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1 Welcome

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

3 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.

4 Confirmation of Minutes
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:
a) confirm the minutes of its ordinary meeting, held on Wednesday, 26 June 2019, as a true and correct record.

5 Leave of Absence
At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

6 Acknowledgements
At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

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

8 Deputations
Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Albert-Eden Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

8.1 Deputation - Sophie Todd - Wash Your Mouth Out Of Pollution

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To deliver a presentation by Sophie Todd and members of the Wash Your Mouth Out Of Pollution community group during the Deputation segment of the business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Sophie Todd – Wash Your Mouth Of Pollution, will be in attendance to lead members of her community group in their Deputation presentation regarding the community group’s activities and advocacy areas, including the Dignan Street Community Garden and climate change mitigation through local composting.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) thank Sophie Todd – Wash Your Mouth Of Pollution, for her attendance and Deputation presentation.

9 Public Forum

A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from members.

9.1 Public Forum - Gareth Teahan, Manager - Auckland Softball Association

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To deliver a presentation during the Public Forum segment of the business meeting, outlining Auckland Softball Association’s position regarding Auckland Council’s proposed alternative design for a demountable fence at Fowlds Park.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Gareth Teahan, Manager – Auckland Softball Association, will be in attendance to deliver a Public Forum presentation, detailing the association’s position on the proposed alternative design for a demountable fence at Fowlds Park.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) thank Gareth Teahan, Manager – Auckland Softball Association, for his attendance and Public Forum presentation.

9.2 Public Forum - Lorna Doogan, Deputy National and Auckland Coordinator - Experiencing Marine Reserves

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To deliver a presentation during the Public Forum segment of the business meeting to update the local board regarding Experiencing Marine Reserve’s recently completed work programme activities.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Lorna Doogan, Deputy National and Auckland Coordinator - Experiencing Marine Reserves, will be in attendance to deliver a Public Forum presentation thanking the local board for its support to undertake the group’s work during the past summer and to provide a summary of proposed work for next summer.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) thank Lorna Doogan, Deputy National and Auckland Coordinator - Experiencing Marine Reserves, for her attendance and Public Forum presentation.

10 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.”
Fowlds Park demountable softball fence
File No.: CP2019/13119

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Albert-Eden Local Board to install a demountable softball fence at Fowlds Park.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In July 2018, the Albert-Eden Local Board passed a resolution to construct a permanent softball backstop fence at Fowlds Park (Attachment A).
3. If the permanent fence is installed, the number two rugby league field would no longer be suitable for senior competition games and only junior games and training could be played on this field.
4. The permanent fence design has been reviewed and has been redesigned to make it demountable. During the winter season the fence is able to be removed and stored onsite.
5. If a demountable fence is installed, softball will have the infrastructure required for senior competition games and the current dimensions of the number two rugby league field can be retained.
6. There is an additional capital expenditure (capex) cost of $159,000 to make the fence demountable, and additional annual operating expenditure (opex) costs of up to $44,500 to erect and dismantle the fence (the opex cost for 2019/2020 is $18,500 as the installation costs will be covered by the capex budget when the fence is being built).
7. Council staff consider the additional capex and opex costs high but based on feedback from the sporting codes that use the park, the local board and neighbouring residents support this option as a compromise to meet the requirements of all parties.
8. $59,000 could be paid for from the currently allocated project budget. However, an additional $100,000 would need to be funded by the local board’s local driven initiatives capex budget (LDI) as there is no unallocated growth funding available.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) agree pursuant to Standing Order 1.10.4 to rescind the following resolution of the Albert-Eden Local Board, adopted during its monthly meeting held on 25 July 2018: AE/2018/248
   c) approve Option 1 in Table One — installing a permanent softball backstop fence in the current configuration on the condition that the number one league field dimensions are not changed.

b) approve the installation of a demountable softball fence in the south eastern corner of Fowlds Park on the number two league field, noting that this commits up to $44,500 of its locally driven initiatives operating budget annually to erect and dismantle the fence.

c) allocate $100,000 of its locally driven initiatives capital expenditure budget towards the installation of a demountable softball fence in the south eastern corner of Fowlds
Park on the number two league field for delivery as part of the 2019/2020 Community Facilities Work Programme.

d) reallocate $15,000 of its locally driven initiatives 2019/2020 Thriving Town Centre Programme budget to remove the demountable softball fence on the number two league field at Fowlds Park in 2019/2020.

e) reallocate $3,500 of its locally driven initiatives 2019/2020 Community Response Fund budget to remove the demountable softball fence on the number two league field at Fowlds Park in 2019/2020.

Horopaki Context

9. In July 2018, the Albert-Eden Local Board passed a resolution (AE/2018/248) to install a permanent backstop fence on field two at Fowlds Park as part of the upgrades taking place at the park.

10. This would enable both major sports user groups of the park to be provided with one full sized regulation sports pitch with the required facilities.

11. Softball would have a full sized diamond with a back stop fence and dugouts in south east corner of the park, with additional diamonds located in other parts of the park.

12. Rugby league would have one full sized field for their number one field.

13. If the permanent fence was installed, the number two field would no longer be suitable for senior competition rugby league games and only junior games and training could be played on this field.

14. Resource consent was obtained, and the project was tendered and awarded to a lead contractor.

15. The construction of the works on site were broken into stages:
   - stage one consisted of the installation of lights on all fields and the installation of a hybrid turf on field one
   - stage two involved installing hybrid turf, drainage and irrigation on fields two and three and the installation of the permanent back stop fence.

16. Stage one works are now complete with stage two due to commence in October 2019.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

17. Following the local board’s decision, staff were approached by the Mt Albert Rugby League Club and the Friends of Fowlds Park, requesting further investigation to see if the softball fence could be made demountable, so that it could be removed at the end of the softball season, stored and then erected at the start of the next season.

18. The main benefits identified by the groups were:
   - less visual impact on the park when the fence was not erected
   - the number two rugby league field could remain at its current size if the fence was not in place, noting that it would still not be a regulation size field.

19. Because of the way the project was being staged, there was a window of time to further review the fence design to see if it was possible to make the poles and panels removable.

20. Four questions were asked during this review:
• was it possible to redesign the fence as previously approved to make it fully
demountable?
• was there space on site to store the fence over the winter?
• what was the additional capex cost to fabricate and install the redesigned fence?
• what was the ongoing opex cost to erect and dismantle the fence each year?

Findings from Review
21. Engineers have been able to redesign the fence using panels and hinged poles that screw
into a concrete slab rather than being cast. The design has been included in Attachment B.
22. Once the demountable fence is taken down at the end of the softball season, the current
dimensions of the league field will be retained. There will be areas of concrete covered with
a shock pad and artificial turf in the safety buffer zone surrounding the field and potentially
on the field of play, as shown in Attachment C.
23. The artificial turf will be safe to play league on. Currently the softball home plates are
constructed out of artificial turf on base course, and are located in the field of play as shown
in Attachment D.
24. There is space on site next to the softball shed to store the fence during the winter. A new
concrete pad would be required to store the fence on.
25. The new design and costs were presented to stakeholders at a meeting on 30 May 2019. In
attendance were representatives from Friends of Fowlds Park, Mt Albert Rugby League,
Auckland Softball, Albert-Eden Local Board and council staff. The views of the various
stakeholders are summarised below.

Mt Albert Rugby League Club
26. The Mount Albert Rugby League Club Committee provided written feedback on 11 June
2019.
27. The club’s main priority is to retain the current dimensions of the number one and number
two rugby league fields to accommodate senior competition games.

Friends of Fowlds Park
28. Friends of Fowlds Park (FOFP) provided written feedback on 11 June 2019.
29. Friends of Fowlds Park support the demountable fence but has requested a number of
changes to the proposed design.
30. The main changes relate to the foundation design, FOFP do not want any concrete closer
than 150mm beneath the rugby league surface and want to see the foundations more like
rugby league goal posts with concrete sleeves in the ground rather than a concrete slab.
They also have requested that the fence is painted green.
31. Staff do not support this foundation design for the following reasons:
• the current foundation slab design requires concrete to be 400mm deep. In ground
sleeves would require deeper foundations needing to be dug in the underlying rock
which is difficult and expensive
• there would need to be 40 in ground sleeves that would need to be found each time the
fence was to be installed. Over time, there is a risk that these could fill up with soil,
making it difficult to install the poles
• having to mow the grass inside the dugouts would be more difficult for contractors and
there is a risk machinery could damage the fences whilst working in the confined spaces
the same outcome can be achieved using the concrete slab design with an artificial surface on top. This is safe for rugby league players and reduces the visual effect of the bare concrete

- having the dugout areas in artificial turf will be much more resistant to wear and won’t have to be reseeded each year at the conclusion of the softball season.

32. Council staff also do not support painting the fence green for the following reasons:
- the cost estimate to paint the fence is $21,000
- the fence paint will scratch off through wear and tear during installing and dismantling and will require additional OPEX cost to keep them in good repair.

Auckland United Softball Club and Auckland Softball

33. The Auckland United Softball Club and Auckland Softball have steadfastly supported the installation of a permanent backstop fence with dugouts on the number one diamond in its current configuration.

34. They do not support the demountable option. They have concerns that it will not be installed and removed properly and believe it will restrict their play to only when the fence is installed and won’t not provide any flexibility to play softball during the fringes of the seasons.

35. They do not believe the benefits of the demountable fence outweigh the additional capex and opex costs.

36. Whilst this feedback is noted, the demountable fence is the same size and scale as the permanent fence. It achieves the same outcomes once installed and will meet the International Softball Federation rules allowing senior competition play.

37. Should the local board approve the demountable option it will commit up to $44,500 of its annually driven initiative budget to ensure that the fence is installed properly and in a timely manner at the start of each season.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

38. Council’s Operations and Maintenance team has been consulted with as well as the full facilities contractor that manage the park regarding the design of the fence and the methodology to install and remove.

39. The quotes received to install and dismantle the fence have been provided by AIM Services who will undertake the work. The quote of $44,500 is a worst-case scenario as it is difficult to gauge exactly how long it will take at this stage. As noted above, should the local board approve the demountable option $44,500 of its annual locally driven initiative budget will be committed in order to ensure that the fence is installed properly and in a timely manner at the start of each season.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe

Local impacts and local board views

40. The local board has the decision-making authority over recreation facilities and initiatives including the specific location, design, build and fit out of new local recreation and sports facilities within budget parameters agreed with the governing body and the use of local recreation facilities and initiatives including leasing and changes of use.

41. At a local board workshop on 12 June 2019 the demountable fence option was presented and discussed. The demountable fence was generally supported by board members and staff were requested to investigate what funding could be made available to cover the additional capex and ongoing opex costs.
42. Staff recommendations for funding are set out in the financial Implications section of this report.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

Māori impact statement

43. Consultation was undertaken with Parks and Recreation – Central/ South Mana Whenua Engagement meeting held on 30 May 2018 and no major objections were raised.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

Financial implications

44. The original capex cost to construct the permanent fence was $240,000. The estimated cost for the demountable fence is $399,000. Staff do not recommend allocating an additional $21,000 to paint the fence green.

45. This is an additional $159,000. The extra costs are mainly attributed to the additional galvanized steel required to make the panels.

46. $59,000 could be paid for from the currently allocated project budget. However, an additional $100,000 would need to be funded by the local board’s local driven initiatives capex budget (LDI) as there is no unallocated growth funding available.

47. An estimate was received from AIM Services to erect and dismantle the fence. It is difficult to estimate costs at this stage and AIM have provided a worst case estimate. To install they have estimated $26,000 and to dismantle $18,500. This includes all labour and machinery costs as well as track matting to protect the hybrid turf.

48. Therefore, should the local board approve the demountable option $44,500 of its annual locally driven initiatives budget will be committed in order to ensure that the fence is installed properly and in a timely manner at the start of each season.

49. The Board has approved 2019/2020 work programmes so some projects are required to be cancelled and funds re-allocated in order to source the opex funding required for the demountable fence.

50. In 2019/2020, only the cost to remove the fence ($18,500) needs to be allocated as the contractors will install the fence as part of their contract.

51. Staff have reviewed the locally driven initiatives opex funded work programmes and recommend the following projects for cancellation:

- Thriving Town Centre Programme (1160) - $15,000 (out of a total budget of $128,000)
- Community Response Fund (3307) - $3,500 (out of a total of $7,164).

52. The Thriving Town Centre implementation is recommended as $15,000 was not spent in 2018/2019 financial year and has been carried forward, to be used for a project in Mt Eden. The same amount of funding was allocated in the Thriving Town Centre 2019/2020 budget but this $15,000 is not required. It is therefore surplus and available for use.

53. The remaining budget is recommended to be drawn from the Community Response Fund as this is unallocated funds which are set aside to fund activities/items that come up during the year. Some budget will remain in this fund to respond to issues throughout the year.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

Risks and mitigations

54. Cost to construct is more than budget allocated. This is mitigated by using a methodology that minimises the depth of the foundations which reduces the risk of encountering rock that needs to be broken through.
55. Installation and dismantling costs are higher than expected. This has been mitigated by the contractors being very conservative and allowing seven days to install and five days to remove the fence.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

56. If the local board approve the demountable fence and allocate required budget, construction will commence from October 2019.
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**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Original Resolution AE2018248</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Demountable Fence Design</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Visualisation of Fence</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Existing situation</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kris Bird - Manager Sports Parks Design &amp; Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Orakei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution number AE/2018/248

MOVED by Member M Watson, seconded by Member J Rose:
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) approve the upgrade of Fowlds Park as per Attachments A and B.
b) acknowledge that the lower platform at Fowlds Park is not large enough to accommodate a full size softball diamond and permanent backstop fence without major earthworks, tree removal and retaining walls.
c) approve Option 1 in Table One – installing a permanent softball backstop fence in the current configuration on the condition that the number one league field dimensions are not changed.
d) approve fields two and three to be constructed in the 2018/2019 construction season and field one in the 2019/2020 construction season (the lights will be installed on all three fields in the 2018/2019 construction season).
e) thank Kris Bird, Manager Sports Parks Design and Programme, for his attendance.

CARRIED
Fowlds Park demountable softball fence

Attachment B

Item 11

1. Refer to Fraser Thomas Technical Specification 412381 for all material and documentation requirements.

2. Concrete shall have a compressive strength of 30Mpa.

3. All services shall be located and protected by the contractor during works.

Plan

DRAFT

4000 Thick concrete 30Mpa base
4000 Thick concrete 30Mpa base

NZSTI

Fowlds Park Mount Albert

Fowlds Park Sports Field: Softball Fence Plan

Fraser Thomas

Engineers - Landscape 
Designers - Surveyors

The concept of this design and drawing is owned by Fraser Thomas LTD, and any reproduction is illegal.
Item 11

Attachment C
Developing an Integrated Area Plan for a part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local board areas

File No.: CP2019/11000

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek Albert-Eden Local Board approval to develop the Integrated Area Plan for a part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local board areas.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Over the next 10 to 15 years, the Urban Development Group (UDG), formerly Homes Land Community proposes to replace approximately 2,500 state houses with up to 10,000 new homes within the Mt Roskill redevelopment area (refer Attachment A).
3. The UDG is developing a draft spatial delivery strategy (SDS) for a part of Mt Roskill to support the increase in housing, alongside investments in infrastructure and community services to assist in delivering strong and resilient communities.
4. In response to the transformational changes proposed by the draft SDS for Mt Roskill, the Plans and Places Department intends to develop an Integrated Area Plan for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local board areas.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) supports the development of an Integrated Area Plan for the Mt Roskill redevelopment area which is part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local board areas.

Horopaki
Context
5. The Mt Roskill redevelopment area as defined by UDG has been identified by the Government as a development area because it has significant state housing holdings, the need to renew the state housing assets, good transport links and community facilities.
6. The UDG is preparing a draft SDS for a part of the Mt Roskill area to support the Auckland Housing Programme, and to identify supporting actions for infrastructure and community services required to ensure their broader objective of providing quality homes and resilient communities.
7. The draft SDS is an aspirational document but is founded on previous Council documents, staff advice and key technical reports.
8. Central to the draft SDS is consideration of the broader environment and the context in which the UDG’s redevelopment area sits and includes:
   - transport links, open spaces and community facilities
   - the character and function of neighbourhood and town centres
   - natural landscapes and heritage features
biodiversity, ecology and water quality.

9. The UDG’s mandate to provide more homes and create greater places to live has led the draft SDS to identify potential future plan changes to rezone land to support better land use and transport outcomes. These may be undertaken at the same time as the development of the Integrated Area Plan.

10. To date, the UDG has engaged with the council, mana whenua, infrastructure providers (e.g. Auckland Transport and Watercare Services), and crown agencies (e.g. Ministry of Education) on its draft SDS. Further, the UDG is actively progressing detailed neighbourhood masterplanning in part of the wider precinct area covered by the draft SDS.

11. The process to develop an Integrated Area Plan will provide a number of opportunities for the community, mana whenua and stakeholders to share their thoughts and ideas on the UDG’s draft SDS, and the future of their area. Community feedback will help inform the development of the Plan for a part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local board areas.

**Process for preparing the Integrated Area Plan**

12. Development of the Integrated Area Plan is proposed to occur over a 15-month time frame from August 2019 to December 2020. The draft process to prepare the Plan is outlined below. The process for developing the plan will be discussed and confirmed at an August workshop, and reported to the board meeting in September 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Indicative dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review existing relevant information</td>
<td>August 2019 to January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First community consultation period</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of feedback and preparation of the draft Integrated Area Plan for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local board areas</td>
<td>March to May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second community consultation period on the approved draft Integrated Area Plan for part of Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local board areas</td>
<td>June to August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of feedback received and plan amendments</td>
<td>September to October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and approval of the final Integrated Area Plan by the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local boards, and adoption of the plan by the Planning Committee</td>
<td>November to December 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The development of the Integrated Area Plan could identify different land use opportunities, improvements to business centres, key infrastructure needs and opportunities to enhance landscape and heritage features. However, the Integrated Area Plan is a non-statutory planning document and cannot set rules for controlling development or directly approve the funding of projects.

14. This approach anticipates regular inputs and integration from other council departments (e.g. urban design, open space, heritage, community, cultural and environmental teams and economic development), council-controlled organisations including Auckland Transport and key external infrastructure providers and other government organisations.
15. There is a need to prepare an Integrated Area Plan for a part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local board areas where UDG’s draft SDS has identified key proposals and actions, including potential future plan changes to rezone land in part of these local board areas to achieve better land use and transport outcomes, and to support a quality compact urban form.

16. The development of the Integrated Area Plan provides the opportunity for the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local boards, council staff, UDG, and the community to work collaboratively together to capitalise on the transformational actions and projects in the draft SDS for the benefit of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local board areas.

17. The exact boundary for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local board areas, that will be subject to review and a detailed work programme will be presented at a workshop with the local board in August 2019.

18. The development of the Integrated Area Plan will involve relevant council departments, and agencies including Auckland Transport and Watercare Services.

19. The UDG’s draft SDS for Mt Roskill includes parts of the Albert-Eden, Puketāpapa, and Whau local board areas; with most relevance to the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local boards.

20. Partnering with the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local boards will be an integral part of developing an Integrated Area Plan for part of these local board areas. There will also be opportunities for the neighbouring Whau Local Board to provide comments to inform the development of the Plan.

21. Consultation on developing the Integrated Area Plan by council has not yet occurred with mana whenua or mataawaka. However, the UDG have worked actively with mana whenua for over a year on the preparation of the draft SDS.

22. If the recommendations of this report are adopted, the preparation of the Plan will include engagement with all mana whenua groups with an interest and kaitiakitanga obligations in this area, and mataawaka. Early and ongoing engagement will help grow relationships with mana whenua and mataawaka and establish key issues and matters to be considered during the development of the Plan.

23. The preparation of the Integrated Area Plan will be funded from existing Plans and Places Departmental budgets.
Risks and mitigations

24. There are risks that the Integrated Area Plan may raise expectations that the council will contribute resources to fund new actions and projects. Funding to support the actions and projects may be sought from the:
   - Annual Plan
   - Long-term Plan
   - council-controlled organisations
   - Central Government
   - Community groups.

25. There is a reputational risk if the actions and projects in the Integrated Area Plan do not progress, and council may be criticised for raising community expectations. Staff will develop an implementation and monitoring programme for the Plan to provide guidance to key council stakeholders, the local board, and delivery partners.

26. It is also possible that the key moves and actions in the Integrated Area Plan will differ from the key proposals and actions in the UDG’s draft SDS. During the preparation of the Plan, there will be opportunities to discuss these matters with the UDG.

Next steps

27. The next steps for preparing the Integrated Area Plan are matters for the Albert-Eden Local Board to consider. This report seeks the support of the local board for the development of the Plan. A report on developing the Plan will also be prepared for the council’s Planning Committee in August 2019.
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Attachment A Item 12
Auckland Transport July 2019 Update

File No.: CP2019/13297

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To receive the Auckland Transport monthly update to the Albert-Eden Local Board for July 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Each month, Auckland Transport provides an update to the Albert-Eden Local Board on transport-related matters and relevant consultations in its area, Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) projects and decisions of Auckland Transport’s Traffic Control Committee.
3. The Auckland Transport July 2019 update is appended to this report as Attachment A.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport July 2019 Update report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Albert-Eden Local Board (the Board) on transport-related matters in its area, an update on its local board transport capital fund (LBTCF) and relevant consultations and the decisions of AT’s Traffic Control Committee.

Whakarāpopotanga matua

Executive summary
2. Progress on the Board’s LBTCF funded projects is noted. The Board has $1,599,072 remaining in this political term.
3. The Board has access to $1,288,926 from a new fund, the Community Safety Fund. Eligibility of projects for this fund is discussed in the report and the projects prioritised for delivery under this fund are listed. When the fund is exhausted, other priority projects can be funded from the LBTCF.
4. Information on the status of significant projects in the Board area is provided.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:
  a) receive the Auckland Transport July 2019 update report.

Horopaki

Context
5. AT is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. It reports on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in its Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role of local boards within and on behalf of their local communities.
6. The LBTCF is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council and delivered by Auckland Transport (AT). Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they believe are important but are not part of AT’s work programme. Projects must also:
   • be safe
   • not impede network efficiency
   • be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice
Community Safety Fund
7. The 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan allocated $20m for local initiatives in road safety: $5m in financial year 2019/2020 and $15m in financial year 2020/2021. It is apportioned to local board areas by formula focused on numbers of Deaths and Serious Injuries (DSI).
8. The fund has been named the Community Safety Fund (CSF) and Albert-Eden Local Board area has been allocated $1,288,926 over the two years, with decisions on projects due by 30 June 2019.

9. Projects may be supplemented with the board’s transport capital fund surplus (if there is one) but all CSF funding must be spent, with no carryover possible.

10. The Board prepared a list of projects in April 2019 and these were assessed, provided a rough order of costs (RoC) and reported back to a workshop in June 2019. At that workshop, the Board prioritised the list of projects and these were confirmed by resolution in late June 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RoC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signalised crossing on Great North Road in Pt Chevalier Village - Improvement</td>
<td>Add improvements to the signals to reduce risky behaviour by pedestrians trying to cross the road against the lights. Recommendations are to consider introducing count down timers to assist pedestrian behaviour, review cycle times and consider “hot” response activation.</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Waterview School (Herdmans Street)</td>
<td>Make improvements to the school’s new, relocated main entrance to increase visibility and safety for children. The recommendation is to upgrade the crossing amenity between Daventry and the new school access. - options may include further speed calming and improvement of inter-visibility between motorists and pedestrians It will need to be located away from GNR to achieve approach sight distance.</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mt Eden Normal Primary School</td>
<td>Upgrade crossings on Valley and Sherbourne Roads to a raised table pedestrian crossing. This should provide both safer crossing points for pedestrians and calm traffic through the Valley Road / Sherbourne Road intersection.</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Our Lady of the Sacred Heart School</td>
<td>Provide a crossing facility for pedestrians needing to get to the bus stop across the road at 539 Manukau Road. Recommendation is for a mid-block signalised crossing as it is a multi-lane environment.</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Epsom Normal Primary School</td>
<td>Safety improvements around The Drive / Greenlane West. Recommendations: Countdown timers at The Drive/Greenlane intersection and raising the existing zebra outside Epsom Primary Upgrade School Zone signage.</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Great North Road (Western Springs)</td>
<td>Improvements to the refuge islands would not be optimal. The safest option would be a mid-block signalised crossing due to the multi-lane approaches.</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Funds Allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Woodward Road The provision of a safe crossing point and better pedestrian connection from Phyllis Reserve / Harbutt Reserve / Waterview Shared Path to the Mount Albert shops and train station. The ROC includes costs for sets of side islands each side of Woodward Road, along with new footpath connections, tactile pavers and 1 new street light. Traffic Management costs are included and will cost a significant amount.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$111,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>New North Road near Wolseley Street Provide a safe crossing point for those crossing New North Road to the underpass at Morningside station. A signalised mid-block crossing is the recommended option.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Great North Road pedestrian safety, 1582 Great North Road, between Blockhouse Bay Road and signals Add a pedestrian crossing point for people exiting the bus on Great North Road. Extremely busy road with people waiting on median strip for a period of time to complete their crossing. The recommendation is for a mid-block crossing as it is a multi-lane environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$390,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Update on Funded Albert-Eden LBTDF projects:**

11. There is $1,599,072 in the Board’s LBTDF and ideally this should be allocated as soon as possible. Projects which are unable to be funded from the Community Safety Fund but which are still important to the Board may be funded from the LBTDF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Funds Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain Park Greenway and Bridge</td>
<td>Construction of shared path and bridge</td>
<td>The shared path will link Rawalpindi Reserve, through the proposed local park, to the North Western pathway. This project is being managed by Auckland Council Community Facilities. Concept designs and costings have been completed. This project is now on hold while consent issues are worked through.</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Road mobility parking</td>
<td>Establishing mobility parking and traffic calming to support activities on Windmill Reserve and the netball courts.</td>
<td>The tender has been let for this project. Traffic management approvals are in progress. A September finish date is still anticipated.</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterview Pathway / Alford Street Tie-in</td>
<td>To provide a more seamless connection between Alford Street</td>
<td>Engineers are now completing more detailed technical investigation. It is</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Progress being made on significant investigations and projects in the Albert-Eden Area

12. The following table provides a summary of the results of investigations and progress on projects in the Board area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point Chevalier to Westmere cycleway</td>
<td>The preferred treatment for Point Chevalier Road has been agreed. A dedicated cycle route along Point Chevalier Road turning into Meola Road and ending near the Westmere Shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Around Schools</td>
<td>Investigations are beginning into providing alternative drop-off areas around Owairaka School as well as measures to slow traffic on Richardson Road near the school gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots Project to improve safety outcomes in the area around Owairaka School</td>
<td>The school crossing upgrade on Richardson Road was recently upgraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 13</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alford Street</strong></td>
<td>An investigation leading to developing a design for a crossing facility on Alford Street close to Kuaka Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carrington Road Zebra Crossing</strong></td>
<td>Improvements to the zebra crossing and nearby cycle lane safety improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mt Eden Road Bus Lane Improvements</strong></td>
<td>To provide for more continuous bus lanes on Mt Eden Road and safety in the Mt Eden Village area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wayfinding Signage on the Northwestern and Waterview pathways</strong></td>
<td>A project to develop wayfinding signage on these routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eden Terrace Parking Survey</strong></td>
<td>An investigation into parking patterns in this inner-city suburb is taking place with a view to introducing a residential parking zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sandringham Area LATM</strong></td>
<td>A project to provide area wide traffic calming in the area behind the Sandringham Village shops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and is working well.
A demonstration day is being planned for late July and the Board has been invited to attend. The community safety team will report back on how the day went and any other updates in August 2019.

This project is included in the 2019/2020 minor improvement programme.

This project is now completed.

Tender documents have been finalised and approval from the Traffic Control Committee has been obtained.
The work in Mt Eden Village is due to begin on 22 July 2019. It includes new parking arrangements, bus lane operating times and an extension of the city-bound bus stop. Time is being taken to discuss how to minimise any disruptions to businesses in the village area.

Schedule is complete. Graphics are completed.
Signage is now being erected on the Northwestern cyclepath from CBD to Westgate and the Waterview pathway to Maioro Road.

AT proposed a residential parking zone to residents in March 2019.
Results of the consultation are expected to be shared with the Board in the August transport workshop.
Implementation of the zone, if supported, will be in the next financial year.

Following review of the programme against available budget, investigation is no longer scheduled for 2019/2020, but the area remains on our shortlist. Further details are available on AT’s website:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Management Programme</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Manukau Road Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT has consulted on improving pedestrian facilities on Manukau Road between Greenlane West Road and Campbell Crescent. This includes a pedestrian refuge and a signalised mid-block crossing.</td>
<td>This project is programmed for delivery early in the 2019/2020 financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Arabi Street / Oxton Road intersection safety improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT is proposing to install two new speed humps on Oxton Road, near the intersection with Arabi Street. This is expected to encourage drivers on Oxton Road to slow down on their approach, improving road safety and reducing risks by increasing driver awareness.</td>
<td>This project has been through public consultation and is now at detailed design phase. Its delivery is expected in the 2019/2020 financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mountain View Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of speed humps to address safety concerns.</td>
<td>This project is at the procurement stage and is expected to be delivered by the end of July 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>St Lukes Road / Morningside Drive Pedestrian Safety Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This would involve raising the existing zebra crossing, widening the pedestrian island and introducing a new advanced stop box for people on bikes as well as some road marking alterations and narrowing of median islands between roads.</td>
<td>This project has been through consultation and is now at detailed design phase. Delivery is expected in the 2019/2020 financial year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

**Council group impacts and views**

13. The impact of information outlined in this report is confined to Auckland Transport and does not impact on other parts of the Council group. Any engagement with other parts of the Council group will be carried out on an individual project basis.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe**

**Local impacts and local board views**

14. Auckland Transport attended a workshop in June 2019 to discuss the community safety priorities. These were confirmed during the June 2019 business meeting and are noted above.

15. A transport portfolio meeting in early July 2019 discussed and refined the Mt Albert traffic calming project and provided feedback before the Board’s 10 July 2019 workshop.

16. The Board workshop of 10 July 2019 considered the Mt Albert traffic calming rough order of costs and the proposed interventions. It was agreed that a report will come to the Board’s August 2019 business meeting so an allocation from the transport capital fund for the project can be confirmed.

17. This workshop also looked at other priorities for the local board transport capital fund and these will also be reported in August 2019.
Consultation

18. Over the last reporting period, AT has invited the Board to provide their feedback on the proposal described below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pine Street, Mt Eden</td>
<td>AT is proposing to upgrade the existing crossing located outside number 38 Pine Street, Mt Eden to raised zebra crossing. Our proposal responds to a request from the local community to address issues of pedestrian safety, especially for school children. The raised crossing is expected to improve road safety for people walking in the area by slowing approaching traffic and prioritising pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Control Committee resolutions

19. The June 2019 decisions of the traffic control committee were not available at the time of the writing of this report and will be reported in the August 2019 report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

20. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no impacts or opportunities for Māori. Any engagement with Māori, or consideration of impacts and opportunities, will be carried out on an individual project basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

21. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no financial implications.

22. The table below gives the LBTCF financial summary for the Albert-Eden Local Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Albert Eden Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds Available in current political term</td>
<td>$4,020,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount committed to date on projects approved for design and/or construction</td>
<td>$2,421,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget left</td>
<td>$1,599,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

23. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no risks.

24. The Board has a considerable sum of money ($1,599,072) left in its transport capital fund. This money is available and could be allocated to projects identified during the process of allocating funds to the Community Safety Fund as that fund is likely to be fully subscribed.

25. The Board should also keep some funds aside to supplement the last Community Safety project that is possible under that funding umbrella so as exhaust that fund.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

26. Auckland Transport will provide another update report to the Board next month.
Ngā tāpirihanga
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Local Board feedback on the Productivity Commission inquiry into local government funding and financing

File No.: CP2019/13162

Purpose of the report

1. To provide an opportunity for local boards to formally provide feedback on the Productivity Commission’s (the commission) inquiry into local government funding and financing.

Executive summary

2. On 4 July 2019, the Productivity Commission released its draft report relating to its local government funding and financing inquiry.

3. The inquiry’s key aim is establishing whether the existing funding and financing arrangements are suitable for enabling local authorities to meet current and future cost pressures.

4. The commission’s draft report:
   - raises eight questions
   - highlights 67 findings
   - makes 30 recommendations.

5. Local boards are advised that their views and feedback for staff to consider when drafting the submission, need to be received by Monday, 29 July 2019.

6. Auckland Council will make a submission on the draft report. Staff will prepare a submission for the Finance and Performance Committee’s consideration at its meeting on 20 August 2019. Submissions on the inquiry close on 29 August 2019.

Recommendation/s

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) provide formal feedback on the Productivity Commission inquiry into local government funding and financing.

Context

7. Central Government asked the Commission to conduct an inquiry into local government funding and financing in July 2018. The inquiry’s terms of reference require the commission to examine the adequacy and efficiency of the current local government funding and financing framework and, where shortcomings in the current system are identified, examine options and approaches for improving the system.

8. The inquiry’s terms of reference do not call for an assessment of, or changes to the current scope and responsibilities of local government.
9. The Commission’s issues paper was released on 6 November 2018. The council made a submission on the issues paper which was approved by the Finance and Performance Committee. The council’s submission to the issues paper can be found as Attachment A.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
10. The draft report is available on the commission’s website.
11. The commission’s ‘At a glance’ document can be found as Attachment B and its ‘A3 overview’ is at Attachment C.
12. The draft report states that:
   - the current funding and financing framework is broadly sound but that councils need new tools to help them deal with some specific cost pressures
   - if councils struggle to deal with rising costs, or are not incentivised to improve their performance, communities are unlikely to reach their potential
   - the funding and financing framework for local government must incentivise good performance and enable local authorities to deliver quality amenities and services that reflect the preferences and aspirations of their communities.
13. The commission has found that the existing funding model is insufficient to address cost pressures in the following four areas and that new tools are required:
   - supplying enough infrastructure to support rapid urban growth
   - adapting to the impacts of climate change
   - coping with the growth of tourism
   - the accumulation of responsibilities placed on local government by central government.
14. The commission also considers the three-waters sector an important area for investigation.
15. The inquiry’s terms of reference have also been amended to require the commission to consider whether a tax on vacant land would be a useful mechanism to improve the supply of available housing. The addition is a result of the Tax Working Group’s final report to the government.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
16. The council group’s impact and views will be developed and presented for the Finance and Performance Committee’s consideration at its meeting on 20 August 2019.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
17. Local boards are advised that their views and feedback for staff to consider when drafting the submission, need to be received by Monday, 29 July 2019.
18. Any formal feedback received after 29 July and before 19 August 2019 will be provided to the Finance and Performance Committee to seek their endorsement to incorporate in the council’s submission.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
19. Staff will also seek input from the Independent Māori Statutory Board.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
20. There are no financial implications in deciding to make a submission. However, there may be positive or negative financial implications if the government decides to implement any of the recommendations made by the Productivity Commission.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
21. If the local board does not contribute to the submission, then there is a risk that the Auckland Council family’s position on this inquiry will not reflect issues that are important to the local community.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
22. The council will make a submission on the draft report. Staff will prepare a submission for the Finance and Performance Committee’s consideration at its meeting on 20 August 2019.
23. A workshop to discuss the draft council submission with the Finance and Performance Committee has been scheduled for 15 August 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Auckland Council submission

New Zealand Productivity Commission Local government funding and financing: Issues Paper

26 February 2019
Auckland Council’s submission on the Productivity Commission’s issues paper on its local government funding and financing inquiry

1. Auckland Council welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on the Productivity Commission’s issues paper. The council looks forward to the opportunity to make further submissions in response to the Commission’s draft report on the local government funding and financing inquiry due to be released in June 2019.

2. This submission has been approved by the council’s Finance and Performance Committee. The address for service is Auckland Council, Private Bag 92300, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142.

3. Please direct any enquiries to Matthew Walker, Group Chief Financial Officer, at matthew.walker@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz and/or on 021-229-4004.
Introduction

1. This submission sets out the council’s views on the key financing and funding challenges as identified in our 10-year Budget 2018-2028, Auckland Plan 2050 and our 30-year Infrastructure Strategy. Commentary is also provided on some of other issues that are not covered by those documents.

Executive summary

2. Auckland is going through a period of economic and population growth that is placing demands on our ability to sustain services levels and to provide the new infrastructure to support this expansion. At the same time our communities’ service level expectations are rising and our costs are increasing faster than the CPI. The council cannot access all the capital to meet these investment demands without facing substantially higher interest costs and its primary funding source is constrained by the community’s strong preference for low rates increases.

3. Local government is led by elected members and primarily self-funding. Councils are responsible for planning their cities and regions and alongside government delivering the infrastructure required to bring these plans to fruition to support living in a modern society. Not all elected representatives or staff in both arms of government are familiar with the responsibilities and constraints on their counterparts. Both parties need to continue to build on their understanding to support a closer and more productive working relationship.

4. Auckland Council differs from the majority of other councils in terms of scale. Auckland is a third of New Zealand’s population and economy and 50 per cent of the country’s growth is occurring within our boundaries. We are equivalent to a state government in Australia yet the funding tools at our disposal are designed for a past we left behind 8 years ago, if not longer. Charges on land, rates and development contributions, are no longer appropriate for the demands and decisions we are responsible for. This submission emphasises the importance of seeking new funding sources, reviewing the respective roles of local and central government and the value of working together.

5. In 2018 the council partnered with Fulton Hogan and Crown Infrastructure Partners (CIP) for CIP to finance the additional infrastructure needed to progress the Milford development. The council is continuing to work on new ways to partner with others to fund and finance infrastructure within the current legislative environment building on the success of Milford. Done successfully this will enable more development areas to be supported earlier. We will continue to work with central government on the Urban Growth Agenda and changes to legislation that would support these kinds of arrangements.

6. The government benefits from increased income tax and GST revenues arising from council investment in economic development, e.g. the Americas Cup and visitor attraction whereas the financial returns to the council are low. Despite the benefits to the region most ratepayers gain little and are unwilling to fund it. Accordingly, there is a strong case for the council to have access to some of the tax gains from this investment and/or the government funding a greater share of the required investment. In addition the council would like the ability to set some industry specific charges like bed taxes as in these circumstances they are superior to our targeted rates mechanisms for recovering some of these costs.

7. The council also considers there is scope for the government to make changes to enhance the flexibility of existing funding tools reflecting the developing trust between government and the council. These tools include rates, fuel taxes, development contributions and New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) subsidies. Useful changes could include:

- allowing the regional fuel tax and development contributions to be set based on broad future funding intentions rather than specific identified projects that limit the council’s ability to respond to the development market and changing transport priorities.
amending NZTA subsidy level rules to reflect the agreement on the share of local and central government funding in the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP)

provide the council with greater information gathering powers to establish how properties are being used so rates can be set fairly. At present ratepayers aren’t required to advise the council on how they are using their land.
Financing and funding challenges

Infrastructure and investment demand

8. Auckland continues to experience strong population and economic growth. It is estimated that the Auckland region has a current shortfall of around 35,000 dwellings to meet demand for housing. A further 313,000 dwellings and work places to support over 250,000 jobs will be required by 2050 to meet expected growth. The building shortfall leads to housing affordability issues that are most obviously manifested in the growing numbers of homeless. Rapid population and economic growth not only challenge our investment programme but also add costs to achieving our goal of building a city inclusive of all its residents irrespective of income or ethnicity.

9. To support this development the council’s 10-year Budget, covering the period 2018/2028, has a capital programme of over $26 billion to develop both physical and social infrastructure. This investment is not, however, sufficient to enable all the future urban areas to be developed or all of the intensification projects to proceed immediately. The council has had to necessarily prioritise and sequence its investment meaning that some infrastructure challenges are still to be addressed.

10. The cost of infrastructure is rising as the cost of land and construction costs increase beyond the CPI. In addition, the cost of providing for consequential operating expenditure is increasing as our investment in infrastructure expands. At the same time the community’s level of service expectations are growing, and or the community becoming increasingly diverse, the type of facilities being demanded is also changing rapidly.

11. In particular the cost of transport investment is rising as construction is conducted with greater attention to management of environmental issues and worker and public safety. Councils experiencing higher growth also face proportionally higher road maintenance costs then more stable regions arising from the heavy vehicle movements associated with construction activity.

12. As New Zealand’s premier city the council is taking responsibility for hosting key events like the America’s Cup and major sporting contests. These and other economic development initiatives require the council to make substantial investment and expenditure commitments. The benefits of this expenditure extend beyond the Auckland region, have little impact on our rates revenue and aren’t felt directly by most ratepayers, particularly those on fixed incomes. However, the principle source of financing and funding remains general ratepayers.

13. Beyond the infrastructure demands required to support growth the council also has to deal with the pressure growth is placing on existing services and systems, in particular transport and the environment.

14. In transport, almost 25 per cent of Auckland’s arterial road net work is now congested in the morning peak compared to 18 per cent less than four years ago. Congestion outside peak times and on weekends is also becoming more frequent with over 10 per cent of the network now experiencing inter-peak congestion. Auckland has also seen a near-doubling in road deaths and serious injuries over the past five years.

15. Part of the strategic response to congestion has been the provision of more frequent and reliable bus services with simple affordable fare structures. This has been very successful in changing mode-share away from private vehicles. However, this comes at a cost and is starting to place pressure on the council’s operating budget as public transport is funded by a mix of fares, NZTA subsidies and general rates.

16. Auckland’s growth is placing increasing pressure on the environment. Marine and freshwater sites have been polluted by sediments and contaminants arising from development, building and industrial activities. Continued investment is required to manage the development of 15,000 hectares of future urban land identified in the Unitary Plan and intensification in the existing urban area.

17. Climate change will also place pressure on our transport and three waters assets. We are already seeing increasing problems with coastal assets, such as sea walls, being severely damaged during storms and
roads such as Tamaki Drive are experiencing inundation on a more regular basis. The SOLGM submission identifies the direct costs to council's at between "... $1-$3 billion for roads and three waters." SOLGM notes that "... while these are significant on their own these may be dwarfed when the process of managed retreat begins."

**Financing**

18. The council’s lack of debt headroom is the primary constraint on our ability to provide the infrastructure to meet the demands identified above. The council has a credit rating of Aa2 and AA from Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s, respectively. Borrowing beyond our debt ceiling – which the council is very close to – would risk a downgrade to the credit rating, meaning a higher interest costs across all our borrowing and a reduced ability to access capital markets. A downgrade in Auckland Council's credit rating would also impact on the credit rating of the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA) thus also impacting the borrowing costs of all other councils that raise funds through the LGFA.

**Funding**

19. Even if we could raise the debt to finance all the required investment the council is likely to face constraints in generating the on-going funding to support additional borrowing. Rates (including targeted rates) are a highly visible form of tax that account for 46 per cent of funding for Auckland Council. Control of its own source of taxation gives local government in New Zealand a larger degree of autonomy than is the case in many other systems of local government, but this comes with a greater degree of accountability to local communities.

20. The community has expressed a strong preference for lower rates increases. The 10-year Budget has set rates limits of 2.5 per cent for 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 and 3.5 per cent for the remainder of the period. It is not certain that the community, and future council's, will support 3.5 per cent increases when incomes are not rising at this level.

21. As part of the 10-year Budget the council consulted on targeted rates¹ set, on capital value, to fund additional investment in improving the quality of Auckland’s waterways, harbours, beaches and environment. This provided for a more informed discussion with the community about increasing the rates to meet these investment needs. The community supported these changes and they were adopted as part of the 10-year Budget.

**Solutions**

22. The Auckland region and the council need access to new financing arrangements and a broader range of funding tools to enable the investment required to maintain service levels for the existing population and provide the infrastructure needed to support future growth. Legislative change and a continuation of the government's involvement in infrastructure financing and funding are required to enable provision of the capital to unlock the region's potential.

**New sources of financing**

23. Limits on the council's ability to borrow mean that new sources of financing are required to support the investment required to accelerate Auckland's growth and speed up housing development. An example of this is the partnership the council, Fulton Hogan and Crown Infrastructure Partners (CIP) entered into for the Milford development. The arrangement used capital from CIP along with debt obtained by CIP in the

---

¹ Water quality targeted rate and Natural environment targeted rate.
private market to fund the additional investment required for the project to proceed. Fulton Hogan and subsequently new house buyers will pay this back over time via an infrastructure payment to be collected by the council and recorded on their rates invoices.

24. The council is continuing to work on new ways to partner with others to build and finance infrastructure within the current legislative environment. Done successfully this will enable more development areas to be supported earlier. We will continue to work with central government on the Urban Growth Agenda and changes to legislation that would support these kinds of arrangements.

Regional fuel tax and NZTA transport funding

25. To manage the demands for greater investment noted above within these revenue constraints the council replaced the Interim Transport Levy, a targeted rate set per separately used or inhabited part of the rating unit, with a regional fuel tax developed in conjunction with central government. The regional fuel tax provides a stronger connection between those paying and road users. Raising the cost of driving also serves to provide incentives to reduce pollution and congestion. However, there are concerns that the higher cost of fuel most impacts on those on lower incomes for whom fuel makes up a greater proportion of expenditure and who are likely to live in areas further from main centres and in areas with less transport options.

26. In conjunction with the introduction of additional funding from the regional fuel tax the council and government agreed on a package of transport investments through the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP). The joint ATAP announcement identified the funding sources for the package of projects. This funding package was identified, however, at a high level and how individual projects would be funded was not specified. The current settings of both co-funding levels and qualifying activities in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport are not sufficient to support the funding set through ATAP. Additionally the timeframe for business case approval means that the council cannot plan in advance for NZTA funding with any certainty. Greater flexibility around budgeted funding is need, reflecting the developing trust between council and government.

27. Consideration should be given to amending NZTA transport funding decision making rules to reflect the funding commitments that the government and council have agreed in ATAP. Without these changes some agreed priority projects may not proceed and committed funding could go unspent.

28. In addition the rules applying to the striking of the fuel tax would be better if they accommodated more flexibility whilst retaining appropriate accountability. While some projects can be committed years ahead government and the council need to have the flexibility to respond to the market, environmental challenges and emerging safety priorities. This ensures resources are committed to the projects that deliver the best outcomes for the community and secure the greatest value from the taxes raised.

Funding economic growth

29. The council would have better incentives to invest in economic development activities like the America’s Cup, major events, stadiums, cruise ship infrastructure, innovation and tourism promotion (including managing the impacts of policy changes like freedom camping) if it had access to some of the resultant tax take gains. These investments increase economic activity and raise the tax take. Central government should consider taking a greater role in funding this kind of development and considering whether the council should have access to a wider range of funding tools better linked to economic activity like a bed tax as discussed below.

---

* A separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit includes both the main house and granny flat and treats each shop in a shopping mall separately.
National approach to managing impacts of climate change

30. Councils will likely require government support to make infrastructure networks resilient to climate change. It is more certain that some councils and communities absorbing the impact of managed retreat will be beyond their capability. The council supports the Society of Local Government Managers submission which suggests the government develop a national framework for addressing the impact of climate change and determining how the impacts on affected communities will be managed.

Amendments to development contributions legislation

31. Current growth funding tools like development contributions are limited in their scope. Development contributions can only require developers to pay a share of costs of infrastructure investments required to service growth. Many of these projects would not proceed without the demands of growth but the cost of funding the wider benefits from these investments fall to ratepayers. Legislation requires development contributions charges to be supported by detailed planning at a project level over a 10-year horizon. However, Auckland has a wide range of potential development areas and effective prioritisation of scarce capital has to be responsive to the market. A more flexible approach is needed.

32. The council supports the proposed amendments to development contributions legislation in the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill. This amendment would restore the Council’s ability to collect development contributions to fund a broader range of community infrastructure (including, for example, public swimming pools and libraries). These facilities are demanded by new communities and include a growth component. They add value to land and developments. Restoring the ability to fund these activities with development contributions would reduce pressure on other funding sources.

33. The council also seeks the ability to levy development contributions for the provision of public infrastructure not owned by the council for which we have funding liability or provided on land we don’t own. This would allow for developments in partnership with community groups and private providers for infrastructure beyond the traditional council owned and operated model. New ownership and operation models may bring better community outcomes, provide another vehicle for introducing outside capital and offer the potential for operating efficiencies.

Amending rating legislation to support use of targeted rates to fund growth infrastructure

34. Targeted rates may allow the council to broaden the funding base for infrastructure investment without having to call on general ratepayers. Targeted rates can provide an incentive to develop land, depending on the timing, and deliver greater revenue certainty for the council than alternatives such as development contributions. However, these advantages come from the element of compulsion inherent in rates. Broader implementation of targeted rates within the current rating legislation may provide a broader based revenue stream but is likely to be resisted by some land owners.

35. To support the development of third-party financing of infrastructure investment noted above and the council’s wider use of targeted rates to fund growth infrastructure we are seeking amendments to rating legislation. However, the current rating legislation is designed for the application of general rates. The changes the council is seeking are intended to provide more flexibility in the design of rating schemes to fund infrastructure.

36. The changes sought for targeted rates to fund growth infrastructure (not to apply more widely) are:

- ability for set a rate for more than one year - providing future funding certainty
- ability to set a rate at any time during the year rather than only in June as part of an annual or long-term plan – as agreements with developers/financers would not necessarily follow the Council’s planning cycle
allowing rates liability to be based on valuations reflecting the council’s future commitment to infrastructure investment as opposed to the use that land can be put to currently – current rating valuation rules require land to be valued on its best current use. Until such time as infrastructure is available some land in development areas may not be valued in accordance with the benefit it has received from commitments to invest in infrastructure. This change would ensure that if land value was used to apportion the cost of future infrastructure it was shared fairly between land owners.

provision for rates liability to be incurred by subsequent purchasers at purchase rather than existing owner occupiers – providing the council with a means of managing the potential immediate impact on benefiting land owners who are not able or willing to realise the benefits of infrastructure investment.

provision for the liability for future rates to be recorded on a land titles – to ensure purchasers are aware of the additional liability.

37. More detail on the council’s position on infrastructure financing and funding is set out in the Additional Supporting Information, Section 7.2 Financing growth infrastructure, that was part of the consultation material for the draft 10-year Budget 2018-2028, see Attachment One.

Other funding commentary

Taxation relationship with government

38. The Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) and SOLGM submissions raise the issue of the application of GST to rates and the Crown’s exemption from rates and development contributions. The council has also previously noted these issues.

39. Central and local government both play key roles in the provision of public and social goods for the residents of Auckland and New Zealand. The primary funding sources for these services are income taxes, GST and rates. However, rates, while a key source of tax funding for the provision of public goods, are subject to GST like other private goods and services. Businesses are able to claim back GST, and expense rates, yet private residents, including those on fixed incomes must pay an additional 15 per cent.

40. Many Crown properties, activities and investments place costs on the council but are exempt from rates and development contributions. If council rates are subject to GST like private goods and services there is a case for government properties to pay rates and development contributions to cover a share of the costs they impose on the city. Like the capital, labour and other goods and services these activities consume property pricing the benefits the council delivers these activities ensures their decision making takes account of all the costs they impose. Additional funding would allow council to increase its spending and investment on the challenges we’ve identified above. However, we recognise this would raise government’s costs and present them with decisions on expenditure priorities, raising taxes or expanding the tax base.

Rates and funding fairness and affordability

41. The issues paper discusses the issue of fairness in levying rates and other charges. Fairness is a subjective issue to which there is no single answer. Assessing fairness requires consideration of:

- setting rates or charges at similar levels for those for whom similar levels of service are provided or available
- balancing the relative ability to pay of differing groups
- the degree of change in rates that any alteration to funding would lead to.

42. Weighing the issues identified above is subjective and requires the exercise of political judgement. Section 101(3) of the Local Government Act 2002 provides a good framework to ensure that councils consider the factors above when making funding decisions. This is reinforced by the matters the council has set out in its Revenue and Financing Policy.

43. The Council considers affordability in determining the rates limit in the 10-year Budget and weight is given to considering this increase compared to the CPI. The Revenue and Financing Policy provides for council
fees to increase annually at the council rate of inflation (i.e. the rate of increase in our costs) and to maintain cost recovery levels. Any more significant changes generally require consultation.

44. When considering its rating policy for the LTP 2012-2022 and when reviewing it for the LTP 2015-2025 the council considered the relationship between household income and property value and the level of home ownership. The council also considered the proportion of income rates represented for those on fixed incomes e.g. superannuation.

45. When considering the level of cost recovery when setting fees the council assesses the financial implications for those who will be paying. Examples in this context are the provision of free pool entry for under 16s, no library fines for overdue children’s books and subsidised public transport fares.

46. Issues of fairness and affordability were extensively canvassed when the council set the level of the UAGC and the business differential in the LTP 2012-2022 and when reviewing those for the LTP 2015-2025. For the business differential consideration was given to the relative demand that businesses placed on council services and their ability to pay. The council decided to gradually lower the business differential over time to a level roughly equivalent to the tax advantage businesses have over owner occupied residential properties. The LTP 2015-2025 review decided to extend the time to reach this target level from 10 to 20 years to reduce annual change in residential rates from 1 per cent above the general rates increase to 0.5 per cent.

47. The move to a single rating system based on capital value when Auckland Council was established in 2010 led to substantial changes to rating levels for many individual Aucklanders over multiple years. Therefore, while not directly identified in s101(3), the extent of change in rating policy was a key element of the debate around the UAGC and business differential. Minimising change is one of the factors the Revenue and Financing Policy commits the council to considering. This has also featured directly and indirectly in subsequent rating policy considerations.

48. The commission also asks about the rating of commercial property. Is rates, as a proxy for a wealth tax, an appropriate basis for assessing how much businesses should contribute towards the provision of local public goods and services? With changes in technology the degree of economic activity undertaken by a business is not readily proxied by its holding of land assets and improvements. This raises the question of whether there are grounds for using different instruments than rates for the local taxation of businesses. Different taxation instruments for businesses may make a stronger link between the council’s revenue and its investments in economic development activity discussed above.

49. The Local Government Rating Act 2002 identifies which types of land and land use is liable for rates and which are non-rateable or 50 per cent rateable. This categorisation reflects historical circumstances and it may be appropriate to reconsider the rateability of types of land, for example whether it is still appropriate for privately owned ports and airports to be non-rateable. The council doesn’t have a position on these issues but it may be something the Commission considers the merits of investigating.

Rates rebates

50. The council is pleased that the government’s recent amendments to the Rates Rebate Act provide for residents of licence to occupy retirement villages to gain access to the scheme. However, the council notes that further changes are required to ensure the Act recognises other ownership structures that have developed since the act was passed in 1973, like papakāinga housing. In addition, changes are needed to ensure that eligible residents in cities like Auckland whose water charges are levied by a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) rather than being included in rates bills aren’t disadvantaged and can have these charges included as part of their assessment.

Expansion of local government responsibilities

51. Delegation by central government of social and environmental regulatory responsibilities to local government is often the most effective means of delivering these services. The services can be delivered locally building on expertise and systems held by local government.
52. Some examples of delegated responsibilities adding cost are the food safety and liquor licensing regimes. It is also common for Treaty of Waitangi settlements to include some form of ‘co-governance’ over significant natural resources and reserve lands with local authorities. Council’s ongoing costs often exceed any Crown contributions.

53. Given the pressures on ratepayers noted earlier additional obligations must be accompanied by the appropriate funding from central government. If any future costs are to be funded from fees and charges these should not be fettered by regulations restricting full cost recovery.

Local income and sales taxes

54. The council does not have a position on the local income or sales taxes. Local income and expenditure taxes would connect council revenue to the economic activity stimulated by our investments to support growth. However, the revenue would follow the economic cycle whereas the core expenses associated with infrastructure investment are steadier and more predictable. This would require the council to move away from a balanced budget approach and plan its expenditure on a cyclical basis accumulating reserves in periods of growth to manage lower revenue during downturns. These instruments are also likely to have high implementation and compliance costs. Rates provide a more certain income stream better matched to this expenditure.

55. The council promoted the introduction of the regional fuel tax allowing for additional investment in transport infrastructure and to replace the ITL. A regional fuel tax has a better correlation between who pays and who benefits but has a greater impact on lower income groups. The next step for the council in terms of revenue raising and demand management is congestion charging. The council supports acceleration of the introduction of new types of charging for roads and in particular congestion charging.

56. Additional tourists benefit the regional economy but add to the pressure on our infrastructure. We therefore need to consider the appropriate alternatives to using general rates to fund these impacts.

57. We therefore support the ability for councils to apply local bed taxes to fund regional tourism organisations and tourism infrastructure. The council has recently introduced an Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (APTR) to provide funding for half of its major events and visitor attraction expenditure. The APTR allocates these costs to those who most directly benefit. However, a bed tax would better share this burden between accommodation providers. A bed tax would distribute the costs between operators based on their revenue and hence benefit from increases in visitor numbers. The APTR distributes the costs based on capital value which is related to revenue but not as directly as a bed tax. In addition, the ownership structure of accommodation providers varies and the liability for rates does not fall evenly between the parties involved in the sector. For some properties the rates may fall on land owners and for others on the operator depending on the contract structure.

58. Changes in technology are changing the way in which business is conducted and properties are used. Current rating legislation was designed for a time when it was very clear how properties were being used. At present ratepayers have no obligation to advise the council of how they are using their properties and face no penalty if a use other than that which we have recorded is subsequently discovered. Changes to rating legislation to require ratepayers to advise the council how property is used would help ensure rates are applied fairly. Legislation should also oblige third parties to share information they hold on a property’s use with the council.

Tax increment financing

59. The council notes that tax increment financing (TIF) is often promoted as a means to fund investment in infrastructure to support redevelopment. Investment in infrastructure raises property values. Higher property values under the TIF model lead to higher rates. A TIF takes the increase in value and uses that to pay back the capital investment in infrastructure.
60. TIFs are not suited to the New Zealand environment. Auckland Council includes forecast growth in the rating base, which would include increases in property values arising from infrastructure investment, into its long-term revenue projections. This revenue provides funding for the consequential operating costs (operations, maintenance and depreciation) of additional infrastructure investment to serve growth. Removing this revenue stream would create additional financial pressure.

61. However, TIFs may have value in circumstances where there is confidence the investments they fund are adding development potential beyond current forecasts. This may arise where new financing arrangements allow material acceleration of the planned infrastructure investment required to release development. Careful design of the instruments to implement TIF will be required to manage the measurement issues associated with separating the impact of infrastructure investment on land values and other market movements.

Local property tax

62. The Issues paper also considers a local property tax set at a fixed percentage of a property’s value. Revenue from a tax in this form would rise or fall with the property market. This would expose the council to wide fluctuations in revenue over time unrelated to the costs of running the city. While the council may be able to forecast and budget over the property cycle this would be much more difficult for individual ratepayers who over the last ten years would have seen their rates more than double.
Attachment One

7.2 Financing growth infrastructure

Purpose
1. To outline the options and implications of proposed changes to the council's financial strategy in relation to financing infrastructure necessary to support new housing and business developments.

Summary
2. The Auckland Unitary Plan has provided sufficient zoning capacity to support substantial amounts of new housing development. However, the capacity of infrastructure needed to support these new houses is a constraint.
3. The infrastructure required to support growth includes arterial roads, public transport works, stormwater drains, sewer mains, pump stations, reservoirs, water mains, parks and community facilities.
4. Auckland Council's current financial strategy is to primarily finance this kind of housing-related infrastructure through borrowings which are repaid over time from development contributions or Watercare’s infrastructure growth charges which are paid by developers as and when they develop their land.
5. While this general approach will continue, there are several reasons why we need to consider making some adjustments:
   a) the infrastructure costs per dwelling in some areas are considerably higher than our current charges and so some pricing increases will be necessary
   b) the council faces borrowing constraints
   c) many growth infrastructure projects also provide benefits to existing dwellings, and it is not appropriate to recover all of the infrastructure costs through development contributions which are charged on new developments. These infrastructure projects can only proceed if another funding source is available to cover the gap in funding.
   d) charging large one-off payments when developers choose to develop their land may incentivise land banking rather than early release of land supply to market.
6. To complement and enhance our existing approach, we are proposing to:
   a) review development contribution pricing in key growth areas
   b) be ready to introduce new growth infrastructure targeted rates in key growth areas
   c) work with central government on the establishment of new legal entities to take a lead role in financing this infrastructure in a way that doesn't rely on significant increases in council debt.

Background

The growth challenge
7. Auckland faces significant challenges in funding its critical infrastructure, including its transport and wastewater network. Auckland’s population has grown by over 45,000 per year for the past two years, and is some four to five years ahead of official population growth projections.
8. Given these pressures, Auckland Council is firmly committed to increasing the supply of land for housing, as evidenced by the significant lift in zoning capacity enabled by the Auckland Unitary Plan. However, the council's lack of debt headroom is constraining our ability to provide the necessary infrastructure to service this land.
Current financial strategy and funding policy

9. The current financial strategy provides that the costs of growth will be met by those who are benefiting from that growth. When the council invests in infrastructure to support growth the beneficiaries are:
   a) land owners whose properties rise in value as they can now be developed
   b) developers who undertake construction
   c) future buyers of the homes constructed.

10. The council presently uses development contribution and Watercare’s infrastructure growth charges as its primary tools to fund growth infrastructure, but can also use targeted rates.

Development contributions

11. Development contributions are only payable on development. If no development occurs then no payment is required. Developers can adjust the timing of development and their liability for development contributions to match the market and their cash position. However, this means that the council sometimes has to make major investments in infrastructure with no certainty of when costs will be recovered.

12. Development contributions are currently widely used and the current contribution policy aims to fund $2.2 billion of growth infrastructure assets over 10 years. While this will provide substantial infrastructure capacity to support new development across the Auckland region, it is not sufficient to keep pace with infrastructure demand in all areas, particularly in the greenfield areas where current infrastructure capacity is very low.

13. The average development contribution charge is currently $19,990 plus GST per household unit.

Infrastructure growth charges

14. Infrastructure growth charges are very similar to development contributions except that they are charged directly by Watercare Services Limited on connection to the water and wastewater networks.

15. Infrastructure growth charges are expected to be able to fund around $1 billion of growth infrastructure assets over ten years. Again, while this will provide substantial additional capacity across the Auckland region, it is not sufficient to enable accelerated development in every location where land owners want to commence development.

16. The infrastructure growth charge for the metropolitan area is currently $11,340 plus GST per household unit.

Growth infrastructure targeted rates

17. Targeted rates can be struck before development occurs and even before infrastructure is built. They are then collected whether development proceeds or not. Targeted rates provide the council with a certain revenue stream.

18. Targeted rates discourage land banking because they raise the costs of holding undeveloped land. However, implicit in higher holding costs is an element of compulsion. Targeted rates push land owners to develop to a timeframe that may not be their preference.

19. There are some practical implications that will need to be considered as part of any proposal to implement targeted rates. These include:
   - Ensuring appropriate timing and duration of any targeted rate e.g. balancing the timing of councils need to fund infrastructure with the developer’s ability to commence development
   - Finding the fairest way to distribute the costs of development between landowners where there may be quite disparate values and benefits because of existing development, geography etc.
   - Managing the impact on existing residents who may be within a development area but not have the ability and/or desire to develop their own property
   - Ensuring that future purchasers are aware of the additional rating obligations.
A fuller discussion of these issues is attached as an Appendix.

20. While the council’s Revenue and Financing policy has recently been amended to provide for the use of targeted rates to fund growth infrastructure, no such rates have yet been implemented. As proposals for individual areas are developed, appropriate tools for managing the issues outlined above will be recommended.

Infrastructure demand in key growth areas

21. Auckland Council’s strategic growth planning envisages that 60 per cent of Auckland’s future growth will occur in existing urban areas. A key focus is currently Housing New Zealand’s intended large scale redevelopment activity in areas such as Mt Roskill, Mangere, Favona and Northcote where they have a high concentration of housing stock. Auckland Council is currently working with Housing New Zealand and its subsidiary Homes. Land. Community (HLC, formerly Hobsonville Land Company) to determine the additional growth infrastructure requirements to support these redevelopment plans.

22. The remainder of Auckland’s growth is expected to occur in rural and coastal areas (15 per cent) and on around 15,000 hectares of land identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) as areas for future urban growth (25 per cent). These future urban areas are located primarily in:

- Kumeu, Whenuapai and Redhills in the Northwest
- Silverdale, Dairy Flat, Waitakuru and Warkworth in the North
- Pukekohe, Drury, Paerata and Takanini in the South.

23. Auckland Council is currently working with central government on a business case for $300 million of growth infrastructure over the next 10 years to support an estimated 10,500 additional houses in Whenuapai and Redhills. The government has agreed in principle to provide some support with financing this infrastructure through its Housing Infrastructure Fund. While this financing support will enable this infrastructure to be provided earlier, it does not remove the need for Aucklanders to ultimately bear the cost.

24. Auckland Council has also been working closely with central government on finding a way to enable investment in $600 million of growth infrastructure to support 5,500 additional houses in Whenuapai in Auckland’s North and 17,800 houses in the South.

Investment partnership model

25. Work on the infrastructure investment for the North and the South has focused on a new investment partnership model, with this work now being led by Crown Infrastructure Partners.

26. Significantly, work on this model has focused on ways in which the accelerated investment can proceed without significant impacts on Auckland Council’s balance sheet.

27. It has also focused on ways in which significant third-party private sector capital can eventually be used to finance this infrastructure rather than Crown capital. All parties involved see significant opportunity to apply this model to finance a wide range of housing enabling infrastructure in other greenfield and brownfield intensification areas.

28. As with the Housing Infrastructure Fund approach, this new financing approach would not remove the need for Aucklanders to ultimately bear the cost of the infrastructure.

29. A specific example of a large scale infrastructure project that this model could be applied to is Watercare’s $1.1 billion Central Interceptor wastewater project. This project will facilitate the substantial intensification of large parts of the Auckland isthmus. It will also reduce the significant wastewater overflows into our harbours.

30. Financing the Central Interceptor project through an investment partnership model would free up council debt headroom, and this headroom could then be utilised to progress transport and housing outcomes for Auckland.
Options

31. The main options are:

**Option One:** Do nothing – growth infrastructure investment is not built at the pace needed to keep up with demand. This is likely to exacerbate existing housing issues.

**Option Two:** Adopt a strategy of using higher development contributions and infrastructure growth charges in the key growth areas to help pay for the additional infrastructure.

**Option Three:** Adopt a strategy of being ready to implement new infrastructure targeted rates alongside existing development contributions and infrastructure growth charges in the key growth areas to help pay for the additional infrastructure.

**Option four:** In conjunction with options (ii) and/or (iii) implement an investment partnership model to finance growth infrastructure.

32. Attachment A sets out the key implications of these options.

33. The council is proposing to proceed with a combination of options (ii), (iii) and (iv) to maximise our ability to provide the critical infrastructure needed to address Auckland’s urgent housing issues.

34. A combined approach allows the mix of targeted rates and development contributions to be customised for each growth area based on its own unique set of circumstances.

35. While we acknowledge that implementing higher growth charges may create affordability issues for some, we consider that it is fair that those landowners who benefit from large increases in land values make an appropriate contribution to the cost of infrastructure that has enabled those large increases. We also consider that there are sufficient tools available to the council to deal with any specific cases of genuine financial hardship.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Options table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Issues for consideration – targeted rates for growth infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attachment A: options table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Impact on developers/land owners</th>
<th>Wider policy implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option One:</td>
<td>Do nothing – growth infrastructure investment is not built at the pace needed to keep up with demand.</td>
<td>• Does not impose any additional council charges on anyone • Leaves it to private landowners to work together to build and finance critical infrastructure to support their developments</td>
<td>• No additional charges, would only pay current development contributions and infrastructure growth charges if they are able to develop • Many land owners will be unable to develop due to lack of infrastructure capacity</td>
<td>• Auckland’s housing issues highly likely to be further exacerbated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Option Two: | Adopt a strategy of using higher development contributions (DC) and infrastructure growth charges (IGC) in the key growth areas to help pay for the additional infrastructure | • Developers should make a fair contribution to the cost of the infrastructure that enables their development • Consistent with well-established approach to paying for growth infrastructure | • Developers would pay higher combined (DC plus IGC) charges as follows: | • May enable faster housing development • The use of this strategy may be limited by the availability of council debt headroom • Potentially creates a greater incentive to land bank rather than release land early for development • This policy tool does not provide a mechanism to recover any proportion of infrastructure costs that primarily benefit existing housing units | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>$30k</td>
<td>$40-50k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>$25k</td>
<td>$40-65k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>$28k</td>
<td>$40-55k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNZ areas</td>
<td>$30k</td>
<td>$35-45k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land owners would be able to develop, but would not have to contribute anything towards the cost of the infrastructure until they choose to develop.

¹ The cost per house for the infrastructure to support the development of all the land provided for in the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (FULLS) is in the range of $80k to $110k. The costs per house noted in the table have been assessed on a marginal approach based on the infrastructure to support the developments in these areas even though they may benefit from some of the wider investments in the FULLS.
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**7.2 Financing growth infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Impact on developers/land owners</th>
<th>Wider policy implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option Three:</strong></td>
<td>Adopt a strategy of being ready to implement new infrastructure, targeted rates alongside existing development contributions and infrastructure growth charges in key growth areas to help pay for the additional infrastructure</td>
<td>• Land owners should make a fair contribution to the cost of the infrastructure that enables their land to be developed</td>
<td>• Land owners would pay new targeted rates in addition to current DCs and IGCs as follows:</td>
<td>• Likely to enable and incentivise faster housing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed new rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North West</td>
<td>$900-$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>$1,300-$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>$1,100-$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HNZ areas</td>
<td>$500-$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option Four:</strong></td>
<td>In conjunction with options (ii) and (iii) implement an investment partnership model to finance growth infrastructure.</td>
<td>• Enables faster housing development in a way that is not limited by the availability of council debt headroom</td>
<td>• Landowners will be able to negotiate with a commercially focused entity to access infrastructure financing</td>
<td>• Likely to enable faster and larger-scale housing development that is not limited by council debt headroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides an opportunity for a commercially focused entity with relevant skills and</td>
<td>• Developers / land owners will ultimately need to pay higher charges in some form to cover the cost of the growth infrastructure. This could take the form of higher DCs and/or IGCs, new targeted rates, higher user charges or voluntary payments under a negotiated contract.</td>
<td>• A third party (not the council) would take substantial risk such as the risk that development is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As note 1 above.*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Impact on developers/land owners</th>
<th>Wider policy implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         | expertise to take a lead role in negotiating infrastructure financing arrangements with developers | • Where private contracts are involved, land owners may need to accept a charge on the land title recognising the obligation  
• Charges may be slightly higher under an investment partnership model as investors (whether public or private sector) will require a rate of return on their investment that fairly reflects the risks they are taking around the timing of when they will be repaid | | taken up over longer timeframes than anticipated  
• The Auckland Council group will still lead the construction of the infrastructure and will be the long-term asset owner and operator  
• Implementation of the investment partnership model could involve the establishment of a new council controlled organisation. |
Attachment B: Issues for consideration – targeted rates for growth infrastructure

Targeted rates provide flexibility to design funding arrangements that can accommodate a wide range of circumstances. A targeted rate can be applied in conjunction with other funding sources to:

- provide revenue security for financing infrastructure
- deliver incentives for land owners to develop
- while recognising the need to accommodate the:
- cash flows constraints developers work within
- interests of different land owners
- interests of future house buyers.

This section addresses some of the key issues the council will need to consider when deciding how to apply targeted rates. Consideration of these matters also highlights areas where changes to legislation would provide the council more flexibility to set targeted rates that address both the council’s goals and the particular needs of all interested land owners.

1. Timing

The commencement date and duration of a targeted rate will influence its impact on current land owners and future house buyers.

Commencement

A targeted rate can be levied at any time from when a decision is made to invest in infrastructure. Once a targeted rate is in place land owners will face an immediate increase in their holding costs and will have to find the cash to meet this additional demand. However, land owners may not be able to develop their land until the plans for infrastructure are finalised and consented or until construction is completed. Depending on circumstances the council has the following options for when it starts to levy a targeted rate. A rate can be applied from when:

- decisions are made to invest in infrastructure in a particular area – allowing funds to accumulate before expenditure is incurred
- infrastructure plans are finalised and consented – allowing developers to secure planning permission and to begin their own investments in readying land for construction
- developers are able to begin making their own investments – which may be triggered by a range of factors
- infrastructure is completed – providing complete certainty that development can proceed.

To start collecting a targeted rate the council will want to consider whether developers face any practical or regulatory barriers that would prevent them from commencing development. The timing of when land becomes “development ready” may differ depending upon the particular circumstances in different parts of the region.

Lifespan

The assets that a targeted rate will fund have long lives, for example roads. Accordingly a rate should run over a long time period. There isn’t a definitive basis on which to set a repayment period. The council will need to consider this on a case by case basis. The recovery period will generally be over 10 years and more likely 20 years or more given the life of the assets. The choice of lifespan is a balance between faster repayment of debt and higher annual costs for ratepayers.

Many home owners like to pay off their mortgages early and may also wish to discharge the targeted rate liability early. In setting any targeted rates, provision will be made for early payment.
2. Sharing the infrastructure costs between land owners

A targeted rate to share the costs of infrastructure between the land owners who will benefit should aim to spread the costs as fairly as is possible. Infrastructure investments to support development provide benefits to current and future land owners:

- by allowing them to realise the uplift in land value from rezoning
- directly in terms of improved services to support a growing community.

The general rates requirement is shared between property owners based on the capital value of their properties. Capital value is the value of the land and buildings. The council can also use land value and land area. Each of these methods is discussed below.

Capital value

Capital value is the value of land and improvements (e.g. a house). Capital value does not share the costs of infrastructure required for development based on the benefits in terms of potential land value uplift. A growth infrastructure targeted rate set on capital value will be higher for a more developed property. While more developed properties are better able to take advantage of service improvements, they don't gain as much from increased development potential. Less developed properties benefit more from infrastructure investment that allows them to develop.

All of the areas where additional infrastructure investment is being considered are underdeveloped. As a result, land within these areas has widely varying degrees of development. Most of the investment being considered is to support growth and allow for development. Applying a targeted rate based on capital value would impose an unfair burden on land that was more developed at any point in time.

Land value

Some development areas, both greenfields and brownfields, may not require immediate infrastructure investment to proceed. However, they may still require substantial investment over time. For these areas, the land value will reflect the development potential for all properties. Where this is the case, land value will be the best means to allocate the share of infrastructure costs.

Land value is a good, but not perfect, measure of a property’s ability to benefit from infrastructure investment. Land value changes over time as property is subdivided for development shifting more of the burden to early developers. In addition, current rating valuation rules require land to be valued on current use potential. Some land cannot be developed until infrastructure is constructed whereas other land in the area may already be zoned and valued as residential. This is primarily an issue for greenfields development. Using land value rating would place a disproportionate share of the infrastructure cost burden on the properties presently valued as residential in the early years of any rate. This impact could be mitigated by applying the rates differentially, i.e. at a lower rate, to different land uses.

Land area

Land area better captures development potential. A larger property with space to build more houses will pay higher rates than a smaller property with less development potential.

However, land area does not differentiate between more and less desirable geography. A hectare of land in a gully will pay the same rates as land on a hill slope with a view. Land closer to a transport hub will pay the same
as land more distant. Where these locational differences are material and impact on several properties they can be managed by the use of existing tools such as:

- differentials, where some land uses or locations pay more or less rates
- remissions.

Conclusion

Both land area and land value may be appropriate depending on the circumstances of individual development areas. The current mechanisms could be improved by allowing the use of land value based on development potential for the purpose of applying a growth infrastructure targeted rate. This would require a change to legislation. The current rules are appropriate for general rates purposes but not designed to fairly share infrastructure costs associated with development.

3. Managing the impact on different land owners

Rezoning land for more intensive development and investing in infrastructure to support growth, whether in greenfields or brownfields areas, requires major capital investments. Both large and small land owners will benefit from increases in land value and improved services.

While all land owners will benefit from rezoning and investment in infrastructure some are better able to realise these gains. Developers holding land in these areas will be able to realise the potential uplift in land value. Holders of smaller developable blocks of land may not be ready to realise the gains or have a different time frame for development. Many owners of existing houses may not:

- be able to realise any gain until they sell their property
- benefit from infrastructure that allows more intense development if there is limited development potential on their site
- want the additional service benefits that development will bring.

For existing home owners there may not be appeal in paying for infrastructure to support development. On the other hand the benefits may be substantial and it is more appropriate that the future beneficiaries pay rather than the cost falling on existing ratepayers. The council has a range of options to balance these concerns in how it sells any targeted rates.

The options are:

1. don’t charge existing houses for the costs of infrastructure required to allow more intense development for example trunk water and wastewater works by:
   i) funding these with infrastructure growth charges and/or development contributions as these are only charged for new properties
   ii) remitting these costs for existing houses where targeted rates are used.
2. provide for postponement for the share of the cost of other infrastructure that benefits existing houses. The existing property owner would have no requirement to pay until they sold the property or were no longer resident.

The council would prefer that the recovery of costs in these circumstances is from the buyer of the property. The new buyer would be making a conscious choice to incur these costs in exchange for the benefits. The buyer would take this additional charge into account in their purchasing decision. The existing owner would not be required to contribute to these costs but the price at eventual sale would be impacted. This would require
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legislative change to provide for an entirely new type of charge to be available to the council. Rates are incident on current land owns and designed accordingly. Substantial changes would be required to provide for a new type of charge incident on buyers, akin to stamp duty but location specific, or for rates to be incident on buyers in particular circumstances.

4. Informed buyers

Houses developed where infrastructure is partly funded by targeted rates will have rates obligations higher than other properties where infrastructure has been funded from other sources. We have a number of ways to ensure new home buyers are aware of their future obligations:

- include information about targeted rates on the Land Information Memorandum.
- include provision in development agreements requiring sales materials to make the future targeted rates obligations clear to prospective purchasers.
- support professional bodies for advisers involved in property purchases (lawyers, real estate agents and financiers) to inform their members.
- present information on the council’s website.
- allow vendors and buyers to discharge future targeted rates obligation as part of a property purchase.

Further assurance could be provided that buyers, and their advisers, are familiar with the obligations by allowing the obligation to be recorded on a property’s title. To provide for this legislative change will be required to allow the council to record this charge on land title.
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To: Chair, Finance and Performance Committee
    Desley Simpson, Deputy Chair, Finance and Performance Committee

Cc: Sandra Gordon, Governance Advisor
    All Waitematā Local Board members

Subject: Feedback on the Productivity Commission Issues Paper - Local Government Funding and Financing

From: Waitematā Local Board

Purpose
To provide Waitematā Local Board’s feedback on the Productivity Commission Issues Paper – Local Government Funding and Financing for consideration by the Finance and Performance Committee

Summary
- The levels of homelessness across the Auckland region continues to increase. Auckland Council plays an important role in responding to homelessness, which needs to be recognised and funded by government through interest free loans and, where a good business case has been submitted, by capital grants towards council and council-supported housing projects. The policy of only providing assistance where council has given majority shareholding to a community housing or private provider should cease.

- An increasing population brings diversity and interest to Waitematā, but also places pressure and demand on resources, infrastructure, community facilities and the environment.

- Central government, local residents, businesses and residents continue to have rising standards and new interests that need to be responded to. This inevitably leads to higher local government spending.

- Climate change also brings two sources of extra costs. One is moving and rebuilding infrastructure along our coast, particularly the expensive coastal infrastructure in the central city. The second is encouraging and enabling a low carbon economy and society through a range of advisory and implementation measures.

- Appropriate environmental taxes need to be available as potential sources of income for local authorities.

- Wide implementation of rates remission and postponement is essential so the asset rich but income poor do not suffer and rates levels can be set at the appropriate levels to maintain the quality of life in all communities.

- There is considerable scope for Value Capture to be introduced in New Zealand to enable the whole of the community to gain benefit from significant investments in infrastructure that provide a financial benefit to private landowners such as the development of Central Rail Link in Auckland City Centre.

- Through the creation of jobs, providing advice, co-ordination and working with businesses to get through regulations and access markets, councils contribute towards achieving sustainable local economic development. Local government should be recompensed and rewarded for this from relevant central government funds such as a share of taxation or grants.
Central Auckland is one of many areas that provide infrastructure and events for tourists and visitors. Councils should be able to obtain a contribution from them through a bed tax, airport arrival levy and a share of GST.

**Issues and Options Paper Key Topics**

**Local government in New Zealand**

Homelessness is complex and results from multiple factors. However, a key driver and therefore consideration when reviewing the differing circumstances that are relevant for understanding local government funding and financing issues includes a substantial lack of social and affordable housing.

The levels of homelessness across the Auckland region increased by 26 percent between the 2006 and 2013 censuses. According to the 2013 census figures, 20,296 people were homeless in Auckland and 29 percent aged between 15 and 24 years. Based on the average increase between censuses, and excluding all other factors, homelessness could stand at 23,409 in 2017, and 26,522 by 2021.

The findings of Ira Mata, Ira Tangata: Auckland’s Homeless Count show that on 17 September, at least 336 people were living without shelter and 2,874 people were in temporary accommodation. It is estimated that we have 800 people living without shelter based on a validation exercise.

Auckland Council plays an important role in responding to homelessness, including leading and coordinating development of a regional, cross-sectoral homelessness plan and funding a range of initiatives that support people who are experiencing homelessness. Future investment is required to support an operational response to homelessness in Auckland.

Auckland Council has provided advice and financial guarantees for social service agencies, community housing providers and iwi to assist and enable them to provide affordable and social housing.

Local Government in New Zealand has historically been a major provider of social and affordable housing, partly to prevent and combat homelessness. This has been particularly the case with providing pensioner housing for older residents with low income and assets. Some councils have also provided rental housing for low income workers, particularly their own staff.

The advantages of council provision of pensioner and other rental housing includes local knowledge of the needs and wants of individual tenants and of local communities; speed of provision, flexibility and innovation. It is important that such housing is close to vital health, community and social services, which is the case for the Waitemata Local Board area.

These vital roles should be funded by government by interest free loans and, where a good business case has been submitted, by capital grants towards council and council-supported housing projects. The policy of only providing assistance where council has given majority shareholding to a community housing or private provider should cease.

**How funding and financing currently works**

Exacerbator pays, polluter pays and appropriate environmental taxes need to be available as potential sources of income for local authorities.

Auckland’s current fuel tax is a very good example of this. It is readily and equitably charged on those who use the transport network and enables valuable improvements to be paid for at the time of provision. It ought to be a tool available for any other region that wants to use it. Congestion charging and road pricing should also be an available option once technically feasible.
Provision for financial contributions should be retained on the same basis as is also the use of weight-related and volumetric charges for waste and volumetric charges for water supply.

Borrowing is appropriate for building or restoring long-term assets as it enables time-appropriate provision and affordability and appropriately applies intergenerational equity for the users of the assets concerned.

**Pressure points**

Statistics New Zealand forecasts that the Waitematā Local Board 2017 population of 108,500 will hit 130,200 by 2033, a 21 per cent increase. The increasing population brings diversity and interest to Waitematā, but also places pressure and demand on resources, infrastructure, community facilities and the environment.

Growing ethnic diversity in the Waitematā Board area has, for example, generated a substantially increased demand for providing indoor sports and recreational facilities for people who prefer to take part in badminton, table tennis, squash and basketball more than for rugby and netball. The aging population has made it compelling that public facilities are fully accessible and safe for all age groups and abilities.

As the city’s employment hub, Waitematā provides 186,000 jobs. The city centre alone accounts for one in seven jobs in Auckland. It is estimated that we have 100,000 commuters coming into the city centre, with approximately half of these using public transport, cycling or walking.

Auckland is both New Zealand’s main international gateway (by air and sea), and an ever stronger standalone destination. For example, the city centre is expected to receive 127 cruise ship visits during the 2018/2019 season, an increase of 17 compared to the previous year.

These factors put substantial pressure on the transport network, infrastructure and local community facilities e.g. there is limited provision of public amenities in the city centre to cater for the large number of daily workers, visitors and rough sleepers.

Waitematā features many of Auckland’s earliest buildings and suburbs. This historic legacy gives our suburbs their unique character; one that varies across the local board area and creates distinctive urban villages such as Parnell, Ponsonby and Grey Lynn.

We know the value our community places on our public and private heritage assets. Good stewardship of heritage buildings, including finding long-term uses, will provide a viable and sustainable future for many of these prized assets but investment is required to achieve this.

The new national system for managing earthquake-prone buildings is now operative. Waitematā Local Board area has 50% of all earthquake prone buildings with 795 buildings already assessed as ‘earthquake prone’. Of these a number are valued public community facilities, which will require significant investment to meet the national standards over the next 10-30 years.

Central Auckland, like Queenstown, has a large and increasing number of tourists and visitors accessing accommodation, hospitality and Council services like community buildings, events, roads and public transport. These visitors do not make a contribution to the substantial costs that they incur. As the Shand Committee recommended issues of fairness generate a strong case for new funding systems derived from tourists and visitors. These include a levy on temporary accommodation providers (Bed Tax); a larger airport arrival tax; and a fair share of GST.

The Waitematā Local Board also has to respond to rising standards expected from central government, local residents, businesses and residents. The higher minimum standards required by
Government and Parliament have been well documented and we agree they are a major source of demands for higher local government spending. However, as with consumers of private goods and services, our people and businesses request and sometimes demand higher standards and variety. They want all weather playing surfaces, more variety and better quality play equipment, more exciting and engaging events, better equipment in recreation centres, safer roads and footpaths, more public transport and more responsive and supportive regulatory services. They also make it clear they want council to support economic development and jobs, stadia and health services in rural areas and community development in urban areas. Some of these resource intensive requests are related to increased diversity but others are natural expectations from the community.

Councils are needing to pay more as they contribute to the implementation of Treaty of Waitangi settlements.

Climate change also brings two sources of extra costs. One is moving and rebuilding infrastructure along our coast, particularly the expensive coastal infrastructure in the central city. The second is encouraging and enabling a low carbon economy and society through a range of advisory and implementation measures.

For those who are asset rich but income poor rates remission and, more importantly, rates postponement must be implemented more closely to universality for those who qualify. This is so that councils can charge the fair property value rates, which should continue to be the main source of Council revenue. Property values are closely related to the provision of local government infrastructure and services to those properties.

New Zealand taxes income relatively heavily, while having relatively low taxes on wealth, assets and property. This imbalance is a major contributor to wealth and income inequality and poverty in New Zealand. So wide implementation of rates remission and postponement is essential so the asset rich but income poor are not excessively disadvantaged and then rates levels can be set at the appropriate levels to maintain the quality of life in all communities. The Shand Report found these provisions at that time provided only 0.3 to 0.7% of total rates revenue. It should be at least 10 times higher.

Future Funding and Financing

As the Productivity Commission has already concluded in its 2015 and 2017 reports there is considerable scope for Value Capture to be introduced in New Zealand, as already applies in many United States cities. This would enable major increases in land values generated by public action, such as investments in infrastructure that directly benefit private landowners, to have part of the windfall gains returned to councils. This could be achieved by directly levying this uplift in land values. At the core of the Waiomatatiri Local Board area the Central Rail Link is costing billions in public investment and all the businesses along the route will consequently gain billions in value uplift. The whole of the community should be enabled to gain benefit from that windfall.

A similar case can be made for allowing local authorities to utilize tax increment funding. This would enable a local authority to forecast the increase in revenue or in capital value that would result from its infrastructure investment and to be able to borrow against that future income without this resulting in a credit downgrade.

There ought to be public financing to encourage, enable and respond effectively to councils that seek to provide appropriate infrastructure and sustainable economic development. Development
contributions need to be extended to cover all useful infrastructure. It also needs to be recognised that such contributions are only received well after the capital costs are incurred. Councils can do a lot to contribute effectively to sustainable local economic development and job creation through advice, co-ordination and working with businesses to get through regulations and access markets and they should be recompensed and rewarded for this from relevant central government funds such as a share of taxation or grants.
MANUREWA LOCAL BOARD COMMENTS: AUCKLAND COUNCIL’S SUBMISSION ON THE PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION’S ISSUES PAPER ON ITS LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDING AND FINANCING INQUIRY

1. Our board supports the Auckland Council submission to the Productivity Commission. However, we note that it does not specifically address the question of local board funding. We believe that it is essential that the commission understands the unique governance structure of Auckland Council, and in particular the relationship between the governing body and local boards, and the implications of that relationship for the funding of services in Auckland.

2. The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 established the current governance structure of Auckland Council. Section 7 of that act sets out that the decision-making power of the council is shared between the governing body and the local boards.

3. However, in practice the shared decision-making model is inherently unequal because the decision as to how local boards are funded is made by the governing body. Auckland Council’s 2016 Governance Framework Review found that “The funding policy is highly paternalistic, the governing body sets the budgets for each local board and directs where the majority of funding can be spent”. Additionally, it noted that “local boards lack clear accountability to their voters for their decisions. … Ultimately any decision-making role is undermined where the decision-maker does not have the responsibility for funding those decisions.”

4. The council submission notes that there is an increasing delegation from central government to local authorities in the delivery of services, particularly in the areas social and environmental services. It is reasonable to expect that local authorities who are being delegated these increased responsibilities should expect an increase in funding in order to provide the required services.

5. The relationship between the local boards and the governing body is similar. The governing body has delegated functions to the local boards, and any formula to equitably fund local boards needs to ensure that boards have sufficient funds to deliver the required services.

6. Our board’s view is that any consideration as to how Auckland Council should be funded to deliver services in the future also needs to address how that funding is distributed to local boards. A part of that consideration should be to address the question of whether the funding of local boards should be decided by the governing body, or if local board funding levels should be set out in legislation.
7. Our board recommends that the commission consider the Governance Framework Review in order to fully understand the Auckland governance model and its implications for the funding of services.


Angela Dalton
Chairperson, Manurewa Local Board
Local government funding and financing
Draft report – July 2019

The Government has asked the Productivity Commission to undertake an inquiry into local government funding and financing. The Government wants to know whether the existing funding and financing arrangements are suitable for enabling local authorities to meet current and future cost pressures.

This *At a glance* summarises the main findings and recommendations from the Commission’s draft report. Your feedback and submissions on the draft report are invited by 29 August 2019.

**High-performing local government is vital for community wellbeing**

Local government matters a great deal to communities and the wellbeing of New Zealanders. High-performing local government can provide greater access to housing; better protection of New Zealand’s natural environment and cultural values; strong, engaged communities; and quality infrastructure at the right time in the right place.

If councils struggle to deal with rising costs, or are not incentivised to improve their performance, communities are unlikely to reach their potential. The funding and financing framework for local government must incentivise good performance, and enable local authorities to deliver quality amenities and services that reflect the preferences and aspirations of their communities.

**The current funding and financing framework is broadly sound**

Local authorities currently have a wide range of funding and financing options, which gives them considerable flexibility in how they raise revenue.

The current funding and financing framework measures up well against the principles of a good system. The current system, based on rating properties, is simple and economically efficient, compared to alternatives, such as local income taxes. Wholesale change to a radically different model would be expensive, disruptive and uncertain.

The current system should therefore remain as the foundation of a fit-for-purpose future funding and financing system for local government. However, councils need new tools to help them deal with some specific cost pressures.
There is scope for councils to make better use of existing tools

Many councils could make better use of the funding tools they already have available to them, and better organisational performance and decision making would also help to relieve funding pressures. Council decision making and broader performance also need to be more transparent.

Changes are needed to strengthen governance and increase the transparency of council performance. All councils should have an assurance committee that is independently chaired, and the legislative requirements for councils’ Long-Term Plans should be clarified and streamlined. In addition, the current performance reporting framework for local government is not fit-for-purpose. It requires fundamental review, aimed at significantly simplifying and improving the required financial and non-financial disclosures.

The best way to use the current funding tools

The Commission favours the “benefit principle” as the primary basis for deciding who should pay for local government services. That is, those who benefit from (or cause the need for) a service should pay for its costs. Councils may also use “ability to pay” as a consideration, taking into account central government’s primary role in income distribution. Where local services also benefit national interests, central government should contribute funding. User charges or targeted rates should be used wherever it is possible and efficient to do so.

Improving equity

There is little or no evidence that rates have generally become less affordable over time. However, legislative changes are needed to make the current funding system more equitable and transparent, including changing rating powers to give more prominence to the benefit principle, phasing out the current rates rebate scheme (which is not equitable or effective), and introducing a national rates postponement scheme.

New funding tools are needed to address key pressures

The Commission has identified four key areas where the existing funding model is insufficient to address cost pressures, and new tools are required:

- supplying enough infrastructure to support rapid urban growth;
- adapting to climate change;
- coping with the growth of tourism; and
- the accumulation of responsibilities placed on local government by central government.

These pressures are not distributed evenly across councils, because they face widely differing circumstances. In addition, small rural and provincial districts are facing particular challenges in funding essential infrastructure and services. These councils need to be open to scalable new technologies and alternative organisational arrangements. They may also require support from central government to make the necessary investments.
New funding and financing tools for growth infrastructure

The failure of high-growth councils to supply enough infrastructure to support housing development has led to some serious social and economic problems. Councils currently have funding and financing tools to make growth “pay for itself” by ensuring revenue for new property developments is derived from new residents rather than existing ratepayers. However, the long time it takes to recover the costs of development, the risks involved, debt limits, and the continued perception that growth does not pay for itself are significant barriers.

Value capture and user charging would help growth “pay for itself”

The Commission has previously recommended a new “value capture” funding tool for councils. This tool would raise revenue because property owners who enjoy “windfall gains” in their property value as a result of nearby publicly-funded infrastructure investment would be required to pay a portion of this gain to the council. Such a tool, combined with powers for councils to levy road-congestion and volumetric wastewater charges, would help give councils sufficient means to fund growth.

Special Purpose Vehicles could help councils nearing their debt limits

Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) are a financing option for new development, that involve debt sitting off a council’s balance sheet. This provides a means for high-growth councils approaching their debt limits to continue to invest in development. The Commission supports the Government’s current work around expanding the use of SPVs to brownfields development.

Considering two additional options

To address the perception that growth does not pay for itself, the Commission recommends considering a new funding stream from central government to local authorities, based on new building work put in place within an authority’s boundary. This can be justified because of the strong national interest in an adequate supply of infrastructure-serviced land and new houses. The Commission seeks feedback on the advantages and disadvantages of such a payment scheme, and how it could be designed. The Commission is also seeking submissions on whether a tax on vacant land would be a useful mechanism to further improve the supply of land for housing.

Adapting to climate change is a significant challenge

As the impacts of climate change unfold over coming decades, local authorities will face a significant and growing challenge. Future sea-level rise and increased flood risk from climate change directly threaten local government infrastructure such as roads and bridges, as well as stormwater, wastewater and flood-protection assets. Moreover, councils are responsible for planning and regulating development on at-risk land.

To help local government prepare for the impacts of climate change, central government should take the lead on providing high-quality and consistent science and data, standard setting, and legal and decision-making guidance. Institutional and legislative frameworks also need to move from their current focus on recovery after an event towards reducing risk before an event.

The Government should extend the role of the New Zealand Transport Agency in co-funding local roads to include assistance to councils facing significant threats to
the viability of local roads and bridges from climate change. The Commission also recommends that the Government creates a climate-resilience agency and associated fund to help at-risk councils redesign, and possibly relocate and rebuild, wastewater, stormwater and flood-protection infrastructure threatened by the impacts of climate change.

Funding support for tourism hotspots

The large and rapid increase in tourism is placing considerable pressure on several types of “mixed-use” infrastructure in popular tourist destinations, such as local roads, parking, public toilets, water and wastewater. Tourists are not paying the full cost of the demands they are placing on this infrastructure.

The Government should legislate to enable councils in tourist centres to implement an accommodation levy. Councils in tourist centres should also make greater use of user pays for mixed-use facilities. For small councils that cannot reasonably use either accommodation levies or user pays, the Government should provide funding from the international visitor levy.

Need to reset the relationship with central government

Another cause of funding pressures on local government is the continued accumulation of tasks and responsibilities passed from central government, without adequate funding means. The Commission sees significant value, and has previously recommended, that central and local government work together to develop a “Partners in Regulation” protocol. This would involve the co-design and joint-implementation of appropriately-funded regulatory regimes, and would promote a more constructive relationship between central and local government.

A new regulatory regime for the three waters

Improving the safety and environmental performance of three-waters services (drinking water, wastewater and stormwater) will be expensive, and will create additional funding pressure on councils. A new approach that both rigorously enforces minimum standards, and is permissive about how councils meet these standards would substantially improve the performance of the three-waters sector. The new regime would be administered by an independent regulator, such as the Commerce Commission. The performance regime would be permissive and flexible, but have a backstop arrangement applied to councils that fail by a specified time period to lift their performance sufficiently to meet minimum health and environmental standards.

Read the full version of the draft report and make a submission at www.productivity.govt.nz, email us at info@productivity.govt.nz or call us on 04 903 5150.

The New Zealand Productivity Commission is an independent Crown Entity. It conducts in-depth inquiries on topics selected by the Government, carries out productivity-related research, and promotes understanding of productivity issues.

New Zealand Productivity Commission
www.productivity.govt.nz
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Rates have grown in line with population and incomes

Local government spending growth has been focused on essential infrastructure
- Road and 3 Waters accounted for 56% of capex over the last decade
- Capex has had a 10% annual increase in the last 20 years
- The price has increased by 1.2% per year
- Debt has risen significantly, but for most councils and the sector as a whole, it is not a concern

Better use of existing tools
- General rates
- Targeted rates (incl. uniform charges)
- Fees and user charges
- Development contributions
- Central government funding
- Debt

Funding pressures
1. Meeting the demand for infrastructure in high-growth areas
2. Tourism hotspots
3. Unfunded mandates
4. Climate change adaptation

Case study: 3 Waters performance

Funding gaps

Reforms and new tools
- Special Purpose Vehicles
- Volumetric charging for wastewater
- Road congestion pricing
- Value capture
- Payment based on new building work
- Accommodation levy
- Portion of the international visitor levy

- “Partners in Regulation” protocol
- Extended NZTA model
- Local Government Resilience Fund and Agency
- Nationally-led science and legal framework
- New regulatory regime and regulator

Improved decision making and performance
- Capability building
- Streamlined Long-Term Plans
- Fundamental review of performance reporting regime
- Encourage uptake of existing performance measurement and benchmarking programmes

Terms of Reference
- Understand the drivers of local government costs, now and into the foreseeable future
- Assess the adequacy, efficiency, sustainability, equity and affordability of the existing local government funding and financing framework
- Advise whether new or improved approaches are required

The inquiry evidence base:
- 136 submissions
- 70+ engagement meetings
- Four in-depth case studies
- Expert advice and input

The current funding and financing framework is broadly sound
- Radical reform is not required, and there is no clearly superior alternative to a property-tax-based system
- However, there is significant scope for councils to make better use of the current funding tools, and improve their performance, productivity and decision making

The best way of using the current funding tools
- The “benefit principle” should be the primary basis for deciding who should pay for local government services
- Councils should consider “ability-to-pay” in a second step, taking into account central government’s primary role in income distribution
- Local services should be funded by local ratepayers. Where local services also benefit national interests, central government should contribute funding
- User charges or targeted rates should be used wherever possible and efficient

Equity and affordability
- There is little or no evidence that rates have become less affordable over time, even for lower income households
- Rates rebate scheme is inefficient and inequitable – replace it with a national rates postponement scheme
- Statutory 2-step process for rate-setting (based on the benefit principle and ability to pay)
- Remove differentials, uniform annual general charges and 30% cap on uniform charges
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Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

File No.: CP2019/13168

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek local board feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery has been developed to ensure Auckland is better prepared to recover from a disaster.
3. The planning framework set out in the document:
   • identifies community values and priorities
   • sets a vision for recovery
   • focuses on the consequences to be addressed in recovery
   • focuses on building capacity and capability and addressing barriers
   • identifies actions to build momentum.
4. It has been developed with local board engagement over 2018 and local board feedback is now sought particularly on:
   • community values
   • community priorities
   • the vision
   • the way we will work in recovery
   • the work to be done to be better prepared for recovery.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) review and provide feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery.

Horopaki
Context
5. Following the Christchurch and Kaikoura earthquakes the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 was amended, and new guidelines were issued requiring better preparation for, and implementation of, recovery from a disaster.
6. Auckland Emergency Management began development of the Resilient Recovery Strategy to ensure Auckland is better prepared. This included:
   • workshops on recovery with local boards between 24 May and 12 July 2018
   • reporting back on the workshops in September 2018
• presentations to Local Board Cluster Meetings in March and November 2018
• updating local boards on the development of the Resilient Recovery Strategy in November 2018 and advising that a draft would go the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee in February 2019.

7. At the beginning of this year the Resilient Recovery Strategy was renamed ‘Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework to Recovery’ (refer Attachment A) as it better described the document’s intent and contents.

8. The Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee approved the draft Pathways document for targeted engagement in February 2019.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice


10. The Pathways document is structured around this process as illustrated in the components of Figure 1 in the Pathways document (page 3):

   i) Identifying community values and priorities
   The planning framework set out in the Pathways document is described as community centric. Community values and priorities guide us in our preparations enabling recovery to be set up and implemented in a way that helps to meet community needs and aspirations.

   An initial set of community values and priorities was derived from workshops with local boards and advisory panels. They will be refined through community engagement as a part of actions to build a better understanding of recovery.

   ii) Setting the recovery vision
   The Pathways document sets the vision whereby “Auckland’s people, communities, businesses and infrastructure are well-placed to recover from a disaster.”

   Being well placed means being well-prepared.

   iii) Anticipation of consequences and opportunities of Auckland hazards and risks
   Anticipating potential consequences and opportunities from the impacts of Auckland’s hazards and risks provides insight into what might be required of a recovery. Auckland’s hazards and risks are identified in our Group Plan and some are the focus of the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan. Building on previous work is part of the work programme resulting from the planning framework under the Pathways document.

   iv) Building capacity and capability, addressing barriers to recovery
   Another way in which the planning framework is community centric is in the way we will work in a recovery. Taking a collaborative, partnership approach means structuring and implementing recovery in a way that maintains its focus on community outcomes.

   A significant recovery will require ‘big government’ structures and processes to effectively mobilise resources and coordinate large scale effort. Such approaches can seem remote from local communities. Effort is required to ensure good communication and community engagement are effectively maintained.

   v) Identifying actions to build momentum
   Another significant focus is the work we need to do to be better prepared. There are 43 actions identified under 5 focus areas: Recovery is communicated, Recovery is
understood, Capacity and Capability is available, Collaboration is supported, and progress is monitored and evaluated.

The actions will form a work programme to be implemented in the lead up to the review of the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan which is due by October 2021 unless delayed by events.

11. Against this background comments and views on the Pathways to Preparation: A Planning Framework for Recovery strategy is particularly required on:
   - community values
   - community priorities
   - the vision
   - the way we will work in recovery
   - the work to be done to be better prepared for recovery.

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

12. Many parts of the Auckland Council group potentially become involved in responding to a disaster and subsequent recovery. The planning framework in the Pathway’s document seeks to provide clarity about what will be required to support effective collaboration across the Council group in recovery.

13. Views from across the Council group are being sought during targeted engagement through June and July 2019.

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

14. Auckland’s hazards and risks may give rise to events with local, sub-regional or region-wide impacts. Their consequences will be influenced by the circumstances of the time and place in which the event took place.

15. Local board views on their community’s values and priorities are important in determining the way we will work together collaboratively in recovering from a disaster.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

16. Recovery addresses the consequences of an emergency and their impacts across the natural, social, built and economic environments. The goals, objectives and execution of recovery holds implications for iwi, environmental guardianship, Māori communities (iwi, hapu and mataawaka), marae, assets and the Māori economy.

17. Building relationships amongst Auckland’s Māori communities to develop a deeper understanding of our potential collaboration across reduction, readiness, response, resilience and recovery is a goal of Auckland Emergency Management. It is also part of the workplan arising from the planning framework set out in the Pathways document.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

18. There are no financial implications arising out of this report.
19. Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery and the work programme it will establish are intended to address the risk of Auckland being unprepared to recover from a disaster.

20. Recovering from a disaster is complex, lengthy and costly. An absence or lack of preparation can:
   - delay commencement of recovery efforts and lengthen the time taken to complete recovery
   - inhibit multiagency collaboration
   - lead to increased costs, disruption and distress for affected communities and individuals.

21. Local board feedback will be collated and considered for reporting to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee and incorporation into the final iteration of the Pathways document.
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**Introduction**

How Auckland might recover from a disaster\(^1\) is important.

Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery (the Framework) sets the scene for recovery, provides direction based on community values and principles, outlines our approach to recovery and identifies actions to build momentum on improving our preparedness to recover from a disaster.

A detailed recovery work programme will be developed to deliver on these actions across Auckland Council group and with our partners.

**The process we followed**

In the wake of lessons learned from Christchurch’s unanticipated, catastrophic earthquakes the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 was amended to make greater provision for recovery. Among other things, the amendments require strategic planning to be undertaken to prepare for recovery before disaster strikes. The Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management issued guidelines stepping out how this can best be done.

We followed this process to:

- identify an initial set of community values and priorities to inform our planning.
- set our recovery vision
- anticipate the consequences and opportunities of Auckland’s hazards and risks
- focus on building capacity and capability; and addressing barriers to recovery
- identify actions to build momentum.

---

\(^1\) ‘Disaster’ in the Recovery Framework is defined as an emergency (under section 4 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002) event that requires a recovery.
Figure 1. Pathways to Preparedness
Community Values and Priorities

The Framework takes a community centric approach, recognising the significant challenges confronting all recovery efforts (from relatively localised events to large-scale disasters).

Community wellbeing is the focus of recovery. In the aftermath of a significant event, individuals and communities will want to get things moving back to normality as quickly as possible. They will also want to see how we keep community at the heart of any recovery effort.

Understanding community values and priorities provides guidance on what will be important to communities, as a basis for pre-event planning and preparations for recovery. They indicate preferences for community involvement and the things communities hold dear. For example, decision-making underestimated the value, the people of Christchurch attached to their built heritage, meaning the pace, manner and extent of demolition caused great upset. Through understanding community values and priorities, we are better able to ensure appropriate decision-making and priority setting processes, and opportunities for participation.

Identifying community values and priorities

Auckland Emergency Management has worked with Auckland Council’s local boards and Auckland Council’s demographic Advisory Panels (Seniors, Ethnic Peoples, Pacific Peoples, Disability, Youth and Rainbow Communities). Our discussions have highlighted some key values and priorities that will be consulted on across Auckland communities.

Strong themes centred on retention of heritage in the natural built and cultural context. The need for local knowledge, leadership, partnerships and voice. Communication and connection was a common theme in the discussions. It was felt that multiple avenues for communicating was a high priority and suggestions for connecting across diversity, hard to reach communities and leveraging traditional and digital media would need to be sought.

The importance of getting key infrastructure such as hospitals, lifelines utilities and social and community infrastructure up and running fast was also identified. Personal safety was also highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity, Diversity and Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence, Resilience and Self Reliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Connection and Culture, Heritage, Amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Knowledge, Leadership, Partnership and Voice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Social Connections, Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Local Input, Lifelines and Key Infrastructure, Economic Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Health and Personal Wellbeing (including our pets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Personal Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Recovery Vision

Auckland’s people, communities, businesses and infrastructure are well-placed to recovery from a disaster.

Recovery

Recovery means "the coordinated efforts and processes used to bring to about the immediate, medium-term, and long-term holistic regeneration and enhancement of a community following an emergency." Correspondingly, recovery activities deal with the consequences of an emergency. An emergency is when something happens which causes or may cause loss of life or injury, or endangers public safety or property that:

- cannot be dealt with emergency services or
- requires a significant and coordinated response.  

The definition of an emergency refers to the likes of earthquakes, tsunami, tornado, plague and floods as well as the leakage or spillage of dangerous substances or failure of or disruption to an emergency service or lifeline utility. For convenience and brevity, we use ‘disaster’ to mean and emergency event that requires a recovery.

The essential issue of recovery is that; what has been built up over many decades through private and publicly funded development, individual, family and civic effort can be destroyed or damaged all at once, needing to be regenerated within a comparatively short period of time. Resulting disruption to businesses, housing, infrastructure networks, facilities and amenities impact on daily life and living standards, potentially for some time.

Recovery is complex and takes time. Recovery initially faces high levels of uncertainty, as the situation evolves. Time required for recovery to be completed can challenge people’s expectations and aspirations. They may feel like their life is on hold.

Preparations for recovery under this Framework aim to respond to and be fit for purpose for any scale of event. For example, depending on its scale, Auckland Council may have to reprioritise its activities to support a recovery.

What does Well-placed mean?

An underlying theme of recovery and its essential problem is complexity. Well-placed means being well prepared.

Lessons have been learnt from recent large events such as the Christchurch earthquakes and Kaikoura earthquakes. Intentionally preparing for recovery rather than leaving matters to chance or orchestrating recovery on the fly, greatly increases the prospects of more effective recovery – that is:

- the early commencement of organised recovery activities

---

3 Adapted from definitions in the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.
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- with a clear sense of purpose
- supported by participants and affected communities.

Achieving a successful start to a recovery requires a shared understanding of what a recovery is; what needs to be done (at least initially), and access to funding and resources. This in turn requires clear roles and responsibilities supporting cooperation and collaboration across many organisations and people, across many work streams. At a more detailed level it requires:

- clear, well understood processes for the transition to recovery
- assessing people's needs and the damage to buildings and infrastructure
- procuring, allocating and managing resources
- managing the delivery of services and implementation of activities and projects.

Reinstatement, regeneration or enhancement?

Ultimately questions arise as to how ambitious or achievable recovery should be.

'Build Back Better' is a term arising out of the fourth priority for action (of 4) — “Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to build back better in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction”, of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction endorsed by the United Nations

"Over the years there has been an appreciation that reconstruction is an opportunity to build back better. Today recovery is defined as the restoration and improvement of facilities, livelihoods and living conditions of disaster-affected communities, including efforts to reduce disaster risk factors," and is reflected in the definitions for recovery and recovery in the Civil Defence Emergency Act 2002.

What this means in practice can be very difficult. What was lost may not be able to be replaced exactly, the values of assets written down, insurance may only cover what previously existed in its then condition and regulations may impose their own requirements.

Responsible and cost-effective rehabilitation of a community does not guarantee a community will be restored to its original state. However, there may be opportunities to enable communities to improve on previous conditions. Through taking a broad, flexible or innovative view, enhancements may include new behaviours increased personal or community resilience, application or urban design and or universal design principles rather or improved structures or upsized infrastructure.

---

4 UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, 14-18 March 2015, Sendai, Japan.
Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

**Understanding consequences and opportunities**

New Zealand and international experience demonstrates the advantages of pre-event planning and preparation over leaving it to chance or having to orchestrate a recovery on the fly.

Pre-event planning and preparation for recovery is supported by analysis of the likely impacts and consequences of emergency events. The potential hazard and its impacts interact with the circumstances existing at the time and in the area the emergency event takes place. Further community values and priorities form part of and inform these circumstances. Understanding the impacts and circumstances, and their interaction in time and place is integral to planning for recovery. Scenario planning and running scenario-based exercises can assist greatly in this area.

This approach helps identify critical factors to an effective recovery, opportunities to improve community resilience and where possible, mitigate existing and identified hazards and risks. Through working with communities, we can prioritise areas of vulnerability while leveraging and supporting continued resilience within recovery.

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)

*Figure 2. Anticipating what recovery may have to address.*

The Auckland CDEM Group’s Plan ‘Resilient Auckland’ identifies several hazards and risks to the Auckland region, including natural events (such as volcanic eruption, severe weather events, tsunami, and coastal inundation) and infrastructure and lifeline utility failures (such as disruption to electricity, water, and transport networks).

When planning for impacts of hazards and risks, consideration needs to be given to the four recovery environments – social, built, economic and natural.

Auckland faces unique challenges - super diversity, rural and urban contexts, housing supply, homelessness, aging infrastructure and high rates of growth and development, which are key considerations for a potential disaster and ongoing recovery effort.

Emergencies and their consequences can be localised, affecting an area within a single local board’s boundaries or of wider impact, affecting an area that is part of multiple local boards, or the entire region.

Some emergencies may involve a series of cascading events, each of which may require different, but complimentary recovery activities. For example, a volcanic eruption in the north
of the Auckland Volcanic Field may cause evacuations and damage on the North Shore, but ashfall may progressively damage wastewater treatment networks that eventually leads to region-wide lifeline utility failures. The context of a recovery can be extremely dynamic.

It should be noted however, there are limitations to the extent to which impacts of hazards and circumstances can be fully anticipated. Work to better understand Auckland’s hazards and risks and their impacts is part of Auckland Emergency Management’s ongoing work programme.
Building capacity and capability, and addressing barriers

Auckland Emergency Management and the Auckland CDEM Group are particularly focused on building capacity and capability for recovery and to addressing barriers that may inhibit or obstruct effective recovery.

The Framework takes a board view to shaping the way we will work in recovery and enabling the work we will do recovery, informed by the community values and priorities.

The way we work – a partnership approach

Auckland Emergency Management and the CDEM Group takes a partnership approach, seeking the best of organic forms, supportive of community action and emerging solutions, and highly structured, institutional / governmental forms to provide coordination and operate at scale. This will enable Auckland Emergency Management, Auckland Council and our partners to deliver a more effective and coordinated recovery informed by community values and priorities.

The partnership approach recognises and respects diversity to ensure recovery is inclusive and provides opportunities for community participation. It is implemented through:

- prioritising the wellbeing of individuals, families and communities and their recovery
- restoring and/or improving the function of infrastructure, structures, physical networks and urban fabric that support communities
- enabling the restoration and/or regeneration of natural environments and their habitats and ecosystems
- supporting the interactions between businesses, business people, employees, resources and assets, and the commerce and trade generated in the economic environment.

The partnership approach identifies scalable, flexible and adaptable coordinating structures, aligned to key roles and responsibilities. It is a mechanism to link local and central government, the private sector and non-government (NGO) and community organisations that play a vital role in recovery. For example – the larger the scale of a recovery the more likely it will orient towards government structures and processes. This raises potential for flexibility, innovation and empowering the recovery of individuals to be unintentionally inhibited.

This approach builds on the work of Auckland’s CDEM Group / Auckland Emergency Management across the 5 R’s – reduction, readiness, response, recovery and resilience, our focus on communities and strengthening resilience and the strengths of the Auckland Council group and its partners. It provides opportunities for communities of practice to be activated, and guides and champions in the community to play a role informing and supporting the recovery effort assisting their communities.

Building upon existing partnerships the approach will also work across wider groups to embrace new formal and informal partnerships.
Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

The way we work – collaborating across formal and informal partnerships

Auckland Emergency Management provides the specialist roles serving Auckland Council’s civil defence function under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 and would lead the initial stages of recovery.


Auckland Council’s governing body has delegated responsibility to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee as the decision maker for the Group.

Auckland Emergency Management and the CDEM Group works closely and collaboratively with many stakeholders. For example, the Auckland Welfare Coordination Group is made up of 26-member agencies active in response. Many of these emergency services, social and health service and non-governmental organisations will also support recovery.

Auckland Emergency Management engages Auckland Council’s local boards across the pre-event recovery work programme and will work closely with local boards when undertaking a recovery in their area or areas.

Auckland Emergency Management will further develop its relationships across the emergency management sector and its communities through the implementation of this Framework. Developing and building relationships with Auckland’s iwi and mataawaaka is a particular focus and a priority.

The work we do – addressing barriers to recovery

Recovery gives rise to a range of inherent challenges and issues, as multiple activities are delivered simultaneously across workstreams addressing recovery in the natural, social, built and economic environments.

Through the development of this Framework, engagement with the Ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management, recovery literature and our engagement with our partners we have identified five focus areas to assist in preparing for recovery. They direct activity towards what is crucial to recovery or address barriers to recovery in Auckland. Focusing on effective recovery the five areas seek to ensure:

- capacity and capability is available
- collaboration is supported
- recovery is communicated
- recovery is understood
- monitoring and evaluation.
Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery
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Figure 3 – Five Focus Areas

It is recognised that effective recovery requires supporting work programmes in addition to implementation of the Framework, such as:

- refining Standard Operating Procedures for recovery
- implementing the readiness work programme of the Incident Management Team
- incorporating and learning from international and New Zealand recovery efforts
- supporting the development of emergency management recovery networks, like the Northern Recovery Managers Group.
Actions to build momentum

The following section outlines high-level, short to medium-term actions. They respond to the set of initial community values and priorities outlined earlier and are directed towards the five focus areas.

They will drive the recovery work programme across the breadth of preparation, relationship building and communication. Delivering on the identified actions will progress us towards achieving the longer-term vision, and that progress will be monitored and evaluated.

Auckland Emergency Management will develop a prioritised work programme to deliver on the identified actions. Our Civil Defence Emergency Management partners will be involved along the way to ensure inter-agency operability is maintained, operational needs are assured and to affirm our shared understanding.

Initially focused within Auckland Emergency Management, a whole-of-council approach to implementing the work programme will involve Auckland Council group first, and then our partners, before expanding outwards engaging additional partners and reaching out into the community.
## Auckland's diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland hosts a rich and diverse population by age, gender, religion, sexuality, nationality and culture. This is a strength of Auckland while also meaning specific needs might present themselves in a recovery. Achieving effective recovery will require the flexibility to ensure recovery works for all Aucklanders and their communities. Communication, understanding recovery, and being able to engage and participate may be challenging for some communities.</td>
<td>Cultivate improved cultural awareness to be able to understand specific concerns, to enable them to be addressed. Access and tap into resources across the Auckland Council group and externally to better communicate and engage. Leverage the potential of Auckland Council’s demographic Advisory Panels – Seniors, Ethnic Peoples, Pacific Peoples, Disability, Youth and Rainbow Communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Building a better understanding of Recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understandably, recovery is not well understood. It has a limited profile beyond the CDEM sector and people with personal knowledge. The current level of understanding is a barrier to people’s ability to anticipate and prepare in advance of an emergency event. Auckland hosts a rich and diverse population by age, gender, religion, sexuality, nationality and culture. This is a strength of Auckland while also meaning specific needs might present themselves in a recovery. Achieving effective recovery will require the flexibility to ensure recovery works for all Aucklanders and their communities. Communication, understanding recovery, and being able to engage and participate may be challenge in some communities.</td>
<td>Develop a ‘Recovery story’ supported by key messages and education materials (translated in different languages). Leverage opportunities to raise the profile and discuss recovery with new audiences through the CDEM Group, Auckland Council group, partners and communities. Support Auckland Emergency Management’s education and outreach programme across the five R’s. Cultivate improved cultural awareness to be able to understand specific concerns, to enable them to be addressed. Access and tap into resources across the Auckland Council group and externally to better communicate and engage. Leverage the potential of Auckland Council’s demographic Advisory Panels – Seniors, Ethnic Peoples, Pacific Peoples, Disability, Youth and Rainbow Communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Expectations</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The disruption to daily life and routines can be sudden and significant. Previously</td>
<td>Clear and consistent communication is critical to maintaining trust in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>routine tasks become complicated and can subject to repeated change.</td>
<td>the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of upset can be exacerbated by ongoing change due to recovery activities or</td>
<td>Strike a balance between ambition and achievability in planning and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather changes. Previous plans go on hold.</td>
<td>preparations for recovery in a recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of this magnitude can be disempowering and a source of frustration and distress</td>
<td>Leverage creativity, community spirit and participation in a recovery to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for many.</td>
<td>promote solutions and assist in the recovery effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is eager to return to something that resembles what was normal before the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event, as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nature of the event, its impacts and the scale of the recovery effort required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inform the type and extent of recovery efforts required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy / Local Economy</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption can bring business, trade and commerce to a standstill. Orders and commitments may not be met, and employees may have not work. Everybody suffers hardships without cash flow or access to money to access necessities. Disrupted supply lines may need to be restored. Distinctions between rural and urban local economies are also important. For example, seasonal activities may have needs or requirements with potential consequences for production over an extended period.</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities and mechanisms for local sourcing/procurement of goods and services during a recovery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding and resources</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacing capital and social investment, restoring natural ecosystems and regenerating the environments that support social and economic well-being requires significant funding. The commitment of financial and human resources to prioritise recovery activities is also significant. Accessing needed skills and expertise can be additional challenges. Sustaining a recovery, prudent financial management, appropriate project management, while maintaining a focus in delivering on the desired outcomes is complex in a pressured environment. Recovery from smaller events can seem disproportionately large, while major and significant events present hurdles that are magnitudes greater. The longer recovery continues the greater the pressure on resources as demand to deliver disrupted projects and work programmes builds. This can pose particular challenges where the event and recovery are limited to a part of the region.</td>
<td>Building shared organisational understanding of what recovery may involve across Auckland Council group. CDEM group, Task Groups, and progressively, with Auckland’s communities.</td>
<td>Sharing of Standard Operating Procedures, plans and recovery documentation as appropriate, and subsequent updates. Generate a deeper shared understanding of arrangements regarding the servicing of recovery in respect of financial, information and project management, specialist and expert advice and general administration. Understanding the way business units across Auckland Council group deliver their services. Raising the profile of recovery arrangements and the understanding of what might be required of service delivery business units and their contractors. Identifying key skills, expertise and services contributing to recovery across Auckland Council group and partner organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori communities</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent experience of response and recovery from disasters has benefited from the participation, support and leadership of mana whenua and local iwi at all levels – from delivering services to decision making.</td>
<td>Develop a shared understanding of recovery within Auckland Emergency Management’s wider engagement with mana whenua and mataawaka. Build on the opportunities for collaboration to cultivate leadership, participation and outcomes for Māori.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Pre-existing issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any existing issues at the time of an event will be magnified in their effect and consequence.</td>
<td>Environmental scanning to maintain general awareness of issues and challenges facing Auckland across the four recovery environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing is under pressure in Auckland, with elevated house prices and rental costs, homelessness and high demand for social housing and refuge. Emergency accommodation will be a challenge in these circumstances.</td>
<td>Maintain engagement with partners and stakeholders and leverage opportunities to gather information and intelligence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples health conditions, disabilities, or personal circumstances may make them especially vulnerable to sudden change and disruption to their environment.</td>
<td>- in recovery planning and preparations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport bottlenecks or previously known weakness in a network may have a pronounced effect in a particular event.</td>
<td>- through the duration of recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychosocial recovery</strong></td>
<td><strong>Psychosocial recovery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International and more recent experiences in New Zealand has raised awareness of the way that emergency events can have very different impacts on people.</td>
<td>Ensuring people involved in recovery maintain an awareness of the complexities of psychosocial recovery that individuals may be going through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some may be unscathed, and others impacted to varying degrees. Impacts may only become apparent after the passage of time.</td>
<td>Sharing best practice amongst experienced practitioners with and amongst front-line staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person individual circumstances can make it more difficult to cope with ongoing disruption and change, to make decisions and to support others.</td>
<td>Apply case management and debriefing principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally, individual recovery from such impacts takes time and is non-linear or continuous, with many ‘ups’ and ‘downs’ possible.</td>
<td>Psychosocial first aid training or other for all people in contact roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness raising of the psychosocial impacts on responding agencies and staff and the putting in place of support mechanisms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Groups are established to provide advice and assistance for each of the natural, social, built and economic environments.</td>
<td>Establishing a ‘pool’ of potential Task Group members to ensure readiness and the ability to scale a recovery proportionate to the nature of the disaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Task Group has a Terms of Reference, setting out its functions, roles and responsibilities. Task Groups may also comprise sub-task groups.</td>
<td>The pool for each recovery environment may be comprised of both:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential members are practitioners, experts or leaders in their field whose knowledge would benefit a recovery. They are generally busy people, which can be a barrier to maintaining Task Groups, keeping informed and abreast of best practice in recovery.</td>
<td>• a <strong>core</strong> membership comprised of people within the wider Auckland Council group / emergency sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further, the membership of Task Groups needs to reflect the nature and scale of the task for each event.</td>
<td>• a <strong>wider</strong> membership of people who might only be called upon if the event demands it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intensity and pressure of a response is very demanding. People in lead roles in response can be expected to be exhausted. Although the same agencies may have lead roles/key roles, they will need to identify specific staffing to support the recovery effort.</td>
<td>Core members would be more involved with up to 4 meetings/exercises a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the current capacity and capability for recovery within participating agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore potential arrangements they may operate in a recovery and their staffing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure key staff in the recovery are different from key staff in response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train staff for recovery as required. (potentially based on common arrangements).</td>
<td>Wider group members would be less involved, though steps taken to ensure relationships and awareness is maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Effective recovery requires high levels of coordination and collaboration, with everyone actively participating. Achieving this level of collaboration is supported by:  
  - strong institutional and personal relationships  
  - clear roles and responsibilities  
  - a shared understanding of what is to be achieved in a recovery  
  - effective support systems and communication. | Develop guidelines setting out the process, considerations, information/intelligence required and potential sources to assist in considering whether a recovery process needs to be activated - incorporate key elements into Standard Operating Procedures, with thresholds. |
| | Share Standard Operating Procedures, plans and recovery documentation (and subsequent updates) with partners as appropriate. |
| | Build and maintain institutional and personal relationships amongst key agencies. |
| | Clarifying agreed roles and responsibilities amongst leading partners and key agencies. |
| | Formalise arrangements, roles, responsibilities in key areas through developing protocols, memorandum of understanding or similar.  
  (Key areas = support delivery of a critical service or critical resources or arrangements important in every recovery) |
## Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

### Attachment A

#### Item 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and evaluation</th>
<th>Development of a monitoring and evaluation framework for recovery able to be applied to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The response to, and recovery from an event are frequently reviewed to identify what went well/not so well and improvements to future practice. Monitoring and evaluation are integral to programme management and the development of best practice. Levels of disruption or distance from previous norms are readily identifiable from common high-level metrics, such as regional GDP or the unemployment rate. Comparisons of these types of metrics (when available) lend themselves to debates on the progress or success of recovery from a significant event. These types of metrics are important and produced methodically by agencies external to a recovery. More particularly, indicators need to be identified to be able to track progress towards fulfilling the vision and objectives for recovery. Similarly, indicators are required to provide information on the extent to which the principles are being applied. Indicators are also required to track progress on the tasks/actions identified in Recovery Action Plans, formulated after an event.</td>
<td>provide insight into the relevance of high-level independent metrics track the extent of progress towards achievement of the Framework’s vision for recovery progress towards completing items on the recovery work programme (generated from the Framework’s actions) provide insight into the overall efficacy in monitoring and preparation for recovery track progress towards the completion of actions and tasks under a Recovery Action Plan formulated for the recovery from an emergency event provide insight into the overall efficacy of actions and tasks under a Recovery Action Plan formulated to address the consequences in a disaster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Regional Facilities Auckland Q3 summary

## Highlights, issues & risks for the quarter

### Highlights:
- RFA’s summer stadium concert line-up boosted the Auckland economy with a visitor spend of $20 million and a contribution to regional GDP of $10 million.
- Disney’s *Aladdin the Musical* ran for nine weeks at The Civic, with 70 performances drawing theatre-goers from around the country with spectacular sets and costumes, and talented cast.
- New Zealand Maritime Museum welcomed hundreds of Aucklanders on its heritage vessels as part of Auckland Anniversary weekend festivities at the waterfront.

### Issues/Risks:
- The financial operational performance is currently forecasted at an unfavourable variance of approximately $250k. Focus remains on securing revenue opportunities and deferral or cutting non-essential variable costs. The $250k variance relates to the accelerated visitor security programme.
- Conventions, Stadiums, and Auckland Live revenue remains cyclical and volatile.
- Business interruption caused by the capital works at the Aotea Centre and Auckland Zoo is having a significant negative impact on revenue generation.
- The loss of the VEC as a conventions venue will hamper RFA’s ability to grow the conventions market.

## Key performance indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Refer to pg. 8 for complete list)</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience RFA’s arts, environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td>1,686,306</td>
<td>2,423,215</td>
<td>2,585,627</td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Māori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurua</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Financial Commentary

### Capital delivery:
The RFA capital programme for FY19 consists of 247 projects, with a forecast 86% delivery by year end. The delivery lag is primarily driven by changes in phasing of the two major projects – the Aotea Centre refurbishment and the South East Asia Precinct which, collectively, are budgeted at $113m over several years.

### Direct revenue:
Revenue is unfavourable to budget due to two large theatre events being postponed and three outdoor concerts did not proceed as budgeted. This has also had a consequential flow on effect on other revenue.

### Direct expenditure:
Overall direct expenditure is $5.7m favourable to budget as costs are actively controlled to offset the unfavourable revenue.
Strategic focus area – Stadia

Key commentary
For the nine months to 31 March 2019, a total of $4.7m was spent towards stadia against a budget of $17.9m, with a forecast year end spend of $15m.

Highlights
1. North Harbour Stadium: reconfiguration of the main field to accommodate baseball has been agreed with stakeholders and design is underway. Works are anticipated to be completed by November 2019. Seismic assessments of the main stand will be concluded shortly and will inform the design of the roof replacement. Detailed design will be completed this financial year.
2. Mt Smart Stadium: works on the lower west stand and the south stand will be completed this financial year.
3. Western Springs: detailed designs will be received by 15 April for the four building renewals, with works projected to be completed by November 2019. In consultation with users, the entry road renewal has been delayed until the end of August, following the conclusion of the rugby season. The building locations and designs have been future proofed to accommodate various alternative future uses of the venue.

Issues/Risks
1. Seismic assessments are currently being undertaken across our stadiums. The outcomes of these assessments will need to be taken into account in the context of future asset management strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Harbour QBE Stadium – baseball reconfiguration</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Reconfiguration and construction to enable the hosting of the Auckland Tuatara’s home games for next season at QBE Stadium</td>
<td>This project is currently in procurement phase with construction to commence in March and completed by November 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Smart Stadium – seating replacement in the lower west stand</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>The replacement of the seating area entirely, including seats, structure and decking on the lower west stand of Mt Smart Stadium.</td>
<td>This renewal project for Mt Smart Stadium is required to ensure health and safety and tenancy obligations continue to be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Harbour Stadium – main stand roof renewal</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>To construct access to the grandstand roof and undertake roof repairs (renewals)</td>
<td>Awaiting the outcome of seismic assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Springs Stadium renewals</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>The replacement of two toilet blocks, gate entry building, maintenance shed, concourse and Stadium Road upgrade works.</td>
<td>Essential renewals currently in the procurement phase and expected to commence in March with completion due in November 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic context
RFA’s Venue Development Strategy (VDS) identifies the issues facing the current major outdoor stadiums in Auckland, and proposes key focus areas over the next 20 years to address these. These primarily provide more fit for purpose stadia which are more financially sustainable, better utilised and provide improved value for money through less duplication.
Strategic focus area – Auckland Zoo development

Key commentary

For the nine months to 31 March 2019, a total of $20.0m was spent towards zoo development against a budget of $40.3m.

Highlights

1. Renewal of the Old Elephant House as a restaurant and functions venue to improve visitor amenities has been completed.
2. Construction of the South East Asian Precinct and new café is well underway.
3. The new Zoo administration wing has been completed, increasing capacity to accommodate staff and providing permanent location for previously isolated staff. Planning for the Stage 2 renovation of the old administration wing has also begun.
4. A significant programme of general renewals and infrastructure upgrades is progressing well.

Issues/Risks

1. The extent of the construction work currently underway at the Zoo (the South East Asia project is currently impacting on more than 20% of the site) is impacting on the visitor experience and perception of value at the zoo. A range of mitigation strategies are in place, the most significant of which is the implementation of an adjusted pricing strategy, reducing the cost of entry by as much as 30%. Visititation numbers are being maintained as a result, although revenues are necessarily impacted.
2. A significant portion of general renewals is planned following the Easter school holidays to avoid visitor impact. This increases the risk of delays due to weather.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. E. Asia Precinct development</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the central area within the zoo to provide modern standards of housing and care for the Zoo’s South East Asian species, and new catering facilities</td>
<td>Largest renewals project ($60m) in the zoo’s history. Tracking to budget and expected to be completed in the 2019/20 financial year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic context

RFA is continuing with development of a world class zoo and conservation facility by addressing aging infrastructure at Auckland Zoo and long-term under-investment through a phased programme of works. This has the aim of essential renewals to ensure Auckland Zoo meets the modern standards of animal welfare, visitor amenity, wildlife exhibition and health and safety obligations.
Strategic focus area – Aotea Centre development

Key commentary
For the nine months to 31 March 2019, a total of $24.3m was spent towards the Aotea Centre development against a budget of $52.8m. This project remains substantially challenged by delays associated with the need for comprehensive re-design to meet new standards.

Highlights
1. Refurbishment of the interior of the Aotea Centre was sufficiently completed in March 2019 to enable successful hosting of the Auckland Arts Festival.
2. The outdoor “Digital Stage” screen in Aotea Square continues to provide free live and enhanced digital experience for visitors to the Aotea Arts Quarter, playing a significant role during the Auckland Arts Festival.
3. Work on developing a precinct master plan for Aotea Square is well advanced and on track to be presented to the Board mid-2019.

Issues/Risks
1. Changing consenting requirements in relation to the tragic events at Grenfell Tower and Nautilus Orewa have caused significant delays with progressing the façade and external weather-tightness work on the centre. This has resulted in redundant work, the need to re-establish the project design team, and conduct a comprehensive re-design of the building’s cladding and weather protection systems. Some portions of work remain in design. An additional $14m in additional costs are estimated as a result, and additional funding will be sought as part of the Annual Plan 2019/20 budget process.
2. Delays to completion of the project will reduce revenue potential from the centre for a longer period than previously anticipated. Significant distraction for Aotea and project teams through need to micro-plan access to conclude unfinished portions of work.
3. There will be some negative impact on the customer experience caused by ongoing construction works until completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aotear Refurbishment</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>The first significant refurbishment of the 30 year old centre, aiming to upgrade foyer and functions spaces and address long-standing weather-tightness issues</td>
<td>NZ’s growing understanding of the safety implications of building façades and cladding standards has required substantial changes to the project mid-programme. There are significant additional costs associated with these changes and further funding will be sought through the annual plan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Square master plan</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>A precinct planning approach to the development of the square and its surrounds to ensure the precinct meets its potential as a key lively and active space for Aucklanders</td>
<td>This project is progressing with input from a broad group of stakeholders and is intended to help guide future investment proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Centre expansion</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Developing concept plans for expanding the current Aotea Centre to provide a home for performing arts organisations and to foster the work of performing arts groups</td>
<td>This project is in its early stages – the concept, funding and potential timing of this proposed development will be discussed with Council in 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Statement of Intent focus areas

**Arts & Culture Strategy**
- **Pacific Sisters: He Toa Tāreta / Fashion Activists** opened at Auckland Art Gallery in February. The exhibition, which pays homage to a collective of Pacific and Māori designers, artists, and performers that electrified 1990s Auckland, has been extended with an interactive art installation, DiscoVERY, by Rosanna Raymond and Ani O'Neill.
- **Guardia Girls: Reinventing the ‘F’ word – Feminism/ opened in March. The anonymous collective’s humorous and provocative work has challenged discrimination in the art world, politics, film and music for three decades.
- **The first boat built by Sir Peter Blake more than 50 years ago, Bandit, has been restored and put on display at the New Zealand Maritime Museum. A new sustainability-themed space for families was opened, with interactive activities encouraging children to contribute ideas on caring for our oceans.
- **Auckland Live produced additional NZ Sign Language-interpreted and Audio described performances for Disney’s Aladdin the Musical, with positive feedback from hearing and visually-impaired theatre-goers.
- **Auckland Zoo announced a partnership with Mazda Foundation for its Outreach Conservation Education programme.**

**Sustainability and Climate change**
- Since the 3rd of January 2019 Auckland Live have been using Globelet reusable wine glasses. Their use for the Aladdin season prevented over 13,500 disposable cups from going to landfill. Globelet cups were also trialled at four of Auckland Stadium’s major events over the 2018-2019 summer season.
- A project has been initiated to progressively replace the Art Gallery’s 300 Watt halogen external up-lights with 30 Watt LED replacements, resulting in a 10-fold improvement in energy efficiency. 25 of these will be replaced starting in April.
- The New Zealand Maritime Museum hosted a Sea week breakfast talk in March with Henri Unwin in partnership with Sustainable Seas National Science and Cawthron Institute. The scientist talked on the development of a new digital tool to track how ocean currents transport plastics.
- The zoo’s water savings have been reported as 42300 m³ ($169k) since April 2017 due to improved metering and real-time leak notification allowing for immediate leak repair.
- 0% of the zoo’s recycling was rejected (sent to landfill) due to contamination this quarter, following a new initiative to hand sort all recycling.
- Rainwater harvesting tanks installed in the zoo’s South East Asia Precinct brings the zoo’s total rainwater collection capacity from quarter of a million to half a million litres of water annually,

**Contribution towards Māori Outcomes**
- **Te Reo Māori:**
  - All business units which have direct customers service responsibilities have implemented te reo Māori, waiata and tikanga Māori staff training opportunities.
  - Aotea Centre upgrade includes te reo Māori signage in its tri-lingual wayfinding plans.
- **Identity and Culture**
  - Internationally renowned artist Lisa Reihana has been commissioned to create a unique world class Māori digital media work for Aotea Centre.
  - Effective Māori Participation
    - Relationships and engagement with iwi, Māori specialists are continuing to be developed and strengthened.
    - Auckland Stadiums has met with Te Puna Trust (owners of Raratonga/Mt Smart Land). Arrangements have been made with the Trust to provide access to meeting rooms within the Stadium.
    - New Zealand Maritime Museum- Hui Te Anau i Tangaroa has a Memorandum of Understanding with Te Toki Voyaging Trust.
    - Auckland Live and Conventions staff organised and supported 75 members of the cast and crew from Aladdin-The Musical to participate in a formal powhiri at Ōrākei by Ngāti Whāitu Ōrākei.

**Local Board Engagement**
- In February, the annual function for local boards, hosted by the chair of RFA, was attended by approximately 50 guests as well as RFA board members and senior management. Guests enjoyed informal tours of the New Zealand Maritime Museum and the opportunity to talk with people from RFA, advisory panels and other local boards across the city. Fourteen local boards were represented.
- The RFA Directors of Stadiums and Stadiums Strategy met with Waitenata Local Board, Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board and Upper Harbour Local Board to discuss the stadiums within the board areas and the Auckland Stadiums Venue Development Strategy.
- The Deputy Director, Auckland Live, presented an update of activities and developments to the Waitenata Local Board, and is working with the board around developments in Aotea Square, such as the Digital Stage, and citizenship ceremonies at the Auckland Town Hall.
- By the end of the quarter, six boards had placed the second quarter report on meeting agendas, while others are yet to do so or are distributing the report to members for reading.
## Direct operating performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net direct expenditure</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct revenue</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; user charges</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating grants and subsidies</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct revenue</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct expenditure</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, contributions &amp; sponsorship</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct expenditure</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other key operating lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC operating funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC capital funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net interest expense</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Commentary

**A:** The RFA performance for the nine months to 31 March 2019 is tracking to budget. This has been achieved through tight control over expenditure by all the RFA divisions. The forecast for the financial year end is unfavourable to budget by $250k due to the acceleration of the visitor security programme.

**B:** Fees and user charges are unfavourable to budget due to planned events not occurring. Two large live theatre events have been postponed and two large outdoor concerts budgeted (but not secured) for this quarter did not proceed. This has also impacted food and beverage sales.

**C:** Employee Benefits contains $7.5m staff costs that are recharged against events. These recharges are budgeted under Cost of Goods Sold (COGS) within other direct expenses. Actual staff costs are favourable to budget.

**D:** Other direct expenses contains COGS which includes salary recharges of $7.5m. The $7.5m recovery should offset against employee benefits – RFA will continue to work with Auckland Council officers to rectify this reporting issue going forward.
### Regional Facilities Auckland Q3 performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key performance indicators</th>
<th>Previous Quarter YTD</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience Regional Facilities Auckland’s arts, environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td>1,686,306</td>
<td>2,423,215</td>
<td>2,585,627</td>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>The Viaduct Events Centre was leased to Team NZ during the second quarter. This re-purpose of the facility has had a negative impact on the overall visitor numbers. It is unlikely this target will be met by year end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to Auckland Zoo</td>
<td>346,806</td>
<td>551,427</td>
<td>503,833</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to Auckland Art Gallery</td>
<td>204,151</td>
<td>304,651</td>
<td>374,067</td>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>International visitor numbers did not achieve the targets set for the summer months and it is forecast that the year-end target will not be met due to a lower number of paid exhibitions and potentially also due to the introduction of the international visitor charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to the NZ Maritime Museum</td>
<td>78,570</td>
<td>124,285</td>
<td>121,651</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>The forecast shows that revenue targets will not be met this year, however tight control over expenditure means that the expected forecast for the financial year end is that RFA will be unfavourable to budget by only $250k due to the acceleration of the visitor security programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Auckland residents surveyed who value RFA venues and events</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Maori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michael Mendoza - Democracy Advisor</th>
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</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina  
Signatories  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michael Mendoza - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Orakei Local Boards</td>
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Report Name: Board member report – Member, Jessica Rose

Alternate Portfolio Lead: Transport, Sustainability, & Environment
Alternate Portfolio Lead: Art, Events, & Heritage
Report Period: July 2018 – July 2019

Portfolio Activities

Transport, Sustainability, and Environment

First and foremost, Auckland declared that we are in a climate emergency. I had written a NOM to call for this action, but they pipped me at the post! I was very glad of it, and instead made a recommendation to ensure that there are solid actions and a panel of people and experts to drive the project. The Auckland Council lead Climate Summit of 2019 bought home some very real concerns for weather events, and preparing the city for resilience. One interesting take home, was the incredible contribution to carbon emissions that comes from using our fossil fueled vehicles; 35.7%. All the more reason to get head and shoulders into rethinking how we move for local trips, and getting kids to school. And getting along to strike for our children’s futures…

Speaking of school, we held the regional EnviroSchools awards in our ward, recognizing all the teachers and students who are leading the way in environment protection. It was a full community centre, with live stalls displaying the stellar projects that our youth are spearheading. And it’s not just the youth, in business, the talented Carolyn Cox of Green Business HQ has been running a sustainable business programme supported by the board. Local organisations were able to sign up and for coaching on lighter living opportunities for their business and for their pockets. It was an astounding success, and all business who participated were thrilled with the results. We hope that we can run this project again for more interested businesses.

This was also the year that tireless community hero Wendy Johns, of Friends of Oakley Creek fame, got her name in the headlines as the astounding nature warrior she is. If only we could find a way to clone her, she is a precious taonga. STEPS are keeping up the pace with kaitaki of Watitiko too. We also have a newly formed group ‘Pest Free Inner West’, or now freshly minted as Urban Ark - Manawa Taiao. This is a collective of humans who are dedicated to protecting our native flora and fauna from pest destruction. In fact, they have a job going at the moment so have a look if you are interested! [https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:6553930832208371712]
We have had so many exciting wins in transport recently. The long overdue but remarkably safer Raised crossing over Carrington Road is just about complete as I write this. It complements the calming projects that have been rolled out in red all through Carrington East. Making a clear indication that these are quiet streets for local people, so please be respectful when in the area.

With safety at the core, Board member Easte has realized his long fought campaign to have safety gates installed at level crossings all over Auckland, starting in Albert-Eden. Less successful has been the much talked about and anticipated Pt Chev and Meola street upgrades to include safer infrastructure for all types of urban mobility. We have been assured that this is still in design, but are very much champsing at the bit to see something in concrete, as we’re sure you are!

Back to the highlights, the opening of both Ian McKinnon bike path, and the Ta Auaunga ‘sets the bar so high, we’re going to need an Olympic pole vaulter’ Path lead by Puketepapa Local Board have community excited. The safe infrastructure coupled with an increase in ebikes in the market and unseasonably good weather have seen an unprecedented uptake in cycling for leisure and commute. The upward trend, which was steep already, doubled itself. It proves that we’re responding to the requests of our community, and that it’s gratefully received. For all ages – Potters Park has been in the spotlight again with the opening of the learn to ride facility. You also may have noticed the new wayfinding signage going up on the Northwestern/Waterview Paths. This has been a project that I’ve been working on with member Watson on for a long time. Well worth the wait!
Arts, Events and Heritage

It has been a busy calendar year for engaging in arts, events and heritage, this was the first year that AELB hosted Japan Day. It was a raging success and stands proudly alongside the Sandringham Village festival, Brazil Day, Asian Family Services multicultural festival, and the Dominion Rd Moon fest. Sandringham village festival goes from strength to strength, although hopefully the 2019 event will see us able to celebrate our shared spaces, and claim the street for people to use, safe from vehicles passing through. We were also rocked by the atrocity of the Christchurch killings, and solemnly thank the understanding and charity of the ANZACs in marking such an important day with people’s safety first in mind.

The sun was shining on ultimate celebration of inclusivity the annual Big Gay out in Coyle Park, a relief after the previous years’ rain out. Just in time for the use of the wonderful new accessible pathway that borders the park and allows for all people of all abilities to get around public space. Coyle Park also was the testing ground for the first ever captioned film in the series. The board are committed to inclusivity and accessibility for all our people and this was just one more step in the right direction. Hopefully we’ll see a lot more paths, captions, and high vis signage across other board areas in future too.

Speaking of Movies in the parks, we had our first ever event at Nixon Park in Kingsland for Valentines Day. I couldn’t have been a better time to see the romantic musical ‘La-la Land’, and the community came out in droves to have a slice of pizza, and a kombucha courtesy of the sponsorship partners for the event. We will definitely be doing this one again.

Some of the most cherished events we have, celebrated in the historic Ferndale house, are the Local Heroes, Grants Recipients, and black tie Albert Eden Business Awards. These events are unique to our board. It’s a welcome reminder that it is our people who make this ward what it is, and that there are so many who put in their time, their effort and their good will to make this city better for everyone. It warms the cockles to be able to recognize these efforts formally and say thank you, from the bottom of our hearts.

Most recently – we unveiled our ‘largest’ art project to date, championed by Member Haynes. The widely talked about Boy Walking by Ronnie Van Haut. If there is anything to get people talking, it’s public art. Our board supports creativity and understands the enrichment public art offers to the community. This piece fits in well with the diverse offerings from artists all over the country that populate the Council collection.
Other Business

It has again been a pleasure to attend some events in support of our adjoining boards and being involved in promoting the great things Auckland Council is doing across Auckland. Our monthly Citizenship ceremonies have continued to be emotional events as we welcome all the new New Zealanders to our nation. A special event was held at Mt Eden stadium and although not quite as prestigious as the civic ceremony, it certainly lent an air of glamour.

I was also invited to enjoy the National Council of Women’s annual speech competition. Aply the topic was Local Government Who Cares? It turns out a lot of young women do, and they spoke well and passionately on the topic. Auckland council partnered with the Spinoff to run a free talk about the future of our suburbs and we experienced a few more passionate speakers there too.

One of the most enjoyable events I’ve attended was the Auckland Zoo tour of the development of its newest enclosure. It was a privilege to get a ‘behind the scenes’ look at the conservation regeneration going on there, with members of the Waitakere Local Board. The changing role of using animals for our entertainment, to protecting and conserving them in our rapidly changing world was inspiring. It was also interesting to see the zoo area from drone footage... at a time when the urban forests couldn’t be more important, the extensive tree cover in this urban park was a sight to behold and cherish.

The partnership community event with Whau Local Board was also a fun day, despite rain warnings. The Kukuwai Park festival had it all, and it was a joy to spend time in the company of the local people. It was a great day for a bike ride too!
Finally – to end on a rather strange note. The life of a board member is never dull: When out and about recently, in Sandringham, I wound up playing the part of goat rescuer on our local streets. You can have a read and a laugh at my debacle here: https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12238188
## Meetings attended 10 July 2018 - 10 July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Describe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>LB Business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July</td>
<td>Pi Chev CLG 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 August</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 October</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 August</td>
<td>Auckland 2050 Launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 August</td>
<td>Pi Chev CLG 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 August</td>
<td>Windmill reserve walk through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 August</td>
<td>Transport wayfinding consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 August</td>
<td>LB Business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 August</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 September</td>
<td>YMCA walk the line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September</td>
<td>Wallace Art Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September</td>
<td>Owhara Dawn Blessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 September</td>
<td>Carrington traffic calming review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 September</td>
<td>Asian Family Service Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 September</td>
<td>Art and the Underpass – Greenlane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 October</td>
<td>Sandringham Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 October</td>
<td>Kura Kawana – Placemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 October</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 October</td>
<td>Dutch Cycling Embassy speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 October</td>
<td>LB Business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 October</td>
<td>Sandringham Village Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 October</td>
<td>Pi Chev CLG 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 October</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 November</td>
<td>Environschool awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 November</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 November</td>
<td>Citizenship ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 November</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 November</td>
<td>Vision Zero seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 November</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 November</td>
<td>Auckland Conversations – Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 November</td>
<td>Pi Chev CLG Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 November</td>
<td>PT Chev CLG 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 November</td>
<td>LB Business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 November</td>
<td>Opening of Ian McKinnon bike path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December</td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 December</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 December</td>
<td>LB Extraordinary meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 December</td>
<td>Opening of ebike recharger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 January</td>
<td>Brazil Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 February</td>
<td>Potters Park team to ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 February</td>
<td>Big Gay Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 February</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 February</td>
<td>Movies In Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 February</td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 February</td>
<td>Sustainability in Business presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 February</td>
<td>Kukumari Kairiway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 February</td>
<td>Pi Chev CLG 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February</td>
<td>LB Business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 March</td>
<td>View Rd walkover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>Transport leads meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March</td>
<td>LB Business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 April</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April</td>
<td>Special Transport meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>AELB Workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17 April  AELB Workshop
1 May  AELB Workshop
8 May  AELB Workshop
8 May  Auckland Transport safe slogans
14 May  Pest Free inner west
15 May  AELB Workshop
16 May  National council of Women – speech competition
17 May  Local Heroes awards
22 May  Transport leads meeting
22 May  LB business meeting
29 May  AELB Workshop
4 June  AELB Business awards
5 June  AELB Workshop
12 June  AELB Workshop
15 June  Opening of ‘Boy Walking’
19 June  AELB Workshop
26 June  LB Business meeting
26 June  ‘Future of Owarariki’ talk
3 July  AELB Workshop
5 July  RFA – Zoo update
6 July  Opening Te Auaunga
10 July  AELB Workshop

Auckland Citizenship Ceremony

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Board Member Jessica Rose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2019/01110

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity for the Chairperson to update the board on projects, meetings and other initiatives relevant to the board’s interests.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In accordance with Standing Order 2.4.7, the Chairperson will update board members by way of a verbal or written report at a meeting of the board.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:
   a) receive the Chairperson’s report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michael Mendoza - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Orakei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance Forward Work Calendar

File No.: CP2019/01117

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide the Albert-Eden Local Board with its updated governance forward work calendar which is a schedule of items that will come before the board at business meetings and workshops over the next 12 months.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

1. This report contains the governance forward work calendar, a schedule of items that will come before the Albert-Eden Local Board at business meetings and workshops over the coming months until the end of the electoral term. The governance forward work calendar for the local board is included in Attachment A to the agenda report.

2. The calendar aims to support local boards’ governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on agendas and workshop material is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is required and when
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.

3. The calendar will be updated every month. Each update will be reported back to business meetings and distributed to relevant council staff. It is recognised that at times items will arise that are not programmed. Local board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) note the Albert-Eden Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar – July 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Albert-Eden Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar - July 2019</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michael Mendoza - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Orakei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Governance Forward Work Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting (workshop or business meeting)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 31 July 2019</td>
<td>10.15am - 10.30am</td>
<td>Local &amp; Area Plan Monitoring Progress Update</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 31 July 2019</td>
<td>10.30am - 11.00am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Community (CEU) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 31 July 2019</td>
<td>11.00am - 11.45am</td>
<td>Point Chevalier community Centre optimisation</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 31 July 2019</td>
<td>1.15pm - 3.00pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Parks, Sports and Recreation (PSR) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 7 August 2019</td>
<td>9.00am - 10.00am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Community (CEU) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 7 August 2019</td>
<td>10.15am - 11.15am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Community (CEU) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 7 August 2019</td>
<td>11.15am - 12.00noon</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Arts Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 7 August 2019</td>
<td>12.00noon - 12.45pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Events Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 14 August 2019</td>
<td>9.00am - 10.00am</td>
<td>Community Facilities (CF) and Leases Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 14 August 2019</td>
<td>10.15am - 11.30am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Community Facilities (CF) and Leases Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 14 August 2019</td>
<td>11.30am - 12.30pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Parks, Sports and Recreation (PSR) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 14 August 2019</td>
<td>1.15pm - 2.15pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Infrastructure and Environmental Services (IES) Work Programme</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 21 August 2019</td>
<td>9.00am - 10.00am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Transport Work Programme</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 21 August 2019</td>
<td>10.15am - 11.30am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Transport Work Programme</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 21 August 2019</td>
<td>11.30am - 12.30pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Albert Eden 2019/2020 Local Grants Round ONE and Quick Response Round ONE</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Review community grant applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 21 August 2019</td>
<td>11.30am - 12.30pm</td>
<td>HNZ and HLC Ōwairaka Redevelopment Update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 28 August 2019</td>
<td>11.15pm - 2.15pm</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Programme</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 28 August 2019</td>
<td>9.00am - 10.00am</td>
<td>Governing Body members’ update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 28 August 2019</td>
<td>10.15am - 11.30am</td>
<td>Chairperson’s report</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 28 August 2019</td>
<td>11.30am - 12.30pm</td>
<td>Board member’s reports</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 28 August 2019</td>
<td>4:00pm - 6:30pm</td>
<td>Albert Eden Local Board Workshop Notes</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 28 August 2019</td>
<td>Mount Eden War Memorial Hall</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Monthly Reports</td>
<td>Local initiatives / Specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval of transport capital fund projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 26 August 2019</td>
<td>4:00pm - 6:30pm</td>
<td>Animal Management Bylaw</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 26 August 2019</td>
<td>3:00pm - 6:30pm</td>
<td>Draft Resilient Recovery Strategy</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 26 August 2019</td>
<td>4:00pm - 6:30pm</td>
<td>Productivity Commission’s inquiry into local government funding and financing</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 26 August 2019</td>
<td>Review of Auckland’s film protocols</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 26 August 2019</td>
<td>Acquisition of land for open space - Mt Albert</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 4 September 2019</td>
<td>9.00am - 10.00am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Community (CEU) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 4 September 2019</td>
<td>10.15am - 11.15am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Community (Places) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 4 September 2019</td>
<td>11.15am - 12.00noon</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Arts Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 4 September 2019</td>
<td>12.00noon - 12.45pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Events Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 4 September 2019</td>
<td>1.45pm - 2.15pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Parks, Sports and Recreation (PSR) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 11 September 2019</td>
<td>9.00am - 10.00am</td>
<td>Community Facilities (CF) and Leases Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 11 September 2019</td>
<td>10.15am - 11.30am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Community Facilities (CF) and Leases Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 11 September 2019</td>
<td>11.30am - 12.30pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Parks, Sports and Recreation (PSR) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 11 September 2019</td>
<td>1.15pm - 2.15pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Infrastructure and Environmental Services (IES) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 18 September 2019</td>
<td>9.00am - 10.00am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Transport Work Programme</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 18 September 2019</td>
<td>10.15am - 11.30am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Transport Work Programme</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Wednesday, 18 September 2019</td>
<td>11.30am - 12.30pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Local Economic Development (LED) Work Programme</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 25 September 2019</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Programme</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 25 September 2019</td>
<td>Governing Body members’ update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 25 September 2019</td>
<td>Chairperson's report</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 25 September 2019</td>
<td>Board member’s reports</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 25 September 2019</td>
<td>Albert-Eden Local Board Workshop Notes</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 25 September 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Monthly Reports</td>
<td>Local initiatives / Specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval of transport capital fund projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 25 September 2019</td>
<td>Last business meeting report (delegations for election period)</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 25 September 2019</td>
<td>ATEED six-monthly report to the Albert-Eden Local Board</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. For the board to receive the records of its recent workshops held following the previous month's business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In accordance to Standing Order 12.1.4 the board shall receive a record of the general proceedings of its local board workshops held over the past month following the previous business meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) receive the Albert-Eden Local Board Workshop Records for the workshops held on 19 June 2019, and 3 and 10 July 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20190619 Workshop Record</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20190703 Workshop Record</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20190710 Workshop Record</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michael Mendoza - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Orakei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Albert-Eden Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Albert-Eden Local Board held in the Albert-Eden Local Board Office, 135 Dominion Road, Mt Eden, Auckland on Wednesday 19 June 2019, commencing at 10.20am.

**PRESENT**
- **Chairperson:** Peter Haynes
- **Members:** Lee Corrick arrived at 11.10am, left at lunch and returned at 1.25pm
  - Graeme Easte
  - Glenda Fryer
  - Margi Watson
  - Jessica Rose.
- **Apologies:** Benjamin Lee
  - Rachel Langton.

Notes: Meeting opened by Chair at 10.20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dog Management Bylaw</td>
<td>• Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>Brief summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Emma Reed - Local Board Advisor</td>
<td>• Keeping informed</td>
<td>Emma Reed was in attendance to provide the Board with a discussion on the Dog Management Bylaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20am – 11.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AELB Work Programme:</td>
<td>• Local initiatives/specific decisions</td>
<td>Brief summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Work Programme</td>
<td>• Setting direction / priorities/budget</td>
<td>Lorna Stewart, Ivy Hao and Antony Hing were in attendance to provide the Board with an update on the transport work programme and a briefing on the Community Safety Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Lorna Stewart - Auckland Transport Elected Member Relationship Manager</td>
<td>• Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Ivy Hao (AT)</td>
<td>• Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Antony Hing (AT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am – 12.15pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members updates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brief summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15pm - 12.30pm</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Board members provided verbal updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Management Bylaw Review</td>
<td>Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>Brief summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Maclean Grindell - Policy Analyst</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Maclean Grindell and Steve Hickey were in attendance to provide the Board with an update on the Animal Management Bylaw Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Steve Hickey - Policy Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15pm - 2.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AELB Work Programme:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Economic Development (LED) Work Programme</td>
<td>Local initiatives/specific decisions</td>
<td>Brief summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Luo Lei - Local Economic Development Advisor</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities/budget</td>
<td>Luo Lei and Mark Scherer were in attendance to provide the Board with a debrief session on the Business Awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Mark Scherer - Contractor</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Leanne Roche - Event Development Manager</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm – 3.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.00pm.
Albert-Eden Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Albert-Eden Local Board held in the Albert-Eden Local Board Office, 135 Dominion Road, Mt Eden, Auckland on Wednesday 3 July 2019, commencing at 10.00am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Peter Haynes
Members: Lee Corrick
Graeme Easte
Glenda Fryer
Benjamin Lee (via Skype during Item 4)
Rachel Langton
Margi Watson
Jessica Rose.

Notes: Meeting opened by Chair at 10.05am.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Brief Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00am - 11.22am</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Community (CEU) Work Programme Update</td>
<td>What is the local board’s governance role with regards to the item being workedshopped: • Oversight and monitoring • Keeping informed • Accountability to the public • Engagement.</td>
<td>Detlev Jackson and Cheng Goh were in attendance to provide the board with an update on the Community (CEU) Work Programme in particular an update on the Balmoral Placemaking and Moon Festival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.22am - 12.17pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Arts Work Programme Update</td>
<td>What is the local board’s governance role with regards to the item being workedshopped: • Local initiatives/specific decisions • Oversight and monitoring • Keeping informed • Accountability to the public • Engagement.</td>
<td>Xanthe Jujnovich, Bronwyn Bent and Amelia Yiakmis were in attendance to provide the board with an update on the Arts Work Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.17pm - 12.30pm</td>
<td>AELB Work Programme: Events Work Programme Update</td>
<td>What is the local board’s governance role with regards to the item being workedshopped: • Local initiatives/specific decisions • Setting direction / priorities / budget • Oversight and monitoring • Keeping informed • Engagement.</td>
<td>Chelsea Healey, Robyn Henry and Kareem Colmenares were in attendance to provide the board with an update on the Civic Events Work Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30pm – 1.30pm</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.30pm - 2.30pm
Update from the City Rail Link
* Maria Hernandez-Curry Communications & Engagement Advisor City Rail Link
* Rachel Blundell, Senior Communications & Stakeholder Manager
* Sonya Leahy, Stakeholder Communications Manager
* Dale Burtenshaw, Deputy Alliance Director
* Hugh Leersnyder, Environment, Sustainability & Planning Manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the local board’s governance role with regards to the item being workshoped:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Keeping informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff from the City Rail Link project team and the Link Alliance group provided the board with an update on the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 21

**2.30pm - 3.15pm**
Roskill Area Plan Discussion;

*Developing an Integrated Plan for Mt Roskill to support the Auckland Housing Programme*

* David Wong - Principal Planner.
  * Fiona Sprott - Team Leader, Planning Central and South, Plans and Places
  * Marc Dendale - Team Leader, Planning Central and South, Plans and Places
  * Nicola Mochrie - Programme Lead Strategic Planning, Urban Development Group (formerly HLC)
  * Tanya Mead - Senior Strategic Planner, Urban Development Group (formerly HLC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workshopped:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Input into regional decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local initiatives/specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Setting direction / priorities/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keeping informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accountability to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Wong was in attendance to facilitate the board's discussion on the area plan and to seek the board's feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.42pm.
Albert-Eden Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Albert-Eden Local Board held in the Albert-Eden Local Board Office, 135 Dominion Road, Mt Eden, Auckland on Wednesday, 10 July 2019, commencing at 9.02am.

PRESENT

Chairperson: Peter Haynes (part of Item 1).
Members:
Lee Corrick
Graeme Easte (Item 2)
Margi Watson
Jessica Rose (via Skype during Item 2).

Apologies: Glenda Fryer, Rachel Langton.
Absent: Benjamin Lee.
Also present: See below in table.

Notes: Meeting opened by Chair at 9.02am.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.02am - 11.02am</td>
<td>What is the local board’s governance role with regards to the item being</td>
<td>Brief summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AELB Work Programme:</td>
<td>workshopped:</td>
<td>Community Facilities staff were in attendance to provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities (CF)</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>their respective Work Programme updates to the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programme Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendees:</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Rodney Klaassen -</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Advisor</td>
<td>* Engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Jody Morley -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Don To'o - Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Grant Burke – Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sanjeev Karan – PSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.21am – 10.35am</td>
<td>MORNING TEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11.02am – 11.17am | What is the local board’s governance role with regards to the item being workshopped:  
• Keeping informed  
• Engagement. | Brief summary  
Board members updated each other on events attended,  
community issues and other related matters of interest. |
| 11.17am – 12.48pm | LUNCH | |
| 12.48pm – 1.54pm | AELB Work Programme:  
Transport Work Programme Update | What is the local board’s governance role with regards to the item being workshopped:  
• Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions  
• Oversight and monitoring  
• Keeping informed  
• Accountability to the public  
• Engagement. | Brief summary  
Lorna Stewart and Reg Cuthers were in attendance to provide the local board an update on the Transport Work Programme. |

The workshop concluded at 1.54pm.