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Submission to the Department of Conservation

In the matter of the proposal on the revocation of certain delegations to territorial authorities under the Reserves Act 1977

Auckland Council, (X) May – 2019
Mihimihi

Ka mhi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,
ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ēna mana whenua,
ēna mana ā-iwi taketake mai, tauiti atu.
Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te lini, wenerau a te mano.
Kātore 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 Tamaki Makaurau

Auckland Council Submission (X) May 2019

Taitara/ Title: Submission on the revocation of certain delegations to Territorial Authorities under the Reserves Act 1977

Submission to the Department of Conservation.

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

Key Points

2. The council does not support the proposal to revoke 44 of the 50 Ministerial powers within the Reserves Act 1977, delegated to local authorities. The reasons for this are outlined below:

3. Substantive justification for the proposed revocation of delegations has not been proved, and cannot be supported by Auckland Council. The council recommends that the Minister be advised that:

   - the Court of Appeal did not make a decision on the lawfulness of the Ministerial delegations to local authorities under the Reserves Act 1977
   - the Opua decision has been appealed to the Supreme Court
   - the leading court decision on Ministerial delegations to local authorities under the Reserves Act 1977 is the 2004 High Court decision of Gibbs v New Plymouth District Council CIV 2004-443-115
   - there is no justification to change the current Ministerial delegation as the leading court decision supports Ministerial delegations to local authorities under the Reserves Act 1977 as lawful.

4. A clear identification of the problems exercising dual delegations by councils under the Act is lacking and undermines local decision-making and community outcomes. The council recommends that the Minister be advised that:

   - Auckland Council, like other local authorities is very capable and experienced at differentiating and making decisions under the Act as both the administering body and under Ministerial delegation
   - Auckland Council has in the exercise of delegation fulfilled the supervisory intent of the Ministerial powers, to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Act
   - it would be a backwards step to undo decision-making at the local level for local communities. It will cause delay in delivering a range of health, wellbeing and social outcomes under the Auckland Plan for our communities
   - Auckland Council has robust processes and systems to appropriately manage potential or actual conflicts of interest when exercising dual decision-making, including having regard to the Reserves Act Guide 2004. This mitigates the risk raised by the judicial comments in the Opua decision.
the most appropriate place to identify concerns and responses to specific practice by
council when exercising dual decision-making (administering body and under Ministerial
delegation) under the Act is through an update of the Reserves Act Guide 2004. A review
that we note has been pending for several years.

5. Delays in Ministerial decision-making would be inevitable and would be at the expense of local
communities. The council recommend that the Minister be advised that:

- revoking Ministerial delegations will add significant delays to all Reserves Act 1977
  processes
- Auckland Council’s ability to be responsive to communities and the changing needs of
  customers will be severely impacted. This could lead to a decline in trust and confidence.

Ngā koringa ā-muri/Next Steps

6. Auckland Council is available to discuss and provide its view to the Minister of Conservation
before a decision is made. This is essential given the number of reserves held under Reserves
Act 1977 in Tamaki Makaurau and the number of New Zealanders we serve.

7. We also strongly urge the Minister to talk to a range of local authorities, including Local
Government New Zealand, before making a decision.

Horopaki/Context

8. This submission responds to correspondence from the Department of Conservation (the
Department) to all Chief Executives of Territorial Authorities dated 14 March 2019.

9. The Department requested feedback on a proposal to revoke Ministerial powers under the
Reserves Act 1977 (the Act) currently delegated to councils. It proposes to revoke 44 of the 50
Ministerial powers currently delegated to local authorities.

10. The Department also requested that territorial authorities identify any new delegation
proposals that would improve efficiencies.

Tunga whānui/Overall Position

Substantive justification for the proposed revocation of delegations has not been proved, and
cannot be supported by Auckland Council

11. The council does not support the proposal to revoke 44 of the 50 Ministerial powers,
delegated to territorial authorities under the Reserves Act 1977.

12. The Department has provided no substantive justification for the proposal.

13. The Department is seeking to justify changes to Ministerial delegations based solely on
comments made by the Court of Appeal in its decision of Opua Coastal Preservation Inc v Far
North District Council [2018] NZCA 262. The Department has expressed a view of the case
that:
- some of the existing Ministerial powers delegated to a council could be potentially
  unlawful
• councils could have a conflict of interest when they make a decision and then use the
deleated Ministerial powers
• the requirements for the Minister to consult with the council, may mean that council
consults with itself, which is potentially another conflict of interest.

14. We are concerned that the Department is seeking to take action in response to the Opua
decision, yet the court did not reach a conclusion on the lawfulness of the dual decision-
making process in this case. The Department, in undertaking this review, expressly
acknowledges that the Court may have decided about the legality of the delegation of
Ministerial powers had the Court considered it.

15. Auckland Council respectfully submits that the Department is erring in its advice to the
Minister of Conservation regarding the voracity of the comments made by the Court of
Appeal.

16. The Opua decision has been appealed to the Supreme Court, which could make any changes
premature.

*The Department has overlooked case law on the lawfulness of Ministerial delegations*

17. The leading decision on Ministerial delegations to local authorities under the Act, is the 2004
High Court decision of *Gibbs v New Plymouth District Council* CIV 2004-443-115.

18. This decision supports the Ministerial delegations to local authorities as lawful.

19. The council argues that this legal case should be relied on, rather than judicial comments on a
case under appeal to the Supreme Court.

20. We recommend that the Minister be advised that:
• the Court of Appeal did not make a decision on the lawfulness of the Ministerial
delgations to local authorities under the Reserves Act 1977
• the Opua decision has been appealed to the Supreme Court
• the leading court decision on Ministerial delegations to local authorities under the
Reserves Act 1977 is the 2004 High Court decision of Gibbs v New Plymouth District
Council CIV 2004-443-115
• there is no justification to change the current Ministerial delegation as the leading court
decision supports Ministerial delegations to local authorities under the Reserves Act 1977
as lawful.

*A clear identification of the problems exercising dual delegations by councils under the Act is
lacking and undermines local decision-making and community outcomes*

21. Delegation of Ministerial powers to local authorities under the Reserves Act 1977 have taken
place since 1999. This was intended to deliver three primary outcomes:
• devolution of a high level of decision-making to local authorities
• greater flexibility in the approach to reserves management
• standardisation and updating of process and terminology.
22. Further delegation of the Ministerial powers to local authorities in 2013 sought to allow for improved decision-making at a local level. It also recognised that the Ministerial powers were supervisory to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Act.

23. The council does not support any proposal that will undermine the primary outcomes sought from improved delegation under the Act. It would be a backwards step to unwind decision-making at the local level and to disempower local communities. There is also a risk that the proposed changes will reduce our ability to deliver a range of health, wellbeing and social outcomes under the Auckland Plan for our communities.

_Auckland Council has experience and clear systems and processes to exercise its responsibilities and delegations under the Act_

24. There is no clear and compelling problem definition to support the Department’s proposal. No evidence has been provided by the Department to illustrate unlawful or persistent problems by local authorities exercising dual decision-making under the Act. No evidence has also been provided about local authorities being unable to recognise and manage potential or actual conflict of interest in dual decision-making.

25. The council has more than 20-years’ experience exercising its responsibilities and delegations under the Act. We have invested in clear systems and processes to discharge our functions under the Act and to lawfully use Ministerial delegations.

26. Auckland Council, like other local authorities, is very capable of differentiating and making dual decisions under the Act as both the administering body and under Ministerial delegation.

27. The council has exercised these Ministerial delegations lawfully and responsibly in service to local communities. We have fulfilled the supervisory intent of the delegated Ministerial powers, to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Act.

28. Elected members across Auckland Council are experienced at making decisions in an independent and objective manner. This includes making many separate decisions with different legal requirements and acting in different statutory roles. This is business as usual for local authority decision-makers.

29. Auckland Council as a unitary authority frequently balances both territorial and regional responsibilities and the inherent conflicts of interest that some of these responsibilities pose. The dual governance structure made up of the Governing Body: Mayor and 20 councillors; and 21 local boards also provides an additional layer of challenge and scrutiny in decision-making.

30. Elected officials are supported in their decision-making capacity with formal training and staff advice.

31. We have processes and systems to manage any actual and potential conflicts of interest, particularly for dual decision-making situations: as an administering body, under Ministerial delegation, in quasi-judicial circumstances and as a territorial authority with regional council oversight.

32. These dual roles are frequently implemented for the same proposal. Key examples include landowner and resource consent approval; asset-owner, service provider and environmental compliance, monitoring and enforcement.
33. The council considers that the many processes, systems and practices we have in place allow legally robust dual decision-making while managing any potential or actual conflict of interest. This mitigates the risk raised by the judicial comments in the Opua decision.

34. We are also guided by the Reserves Act Guide 2004 and through sharing and debating practice with other local authorities and officials from the Department.

35. The council recommends that the Minister be advised that:

- Auckland Council, like other local authorities is very capable and experienced at differentiating and making decisions under the Act as both the administering body and under Ministerial delegation
- Auckland Council has in the exercise of delegation fulfilled the supervisory intent of the Ministerial powers, to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Act
- It would be a backwards step to undo decision-making at the local level for local communities. It will cause delay in delivering a range of health, wellbeing and social outcomes under the Auckland Plan for our communities
- Auckland Council has robust processes and systems to appropriately manage potential or actual conflicts of interest when exercising dual decision-making, including having regard to the Reserves Act Guide 2004. This mitigates the risk raised by the judicial comments in the Opua decision
- the most appropriate place to identify concerns and responses to specific practice by council when exercising dual decision-making (administering body and under Ministerial delegation) under the Act is through an update of the Reserves Act Guide 2004. A review that we note has been pending for several years.

Ngā whakaawae a Kaunihera/Impacts on council

36. The following section outlines the impact the revocation of delegations under the Reserves Act 1977 would have, should the proposal proceed.

Auckland is experiencing fast-paced growth and we need to empower and meet diverse community needs

37. Tāmaki Makaurau is the largest and fastest growing region in New Zealand.

38. Auckland’s parks and reserves provide critical social infrastructure that support and respond to this growth. They provide opportunities for all Aucklanders to participate in sport and recreation and for a range of social and environmental outcomes.

39. Tāmaki Makaurau is one of the most diverse cities in the world with over 180 ethnicities. 40 percent of the population was born overseas.

40. It is essential that council have the most efficient and effective decision-making processes. This enables the council to provide accessible services, social and cultural infrastructure that are responsive to Aucklanders diverse and evolving needs.

41. The Ministerial delegations are essential to manage the enormous scale and volume of decisions that are required for the effective and efficient administration of reserves, as required under the Reserves Act 1977.
42. Tāmaki Makaurau has over 4000 parks and reserves amounting to over 18,000 parcels of land. Auckland Council also has 792 leases that authorise sporting and community organisations to occupy recreation reserves and local purpose reserves.

43. The continually evolving processes and systems that council has had in place to implement the delegations since 1999 has ensured that council can deliver effective service for our local communities under the Reserves Act 1977.

Delays in Ministerial decision-making would be inevitable and would be at the expense of local communities

44. The number of reserves that we administer means council will likely request decisions from the Minister on weekly basis if the delegations were to be revoked. These decisions would relate to:
   - reserve management plans
   - classification (recreation, scenic, historic, local purpose) and reclassification
   - land exchanges
   - easements
   - leases and licences.

45. Seeking approval under the Reserves Act 1977 from the Department on any of the above matters would lead to significant delays. The council also seeks an understanding from the Department on how it proposes to resource the significant volume of work required to process these decisions.

46. These delays would have a pronounced impact on our ability to deploy and manage community infrastructure, programmes and activities that are core to our local government function. It would reduce our ability to effectively improve the quality of our environment and social wellbeing across our communities.

47. These issues would be exacerbated in Auckland because of growth and associated high-speed change in infrastructure and the tensions around the delivery of multiple outcomes from scarce resources managed under the Reserves Act 1977.

48. The council is concerned that the Ministerial decision-making would be undertaken with little understanding of the local issues. We do not see any benefit to decision-making from this perspective and we are concerned that this would ultimately cause unnecessary delay to delivering health and wellbeing benefits to our local communities. This could lead to a decline in trust and confidence in local and central government.

49. The proposed revocation of delegations will mean that the Minister (or delegate in the Department) will largely focus on whether procedural steps were followed.

50. The council recommend that the Minister be advised that:
   - revoking Ministerial delegations will add significant delays to all Reserves Act 1977 processes
   - council’s ability to be responsive to communities and the changing needs of customers will be severely impacted. This could lead to a decline in trust and confidence.
Ngā koringa ā-muri/Next Steps

51. Auckland Council is available to discuss and provide its view to the Minister of Conservation before a decision is made. This is essential given the number of reserves held under Reserves Act 1977 and the number of New Zealanders they serve.

52. We also strongly urge the Minister to talk to a range of local authorities, including Local Government New Zealand, before making a decision.
Attachment A - Annual Budget 2019/2020 and Proposed Amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers consultation feedback report for Kaipātiki Local Board

1. Purpose

This report summarises feedback relating to the Kaipātiki Local Board received through the Annual Budget 2019/2020 consultation. This includes:

- Feedback on the Kaipātiki Local Board priorities for 2019/2020; and
- Feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 from people or organisations based in the Kaipātiki local board area

The feedback received will inform Kaipātiki Local Board decisions on the allocation of local budgets in its local board agreement for 2019/2020. It will also inform the Kaipātiki Local Board input and advocacy on regional budgets and proposals that will be agreed at the board’s business meeting on 17 April, and subsequently discussed with the Finance and Performance Committee on 8 May.
DRAFT

2. Executive Summary

This report summarises consultation feedback on the Annual Budget 2019/2020 (including on local board priorities for 2019/2020).

Council received feedback in person at community engagement events, through written forms (including online and hard copy forms, emails and letters) and through social media.

Feedback on Kaipātiki Local Board priorities for 2019/2020

No specific priorities were provided for feedback as the direction was to continue with delivery of the projects identified through the consultation process for the 2017 Kaipātiki Local Board Plan. The question on local board priorities for the Kaipātiki Local Board area was a general, “have we got our priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?”.

125 submissions responded to the question on local board priorities for Kaipātiki. A slight majority partially supported (49%) the local board’s priorities, with a slightly smaller number in support (43%). This equated to a difference of just seven submitters. Only 10 submitters, comprising 8% of submissions responding to this question were not in support of the local board’s priorities.

Of the slight majority of 61 submitters that indicated partial support, 37 provided comments to elaborate on their choice. Of these, 14 indicated support for the focus on the environment. This comprised 38% of submissions that provided comments to this question and had selected partial support, and 23% of the overall group of submitters that partially supported the local board’s priorities. Of these 14 submissions, eight submissions, slightly more than half, specifically voiced support for the renewal of 17 Lauderdale Road, Birkenhead, as the base of operations for Kaipātiki Project.

For the 54 submissions that supported the local board’s priorities, 17 submissions included comments to accompany their choice. Seven of these submissions cited the local board as being in touch with the community and appreciated the community and environmental projects being embarked upon.

10 submitters did not support the local board’s priorities, and seven provided comments to explain why. Of these, three called for a focus on core Auckland Council activities, three voiced support for the renewal of 17 Lauderdale Road, Birkenhead, one felt that the money spent on the coastal walkway between Shepherds Park and Tui Park should go towards upgrading existing walkways in the bush, and one wanted greater focus on improving cycling infrastructure and re-opening closed tracks and reserves.

Feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 from the Kaipātiki Local Board area

Out of the 5,250 written submissions received on the regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020, 226 submissions were from people living in the Kaipātiki Local Board area.

Changes to rates and fees

- Annual waste management changes

There were 569 responses in total to the question on waste management charges. 49 of these submissions were from the Kaipātiki Local Board area, 29 of the 49 respondents identified as coming from the Kaipātiki Local Board area did not support the increase to the waste management targeted rate base service charge. This made up a clear majority at 59% of responses from the Kaipātiki local board area to this question. 17 submitters supported the increase, forming a minority of 35%, while only three submitters, possibly demonstrating the polarising nature of this proposal, gave partial support for the proposal.
Kaipātiki Local Board
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- Food scraps targeted rate
  457 submissions from across the region responded to the proposal to introduce a food scraps collection targeted rate for 2000 properties in the North Shore former trial area that currently receive the service for free. Although this would apply to 550 houses in Northcote, just 50 submissions were received from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. A clear majority of 29 submitters were against the proposal, making up 58% of all responses from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. A minority of 20 submitters, or 40% of all responses from the Kaipātiki Local Board area, supported the proposal. Only one submitter was in partial support.

- Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate
  This question received just 301 submissions in total, only 11 of which were from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. This is unsurprising, as the proposal to phase out the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate will not affect any properties in the Kaipātiki Local Board area. A large majority of nine submissions from the Kaipātiki Local Board area supported this proposal, with only two against. None of the responses partially supported this proposal.

- Urban boundary rating
  The proposal to adjust the urban rating area to include properties that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours received 159 submissions in total. 20 submissions of these were from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. 14 submitters supported the proposal forming a clear majority, with only five against. Just one submitter partially supported the proposal.

- Religious properties rates
  This proposal attracted the largest number of submissions by far with a total of 1156 responses. Only 59 of these submissions came from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. Mirroring the response regionwide, a majority (63%) of submitters from the Kaipātiki Local Board area did not support the proposal not to charge rates to religious use properties. Only 19 responses from the Kaipātiki Local Board area were in support of this proposal, and partial support was only given by three submitters.

- Regulatory fees
  The proposal to increase some regulatory fees to maintain cost recovery received 476 submissions in total. There were only 39 submissions from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. As with the proposal on religious properties rates, a large majority of submitters (77%) from the Kaipātiki Local Board area did not support this proposal. Seven submissions were in support, and only two gave partial support.

Draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2019/2020

While the Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority Draft Operational Plan 2019/2020 was included in the consultation document no specific question was asked regarding this in consultation. Only one submission from across the region was subsequently received, from the Manurewa Local Board area. The submission was against a proposal from the Maunga Board to put a zip line on Rangitoto as it would negate the planting and restoration work done at Motutapu.

Feedback on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers

Out of the 2315 submissions received on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers, 186 submissions were from people living in the Kaipātiki Local Board area. A clear majority of 67% supported the proposal, while only 10% did not support. A significant proportion of submitters, slightly over a fifth at 22%, partially supported the proposal.
124 submitters from the Kaipatiki Local Board area supported the proposal and of these, 39 provided comments to elaborate on their choice. Close to half at 20 submissions (51%) cited cost savings and reduction of governance duplication for their support. A notable number of 8 submitters (21% of submitters supporting the proposal who provided comments) supported the proposal due to their dissatisfaction with Panuku in some shape or form.

Of the 19 submitters that indicated partial support and provided comments, the majority (eight) expressed distrust of Council and Panuku, two were concerned with potential congestion in the Wynyard Quarter and Quay Street, two wanted more public visibility and consultation, three felt that development was too slow, and two advocated for retaining the Waterfront as a public space for all.

While the number of submitters to this proposal that were not supportive was relatively low at just 18, among those that provided comments (13), a majority of eight submitters expressed some form of distrust or dissatisfaction with Council and/or Panuku.
3. Context

Auckland Council consulted on its Annual Budget 2019/2020 and a proposed Amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers between 17 February and 17 March 2019. The Annual Budget 2019/2020 must include a Local Board Agreement for the Kaipatiki Local Board which sets out our priorities and how we're going to pay for them. Auckland Council also consulted on the Our Water Future discussion document at the same time. The feedback received on this discussion document will be presented at a later date.

Types of feedback

Overall Auckland Council received feedback in the consultation period through:

- Written feedback – 5250 hard copy and online forms, emails and letters
- In person – feedback was received through 14 have your say events and 51 community events.
- Social media – 25 comments were received through Facebook (12) and Twitter (13).

For the Kaipatiki Local Board area, the breakdown in feedback received throughout the consultation period was:

![Bar chart showing feedback types and counts.]

- Online: 124 feedbacks
- Hard copy: 98 feedbacks
- Non-form: 4 feedbacks
- An individual: 221 feedbacks
- Organization: 5 feedbacks

---

Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028
4. Feedback received on Kaipātiki Local Board priorities for 2019/2020

At its 12 Dec business meeting, the Kaipātiki Local Board adopted the documents on local content and local supporting information for consultation that were tabled at the meeting. As the direction was to continue with delivery of the projects identified in the 2017 Kaipātiki Local Board Plan, no major changes were proposed. Since these projects had already been consulted on through the consultation process for the 2017 Local Board Plan, no specific priorities were provided for feedback. The question on local board priorities for the Kaipātiki Local Board area was a general, “have we got our priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?”.

228 submissions to the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and Proposed Amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers came from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. Of these, 125 responded to the question on the Kaipātiki Local Board priorities for 2019/2020, with the majority forming close to half (49%) in partial support. Submitters who supported the Kaipātiki Local Board priorities for 2019/2020 formed only a slightly smaller proportion of 43%. Just 8%, or 10 submitters, disagreed with the Kaipātiki Local Board priorities for 2019/2020.

Key themes across all feedback received (through written, event and social media channels) were:

- Local environmental management attracted the most feedback, receiving 22 submission points. Most of the feedback was in support of the renewal of 17 Lauderdale Road, Birkdale.
- Local governance & support received 17 submission points, with comments largely around the local board and its priorities.
- Local community services and local parks, sport & recreation had 10 submission points each. Feedback was mostly concerned with greater development and support for community services, sports, and parks.

A summary of the feedback received through each channel is provided below.

Feedback received through written submissions

125 submissions were received on Kaipātiki Local Board priorities for 2019/2020, showing that most either partially supported (49%) or supported (43%) the local board’s priorities. The difference between the number of submissions that supported the local board’s priorities and those in partial support was just 8 submitters. Only 10 submitters, comprising 8% of submissions responding to this question were not in support of the local board’s priorities.

Among the nine themes that feedback was categorised on, local environmental management received the most comments with 22 submission points, followed by local governance and support, with 17 submission points. Local community services and local parks, sport and recreation each both received 10 submission points. Local planning as a theme was a distant fourth having seven submission points. Comments that did not fit within any of the nine themes contributed six submission points, and local arts, culture and events just had two submission points. There were no comments related to either local libraries or local economic development.

Comments relating to local environment management were all supportive of environmental efforts in Kaipātiki. There were no comments to the contrary that suggested focusing on other issues instead of the environment. Of the 17 submissions that provided comments concerning local environmental management, nine were on the importance of the renewal of 17 Lauderdale Road, Birkdale. Other comments ranged from the upgrade of tracks and walkways because of kauri dieback, to pest and weed control. There were three comments that expressed support for the local board’s focus on the environment.

“Kaipātiki Project supports community—led environment programmes and projects that are increasingly important in addressing our environmental challenges. Kaipātiki Project is essentially the community science hub of our rohe. The current building is leaky and unhealthy for community activities This project has been a very long time coming — it’s time to deliver!” (Submission AB1903063)
Local governance and support was the next theme that had the most submission points (17). There were 17 submissions that provided comments on local governance and support, and five were on the general local board direction and its priorities.

“They do their best. Anything that improves safety of the public, day and night, is good.” (Submission 1903069)

There were four comments on the renewal of 17 Lauderdale Road, Birkdale, specifically relating to local board support for the project. There were also, however, two comments that disagreed with the influence of CCOs, particularly Auckland Transport.

“They have approved the building of grand edifices on corners of Highbury while the footpaths are in disrepair and a danger to pedestrians. They have approved the widest pedestrian crossing in the world for Hinemoa St that is totally out of proportion with the need and the neighbourhood. They seem to be in thrall to Auckland Transport and its very clear desire to reduce parking and increase congestion. But, a good thing, the shade sails on the Little Shoal playground.” (Submission AB1900357)

There were 10 submission points each for local community services and local parks, sport and recreation. Comments relating to these themes were largely in support of more development and funding for community services (more community service centres), sports (Birkenhead War Memorial Park needs to be fast tracked, more support for tennis) and parks (more shade sails, more work on bush/exercise tracks) in the local board area.

“more development needed in the area (more community service centres, parks or recreational areas).” (Submission AB1900937)

Feedback received through events
The Kaipātiki Local Board received two pieces of feedback at Kaipātiki Project’s Eco Fun Day on 9 Mar. One was that a slip near Lynn Reserve had dropped rubbish into the water, the other was related to regional planning and was against building in rural areas as this would lead to more cars on roads.

Feedback received through social media channels
Feedback was received from the following social media channels:

- 12 people from Facebook
- 13 people from Twitter

However, none of the social media feedback were on the Kaipātiki Local Board’s priorities. Topics ranged from transport (reduce congestion), to waste management (tip passes and better rubbish collection), and council expenditure (Eden Park debt bailout, free events).

Feedback on other local topics
Transport and congestion in the Kaipātiki Local Board area received nine comments. Four submitters highlighted the importance of safety for cyclists and improvements to cycling infrastructure, particularly if cycling is to be encouraged as a viable alternative transport option. Three comments mentioned the narrowing of roads, removal of carparks and on street parking.
that only exacerbates congestion. There was one comment on the new bus routes and the unreliability and scarcity of the buses resulting in overcrowding for passengers.

**Requests for local funding**

The renewal of 17 Lauderdale Road, Birkdale, was a prominent project that received 13 comments in support of the project. Among the reasons supporters cited were the poor conditions of the current building that made it unsuitable and unhealthy for volunteers and visitors including schoolchildren, the importance of Kaipatiki Project’s work to the area and the environment, and the social benefits of the centre connecting volunteers and the community.

There were also two comments that asked for more funding to be put into Beach Haven and Birkdale.

“Northcote keeps getting all the redevelopment money. With ferries now going from Beach Haven, put more funding into the Beach Haven Village.” (Submission AB1902848)

**Information on submitters**

The tables and graphs below indicate what demographic categories people identified with. This information only relates to those submitters who provided demographic information.

A total of 2,807 submitters provided demographic information in their submission. While 2,810 submitters provided information on their ethnicity, 18 did not provide information on their gender. Of the 2,807 submissions with demographic information, 194 were from the Kaipatiki Local Board area.
2,789 submitters provided information on their gender. There were slightly more females than males, at 1,404 to 1,383 submitters. This is reflected in the gender breakdown for the Kaipātiki Local Board area, with female submitters slightly outnumbering males at 107 to 87. Male submitters outnumbered females in four age groups across the region, under the age of 15, 15-24, 55-64, and those over 75. In comparison, female submitters outnumbered males in the Kaipātiki Local Board area except in three age groups, under the age of 15, 45-54, and over the age of 75. The difference in the number of male and female submitters was slight across all age groups both regionally and for the Kaipātiki Local Board area. The greatest difference between the number of male and female submitters was in the age group of 35-44, with 63 more females than males. Among submitters from the Kaipātiki Local Board area, it was the same age group of 35-44 that had the largest difference of 13 more female than male submitters. Only 22 submitters identified as gender diverse across the region, none of them were from the Kaipātiki Local Board area.
Ethnic information was provided in 2,807 submissions, 192 of which were from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. Europeans comprised a large majority (71%) of all submitters and formed slightly over half of submitters (53%) from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. However, this was an under-representation as Europeans made up 65% of the population of the Kaipātiki Local Board area.

Asian submitters formed the second largest group at slightly over a quarter (27%) across the region. For the Kaipātiki Local Board area, the proportion of Asian submitters was much larger at just under half of submitters (42%), a significant overrepresentation considering the proportion of Asians (27% as of the 2013 Census) in the Kaipātiki Local Board area.

Submitters from the remaining ethnic groups of Māori, Pasifica, and MELAA (Middle Eastern, Latin American, and African) made up just 7% of all submissions, or 214 submitters. 38 submitters (1%) were of ethnicities that did not fall under the European, Asian, Māori, Pasifica or MELAA categories. Submitters from these ethnic groups made up an even smaller proportion of submitters from the Kaipātiki Local Board area, comprising just 5% of submissions from residents. There were no Māori submitters despite the proportion of Māori residents comprising 9% of all Kaipātiki residents as of the 2013 Census. Similarly, there were no submitters of ethnicities in the MELAA group despite comprising 2% of the population in the Kaipātiki Local Board area.
5. Overview of feedback received on the Annual Budget from Kaipātiki Local Board area

The Annual Budget 2019/2020 sets out our priorities and how we’re going to pay for them. The regional consultation on the proposed Annual Budget focused on changes to rates and fees:

- Changes to rates and fees
  - Annual waste management changes
  - Food scraps targeted rate
  - Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate
  - Urban boundary rating
  - Religious properties rates
  - Regulatory fees

The submissions received from the Kaipātiki Local Board area on these key issues is summarised below, along with an overview of any other areas of feedback on regional proposals with a local impact.

Changes to rates and fees

Aucklanders were asked about a proposed small number of rating and fee changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These changes include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2000 properties in the North Shore former trial area to whom the service is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• phasing out the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020-2020/2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Kaipātiki Local Board area.
Feedback on the proposed changes to rates and fees was mixed. Considering there were 226 submissions from the Kaipātiki Local Board area, responses to each proposal was low, with the rating of religious properties receiving the most at 59, and the phase out of the Waitākere rural sewerage service having only 11.

Most of the responses to the question on the overall proposed changes to rates and fees were supportive, with 26 positive to 12 against, making for a total of 38. In comparison, the three proposed changes that most submitters did not support received more responses, attracting a total of 158 responses out of the 226 from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. These three proposed changes were an increase to the annual waste management charge to cover higher costs, land owned by religious organisations being exempt from paying rates, and the extension of the food scraps targeted rate to 2000 properties in the North Shore former trial area that have food scraps collection. For the Kaipātiki Local Board area, 550 houses in Northcote would be affected by this last proposal. The difference between the number of responses in support of these three
proposals and the number that were opposed, was relatively low, but still significant due to the overall low number of submitters. The smallest difference was just nine more submitters against the extension of the food scraps targeted rate to 2000 properties in the North Shore former trial area, or 29 submitters opposing the proposal compared to 20 that supported it. It is the proposal to not charge rates on land owned by religious organisations that received the most responses, with a majority of 37 submitters against the proposal, and 19 for.

The two proposals that were supported by a majority of respondents were the phase out of the Waitākere rural sewerage service, and the adjustment of the urban rating area to include 400 properties in recently urbanised areas. However, the number of submissions from the Kaipātiki Local Board area that responded to these proposals were low, with just 11 submissions in total for the phase out of the Waitākere rural sewerage service, and 20 for the extension of the urban rating area.

Responses of partial support for all proposed changes to rates and fees were very low with three submitters at the most for any one proposal. Two proposals had three submitters indicating partial support, and these were to raise the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs, and to not charge rates on religious use properties.

Feedback on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2019/2020

No feedback was received from the Kaipātiki Local Board area on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2019/2020.

Feedback on other regional proposals with a local impact

Feedback was received from the Kaipātiki Local Board area on the proposed increase to regulatory fees to cover the full costs of service provision that have risen faster than inflation. Raising these fees would ensure users, rather than ratepayers, cover the cost of these services. The identified services are:

- resource consents – bundled consent deposits, tree consents, boundary adjustments (unit title and cross lease), change of condition (s127) and others
- building control – lapsed/refused building consent, waiver/modification of building code, extensions of time to start building work, solid fuel heater/injected wall application and others
- harbour master fees – mooring fees and foreign vessel (over 40 meters in length) anchorage/dynamic positioning
- animal management – impound and sustenance fees.

The graph below shows the areas covered by this feedback.
Changes to regulatory fees

The proposed increase to regulatory fees received a low number of responses, 102 in total of the 226 submissions from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. None of the proposed increases were supported by submitters, with a majority against for each. The question on the overall proposed increase to regulatory fees received both the most submissions (68), and the largest number of submitters that were against (30). However, the number of submitters that indicated partial support was nearly equal in size to those opposing the overall increase, at 29. There were just seven submitters that indicated support for this question.

The increase to resource consent fees received the next highest number of submissions at 18, though this was still very low compared to the total number of submissions from the Kaipātiki Local Board area. An overwhelming majority of 16 of the 18 submitters for this particular proposal opposed the increase, compared to just two that supported it.

There were only 11 responses to the proposed increase to Harbour master fees. However, a response of support, partial support or opposition to the proposal could only be determined from five of the 11 submissions however. There were two submitters that supported the increase to mooring fees, and three that did not support it. Of responses to the introduction of foreign vessel charges, three submissions opposed the proposal.
Only seven submitters responded to the proposed increase to building consent fees, and none were supportive. A proposed increase to animal management fees received no submissions.
6. Overview of feedback received on the proposed amendment to the
10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers from
Kaipātiki Local Board area

The question and text below is directly from the feedback form. The feedback from the Kaipātiki Local Board area is set out under the question.

Question 1:
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

The graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Kaipātiki Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Year Budget Amendment</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially support</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

186 submissions on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers came from in the Kaipātiki Local Board area compared to 2315 from across the region. A clear majority of 67% supported the proposal to transfer legal ownership of the city centre waterfront properties currently owned and managed by Panuku. Only 10%, or 18 submitters from the Kaipātiki Local Board area did not support. A significant proportion of submitters, close to a quarter at 22%, partially supported the proposal.

Of the three submitters (2%) whose response could not be categorised as supportive, partially supportive, or opposed, one felt that they did not possess enough information to comment, while another did not think the proposal was applicable to them.
08 April 2019

Open Letter to His Worship the Mayor
Auckland Council Governing Body
Phil.Goff@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Your Worship

The 21 Local Board Chairs of Auckland Council hold significant concerns as to what appears to be a gradual but consistent reduction of subsidiarity in their shared governance role within Auckland Council.

In 2017 a review was conducted by Gareth Stiven on the shared governance model of Auckland Council. His report identified Local Boards did not hold enough subsidiarity delegations. His report provided multiple recommendations to the Governing body to improve the governance role of Local Boards, these were addressed under four themes:

- organisational structures and culture have not adapted to the complexity of the model
- complementary decision-making, but key aspects of overlap
- lack of alignment of accountabilities with responsibilities
- local boards are not sufficiently empowered.

As a result, the Governance Framework Review Political Working Party was formed, with participants chosen by yourself, to identify priority recommendations and progress implementation of those including delegations and decision making. This work is fundamental to ensuring the intention of the Act is fulfilled.

It is an irony that Local Boards now find themselves in a worse position than in 2017 in terms of their input into decision making on by-laws, as per the Act.4

s16 (b) Identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area in relation to the content of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of the Auckland Council;

For example, in the current consultation on the "Policy on Dogs" and "Dog Management Bylaw"
Local Boards have been invited to speak to the Hearings Panel with their input before the consultation period closes. This is not appropriate if Local Boards are to identify and communicate the interests and preferences of their local board area.

This by-law is going through a formal consultation process, therefore Local Boards should be receiving and analysing the formal feedback before they present their community's views to the Hearing Panel.

---

1 Governance framework review 17 November 2016 FINAL REPORT
2 Governance framework review 17 November 2016 FINAL REPORT, p6
3 Local Government (Auckland Council Act 2009)
4 Local Government (Auckland Council Act 2009) s16
A similar approach was taken with the ‘Freedom Camping in Vehicles Bylaw’ where by Local Boards were again limited to their input in the process of the development of the by-law.

There has been no sympathy from the Community and Social Policy Department in response to the advocacy of many Chairs on the right for their governance role to be respected. They are unmoved. In fact, one Chair has been advised they may attend a formal ‘Have Your Say’ event but may not speak.

The 21 Local Board Chairs are united in their concerns over limitations being placed over our legislated roles for our communities. This culture of marginalising Local Board’s input and undermining of the shared governance model is particularly an issue we have encountered within the Community and Social Policy Department.

It is unclear to us why the previous practice of Local Board input has changed, particularly when we are dealing with internal Council processes where the Council organisation is totally in control of the timeframe and could easily add in time to properly include Local Boards as required by the legislation and allocation table.

Another consequence of the limitation of our input is that it places us in a difficult position with our communities. The perception is we are not fulfilling our responsibilities on their behalf and as the first point of contact for the public we are front facing their understandable angst with no apparent recourse to adjust the current process.

We respectfully request a meeting with you and a delegation of local board chairs to discuss our concerns.

Yours sincerely

Peter Haynes
Chair – Albert Eden Local Board

George Wood
Chair – Devonport Takapuna Local Board

Angela Fulljames
Chair – Franklin Local Board

Izzy Fordham
Chair – Great Barrier Island Local Board

Shane Henderson
Chair – Henderson-Massey Local Board

Julia Parfitt
Chair – Hibiscus and Bays Local Board
From: Res Local Boards  
Sent: Tuesday, 16 April 2019 10:22 AM  
To: GRP AC All Local Board Members  
Subject: Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw Hearings Panel

Last week staff received a copy of the letter sent from the 21 Local board chairs to the Mayor raising concerns about when and how local boards get to present their views to the hearings panel during formal consultation on bylaws. In response to this; and subsequent meetings with the Mayor’s office, the meeting for the local board to present to the hearings panel on the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog management Bylaw will now be moved from the last week of the consultation period (2 May) to the first day of the panels deliberations (21 June).

This will mean that the Local Boards will:
- have an extra month to resolve delegations to speak and/or formalise their views through a business meeting if they want to
- have access to all of the submissions (sorted by local board) when these are posted on-line and
- have access to the deliberations report containing the summary of all submissions at the same time as the hearings panel members get it (typically four days before deliberations commence)

Local Boards will not have their views on the statement of proposal included in the deliberations report; as these would not have been received prior to the report being drafted; but the hearings panel will considered the views presented to them and a summary of these will be able to be included in the panels report back to the Governing Body.

In order to further assist local boards to understand the views of their community, we will also:
- sorting all of the submissions by local board when they are uploaded to the web and
- let the local boards know when the deliberations report and submissions goes online

As we have received high volumes of submissions on this proposal (over 2000 on-line submission were completed in the first 10 days), we will also be pushing the deliberations back a couple of weeks to give staff sufficient time to process and analyse all of the submissions. The new dates for deliberations will be:

- Friday 21 June, 9.30am – 1.00pm. Local boards present views to the Hearings panel
- Friday 21 June, 1.30pm – 5.00pm. Deliberations commence
- Wednesday 26 June, 12.30pm – 5.00pm. Deliberations session 2.
- Wednesday 3 July, 1.30pm – 5.00pm. Deliberations session 3.
- Thursday 4 July, 1.00pm – 5.00pm. Deliberations back up (if required).
- Friday 5 July, 1.00pm – 5.00pm. Deliberations back up (if required).
I hereby give notice that a confidential meeting of the Kaipātiki Local Board will be held on:

**Date:** Wednesday, 20 March 2019  
**Time:** 4.00pm  
**Meeting Room:** Kaipātiki Local Board Office  
**Venue:** 90 Bentley Avenue  
Glennyld

---

**Kaipātiki Local Board**  
**CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
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<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Endorsement of the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** The reports contained within this agenda are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. Should Members require further information relating to any reports, please contact the relevant manager, Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson.
Endorsement of the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan

File No.: CP2019/02861

### Matataputanga Confidentiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason:</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interests:</strong></td>
<td>s7(2)(b)(i) – The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would disclose a trade secret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 contains sensitive commercial information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grounds:</strong></td>
<td>s48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Te take mō te pārongo

**Purpose of the report**

1. To endorse the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan including the principles and criteria for success.

### Whakarāpopototanga matua

**Executive summary**

2. In March 2016 the Auckland Development Committee endorsed the Northcote High Level Project Plan and granted Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku) the authority to lead the regeneration in Northcote.


4. Following significant further planning, Panuku has developed a benchmark masterplan for the Northcote town centre (Attachment A). This benchmark masterplan presents an exciting enhanced vision for Northcote town centre, underpinned by urban design and Te Aranga Māori design principles.

5. The benchmark masterplan comprises three key components, namely the design principles, the criteria for success and the current spatial plan showing how it is proposed that the principles and criteria are achieved.

6. These principles and criteria for success are articulated from years of public engagement and consultation and reflect a long-held desire by the community to see the town centre revitalised.

7. The primary benefit is the strategic urban renewal of the town centre achieving the ambitious vision for Northcote.
Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

a) endorse the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan as per Attachment A to this agenda report.

b) endorse the overarching principles of the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan, namely:
   i) Identity
   ii) Cultural Values
   iii) Safety/Crime Prevention through Environmental Design
   iv) Flexibility to allow future proofing

c) endorse the criteria for success of the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan, namely:
   i) Outward facing and inviting
   ii) Legible street network
   iii) Green and sustainable
   iv) Sunny sheltered town square
   v) Multi-purpose community hub building
   vi) Facilitate multi-modal transport
   vii) Flexibility to provide car parking options
   viii) Food culture destination
   ix) Active retail and commercial environment
   x) Apartment-led residential

Restatement

d) confirm that there be no restatement of this confidential report, attachments or resolutions until Panuku has served notices of desire under Section 18 of the Public Works Act 1981.

Horopaki Context

8. In March 2016 the Auckland Development Committee endorsed the Northcote High Level Project Plan and granted Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku) the authority to lead the regeneration in Northcote.

9. In November 2016 Panuku published the Northcote Framework Plan. The Framework Plan sets out an ambitious vision for a regenerated Northcote anchored on community, culture and business. The Framework plan includes four key moves, the first of which is Key move one: Town centre – creating a vibrant heart.

10. The vision for the Northcote of 2030 is “a growing community, with lively and welcoming heart that celebrates culture, and where business thrives, and everyone needs are met.

11. Master planning of Northcote has been underway and refined with the community over many years. Some elements of the masterplan are already under construction such as the greenway while other are at concept stage and will change over time.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

12. The latest town centre masterplan builds upon the Framework Plan 2016 which has permanently been on display in the Northcote Information Kiosk and on the Panuku website.

13. Panuku have been refining plans and priorities for the town centre taking into consideration ongoing community feedback, property-mix research, urban design best practice and economic research.

14. The work is now sufficiently developed to update the community by sharing the benchmark masterplan and it also helps to facilitate Panuku’s ongoing property acquisitions.

15. The masterplan for local board endorsement is provided as Attachment A. It is referred to as the benchmark masterplan as it establishes the expected requirements for any urban renewal of the town centre while at the same time signalling that the specific layout, building locations and other details are not fully locked in but subject to negotiation and confirmation with a development partner(s).

16. The benchmark masterplan builds on the Framework Plan but ambitiously envisages the comprehensive urban renewal of the town centre. The benchmark masterplan represents the distillation of a wide range of inputs over many years, including:

- Northcote Central Project 2005
- Eastern Area Planning Framework Final Report 2010
- Northcote Town Centre Plan 2010
- Unlock Northcote 2015 – present
- Northcote Development – Housing New Zealand / HLC 2016 – Present

17. The benchmark masterplan comprises three key components, namely the design principles, the criteria for success and the current spatial plan showing how it is proposed that the principles and criteria are achieved.

18. The principles and criteria for success have been based on many years of master planning, engagement and consultation and seek to summarise the previous work.

19. The benchmark masterplan has been produced based upon those principles and success criteria. It has received peer review and input from the Technical Advisory Group made up of several leading New Zealand urban designers. Additionally, Panuku sought input from HLC, Council Family (including Kaipātiki Local Board, Auckland Transport, Community Facilities, Parks, Healthy Waters, Watercare and Community Services), Colliers (property consultants), and Property Economics Limited (economic research).

20. The primary benefits of the benchmark masterplan are strategic urban renewal of the town centre, including:

- Significant residential development of potentially 750 units.
- A safe and vibrant heart with increased activity.
- New and improved public realm spaces and amenities, with better functionality and integration with the town centre and the natural ecosystem.
- A vibrant diverse community that is connected to the built and natural environments
- Improved retail, commercial and public space that services its local community.
- Flood resistant retail and housing.

21. The benchmark masterplan sits within the context of the wider Unlock Northcote project. This encompasses the wider area with extensive collaboration with HLC particularly concerning the greenway project.
22. It is intended that the contents set out in the benchmark masterplan will be published following the anticipated Panuku Board March/April 2019 approval of the remaining acquisitions and the ground leaseholders have been approached to buy their properties. Negotiations will proceed on a willing seller willing buyer basis and a notice of desire to acquire (Section 18, Public Works Act 1981) will be registered on the titles alerting potential buyers.

23. Following further feedback from potential development partners, the next iteration of the masterplan will be brought to the local board for discussion.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

24. Unlock Northcote is a council family project led by Panuku.

25. Panuku has an engagement process in place to inform, update and seek feedback from the council group.

26. Panuku has liaised closely concerning both the urban design outcomes and respective funding responsibilities.

27. Panuku can confirm that all the involved member of the council family support the benchmark masterplan subject to clarification of the final details.

28. Panuku is working with Community Facilities to instigate a Community Needs Assessment to form a basis for decisions concerning a new community facility.

29. Panuku is working with Auckland Transport, in particular concerning the public transport which will form the next layer of detail.

30. Panuku is working closely with Healthy Waters concerning the delivery of the greenway project on the edge of the town centre including the start of the stormwater detention work on Greenslade.

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

31. Northcote is a neighbourhood with a unique identity with primary town centre catchment being quite heterogeneous:
   - A relatively high proportion of local residents in the broad ‘Asian’ ethnic group
   - Affluent NZ European population with above average income and education
   - Current Housing New Zealand residents with high share of Maori and Pacific residents.

32. The resident population of Northcote is 28,180 (Statistic NZ 2018 est.) and is projected to reach 31,010 by 2033 on its current path according to Statistics NZ. However, Panuku anticipates additional growth once the town centre and housing stock are improved.

33. The local board has been part of the journey to develop this benchmark masterplan. Board members are aware that this benchmark masterplan is the next stage in order to achieve the long-awaited urban renewal of the town centre.

34. Panuku is in regular contact with stakeholders and members of the community to respond to questions and address concerns as needed. Several strategies are in place to keep the community up to date with progress including; placemaking activations, presence at key community events and activities, regular attendance at the Northcote Business Association and other key stakeholder meetings.

35. Panuku anticipate high interest from ground lessees and businesses as they may wish to know about the benchmark masterplan as it has implications for them.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
36. Since March 2016, Panuku has been engaging regularly with mana whenua through the Panuku Mana Whenua Governance Forum and the Project Working Group. The Forum supports the four key moves of the Unlock Northcote Project.
37. Panuku will continue to work with mana whenua and seek feedback about the project.

Ngā ritinga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
38. Panuku is working across the council to secure the necessary funding to give effect to the urban renewal.
39. Funding for acquisitions is allocated from Panuku’s Strategic Investment Fund
40. Panuku has allocated a significant investment for public realm investment in Northcote with further allocations to follow.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
41. Delivery of this benchmark masterplan is dependent on reaching development agreement(s) with development partner(s).
42. Panuku is developing a go to market strategy to begin a formal process in mid-2019.
43. Publication of the benchmark masterplan may generate some concern from the ground leaseholders, business owner and the community. Panuku is developing a comprehensive engagement and communication plan to deal with any likely questions and concerns.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
44. An update concerning the benchmark masterplan will be provided to the Panuku Board in March 2019 including feedback from the local board.
45. The following timelines are subject to Panuku Board Approvals as required:
46. Panuku intends to publish the benchmark masterplan in April or May 2019 and the Local Board will be informed in advance. The benchmark masterplan will be displayed in the Northcote Information Kiosk, a copy will be delivered to the local board office and Northcote Library and it will be on the Panuku website.
47. Panuku intends to start the process of identifying potential development partners in June/July 2019. We currently expect that this process may take between nine and twelve months to conclude.
48. Panuku intends to use the formal provisions of the Public Works Act 1981 to acquire the essential interests for urban renewal. It is anticipated that a “notice of desire” will be served in May 2019 and willing buyer willing seller negotiations will continue for several months.
49. Panuku will keep the local board informed, at regular scheduled meetings, of feedback received from commercial development partners.
50. Panuku will send monthly written updates of project progress.
51. Panuku is aiming to have received meaningful feedback from commercial development partners by Q1 2020 and will then update the local board accordingly.
### Ngā tāpirihanga
#### Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20 March 2019 - Kaipatiki Local Board Business Meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan - March 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20 March 2019 - Kaipatiki Local Board Business Meeting</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resolution number KT/2013/331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ngā kaihaina
#### Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Carlos Rahman - Senior Engagement Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Angelika Cutler – Director Corporate Affairs, Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gavin Peebles, Acting Director Development, Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager, Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlock Northcote
Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan

Panuku Development Auckland
An Auckland Council Organisation

March, 2019
Vision

À te tau 2030 ka tupu a Awatea he i haporī hīhīka me te pokapū manaaki e whakanui ana i ngā tikanga ā-iwi, e rahi ake ai ngā mahi pakihi, e e ai hoki ngā tūmanako o te katoa.

The Northcote of 2030 will be a growing community, with a lively and welcoming heart that celebrates culture, and where business thrives and everyone’s needs are met.

The Northcote Integrated Plan (November 2016) set out an ambitious vision for a regenerated Northcote anchored on community, culture and business. One of the Plan’s four key themes was the regeneration of the town centre.

In 2017 following the acquisition of several buildings, the Board of Panuku Development Auckland received that all of the land and buildings in the town centre should be included in the urban renewal.

This benchmark masterplan for the Town Centre presents an exciting vision for Northcote Town Centre. It is underpinned by urban design and ‘true Avana design principles’, delivering a lively and welcoming littoral with community, culture and business at the heart. It promotes a comprehensive, staged development with new buildings that are fit for their 21st Century business purpose. It aims to build on the best of the key characteristics of the centre that the community value - pedestrian areas, the Ellesmere Park Plaza, the alignment of key streets, a public realm with flexibility to adapt to accommodate large community events and festivals and an additional opportunity to human scale and activity.

The new Northcote will have a greater mix of housing types delivering over 2000 new homes, with up to 50% of these within the town centre apartment blocks, up to 400 townhouses. It will have a new multi-purpose community facility, which will include a library, connected to a new town square.

There will be a network of pedestrian priority streets and lanes, framed by high-quality buildings, with a vibrant mix of uses, including community, retail, commercial and residential. The street network will provide pedestrian connectivity to the local community and its recreation spaces, including River Levee Reserve, Clyde River Reserve and the Avana Stream.

The benchmark masterplan leverages high-quality public spaces for informal gathering, outdoor dining, markets, and Caesar footpaths, enabling the community of Northcote to live, learn, work, and play in their town centre.
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Key Moves

**Key move one:**
- **Towns centre - creating a vibrant heart**
  - Retail development is brought forward at town centres, creating a gateway with a new multi-purpose community building and public open space such as a town square.

**Key move two:**
- **Lakes Road - creating a green linear spine**
  - Lakes Road is remodelled as a pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly route, incorporating cycle boxes and walkways.

**Key move three:**
- **A greenway - a network of public open space**
  - This landmark public open space network will run the length of the town centre and north of the town. It will be designed with the community so that it becomes something treasured and cared for by everyone.

**Key move four:**
- **Housing - increasing density, choice and tenure mix**
  - The new mixed-use development provides an opportunity to deliver integrated housing with high-quality offering diverse choice in types, tenure, and price points.

*Unlock Northcote Benchmark Masterplan*
Overarching Principles & Criteria for Success

These principles and criteria have been developed following extensive consultation including on the Northcote Central Concept Plan (2005), the Northcote Town Centre Plan (2010) and the Northcote Framework Plan (2010).

Principles

A. Identity

The masterplan establishes a recognisable "Northcote" character, as a point-of-
difference from other central Auckland

town centres. Retail and celebrates the

existing strong Asian influence, renewed
destination for Asian food. Celebrates North, Pacific and

Asian communities. Delivers a

strengthened sense of community, utilising

placemaking and public art and sculpture as

components of building identity.

B. Cultural values

To Aroha values and design principles

embedded within the masterplan through
design process and engagement. Monas

wherever presence, narrative and values are

respected and made visible.

C. Safety / CFED

The masterplan prioritises safety. Designed to

both safety in Design and Crime

Prevention Through Environmental Design (CFED) principles.

D. Flexibility / Future Proofing

The masterplan is flexible in layout now (as a masterplan) and into the future (as a

built environment). Staging of development is considered as fundamental to design

delivery and outcomes.

Criteria for Success

1. Outward facing & inviting

The town centre is integrated into
 the Northcote community. Stitched into wider context through

cover parking and family friendly

land uses, reduced black cabs, and

street facing development blocks.

2. A legible street network

A legible network of public

spaces and spaces.

Clear hierarchy, accessibility, connectedness, permeability and

availability.

A network of elements - green retail

and mixed-use streets and parks

connecting between neighbours.

College Road and Goshawk Street.

3. Green & sustainable

Selects the ability to live work

and play in the local community

high quality interface with

adjacent open spaces, linear

and open spaces.

Public open spaces and squares

designed as spaces for public

life, rest and recreation.

Potential for improved management

of stormwater and drainage systems.

4. A sunny, sheltered

town square

A sunny sheltered

town square.

Scots pine stand with flexibility

to extend for larger events (i.e.

temporary food/dessert),

Optional to locate with other

community amenities, (HUB)

building.

A balance of soft hard

landscape elements.

Preparation for social market and

community event space uses.

5. Multi-purpose community hub building

A multi-purpose community building

meeting community needs

Active ground floor area.

In an accessible location.

5. In a visible location, to draw

people into the town centre

Turnaround at pedestrian friendly

space (squares, reserve, etc.)

enable spill over activity.

6. Facilitates multimodal transport

A town centre that facilitates

multiple modes of transport

walking, cycling, private

vehicles and public transport.

A strong fire safe

public transport interface,

unanimously located in use.

Clear transport axes and nodes,

towards to the town centre.

Transport & ability of public

transport interface into town centre.

7. Flexibility to provide car parking options

Deliver a balanced provision of

street parking and private

parking.

Facilities pop in as well as

as longer term off-parking.

Utilises ground level advantage

Parking under retaining and

ground level uses at street levels.

8. A food culture destination

The town centre has the potential to

create a destination for food culture

Designs to facilitate the existing

local food culture, while

encouraging people to linger.

Provide outdoor dining space

a variety of a tenancies - street

duced food/dessert, cinema

open dining and corner

smaller ground floor.

Delivers the ability to live, work

and play in the local community.

High tenure management.
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Attachment C1
Endorsement of the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan
Wider Northcote Masterplan

Wider Northcote Regeneration

Wider Northcote is leading the delivery of around 1500 homes, with a target completion date of 2025.

Of the 1500 homes, around 600 will be for housing New Zealanders and the balance for the market. (Approximately half of those will be more affordable homes) with a mix of houses and apartments (including walk-ups).

The delivery of this new housing stock will enhance retail demand and reposition Northcote as a strong growth location.
Northcote Town Centre – Delivery of Northcote Town Centre Plan 2010
Pete Baddington, Team Lead City Transformation – NorthWest, and Ian Scueru, Senior Project Leader, City Transformation Projects, were in attendance to speak to the report.
Resolution motion: ICT 2019/330
Moved by Member O’Gorman, seconded by Member J. Gillon.
That the Kaipatiki Local Board:
1. reinforces the Northcote Town Centre Plan 2010 that was adopted by North Shore City Council in July 2010;
2. continues the below project prioritisation and allocation of available budget:
   i. FY 2014: $402,355 for landscaping to less, signage, CCTV and car park design
   ii. FY 2015: $493,184 for Lake Road car park works (including lighting)
   iii. FY 2016: $948,591 to bring forward to 2016 for Lake Road car park works
   iv. FY 2016: $1,811,682 for final stage extensions, bringing forward to 2016 for Lake Road car park as required
   v. FY 2016: $2,285,061 Lake Road: bringing forward to 2016 for Lake Road car park as required
3. endorses the proposed new ten-year plan for Northcote Town Centre;
4. endorses the 89-89 cost share with Business Association to upgrade the security camera system to a maximum cost to council of $25,336.
5. requests that the Northcote Camera Surveillance Systems be designed and executed in accordance with the Auckland Council “Guideline for Camera Surveillance Systems in Public Areas” and that access to the system be provided to Police under the terms of the MoU signed between Council and Police. These matters should be documented in a funding agreement with the Business Association, including regarding operational requirements, data access, data security and privacy matters;
6. endorses a new two pre-pacified toilet near the bus stop on Teine Crescent, with final design and location subject to the Lake Road car park design plan.

CARRED
Kaipātiki Local Board

CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

Confidential minutes of a meeting of the Kaipātiki Local Board held in the Kaipātiki Local Board Office, 90 Bentley Avenue, Glenfield on Wednesday, 20 March 2019 at 4.06pm.
C1 Endorsement of the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan

Resolution number KT/2019/41

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

a) endorse the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan as per Attachment A to the agenda report.

b) request that Panuku take the following matters into account as part of future conversations with Auckland Council and potential commercial development partners:

i) that the size of the Northcote Town Square exceeds Auckland Council’s open space guidelines (1500m²) on the minimum size for town squares, and that any commercially licensed space used for hospitality (for example, cafe outdoor seating) and any adjacent road is in addition to the required minimum space, and not part of the space.

ii) that any road adjacent to the Northcote Town Square is of a slow speed that gives priority to pedestrians.

iii) that sufficient free, public parking is made available in the Northcote Town Centre to support the large variety of community, social service, hospitality outlets and retail stores.

iv) that the future community hub building includes sufficient free, 24/7 public parking within the footprint of the building, and a public open space is included on the roof of the building to help compensate for the loss of public space in the Northcote Town Centre.

v) that the elm tree on Pearn Place is retained, and that this be added as an additional bullet point to the “Green and sustainable” criteria for success.

vi) that a high quality interface with the Northcote Greenway is added as an additional bullet point to the “Green and sustainable” criteria for success.

c) endorse the overarching principles of the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan, namely:

i) Identity

ii) Cultural Values

iii) Safety/Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

iv) Flexibility/Future proofing.

d) endorse the criteria for success of the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan, namely:

i) Outward facing and inviting

ii) A legible street network

iii) Green and sustainable

iv) A sunny, sheltered town square

v) Multi-purpose community hub building

vi) Facilitates multi-modal transport

vii) Flexibility to provide car parking options

ix) A food culture destination
x) An active retail and commercial environment
xi) Apartment-led residential.

e) request that these resolutions be appended to the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan.

f) note that these resolutions will be provided to the board of Panuku Development Auckland in March 2019.

Restatement

g) confirm that there be no restatement of this confidential report, attachments or resolutions until Panuku Development Auckland has served notices of desire under Section 18 of the Public Works Act 1981.

CARRIED

6.02 pm

The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE KAIPATIKI LOCAL BOARD HELD ON

DATE: ..............................................................

CHAIRPERSON: .............................................
**Memorandum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Update on the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>15 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>Kaipātiki Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Eric Perry, Relationship Manager, Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Edwards, Senior Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>Stephen Milner, Development Manager, Panuku Development Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Rahman, Senior Engagement Advisor, Panuku Development Auckland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose**

1. To update the Kaipātiki Local Board about the Unlock Northcote project.

**Context**

2. On 20 March 2019, at its monthly business meeting, the Kaipatiki Local Board resolved their position in relation to the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan. The item ‘Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan’ was presented by Panuku Development Auckland in the confidential section of the meeting.

3. As part of the resolution, the local board agreed that there will be no restatement of the confidential report, attachments or resolutions until Panuku has served Notices of Desire under Section 18 of the Public Works Act (1981).

4. The restatement should have reflected that the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan remain confidential until a time where the affected property owners and ground lessees had been contacted by Panuku and:
   - informed that Panuku is seeking to acquire their property or interest for urban renewal under the Public Works Act (1981), and
   - opportunity provided for them to consider Panuku’s approach and where applicable inform their tenants of the approach.
5. As of Monday 8 April, Panuku have engaged with all the affected property owners and ground lessees. They have been informed of Panuku’s desire to enter into negotiations about purchase of the property and interest, and that these will be purchased under the provisions of the Act. They were also advised that the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan was to be released and available to the Northcote community on Monday 15 April.

6. The intent of the restatement will have been met with the release of the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan on Monday.

7. Panuku wishes to share its vision for the urban renewal of the town centre. We are also keen that the local board members are able to share their views. We are committed to a no surprises approach with the local board and wish to confirm that the Northcote Town Centre Benchmark Masterplan can be discussed publicly from Monday 15 April 2019 onwards.

Communications activities

8. Here is what we have planned for the coming few days:

9. On Monday 15 April:
   - update the information in the kiosk and the project team will be available to provide information and answer questions from the public.
   - the benchmark masterplan will available on our website www.panuku.co.nz/Northcote and in the kiosk.
   - The kiosk will be open to the public Monday and Tuesday from 10am to 6pm.

10. On Tuesday 16 April:
    - An update about the benchmark masterplan will be shared on our website.
    - Auckland senior reporter Todd Niall will be briefed on a walkaround with Angelika Cutler and local board chair John Gillon (12.30pm – 1.30pm).

11. On Wednesday 17 April:
    - At Midday, Our Auckland story with the regeneration of Northcote will be published.