New Zealand</td>
<td>No significant changes for Auckland, as it is already under a regional model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Between three and five cross-regional water services providers across the nation | • less local accountability for services  
• could result in cross subsidisation  
• would need to ensure it supports Auckland growth plans  
• could be less responsive to Auckland issues | • it may provide Auckland with more certainty of water supply in the long-term | • it would likely become a Crown entity, which would remove it from the council’s control and balance sheet. This would have a favourable impact on the debt to revenue ratio |
| NZTA model (where a national, hypothecated revenue source is used to provide some funding for local investment based on business cases) | • this option has been less worked through. In principle, this model is based on deriving a portion of funding for projects from a national revenue source (which means that some level of cross-subsidisation is implicit)  
• there is no obvious revenue source without difficulties attached to it. For example, one option is a tax on water takes, however it is likely to attract significant opposition from iwi |                                                                         |                                                                         |

Proposed key messages: service delivery

13. We recommend that the council adopts the following early positions, which have informed the draft letter:

• strong support for the government’s bottom line of continued public ownership.
• While the quality of Auckland’s reticulated water supply is consistently ‘Aa’, higher standards for water are likely to mean higher costs for some communities.
• Any subsidies for communities should come from central government taxes, not from rates or user charges.
• The council group is happy to offer its expertise to other councils on a contractual basis to achieve efficiencies of scale, noting that Watercare is currently in early negotiations to provide three waters services to the Waikato district on a commercial basis. This is premised on Auckland not being negatively affected and no cross-subsidisation occurring.
• There should be careful consideration of whether stormwater is included in changes to service delivery, and offering to share the analysis around whether some stormwater functions should go to Watercare, once the council has made decisions on this.
Local Government New Zealand positions

14. DIA has formed a reference group with LGNZ to seek the views of the sector on the three waters review. In general, LGNZ is advocating for:

- A ‘co-regulatory’ approach. LGNZ’s view is that “this would bring together the information held by central government policy makers with the knowledge of local issues held by local government and the technical insights of suppliers and assessors.”
- A clearer problem definition for any changes to service delivery arrangements, and questioning the move towards aggregation. LGNZ argues that any changes must be based on evidence and should not be mandatory.

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

15. Because the review is still at an early stage, we have not sought the views of local boards to date. Once the government’s proposed options are more clear, we will consult with local boards.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

16. There are likely to be significant impacts for Māori of any changes, and therefore a high level of interest in the review. Because the government’s proposals are not clear yet, we have not prepared a detailed assessment of the impacts. However, we will begin engaging with mana whenua as the proposals become clearer. The draft letter emphasises the need for the government to engage with Māori.

17. The Independent Māori Statutory Board has been informed of the review.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

18. There are no financial implications of this proposal.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

19. There are no risks associated with the recommendation to communicate the council’s early position to the minister. However, given the significance of the review and possible changes, there are likely to be risks associated with the proposals. We will assess these risks when further information is released by the government.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

20. If the Committee agrees to the recommendations, we will finalise the letter in consultation with the mayor and chair and send it to the minister of local government.
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Three waters

- Aotearoa New Zealand’s drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater services are collectively described as the “three waters”.
- A social and economic enabler, fundamental to the wellbeing of our communities and the quality of our environment.
- The need to recognise Te Mana o te Wai – the cultural value of water and water bodies to mana whenua.
- A vast and diverse sector, large number of providers, large number of assets across a wide geographic spread, heavily influenced by topography and natural features such as drinking water sources and discharge options.
- Primarily owned and provided by local authorities.
- Multiple Ministerial portfolios and government agencies. Key departments include: Internal Affairs, Environment, MBIE and Health.
- One of NZ’s core infrastructure sectors – very large investment: the combined local government assets have a $51.4 billion replacement value, with $12.8 billion planned expenditure from 2016 – 2025.
Origins of the Three Waters Review

➢ Ministers agreed in October 2016 to ‘have a look’

➢ Review formally established in mid-2017 to:
  ➢ look into the challenges facing New Zealand’s three waters system; and
  ➢ develop options and recommendations for system-wide performance improvements.

➢ Cross-government initiative – led by Department of Internal Affairs

➢ Initial work ran in parallel to Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water.

➢ Three Waters Review ‘key findings’ provided to new Minister of Local Government and broader group of interested Ministers in November/December 2017.

➢ Three Waters Cabinet paper in April 2018 – agreement to further work.

➢ Interconnected with work to respond to the Havelock North Inquiry’s other recommendations, and broader work (such as Inquiry into Local Government Funding).
Key findings and unpicking the issues
Our key findings point to a range of national and local issues, covering both the three waters regulatory regime and service delivery.

- Risks to human health and the environment in some parts of the country
- Low levels of compliance, monitoring and enforcement of drinking water and environmental regulations
- Minimal central oversight and poor connections across the system
- Lack of protection, transparency and accountability for consumers, especially compared with other infrastructure sectors and overseas water systems
- Affordability issues, driven by a range of funding pressures and financial challenges
- Capacity, capability and sustainability challenges – particularly outside large scale organisations
- Variable asset management and governance practices, and a lack of good asset information to support effective decision making

NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY
Regulatory

➢ Widespread systemic failure of water suppliers to meet the standards required to ensure the safe supply of drinking water – Havelock North Inquiry.

➢ Questions about whether the current regulatory regime is providing good environmental outcomes in respect of water services – patchy data giving scope for debate on performance and ‘facts’.

➢ Issues with compliance, monitoring and enforcement (CME).

➢ A complex regulatory environment, with poor connections between regulatory functions and minimal central oversight of the three waters system.

➢ A lack of information to allow consumers and other interested parties to assess the performance of three waters services – and a lack of transparency about the prices they are paying for those services.

➢ Three waters networks have strong natural monopoly characteristics but no economic regulation regime to protect water consumers.

NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY
The three waters system has a complex regulatory environment, and many organisations have a role in regulation, monitoring and/or service delivery.

**National**
- Ministry for the Environment: sets the national environmental direction under Resource Management Act, through tools such as the National Policy Statement for Freshwater, national environmental standards, and regulations.
- Ministry of Health: responsible for national level regulation of drinking water, including setting standards, appointing drinking water assessors, and reporting annually on compliance.
- Controller and Auditor General: conducts annual audit of local authorities, and ad hoc inquiries.
- Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management: has national level responsibility for civil defence emergencies.
- Fire and Emergency NZ: is the national fire service.
- Water New Zealand (NGO): sector organisation that conducts an annual performance review of local authority services.

**Regional**
- 16 regional & unitary authorities: have responsibility for regional environmental planning, issuing consents, monitoring compliance and enforcement.
- 36 Drinking Water Assessors: employed by 20 DHBs provide regional level inspection for compliance with standards and water safety plans.
- Local authorities and lifeline utilities: provide regional level civil defence emergency planning and response.

**Local**
- 67 territorial & unitary authorities: provide drinking water, stormwater, and wastewater services to their communities, meeting planning and reporting requirements under the Local Government Act.
- 600,000 people: on very small, tanker & self-supplied drinking water.
- 270,000 people: on private wastewater systems (e.g. septic tanks).

NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY
Funding challenges: drinking water and wastewater infrastructure upgrades

- Mandatory compliance with the Drinking Water Standards and mandatory treatment carries significant costs (Beca research)
  - estimates of at least $309 to $574 million in capital costs
  - estimated annual operating costs of $11 to $21 million

- Councils are facing even bigger costs for wastewater infrastructure upgrades to meet the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (draft GHD and Boffa Miskell research)
  - estimates of at least $1.4 to $2.1 billion in capital costs
  - estimated annual ongoing operating costs of $60 to $90 million
### Funding challenge summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost pressure</th>
<th>Capex ($m)</th>
<th>Opex ($m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>$309 - $574</td>
<td>$11 - $21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste water (discharge to fresh water, 40%)</td>
<td>$1,400 - $2,100</td>
<td>$60 - $90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste water (discharge to coastal, 60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste water (overflows)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change / Resilience / Adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ cost pressures from renewals, tourism, growth and housing/development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 12 Projected annual average spend (2015 LTPs)</th>
<th>$1,952</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 – 2017 Water and Wastewater spend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY**
Asset management and governance

- A lack of robust data means we do not have a comprehensive, reliable picture of the state of water assets, how much renewal/improvement is needed, or timing and costs
- Asset management capability across the system is mixed – and relatively low in some places
- Asset management ‘maturity’ is largely commensurate with the scale of the organisation
- The separation of governance and management is generally blurred, which weakens accountability
- Professionalisation of governance of 3 waters is below that of other infrastructure assets (such as electricity and gas) despite equal or greater challenges
- The standard of governance matters less in a stable context with few critical decisions and risks to manage – but councils are facing a range of challenges and risks, placing a increasing emphasis on effective governance and decision making
Clarifying the scope of the Review
Taking a system-wide approach is essential

What happens in one part of the three waters system has implications for the quality and outcomes related to other parts of the system.

Case for an improved regulatory framework across all three waters:

- NES for sources of drinking water has a strong relationship to provision of safe drinking water.
- Potential to reinforce catchment approach and freshwater standards.
- There are indications of regulatory weaknesses and performance in respect of waste water and stormwater.
- There is little information to allow consumers to assess the value for money and overall performance of all 3 water services.
Clarifying the scope of this stage of the Review

- The Government is taking a broad, system-wide perspective – covering:
  - issues and options relating to the regulatory regime and service delivery arrangements
  - all three waters – drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater

- Regulatory scope is:
  - Public health / safe drinking water
  - Environmental performance of water services
  - Economic regulation / information disclosure and system oversight

Service delivery is looking at how the system organises itself to respond to the capability and financial challenges in front of us

NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY
Outcomes – what and how?
What outcomes is the Government seeking for the three waters system?

Specific outcomes are still being discussed with Ministers – but likely to relate to:

- ensuring safe, reliable, fit-for-purpose drinking water
- better environmental performance
- three waters services that contribute to the wider social (eg housing), environmental and economic outcomes that are important to New Zealand
- achieving the above outcomes in ways that are affordable for our communities

Broader goals relate to things like:

- Delivering the water infrastructure needed to support growth
- Protecting/enhancing our reputation as a tourist destination and export market
- Continuity of water services in the face of climate change and natural disasters

NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY
What options are being explored?

An integrated regulatory system for three waters services

- Regulation for health outcomes
- Regulation for economic outcomes
- Regulation for environmental outcomes
- 3 waters service provision settings

System Oversight
The three waters system is complex and interdependent. Regulatory design will take time, and needs to happen at the same time as development of options for service delivery arrangements.
Service delivery options

The HNI recommended moving to a system of aggregated, dedicated water providers. If we were to consider a new model, what might the options look like?

- Regional, publicly-owned water providers?
- A small number of cross-regional, publicly-owned water providers?
- Or something else?

NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY
From the sector

- Mixed views
- Needs to be four not three waters
- Scale of the problem, diagnosis, data and evidence?
- Subsidising outside their boundaries
- Integration with land use and planning – core Council functions
- Penalising those that have invested - equity
- Nervousness about their role – regulatory and service delivery
- Thresholds and smaller suppliers - local solutions

It is important that a wide range of voices and views are heard, including: industry, water users, businesses and Iwi/Māori.
Concluding
Next steps

- This is an ongoing conversation
  - LGNZ reference group established to have high trust conversation with officials. Also engaging directly with local government through a variety of other channels – Metro Sector, Rural and Provincial, Mayoral Forums, National Council plus direct discussion
  - Specific targeted engagement process with Iwi and Māori
  - Talking to industry and businesses, sector groups
  - Governance of the Review is provided by a large group of Ministers with interests in three waters services and outcomes

- Next milestone is Cabinet consideration of high level options in October 2018
- Will be further public engagement in 2019 on the challenges and options for how the system can respond to them
- Work on a future regulatory regime likely to seek government decisions in 2019. Clear priority is public health, safe drinking water
In summary

- Key findings of the review to date show that our current three waters system has a number of challenges and the status quo is not sustainable.
- The Government is actively engaged in a conversation with the local government sector and associated communities on defining the challenges and scoping the solutions.
- The conversation includes which regulatory arrangements, service delivery models and funding arrangements are best suited for the delivery of three waters services.
- Continued public ownership of existing three waters assets is a bottom line.
- The work is at an early, high level conceptual policy stage and options and discussion will continue into 2019.
- Important that we hear all voices.
Contacts

www.dia.govt.nz/three-waters-review

threewaters@dia.govt.nz
Dear Minister,

Following your announcement of the Government’s three waters review earlier this year, we are writing on behalf of the Auckland Council group to put forward our early views on the three waters reforms.

We appreciate that the Government is engaging early. While we understand that there will be further opportunities for local government to provide more formal input in 2019, we consider that it is important to communicate our views to you before the scope of options are set.

We support your efforts to address challenges facing the three waters system. Effectively managing three waters is critical for New Zealand’s public health and safety, environmental protection, and economic prosperity.

**Auckland’s context**

Auckland is in a unique position nationally, being the only region where water and wastewater services are provided by an asset-owning council-controlled organisation, which has a specific legislative mandate. Auckland Council and Watercare have been through a significant period of consolidation. Since 2010, we have:

- combined multiple council stormwater operations into a single Healthy Waters Department – responsible for stormwater operations and planning
- vertically integrated Watercare to take over the management of both retail and wholesale management of water and wastewater services in Auckland.

A recent council review of three waters (under section 17A of the Local Government Act) showed that the current services are delivering value for money. However, it also found that we could be doing more to improve cost-effectiveness. The council, Watercare and Auckland Transport are taking active steps in this direction.

**Regulation of the three waters**

While the quality of Auckland’s reticulated water supply is consistently ‘Aa’, the council group recognises there is a clear case nationwide for changes to the regulation of drinking water. The weaknesses in the current system were well explored by the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry, and in our view there should be changes which would see clear standards set, followed by effective monitoring and compliance by an independent regulator.

We support your move to look at environmental considerations of the three waters system, and acknowledge the scale and complexity of the problems. The council supports a catchment-based approach to managing water quality, including the adjacent coastal waters.

In regard to economic regulation, we support the principle of more protection and transparency for consumers but would need to understand more about the specific proposals before taking a definitive position. You would also need to look at how this works with section 57 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 (which requires overall costs to customers for water and wastewater to be kept to a minimum). We would be happy to engage with you about this.

**Investing for growth and addressing water quality issues**

Despite constraints on the council group’s debt to revenue ratio, and therefore its ability to take on more debt, Auckland is investing for growth and addressing water quality issues:

- Auckland has a single vision for growth, which guides development.
- Watercare and Healthy Waters have a significant amount of planned capital works over the next ten years ($5.5 billion and $1.4 billion respectively). For example, Watercare will start construction of the $1.1 billion Central Interceptor in May 2019.
This project will significantly reduce the volume and frequency of overflows into the Waitemata Harbour.

- The council group is making other efforts to address the most significant environmental issues associated with three waters (including the SafeSwim initiative and other programmes funded by the recently introduced water quality targeted rate).

Changes to service provision of three waters

We strongly support the government’s bottom line that three waters assets will remain in public ownership.

We appreciate the significant challenges facing some parts of the country in providing for and managing water. While we support the push for better regulation, meeting higher standards will mean more costs for some local authorities around New Zealand. If the Government believes that those costs should be met with subsidies, we are strongly of the view that those should come from central government taxes. Rates and local user charges are imposed to fund outcomes in the community they are collected from and should not be used to subsidise other communities.

We recognise that the Government is also looking to address issues of staff retention and lack of capability in some regions. Auckland Council is happy to offer its expertise to other councils on a contractual basis to achieve efficiencies of scale. Watercare is currently negotiating with Waikato District Council to provide water services for the Waikato district on a commercial basis. This is still at a very early stage and would be subject to a thorough assessment of potential risks and benefits before any final decision. However, it is a model that could spread the benefits of Auckland’s scale and capability and deliver those benefits earlier and in a less disruptive way than structural change, such as amalgamation. We believe arrangements such as the above should be included as one of the service delivery options under consideration by the Government.

Stormwater

There needs to be careful consideration of whether any review of service delivery should bundle stormwater with water and wastewater. Water and wastewater are piped networks; stormwater is an open network and is more intrinsically linked with land use and transport decisions (roads are significant to stormwater because they are a major conduit into piped systems and overland flow paths). The council and Watercare are currently exploring whether there could be benefits for transferring aspects of stormwater to Watercare. We would be happy to share our findings with you when this has been completed.

Māori interests in the three waters

In Auckland there are nineteen mana whenua groups who have a high interest in the three waters. Auckland Council works with a Kaitiaki Forum who have prioritised water as a priority area of focus. We would support the Government engaging with Auckland mana whenua and Māori in this review and ensuring full consideration of their interests and impacts.

Conclusion

We look forward to seeing further details of the Government’s proposals.

Yours sincerely
Water quality targeted rate – Quarter one 2018 update

File No.: CP2018/10367

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To note a progress update on the water quality targeted rate work programmes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. In June 2018 Auckland Council introduced a new water quality improvement targeted rate. This will provide $452 million of additional investment over the next ten years into water quality outcomes.

3. These outcomes will be delivered through five key work programmes:
   - western isthmus water quality improvement programme - $361 million
   - contaminant reduction programme - $54.3 million
   - urban and rural stream rehabilitation programme - $22.6 million
   - septic tank and onsite wastewater programme - $9 million
   - safe networks programme - $5 million.

4. Significant achievements for these work programmes from the first quarter include:
   - Three major projects are currently on track to upgrade stormwater infrastructure in preparation for the America’s Cup. These are the St Mary’s Bay and Masefield Beach project, Daldy Street outfall and Picton Street separation.
   - The St Mary’s Bay and Masefield Beach water quality improvement project is well underway, with resource consent hearings completed in September 2018. This project will significantly reduce the frequency of overflows from the combined network at these two beaches. The project is currently on track to start construction in early 2019 and be completed by late 2020.
   - The construction consent for the Daldy Street outfall project will be lodged in early October 2018. This project will improve water quality in the Freeman’s Bay, Viaduct Harbour and Wynyard Wharf areas.
   - Detailed design for the Picton Street stormwater network extension project has been completed. This $15 million project will reduce stormwater runoff to the combined sewer network and overflow volumes from the Wynyard Wharf outfall. An application for resource consent has been lodged and the project will go to tender in October 2018. It is currently on track to be completed by November 2020.
   - Waterview - council is leading design work to separate the combined network in this area, in order to reduce overflows to the Waterview inlet. The planned construction start for the project is June 2020, with completion due by June 2022.
   - Council is working with the Tāmaki Regeneration Company on a project to install stormwater treatment devices in Glen Innes, to counteract the impact of urban development and high traffic on Omaru and Ann’s Creek. A business case has been completed to commit $1.8 million from the targeted rate to this project.
   - Council and Watercare have been undertaking significant network investigations in Northern Manukau, Takapuna and Red Beach to trace sources of faecal contamination in the stormwater network and identify solutions to these issues.

5. Maps showing safe network investigations and current or potential healthy waters capital works projects that will contribute to water quality outcomes are provided in Attachment A.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) note the update on the water quality targeted rate work programmes.

Horopaki / Context

6. Auckland’s harbours, beaches and streams are being polluted by overflows from ageing sewerage and stormwater systems that cannot cope with heavy rainfall and from contaminants washed into natural waterways.

7. Aucklanders want to improve our infrastructure to address this problem but under the council’s previous budgets this would have taken 30 years to achieve.

8. Auckland Council’s introduction of the new water quality improvement targeted rate in June 2018 will provide an additional $452 million of funding to address these issues. Watercare will also invest a further $404 million from user charges, over the same period.

9. This extra funding will allow significantly more infrastructure upgrades and other water quality improvement projects to speed up delivery of cleaner harbours, beaches and streams within ten years.

10. The overarching goals of the water quality targeted rate investment are to:

- reduce wastewater overflows into the Waitematā Harbour
- reduce stormwater volumes into the Manukau Harbour
- reduce contaminants (such as litter, sediments, metals and oils) in stormwater across the region and in the South Kaipara Harbour
- improve water quality, from the perspectives of public health and ecology.

11. Over time, the targeted rate work programmes will also reduce Safeswim non-compliance public health warnings at our recreational beaches across urban Auckland. Reducing pollution of our beaches will improve their amenity value and mean Aucklanders can swim safely there.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

12. Implementation of the water quality improvement targeted rate will be achieved through five work programmes.

13. The budget, key objectives of each work programme and some highlights from the first three months of the financial year are briefly summarised in Table One below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work programme – objectives and highlights</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Isthmus water quality improvement programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Key objective:</em> The primary benefit of this work will be to reduce waste water overflows into Waitematā Harbour and reduce stormwater volumes into Manukau Harbour. The project will reduce offensive beach litter, remove permanent closure of Meola Reef and Cox’s Beach and reduce other intermittent beach closures in this area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This workstream is being delivered in partnership with Watercare who will provide $452 million of additional funding for infrastructure upgrades. These upgrades will enable Watercare to reach their targets for the frequency and volume of wastewater spills per annum. They will also contribute to the Unitary Plan’s objectives of improving the health of receiving environments (i.e., harbours and other waterbodies).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten years: $361 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/2019: $18.3m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core deliverables for this programme include:

- construct a new 4.5 metre diameter tunnel from the Central Interceptor termination point at Western Springs through to Grey Lynn
- construct new wastewater infrastructure to enable growth
- construct new stormwater enhancements, including separation of existing combined networks and the construction of strategic consolidated outfalls.

Highlights:

- **St Mary’s Bay and Masefield Beach improvement project.** This project will significantly reduce the frequency of overflows from the combined network at these two beaches. The resource consent for construction for the project has been publicly notified and the hearings were completed in September 2018. A decision is expected in early November 2018. Procurement is also underway, with the project currently on track to start construction in early 2019 to be completed by late 2020.

- **Daldy Street outfall.** This project will relocate the existing outfall at Daldy Street to the end of Brigman Street. This will directly improve water quality in the Wynyard Basin and significantly reduce the closure events at the nearby designated Safeswim site in the Viaduct Harbour. Stage two of the project involves looking at stormwater treatment options, such as catch pit filters and raingardens throughout the Freemans Bay catchment. The project will be delivered by the America’s Cup 36 alliance. The construction consent for the project will be lodged in early October 2018.

- **Picton Street stormwater network extension project.** This $15 million project will construct new separate stormwater and wastewater networks, where a combined area currently operates. This will reduce stormwater runoff to the wastewater network and overflow volumes to the Wynyard Wharf outfall. A detailed design report is complete, and consultation has been undertaken with the local community and mana whenua. An application for resource consent has been lodged and the project has gone for tender, with the contract likely to be awarded before January 2019. Completion of the works is expected by November 2020.

- **Waterview separation works:** Healthy Waters is leading design work in Waterview to extend and upgrade the existing stormwater network and outfalls to Waterview Inlet, in order to separate the currently combined drainage network. Planned construction start for Waterview at this stage is June 2020, with completion by June 2022.

### Contaminant reduction programme

*Key objective:* Reduce contaminants entering waterways across the region. This programme will reduce the amount of litter, sediment and road pollutants entering waterways.

In rural areas, the primary focus will be on sediment reduction by reducing streambank erosion. Approximately $15 million over ten years is allocated to address sediment in Kaipara, a predominantly rural area where water quality is affected by agriculture and forestry.

In urban areas, the focus of the programme will be on the capture of both gross pollutants (i.e. litter) and the multiple contaminants from heavily trafficked roads.

| Ten years: | $54 m |
| 2018/2019: | $4m |
Highlights:
- Auckland Council has entered into an agreement with the Ministry for the Environment to jointly fund the Hōteo Sediment Reduction Project. This project includes representatives from mana whenua, community, private landowners and business. It is a five-year project to trial a range of management solutions to stabilise stream banks and reduce sediment loads into the Kaipara Harbour. This project is not funded through the rate but it is expected to provide insights for future targeted rate-funded projects in this area.
- A regional modelling tool is being developed to identify the highest areas of contamination across the region, and from this information target ‘hotspots’. The first draft list of high priority areas will be complete in November 2018. However, the tool will take several years to develop full capability, as it will need to analyse 20,500 km of waterways across 230 catchments.
- Healthy Waters and the Tāmaki Regeneration Company have identified a project to retrofit stormwater treatment devices in Glen Innes. It will be delivered as part of a partner funding arrangement, of which $1.8 million will come from the targeted rate.

Urban and rural stream rehabilitation projects
Key objective: Improve ecological health of streams and reduce flow of contaminants into harbours. In particular, this programme will reduce and manage streambank erosion across the region.

Highlights:
- A tool is being developed to analyse erosion risk and test where sedimentation is occurring and the ability of natural stream beds to cope with this. It will be used to predict the best places for urban growth for the least impact on water quality.
- Local stream rehabilitation projects are also being developed in collaboration with community organisations. Regional programmes that are currently being scoped for local delivery include:
  - Wai Care: water quality monitoring, education and action programme for community groups.
  - Whitebait Habitat Restoration: A partnership with the Whitebait Connection to locate and where feasible enhance inanga spawning habitat across the region.
  - Million Metres: Partnership with Million Metres to crowdfund and coordinate community riparian tree planting at specific sites.
  - Ngaroto Lakes Groundwater Model: Investigation to understand how water enters the lakes to enable communities to target their interventions.
  - Small Building Sites Sediment Control: A behaviour change initiative aimed at reducing sediment from small building sites entering waterways.
  - Fonterra Partnership: Partnership with Fonterra to support their 50 Catchments campaign.
  - Regional Litter Programme: A regional approach to preventing litter from entering waterways.
- Local boards were consulted on potential water quality improvements projects to be delivered in their areas in September and October 2018, some of which are targeted rate funded. Their feedback on these will be taken into account before final projects to be delivered in each area are confirmed.
Septic tanks and onsite wastewater systems

Key objective: Develop a compliance programme to ensure wastewater systems are regularly inspected and maintained to reduce the amount of wastewater entering our waterways.

Highlights:

- A regionally consistent compliance programme for on-site wastewater systems across Auckland is being developed. This will improve the maintenance and operation of systems, by requiring property owners to regularly provide documentation that their systems have been inspected and maintained.

- A review of the septic tank pump-out service operating in the legacy Waitakere City Council area is underway, to consider whether it is still fit for purpose. To date the review has identified that the septic tank pumpout service does not appear to be achieving desired outcomes, as water quality has not improved in areas where it is operating and in some places is getting worse.

- The views of the impacted local boards (Henderson-Massey, Upper Harbour and Waitākere Ranges) are being sought in October 2018 on a proposal to consult in the Annual Plan 2019/2020 on ending the septic tank pumpout service and associated targeted rate.

Ten years: $9 m
2018/2019: $0.5m

Safe Networks

Key objective: Investigate and eliminate the sources of wastewater and other faecal contamination of discharges from stormwater networks and watercourses, which cause increased public health risk at the region’s beaches.

Examples of sources include illegal private wastewater connections to the stormwater system, unidentified wastewater overflows, broken infrastructure, and neglected drain maintenance at private properties.

Highlights:

- Council’s existing safe networks programme has been scaled up to reduce public health risks at beaches that are monitored by Safeswim. This will be achieved by investigating and reducing the sources of contaminated discharges entering stormwater drainage systems. Examples of sources can range from illegal wastewater pipes connected to the stormwater system, broken infrastructure and neglected drain maintenance at private properties. Over time the programme will reduce Safeswim non-compliance alerts and improve the amenity value of recreational beaches across the Auckland region.

- In addition to the extensive sampling programme underway for Safeswim, safe networks investigations have made significant progress during the 2018 winter around the areas of Glen Innes, Takapuna, Red Beach and along some of the northern Manukau beaches. The investigations have included a combination of water sampling, smoke testing, dye testing, closed circuit television (CCTV) and manual inspections to identify location-specific problems that contribute to the stormwater contamination. This information will enable the council and Watercare to develop solutions to make these beaches safer for swimming.

Ten years: $5 m
2018/2019: $0.3m
14. Two of the programmes described above will be delivered jointly by Auckland Council’s Healthy Waters team and Watercare. These are:
   - the western isthmus water quality improvement programme, which will involve significant collaboration to reduce wastewater overflows and the safe networks work programme, and the
   - safe networks programme which involves investigations and remediation of both the stormwater and wastewater networks to reduce bacterial contamination. This programme is run by Healthy Waters but will work collaboratively with Watercare’s inflow and infiltration programme, which has similar goals.

15. The other three programmes will be primarily delivered by Auckland Council’s Healthy Waters departments.

16. In summary, delivery of the five work programmes is well underway, with significant progress towards delivering a number of major infrastructure projects in the first quarter of 2018/2019.

17. Maps showing safe network investigations, current and proposed healthy waters capital works projects that will contribute to water quality outcomes are provided in Attachment A.

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

18. Local boards provided formal feedback on the water quality targeted rate through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 consultation process. Overall, this feedback showed strong support, with 16 local boards fully supporting introduction of the rate. While some of the remaining local boards did not support the funding mechanism, almost all expressed support for the desired water quality outcomes identified through the consultation.

19. A strong theme in local board feedback was the desire to be involved in development of the detailed work programmes for implementing the water quality targeted rate. In response to this feedback, staff have held workshops with all local boards from September to October 2018 on the water quality improvement targeted rate work programmes.

20. At these workshops, local boards have been presented with a list of potential water quality improvement projects to be delivered in their area through the targeted rate (see maps in Attachment A). Local boards have also provided informal feedback on priorities for their area. In general, key themes arising from local board feedback include:
   - Concerns relating to the impact of growth on waterways, particularly sediment run-off from development.
   - Support for local stream restoration projects in their board area.
   - Concerns relating to wastewater overflows at popular recreational beaches and a desire to see these urgently resolved.

21. Staff will review this feedback and use it to shape the programme of local projects that will be delivered through the water quality targeted rate work programmes.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

22. During consultation on the Long-term Plan 2018-2028, the council sought formal feedback from mana whenua on the water quality improvement targeted rate. 10 iwi made submissions which commented specifically on the rate. Nine of out ten iwi supported the rate and one iwi (Ngāti te Ahiwaru – Waiohua) expressed conditional support.

23. A clear theme in all submissions was the expectation that council should work in partnership with mana whenua as kaitiaki to implement the water quality targeted rate.

24. Building and maintaining respectful relationships and partnerships with Māori, including valuing mātauranga Māori (traditional Māori knowledge, wisdom and understanding) are key principles of the water quality improvement targeted rate work programmes.
25. As such, staff are carrying out engagement with mana whenua on each of the major projects to be delivered through the water quality targeted rate.

26. For example, iwi have been involved in extensive consultation on the St Mary’s Bay and Masefield Beach water quality improvement programme since its inception through a formal mana whenua Project Working Group. This approach has resulted in the design of the project being consistent with mana whenua aspirations and iwi support for the Resource Consent application.

27. The Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Governance Forum have also been contacted regarding the level of oversight they would like to have of implementation of the water quality targeted rate work programmes. They have indicated that at this stage they are comfortable with consultation taking place at an operational level on specific water quality projects.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

28. The budget expenditure on the targeted rate has been phased as shown in Table Two across the five work programmes.

Table Two. Phased budget across water quality targeted rate work programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Programme</th>
<th>Year One 2018/2019</th>
<th>Year Two 2019/2020</th>
<th>Year Two 2020/2021</th>
<th>Years 4 to 10 2021/2022 to 2027/2028</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western isthmus programme</td>
<td>$18,288</td>
<td>$28,169</td>
<td>$32,714</td>
<td>$281,746</td>
<td>$360,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contaminant reduction</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$39,750</td>
<td>$54,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and rural streams</td>
<td>$2,063</td>
<td>$2,233</td>
<td>$1,805</td>
<td>$16,208</td>
<td>$22,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe networks</td>
<td>$509</td>
<td>$519</td>
<td>$529</td>
<td>$4,012</td>
<td>$5,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic tanks and onsite wastewater</td>
<td>$305</td>
<td>$311</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>$8,320</td>
<td>$9,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,165</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,232</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,971</strong></td>
<td><strong>$350,036</strong></td>
<td><strong>$452,405</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. In the first three months of 2018/2019 approximately $1.9 million has been spent on delivery of water quality improvement targeted rate work programmes. This is slightly ahead of phased expenditure for this time period of $1.7 million.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

30. Some key risks that have been identified to successful delivery of the water quality targeted rate are identified below, along with proposed mitigations.

Table Two. Risks and proposed mitigations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful achievement of water quality targeted rate outcomes requires collaboration between Auckland Council, Watercare and other members of the council family.</td>
<td>Auckland Council is working closely with Watercare to progress delivery of water quality targeted rate projects, particularly the western isthmus and safe networks work programmes. Healthy Waters department is also collaborating with Auckland Transport, Panuku and other parts of the council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compressed timeline for delivery of major infrastructure projects before the America’s Cup creates a risk that projects may not be completed by late 2020. In particular, regulatory and consenting processes may cause delays to project delivery.

Council is prioritising delivery of these infrastructure projects. Design, consenting and procurement processes are being progressed with urgency. However, some regulatory processes may still cause delays.

Limited contractor capacity to deliver major capital works projects.

Early engagement with contractors and use of strategic procurement approach to encourage participation in tenders. Procurement of some works will be bundled together to reduce barriers to tendering and give certainty of supply.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

31. As outlined above, some of the top priorities in 2018/2019 will be to:

- Progress delivery of key infrastructure upgrades project, such as the St Mary’s Bay and Masefield Beach, Picton Street separation and Daldy Street outfall projects, with an aim of completing these before the America’s Cup.

- Continue engagement with local boards and community groups to confirm programme of local water restoration projects that will be delivered across the region.

- Continue investigations through the safe networks programme to identify sources of pollution at popular recreational swimming beaches and resolve these.

32. The next update on the water quality targeted rate will be provided in February 2019.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Healthy Waters Investment Maps - Capital Works Programme and 18/19 Safe Networks Programme</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craig Mcllroy – General Manager Healthy Waters</td>
<td>Barry Potter - Director Infrastructure and Environmental Services Dean Kimpton - Chief Operating Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To receive a progress update on the natural environment targeted rate work programmes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. In July 2018 Auckland Council introduced a new natural environment targeted rate. This will provide $311 million of additional investment into environmental outcomes over ten years.
3. An implementation plan for the targeted rate, comprising ten work programmes, has been developed. These programmes cover areas such as kauri dieback management, protecting our parks and expanding community conservation action.
4. Key outcomes and deliverables for each work programme are shown in Attachment A. Maps showing some recent activities and currently planned work for 2018/2019 are provided in Attachment B.
5. An update on progress to date over the first three months (July to September 2018 inclusive) is provided below. Significant achievements include:
   - Expanded kauri dieback control work outside our two largest regional parks (Waitākere Ranges and Hunua) to our local community parks. In consultation with Kaipātiki Local Board, 13 tracks in local parks have been closed in this area. Part of Clevedon Scenic Reserve has also been closed to protect a significant stand of Kauri. These will be re-opened once they have been upgraded to a sufficient standard.
   - Track upgrade design work in the Waitākere Ranges so that closed tracks can reach kauri safe standards and be opened. Staff are working closely with Te Kawerau ā Maki to agree track standards required prior to re-opening tracks.
   - An expanded round of aerial application of 1080 in the Hunua ranges and adjoining privately owned and Department of Conservation land. This key project will protect endangered bird species, such as kōkako, during the spring breeding season.
   - The launch of Te Korowai o Waiheke on 16 September 2018. This is an ambitious project with a vision of eradicating mammalian pests from Waiheke. The project is a community-led initiative with targeted rate investment from council of $2.6 million (over a seven year period) and significant additional funding from Predator Free 2050 and Foundation North.
   - Council’s annual Pestival and inaugural Mayoral Conservation Awards were both held during Conservation week in September 2018. The Festival was attended by over 500 community groups, reflecting a significant growth in school and community group participation in conservation activities.
   - Increased investment of $200,000 per annum in the Regional Environment and Natural Heritage grant scheme to support more community conservation activity.
   - Expansion of feral deer, goat and possum control in high priority areas across the region
   - Surveying marine pests at Kaipara and Manukau harbours to fill current knowledge gaps and provide data on presence of marine pests.
6. The next update on the natural environment targeted rate will be provided in February 2019.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) note the progress update provided on the natural environment targeted rate work programmes.

Horopaki / Context

7. In June 2018 the governing body adopted Auckland Council’s ten-year budget for the period 2018-2028. This included a natural environment targeted rate which will provide $311 million of additional investment towards environmental outcomes.

8. This investment is focused on programmes to achieve Pest Free Auckland outcomes by:
   • controlling pest plants and animal species, at high priority sites on Council parks, in our harbours, Hauraki Gulf islands and high priority freshwater lakes;
   • reducing the risk of plant pathogens spreading, particularly kauri dieback;
   • supporting community groups, schools and households to take action.

9. This investment creates a significant opportunity for Auckland Council to address the ongoing and gradual decline in wellbeing of our native ecosystems and species.

10. An update on progress on implementing the natural environment targeted rate work programmes over the first three months of the financial year is provided below.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

11. Ten work programmes have been developed to implement projects funded through the natural environment targeted rate.

12. A fuller description of the key deliverables and objectives for each works programme is provided in Attachment A. Maps showing some recent activities and currently planned work for 2018/2019 are provided in Attachment B.

13. Significant achievements have been made for eight programmes during the first quarter of implementation. The budget and key outcomes for these work programmes plus highlights from the first three months of the financial year are briefly summarised in Table One below.

Table One. Key outcome and highlights of the natural environment targeted rate work programmes – Quarter one 2018/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work programme</th>
<th>Budget (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant pathogen management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key outcome:</strong> To reduce the risk of spread of plant pathogens (including kauri dieback, myrtle leaf rust and Dutch elm disease). For kauri dieback this will be achieved through upgrading the track network and hygiene stations, as well as awareness raising and monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highlights:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council is working alongside Te Kawerau ā Maki to provide continued access to parts of the Waitākere Ranges in a manner that respects the rāhui. Staff have completed track upgrade works that the winter months will allow, and are now engaging in medium to long term planning for a more strategic approach to our track network. Together with Te Kawerau ā Maki we have been working to develop best practice guidelines for track design across different forest types, to mitigate the risk of spreading kauri dieback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten years: $102 m
2018/2019: $7.5 m
The scope of kauri dieback control work has also been expanded from our two largest regional parks (Waitākere Ranges and Hunua) to our local community parks.

In consultation with Kaipātiki Local Board, 13 tracks in local parks have been closed in this area. These will be re-opened once they have been upgraded to a sufficient standard.

Part of Clevedon Scenic Reserve, which homes a significant stand of healthy kauri, has also been closed as a precautionary measure.

The next priority is to agree and implement an approach to kauri dieback across the local park network in the Waitākere, Waiheke and Upper Harbour local board areas.

Contracts for temporary compliance staff have been extended with staff being enabled to undertake a broader range of tasks.

Expanding community action

*Key outcome:* To provide a high level of support to over 600 community groups, iwi, households, landowners and schools to achieve biodiversity outcomes. Currently council provides a low level of ad hoc support to around 450 community groups.

This will be achieved by providing technical advice, funding, training, tools and networking/connections between community groups. A co-design approach is being taken to the programme to ensure council understands what the community most needs and to build ownership external to council.

*Highlights:*

- The annual Pestival was held on 15 September 2018 with 500 attendees representing the community conservation sector. The event included presentations from thought leaders, a showcase of innovations and networking for communities to share experiences, successes and challenges.

- The inaugural Mayoral Conservation Awards were held on 20 September 2018. The event recognised and valued the substantial commitment by communities and landowners around the region to restore the natural environment.

- Council is seeking expressions of interest for funding conservation activity coordinators embedded in the community at a variety of levels. This will allow conservation groups to increase their capacity and on the ground delivery in priority areas.

- A community nursery pilot project is underway to assess biosecurity preparedness and develop best practice standards for the industry.

- Over 2,500 traps and over 2,000 kg of bait, as well as other tools have been provided to support community conservation activities.

- The value of the Regional Environment and Natural Heritage grant scheme is being increased by $200,000 per annum so the fund can support more community conservation activity.

Protecting our parks

*Key outcome:* To protect 66 per cent of highest ecological value areas on regional and local parkland. The current level protected is 30 per cent.
Item 14

**Highlights:**

- The latest round of Project Hunua pest animal control through aerial application of baits containing 1080 was successfully completed in October 2018. Funding from the natural environment targeted rate enabled the scope of this existing programme to be expanded to include pest control on privately owned land adjoining to the park and Department of Conservation land. It will also fund land based pest control in buffer zone properties around the park that will occur up to December 2018.

- Pig control within the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park has been expanded to double the hunting programme.

- The Whakanewha Regional Park pest plant control programme has been expanded.

- Work is underway to expand council’s ecological restoration contracts to deliver more pest plant and animal control on significant ecological areas within local community parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Islands biosecurity</th>
<th>2018/2019: $2 m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key outcome:</strong> To either control, or where possible, eradicate plant and animal pests from Hauraki Gulf Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highlights:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Te Korowai o Waiheke was launched by Mayor Goff and the Minister of Conservation. This is an ambitious project with a vision of eradicating stoats and rats from Waiheke within seven years. It will be a world first for these mammalian predators to be eliminated from such a large and urbanised island. The project is a community-led initiative and is jointly funded by Auckland Council, Predator Free 2050 and Foundation North.

- Scope of work to contain and eradicate Argentine and Darwin’s ants from Aotea Great Barrier and Kawau has been doubled.

- Work to control rhamnus on Rakino has been significantly increased to complete eradication of the weed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region-wide biosecurity</th>
<th>2018/2019: $1.8 m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key outcome:</strong> To control priority pest plants and animals across the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highlights:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The proposed Regional Pest Management Plan is being revised based on public, local board and mana whenua feedback. The final plan will be presented to the committee for approval by March 2019. Once finalised this plan will help to further shape and enforce region-wide biosecurity activity funded under the targeted rate.

- Feral deer and goat control has been expanded from approximately 2,200 hunting hours per annum to approximately 7,000 hunting hours per annum. It will now include buffer zones around Hunua and Waitākere regional parks, Te Rau Puriri, Kawakawa Bay and Puhoi.

- The area targeted for ground based possum control has been significantly increased, with Okura, Awhitu and Tapora being targeted to increase the effectiveness of council and community programmes.
Freshwater biosecurity

*Key outcome:* To protect the region’s two highest ecological value freshwater lakes (Tomarata and Rototoa Lakes) and reduce the incidence of human-mediated spread of freshwater pests to freshwater bodies.

*Highlight:* Staff are working with NIWA, University of Waikato and Cawthron Institute to provide monitoring and collection of baseline data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten years: $6 m</th>
<th>2018/2019: $0.1 m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Marine ecology

*Key outcome:* To increase protection of marine habitats and seabird populations.

*Highlight:* Survey work is being carried out to obtain sub-tidal marine and coastal seabird habitat data to inform ecological restoration actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten years: $3.9 m</th>
<th>2018/2019: $0.3 m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Marine biosecurity

*Key outcome:* To protect threatened marine ecosystems and species from pests. This is also important to prevent the spread of marine pests during America’s Cup 36.

*Highlights:*
- Increased presence at the on-water boat show in October 2018, directly interacting with an audience of over 1,500 people to convey key marine biosecurity messages.
- Surveying marine pests at Kaipara and Manukau Harbours to fill current knowledge gaps and provide data on presence of marine pests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten years: $2.1 m</th>
<th>2018/2019: $1.0 m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. In summary, as outlined above in Table One, implementation of the natural environment targeted rate is well underway, with many positive achievements in the first quarter of 2018.

15. Two natural environment targeted rate work programmes (region-wide biodiversity and threatened species and ecosystems) are not included in the table as there has been no significant targeted rate expansions of these in this first quarter. Plans to expand work to incentivise private landowner investment in biodiversity protection are underway and will be reported in future update reports.

16. For the enabling tools work programme plans are underway to develop the spatial data management and community relationship management tools that will underpin delivery.

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

17. Local boards provided formal feedback on the natural environment targeted rate through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 consultation process. Overall, this feedback showed strong support from local boards for the natural environment targeted rate. A theme in local board feedback was the desire to be involved in development of the detailed work programme for implementing the targeted rate.

18. In response to this feedback staff are holding workshops with all local boards from September to November 2018 on the natural environment targeted rate work programme.

19. The objective of these workshops is to provide an overview of the proposed targeted rate funded work programmes and seek local board feedback on any local projects they are aware of that will meet criteria for regionally funded investment. These criteria include biodiversity value, defendable areas, gaps in wildlife corridors, significant community support and meeting multiple outcomes, such as improving both water quality and human wellbeing.

20. Once the local board feedback has been collated, investment decisions will be made based on alignment with the regional criteria outlined above.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

21. Natural environment targeted rate activities are of key significance to mana whenua in their role as kaitiaki of Auckland’s environment. During consultation on the Long-term Plan 2018-2028, 11 iwi made submissions which commented specifically on the natural environment targeted rate. Ten out of 11 iwi supported the natural environment targeted rate.

22. There was a strong theme in iwi feedback that council should work in partnership with mana whenua on the delivery of this increased investment. Iwi also stated their expectation that mana whenua will be part of the delivery of these environmental outcomes.

23. In response to this staff, have contacted the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Governance Forum to seek their guidance on what oversight they would like to have of the natural environment targeted rate work programmes.

24. Some work programmes that are being expanded through the targeted rate have also already involved significant engagement with mana whenua. For example, considerable engagement has been undertaken on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan. Key messages from mana whenua through this consultation have included:
   - the importance of building the capacity of mana whenua to directly undertake pest management in each rohe
   - acknowledgement that the council should control pests on its own land if asking public to do the same on private land
   - the need to look holistically at rohe (regions)
   - a desire to see pest control across the landscape including urban areas and all wai māori, rather than solely at highest value sites.

25. As outlined above, the council is also working closely with Te Kawerau ā Maki to provide access to the Waitākere Ranges while respecting the rāhui. As part of this we have been working to develop best practice guidelines for track design across different forest types, and to agree a schedule for track reopening, with input from the public.

26. Staff are also working closely with mana whenua on the development and implementation of a wide range of other biosecurity and biodiversity projects funded through the rate. These provide opportunities for mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga, through direct involvement in the protection of culturally significant sites and taonga species. This engagement will continue as new projects are confirmed for delivery through the targeted rate.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

27. The budget expenditure on the targeted rate has been phased as shown in Table Three across the three major work programmes and other smaller work programmes.

Table Three. Phased budget across natural environment targeted rate workstreams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work programmes</th>
<th>Year One 2018/2019</th>
<th>Year Two 2019/2020</th>
<th>Year Two 2020/2021</th>
<th>Years 4 to 10 2021/2022 to 2027/2028</th>
<th>Total (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant pathogens (including kauri dieback)</td>
<td>$7,827</td>
<td>$24,222</td>
<td>$22,864</td>
<td>$47,174</td>
<td>$102,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding community action</td>
<td>$2,203</td>
<td>$3,856</td>
<td>$3,235</td>
<td>$28,227</td>
<td>$37,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting our parks</td>
<td>$2,096</td>
<td>$4,944</td>
<td>$9,266</td>
<td>$55,408</td>
<td>$71,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other targeted rate funded work programmes</td>
<td>$5,631</td>
<td>$15,028</td>
<td>$12,558</td>
<td>$66,307</td>
<td>$99,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,050</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,923</strong></td>
<td><strong>$197,116</strong></td>
<td><strong>$310,846</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. In the first three months of 2018/2019 approximately $588,000 has been spent on delivery of natural environment targeted rate work programmes. This is consistent with phased expenditure for this time period of $562,000.

29. Expenditure in Year One (2018/2019) was originally estimated in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 to be approximately $24 million. However, contractor capacity to carry out some of the infrastructure projects included in the plant pathogen management workstream (such as track upgrades to prevent kauri dieback) is constrained.

30. The forecast expenditure on this workstream is therefore now estimated to be $6 million capex less, that is $18 million rather than $24 million in 2018/2019. The additional funds will be carried forward and spent in 2019/2020.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

31. Some key risks to successful delivery of the natural environment targeted rate funded work programme are identified below, along with proposed mitigations.

**Table Three. Risks and proposed mitigations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the natural environment targeted rate work programme is dependent on participation by a range of departments across council.</td>
<td>A governance structure has been established to enable efficient implementation of the targeted rate work programme across key departments of council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful achievement of targeted rate outcomes will require coordination of work across the council family, with external partners such as Department of Conservation and input from a wide range of environmental community groups.</td>
<td>An Executive Advisory Group including key external partners and representatives from across the council family will be established. A co-design approach with external partners through the Expanding Community Action workstream will enable high levels of community participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient staff capacity to deliver a work programme that is 300 per cent larger than previous workload. Some advisor positions required are also highly specialised and may be difficult to recruit in current market.</td>
<td>An initial phase of recruitment is underway to provide increased capacity in the short-term. Recruitment strategy includes targeted use of specialist technical networks to address lack of market capacity in some areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market capacity to provide capital works (such as track upgrades) required for implementation of the natural targeted rate work programme is limited.</td>
<td>Staff are developing best practice standards and procedures to build capability of contractors to deliver these works. Council will be providing training and auditing of contractors to ensure market capability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

32. Staff will continue to deliver those environmental programmes that can be immediately expanded, while also completing the detailed design for new work programmes including our pest control work on our mainland parks, plus Auckland’s islands and harbours.

33. Most importantly, the council will be enhancing our support for the growing (estimated now up to 1,700 groups versus 700 a year ago) number of community groups leading conservation work across the region.
34. The key next steps for delivery of individual work programmes are listed below:

- Continued track upgrades and installation of phytosanitary stations in Waitakere Ranges and Hunua Regional Parks.
- Finalising the Regional Pest Management Plan by March 2019.
- Significant increases in the ecological restoration contracts to achieve best practice pest management in high ecological value Auckland Council parks.
- Increase in Pest Free Warrant holders and increased inspections of high risk vessels and vehicles going to the Hauraki Gulf Islands.
- Focused pest control work on Aotea Great Barrier and Kawau Islands, such as working with the Department of Conservation on Aotea to achieve plague skink eradication.

35. The next update on progress in implementing the natural environment targeted rate work programme will be provided to Environment and Community Committee in February 2019.
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Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mara Bebich – Stakeholder Manager, Infrastructure &amp; Environmental Services</td>
<td>Gael Ogilvie - General Manager Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Authorisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Potter - Director Infrastructure and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Dean Kimpton - Chief Operating Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment A. Key objectives and deliverables for natural environment targeted rate work programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Plant pathogen management**  | Kauri dieback — maintain and control kauri dieback-free areas, significantly reduce the rate of spread of kauri dieback, reduce the impact of the disease in infected areas  
Dutch elm disease — control Dutch elm disease to prevent adverse effects on economic well-being, human health and enjoyment of the natural environment                                                                                   | • Approximately 190km of track upgrades, to reduce risk of kauri dieback  
• 300 plus phytosanitary stations installed and maintained to reduce risk of kauri dieback  
• 12 vehicle washdown stations installed and maintained to reduce risk of kauri dieback and other pest plants and pathogens  
• Kauri dieback ambassadors and compliance staff  
• Disease distribution mapping and tracking of plant pathogens over time across whole region, including data collection via aerial survey, ground-truthing, soil sampling on private land, and associated data management  
• Awareness and behaviour change campaigns in relation to plant pathogens, including signage, events, schools, electronic platforms including Facebook and website, hard copy collateral such as brochures  
• Development of enhanced regulatory programmes through implementation of Regional Pest Management Plan provisions  
• Support to landowners for kauri protection (and potentially other pathogens) on private land via resourcing such as phytosanitary supplies, tree falling, fencing  
• Driving industry phytosanitary best practice, through nursery accreditation scheme, SOPs  
• Membership of multi-agency programmes. Co-facilitation of research projects including social science, epidemiology and control tools. |
| **Protecting our parks**       | Protect 66% of highest ecological value area on regional and local parkland by expanding the existing General Rates funded work programme to control priority pest plants and animals in and around parkland                                                                                       | • Best practice control of > 30 pest plant species on and around 66% of high ecological value council parkland.  
• Best practice control of seven priority pest animal species on 66% of high ecological value council parkland.  
• Best practice control of feral pigs in managed park sites to reduce the risk of kauri dieback spread.  
• Targeted education, behaviour change and enforcement campaigns on surrounding private properties to reduce pest reinvasion of parks.  
• Increased populations of priority indigenous species.  
• Improved condition of indigenous ecosystems. |
| **Expanding community action** | Supporting community groups, iwi, households, landowners and schools to achieve and amplify biodiversity outcomes for the region                                                                                                                                             | • Working with the community to identify, manage and enhance landscape ecological connections to provide safe, healthy and linked habitats.  
• Enabling and developing capacity and co-ordination within the community through a toolbox of mechanisms so the community can act and influence more directly.  
• Developing and implementing funding tools (including an innovation grant) to remove barriers, stimulate new thinking; facilitate best-practice conservation action across community and land tenure types and deliver Focus Area management on private land.  
• Providing direct support to the conservation community in the form of advice, training and tools.  
• Council and community working together and the use of behaviour change principles to share and amplify the Auckland conservation story and key messages.  
• Council and business working together to develop and implement a ‘green credential’ that supports a broad application of ‘Pest Free Auckland’.  
• Increased eco-literacy of Aucklanders.  
• Increased populations of priority indigenous species.  
• Improved condition of indigenous ecosystems. |
| **Islands, biosecurity**       | Eradicate significant plant and animal pests from priority Hauraki Gulf islands                                                                                                                                                                                                    | • Protect priority native ecosystems and threatened species, and other parts of the Hauraki Gulf from pest impacts.  
• Expand the protection of the Hauraki Gulf Island Controlled Area from pests, thereby avoiding economic, recreational and ecological costs.  
• Expanding biosecurity education and behavioural programmes for the Hauraki Gulf.  
• Undertake to eradicate pests from Waiheke, Kawau and Aotea Great Barrier Islands with community support. |
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| Marine biosecurity | Protect a representative range of Auckland’s marine ecosystems types and threatened species, and also gives effect to aspects of SeaChange – Tai Timu Tai Pari | - Minimise the number of new to the region infestations from marine pests already established elsewhere in the country.
- Minimise human-mediated spread of marine pests already present within the region.
- Reduce the threat of marine pests to our marine environment and biodiversity.
- Maintain reputational integrity and continue to lead in regional marine biosecurity, for the North Island collectively with our neighbouring regions through the Top of the North marine biosecurity partnership. |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Marine ecological health | Improve representation of marine habitats in Significant Ecological Area protection. Increase the knowledge and understanding of seabird habitat utilisation to underpin management strategies to protect and restore seabird populations. | - Review important species and habitats and their threats and vulnerabilities, approaches to implementing Significant Ecological Areas nationally, and existing Significant Ecological Area layer to identify gaps.
- Survey target locations and habitats.
- Prioritise habitats and locations for protection.
- Protect habitats through a plan change scheduling new Significant Ecological Area - Marine areas.
- Assess seabird populations and breeding health data.
- Survey habitat on Hauraki Gulf Islands and identify potential restoration sites.
- Develop and trial of seabird restoration techniques.
- Inform implementation of restoration actions. |
| Freshwater biosecurity | Reduce the incidence of human-mediated spread of freshwater pests to new waterbodies. Manage freshwater pest plants and fish at two high priority lakes. | - Adaptive management of five pest fish species and two pest plant species at two lakes: Tomarata and Rototoa.
- Awareness and behaviour change campaign, including signage, events, electronic and other media channels, hard copy collateral such as brochures. |
| Region-wide biosecurity | Control priority pest plants and animals across the region | - Pest animals across the region are controlled, including feral deer, goats, pigs, cockatoos, rabbits, wallabies, possums and unowned cats;
- Pest plants across the region are controlled, including low incidence pest plants, and agricultural pest plants; and
- Trade regulations are in place with industry including nurseries and pet traders. |
| Region-wide biodiversity | Auckland’s biodiversity is flourishing and treasured | >42 species are actively managed with no risk of regional extinction;
A representative range of ecosystems are actively managed with no risk of regional extinction; and
Priority species and ecosystems have management plans in place. |
| Enabling tools | Data is transparent and accessible for increased operational efficiencies, and to enable quality advice and support to elected members | - We have transparent and streamlined reporting mechanisms in place on the current state and impact of natural environment targeted rate work programmes to ensure we are maximising the efficacy of investment;
- Biodatabase developed with legacy programmes discontinued;
- Community relationship management system developed; and
- Digital portal to streamline access and dissemination of data developed. |
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Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To update the Environment and Community Committee on progress since Auckland joined the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) Creative City Network as a designated City of Music.

2. Members of the Auckland City of Music steering group will be in attendance and present their update.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the update presentation and thank the members of the Auckland City of Music steering group for their attendance.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Williams – Head of Creative Strategy, Arts and Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Richard McWha - Manager Arts &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Kimpton - Chief Operating Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 11 September 2018.
3. To be informed of the *Waitakere Ranges Programme – Six month update report* that was considered by Waitākere Ranges Local Board at its meeting held on 13 September 2018 where it was resolved that the report and its attachments be provided as an information memorandum to the Environment and Community Committee and the Whau Local Board. The *report and attachments* are available on the Auckland Council website at this link: [http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/](http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/)

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
4. This is a 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.
5. The following papers/memos were circulated to members:
   - 20181001_Global Activity Memo – October 2018
   - 20180907_Memo update on the Te Korowai o Waiheke project
   - 20180912_Workshop re: Proactive approach to council’s investment in golf is available on OurAuckland

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.

6. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: [http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/](http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/)
   - at the top of the page, select meeting “Environment and Community Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
   - under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled “Extra Attachments”.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:
a) receive the Environment and Community Committee information report – 11 September 2018.
### Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
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<td>Forward work programme</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20181001_Global Activity memo - October 2018 (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20180907_Memo update on the Te Korowai o Waiheke project (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20180912_Workshop: proactive approach to council's investment in golf (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Committee Priorities:

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategic approach to Climate Change** | To demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce emissions. | **Strategic direction** will be provided in the coming months.  
**Progress to date:**  
A summary of activities to prepare for climate change was given in the presentation on 8/8/17 meeting.  
Report was considered on 20/2/18, resolution ENV/2018/11  
Dec 18 – approval for consultation  
Feb – Mar 19 - targeted public engagement  
Apr 19 – feedback presented to elected members  
Jun 19 – final strategy for adoption | Jan-Mar 2018  
20 Feb  
13 March  
Apr-Jun 2018  
10 April  
8 May  
12 June  
Jul-Sep 2018  
10 July  
14 Aug  
11 Sept  
Oct-Dec 2018  
16 Oct  
13 Nov  
4 Dec |
| **Low carbon living**         | 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. | **Strategic direction and endorse** programmes as part of the Low Carbon Auckland Plan implementation.  
**Progress to date:**  
Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group (IAG) was approved. Chairs Planning and Env & Community Ctees, an IMSB member and the Mayor’s office to decide on the membership of the IAG. | Q3 (Feb)  
Q4  
Q1 (Sept)  
Q2 (Dec) |
| **Low Carbon Auckland / Climate Change Mitigation** | 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 Climate Plan Workshop: | **Decision and endorsement** of strategic direction  
**Progress to date:**  
Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group (IAG) was approved. Chairs Planning and Env & Community Ctees, an IMSB member and the Mayor’s office to decide on the membership of the IAG. | Q3 (Feb)  
Q4  
Q1  
Q2 (Dec) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 16</th>
<th>Attachment A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risks and vulnerabilities (June)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decision on strategic direction and endorsement of strategy.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Committee workshop on risks and vulnerabilities | **Progress to date:**  
| • Communication strategy for broader public engagement | A workshop was held on 14/06/17. Report was considered on 12/09/17 [ENV/2017/116](#). A full draft of the strategy was considered 20/02/18, res ENV/2018/12 with a report back on the results of the LiDAR and an implementation plan on costs and benefits in Aug 2018. An update was included in the [14 Aug agenda](#) regarding several workstreams covered by the 18 high level implementation actions. A report on full progress implementing the strategy will be in August 2019. |
| • Local Board workshops | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q1** (Aug19) | **Q2** |
| • Mana whenua engagement (integrated throughout) | **Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund** | **Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation** | **Progress to date:** Decision: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17. |
| • Stakeholder workshops | **and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year.** | | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q1** | **Q2** |
| Prioritisation criteria and identified actions (Jul/Aug) | **Progress to date:** Decision: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17. | | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q1** | **Q2** |
| • Cost benefit and total value analysis | **Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund** | **Decision making over medium and large funds from the** | | | | |
| • Agree prioritisation criteria | **Progress to date:** Decision: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17. | **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.** | | | | |
| • Review all actions | | **Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation** | | | | |
| • Draft plan | | **and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year.** | | | | |
| • Draft plan to committee (Dec 2018) | | **Progress to date:** Decision: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17. | | | | |
| • Consultation (linking to other plans, approach tbc) | | | | | | |
| • Updates to action plan | | | | | | |
| • Adoption of updated plan by council (Proposed December 2018) | | | | | | |
| • Final Adoption of Climate Plan (Mar 09) | | | | | | |
| Group was approved. | | | | | | |
| Workshops scheduled: 4/7/18 and 26/09/18. An update was on 12/06/18 meeting agenda. | | | | | | |
| Urban Forest Strategy | **Auckland’s water strategy** | **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.** | | | | |
| 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. | 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. | | | | | |
| | **Progress to date:** A report was considered on 12/06/18 to approve the proposed scope, timeframe and budget for the development of the strategy. Res [ENV/2018/79](#). | | | | | |
| | **Key milestones:**  
<p>| | • June 2018 – develop a strategic summary of water related outcomes, identify integrated water outcomes, | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Regional Pest Management Plan review** | July-Oct 2018 – high level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes – consultation with mana whenua | 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. **Progress to date:** Decision: Agreed to the inconsistencies in ACT at the 14 Feb 2017 ENV/2017/7 Item 12 Workshops held on 4/04/17, 3/05/17 and 27/09/17 Draft plan was approved for consultation in Nov 2017 Funding for implementation of the proposed RPMP through LTP. A memo was distributed and is attached to the July agenda. Key milestones:  
- workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018  
- workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018  
- engagement with mana whenua – September – October 2018  
- workshop with Environment and Community Committee – October – November 2018  
- formal feedback from local boards at business meetings – October – November 2018  
- approval of final plan by Environment and Community Committee – March 2019 |
| **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. | Decision on the development of the discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan for public consultation. **Progress to date:** A memo was distributed on 31/05/18 advising the committee on the Auckland Council’s participation in the development of a discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan, through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity partnership.|
| **Allocation of the Regional Natural Heritage Grant** | Decision-making over regional environment fund as per the grants funding policy and fund guidelines | Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year. **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

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.

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

#### 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


A report was considered on 26/6/18; Res ENV/2018/78

- June 2018: develop strategy
- July to Oct 2018 – High level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes in consultation with mana whenua, local boards and key stakeholders.
- Dec 2018: Draft Auckland's waters strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for approval for release for public consultation
- Feb to Apr 2019 - Targeted public engagement on the draft Auckland's waters strategy in February to March 2019.
- Apr 2019 - Feedback analysed and presented to elected members in April 2019
- Jun 2019 - Final strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for adoption

### Food Policy Alliance

To consider food policy alliance

**Decision** on food policy alliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2 (Dec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Auckland Growing Greener


Consideration of items to give effect to the adopted commitment of Auckland Council to grow greener.

**Strategic direction** and oversight into council’s role to improve the natural environment, and to endorse proposed incentives.

This may include **endorsing**:
- a framework to ensure planning and growth decisions are underpinned by relevant environmental data
- proposed incentives for green growth
- recommendations arising from a current state statutory obligations review.

### Hunua Aerial 1080 Operation

Provide information on outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation

To note outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2 (Nov)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Parks, Sports and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Parks, Sports and Recreation Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sport and Rec Strategic Partnership Grant to Aktive Auckland Sports Rec** | Approval of $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport & Recreation to deliver on agreed priority initiatives. To approve the $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport & Recreation for 2017/2018  
**Progress to date:**  
Report was considered 5/12/17 Resolution ENV/2017/186 – report back against KPI every six months.  
A report was considered on 10 July 2018 to approve the strategic partnership grant of $552,000 per annum for a three-year term (2018-2021) Res ENV/2018/90  
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. (TBA) |
| **Te Motu a Hiaroa (Puketutu Island)** | Status update on the Te Motu a Hiaroa Governance Trust  
To note further update on progress of the governance trust. |
| **Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan** | Status report on implementation plan  
**Direction** on future options for sport and recreation. |
| **Sports Investment Plan** | Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports  
**Decision** on issues papers  
Draft Plan approval  
Finalise and adopt investment plan – approval of guidelines  
**Progress to date:**  
Evaluation of current sports facilities investments and proposed changes was adopted on 14 March, resolution ENV/2017/39 Item 13 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. |
| **Golf Investment Plan** | Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in golf.  
**Decision** on issues papers  
Draft Plan approval  
Finalise and adopt investment plan  
**Progress to date:**  
A workshop was held on 12 Sept and information is available on OurAuckland. |
| **Indoor Courts** | Strategic business case for indoor courts investment  
**Decision** on investment approach |
| **Western Springs Community School** | Improve Community Access to school facilities  
**Decision** on Business and Investment in indoor court facility at Western Springs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 16</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td>The report was considered in May. Resolution ENV/2017/71. 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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Programme</th>
<th>Update on proposed growth funding allocation for 2018-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on growth funding allocation</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Sport and Recreation grants programme 2018/2020</th>
<th>Review of previous grants allocation and recommendation for next round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on sport and recreation grants programme objectives and approach</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (May19) Q1 (Sep)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012: TOR</th>
<th>The review will assess the efficacy of the guidelines in for the council to deliver the best possible outcomes for Auckland through community leases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on the terms of reference for the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Nov)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Recreation Investment and Visitor Experience</th>
<th>Council’s strategic approach to outcome, priorities and investment for active walking, cycling, waterways and visitor experience on open space, parks and regional parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on scope and phasing</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Aug) Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Takaro – Investing in Play discussion document</th>
<th>Development of a play investment plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on approval for public release</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Oct) Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Parks Management Plan 2010 –</th>
<th>To approve variation to incorporate land purchased at Piha to be known as Taitomo Special Management Zone as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on approval to a variation</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Environment and Community Committee information - updates, memos and briefings - 16 October 2018**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Decision on scope/addressing homelessness</th>
<th>Funding/Investment Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Variation to incorporate land at Piha into the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td>Approved 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>(tbc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Southern Initiative (TSI)</td>
<td>Provide an update on the TSI approach, priorities and achievements.</td>
<td>Strategic direction of the TSI approach to social and community innovation in south Auckland</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Engagement Strategy</td>
<td>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. Funded</td>
<td>Strategic direction of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options to expand revenue streams for sport facilities investment</td>
<td>Provide strategic direction to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft Sports Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td>strategic direction to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft Sports Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SOCIAL, COMMUNITY, CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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. A progress report was considered on 14 March. Resolution ENV/2017/36 Item 11 to report back on an indicative business case for investment in the central-west area.</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar)</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 co-ordinated approach to its sports facilities investment.</td>
<td>Decision on the Auckland Sport Sector : Facility Priorities Plan. Decision on sector’s investment priorities and investigate potential funding options.</td>
<td>Q1 (Sept)</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 role and direction addressing homelessness. A report was considered in Aug. Res ENV/2017/121</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb)</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Attachments A</td>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>Facilities Partnerships Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments A</td>
<td>Item 16</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments A</td>
<td>Item 16</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments A</td>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Intervention</td>
<td>Understanding NZ and international interventions to address affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments A</td>
<td>Item 16</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments A</td>
<td>Item 16</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments A</td>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Work around the integration with customer services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investing in Aucklanders</td>
<td>Identify issues and opportunities for an inclusive friendly city (Regional Policy and Strategy resolution REG/2016/92)</td>
<td>Strategic direction on the approach to a friendly, inclusive, diverse city.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Age Friendly City)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Enterprise approaches for youth and long term unemployed</td>
<td>Improved understanding of social enterprise reach, impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on councils approach to social enterprise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events Policy</td>
<td>A review of what is working well and what isn’t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant Policy Monitoring</td>
<td>Audit of the application of the Grants Policy</td>
<td>Decision on audit results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toi Whitiki Strategy</td>
<td>Targeted analysis of social return on investment on specific art and culture investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Art Policy</td>
<td>Review of the Public Arts Policy: what’s working what’s not. Decisions relating to major public arts</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td>Progress to date: The report was considered on 14/08/18. Resolution ENV/2018/103 report back on implementation within 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Development Contribution revenue and expenditure – funding for open space purposes</td>
<td>Highlight the new parks and open spaces for Aucklanders’ use and enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
<td>A report was considered on 14/08/178 on Open Space acquisition in 2017/18 financial year. resolution ENV/2018/104 to report back on DC revenue and expenditure by funding area for open space purposes based on current based on the current DC policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LEGISLATION/CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 16</th>
<th>National Environmental Standards</th>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Committee agreement to a council submission on the National Direction for Aquaculture</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### LAND ACQUISITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic acquisition issues and opportunities</th>
<th>Understanding current acquisition issues and options.</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land acquisition for stormwater purposes</th>
<th>Delegated responsibility of the committee. To acquire land for stormwater management and development purposes, to either support a structure plan or ad-hoc development.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### OTHER
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Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Environment and Community Committee

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

C1 Acquisition of open space land - Three Kings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities. In particular, the report identifies land the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes. s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations). In particular, the report identifies land the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>