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Terms of Reference

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2 Declaration of Interest

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

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 11 June 2019, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

4 Petitions

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

5 Public Input

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

5.1 Public Input: John Walker Find Your Field of Dreams Foundation - Rick Pickard

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. Rick Pickard, General Manager John Walker Find Your Field of Dreams Foundation will provide an update on the foundation.

Ngā tūtouhunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) thank Rick Pickard, General Manager John Walker Find Your Field of Dreams Foundation for his presentation and attendance.
5.2 Public Input: Provision of land for new civic open space - Takapuna - Jeff Stack

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Jeff Stack will be in attendance to address the committee on the future vision the Council has for the Takapuna.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:
a) receive the presentation from Jeff Stack and thank him for attendance.

5.3 Public Input: Provision of land for new civic open space - Takapuna: Heart of Takapuna Inc - Ruth Jackson

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Ruth Jackson from Heart of Takapuna Inc will address the committee regarding report on provision of land for new civic open space - Takapuna.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:
a) receive presentation from Ruth, Heart of Takapuna Inc and thank her for attendance

6 Local Board Input

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

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

6.1 Local Board Input: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board - Increasing Aucklanders Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide feedback to the committee regarding Increasing Aucklanders Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:
a) thank the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Local Board for their presentation and attendance regarding Increasing Aucklanders Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039
6.2 Local Board Input: Manurewa Local Board - Redevelopment of War Memorial Park, Manurewa indicative business case.

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Angela Dalton, Chair Manurewa Local Board and Joseph Allan, Local Board Member wish to address the committee on the redevelopment of War Memorial Park, Manurewa indicative business case [Refer to Item 12 – Redevelopment of War Memorial Park, Manurewa indicative business case of the agenda.]

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

a) receive the presentation regarding the redevelopment of War Memorial Park, Manurewa indicative business case and thank Angela Dalton, Chair Manurewa Local Board and Allan Joseph, Manurewa Local Board member for their attendance.

6.3 Local Board input: Albert-Eden Local Board - Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Peter Haynes, Chair Albert-Eden Local Board will address the committee regarding the report on the redevelopment of Chamberlain Park. [Refer to Item 11 – Indicative business case: Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park of the agenda.]

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

a) thank Peter Haynes, Chair Albert-Eden Local Board for his presentation and attendance.

6.4 Local Board input: Upper Harbour Local board - One Local Initiative

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Margaret Miles, Chair Upper Harbour Local Board and Lisa Whyte Deputy Chair Upper Harbour Local Board will address the committee regarding the Upper Harbour Local Boards One Local Initiative.

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

a) receive the presentation from Margaret Miles, Chair Upper Harbour Local Board and Lisa Whyte Deputy Chair Upper Harbour Local Board regarding the board’s One Local Initiative and thank them for their attendance.
6.5 Local Board Input: Franklin Local Board - Proposed Hunua Trail

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Angela Fuljames, Chair Franklin Local will address the board regarding the proposed Hunua trail.

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

a) receive the presentation from Angela Fuljames, Chair Franklin Local Board regarding the proposed Hunua trail and thank her for attendance.

6.6 Local Board Input: Devonport - Takapuna Local Board - Provision of land for new civic open space - Takapuna

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. George Wood, chair Devonport-Takapuna Local Board wishes to address the committee on the provision of land for new civic open space [Refer Item 14 – Provision of land for new civic open space - Takapuna of the agenda].

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

a) receive the presentation regarding the provision of land for new civic open space and thank George Wood, chair Devonport-Takapuna Local Board for his attendance.

7 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting."
Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

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

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

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

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

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”
Adoption of Sport Investment Plan

File No.: CP2019/08134

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. To respond to population growth and demographic change, Auckland Council has developed a plan for how it will invest in sport for the next 20 years.
3. Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039 will:
   - increase participation in sport by targeting communities of greatest need and addressing disparities
   - deliver a broad range of sport programmes, services and facilities that respond to the diverse needs of Auckland’s communities
   - address population growth and changing sport preferences through regular assessments of, and changes to, sport programmes, services and facilities to maximise participation.
4. Public consultation feedback on the draft plan was strongly positive. Nineteen local boards formally endorsed the plan, one local board endorsed the key components of the plan and one local board carried the agenda without feedback.
5. The main concerns were about the implementation process, rather than the content of the plan. Some respondents sought clarification of key definitions.
6. Staff recommend adopting the final plan (Attachment A), which has incorporated the following small changes:
   - further clarification of key definitions
   - removal of explanatory notes and fictional scenarios that were added in the draft plan to assist public consultation - the final plan will focus solely on setting the broad direction and the framework for future council sport investment
   - minor editing and design changes to ensure clarity and logical flow of the document.
7. A dedicated internal project team will be set up to clarify implementation issues and assist adoption across the council. Because council invests in a wide range of sport projects through grants, community leases, loans and partnerships, a flexible approach is needed to reflect the scale, complexity and risk of different investments. The project team will provide this flexibility.
8. The next step is to embed high-level plan objectives and principles in all new projects from August 2019. Full implementation of the plan will be staged over the next three to five years, depending on the scale and nature of the changes.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) adopt the *Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039* as set out in Attachment A to this report.

b) delegate authority through the Chief Executive to the General Manager, Social and Community Policy to make minor changes and amendments to the text and design of the document titled *Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039* that are required before public release.

c) agree that staff develop and release a public feedback document based on Attachment B of the agenda report which provides the consultation feedback summary and analysis.

Horopaki
Context
The plan sets out a new sport investment approach that better responds to the growing and changing needs of Aucklanders

9. Auckland is experiencing rapid population growth and social change. Our diverse communities have different preferences for sport and recreation activities.

10. *Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039* is the council’s response to these changes. It sets out a new approach to regional investment in sports facilities, programmes and services for Aucklanders over the next 20 years.

11. The plan will:
   - target communities of greatest need and address disparities
   - deliver a broad range of sport programmes, services and facilities that respond to the diverse needs of Auckland’s communities
   - address population growth and changing sport preferences through regular assessments of, and changes to, sport programmes, services and facilities.

The development of the plan followed a robust process

12. The final plan (Attachment A) is a result of consolidated efforts across the council, research, consultation feedback and Governing Body decisions.

13. The development of the draft plan started in 2016. The council undertook public consultation on a discussion document to ask Aucklanders what they would like to see in the sport investment plan. The draft plan was developed based on the feedback and several Governing Body reports [CP2016/12613, CP2017/00192, CP2017/03041, CP 2017/12378].

14. In December 2018 the Environment and Community Committee endorsed the draft plan for public consultation [ENV/2018/172]. Over 1200 online responses were received between February and April 2019. In addition, qualitative feedback was collected via emails and from a series of focus workshops with community groups, sport players, sport organisations, advisory panels and investors across Auckland. Formal feedback from local boards was sought separately through business meetings. The consultation feedback summary and analysis are outlined in Attachment B.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Adoption of the plan will contribute to strategic outcomes

15. The plan focuses on delivering a single outcome: increasing Aucklanders’ participation in community sport. This aligns with the vision of the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan 2014-2024: ‘Aucklanders: more active, more often.’

16. Sport is one of the key areas Auckland Council invests in to deliver the ‘Belonging and Participation’ outcome in Auckland Plan 2050.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belonging and Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Focus Area 7 – ‘Recognise the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direction 1 – ‘Foster an inclusive Auckland where everyone belongs’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direction 2 – ‘Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing disparities in opportunities.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plan puts people at the heart of investment

17. The draft plan sets out a people-centric approach to increase sport participation. Future sport investment will focus on meeting the needs of three target groups:

1. **People who already play sport:** There will be more fit-for-purpose facilities and programmes to keep them actively involved in sport.

2. **People who play a new sport (like futsal)**
   
   Currently there are limited opportunities to play but, in the future, there will be more fit-for-purpose facilities and programmes that cater to new and emerging sports.

3. **People who currently do not participate in sport**
   
   Auckland Council will create more opportunities and make it easier for them to take up sport.

18. A key step towards increasing sport participation rates in these targeted groups is through addressing disparities.

19. Decision-makers will use a set of principles to prioritise multiple investment projects. ‘Equity’ has the highest weighting to ensure all Aucklanders enjoy the same outcomes. The full list of principles includes:

   • Equity (40 per cent of assessment): Sport investment should ensure equity of outcomes across the population regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status or location.
There will be changes to the way we currently invest in sport

20. The plan includes four key shifts in the way council will invest in sport in the future as illustrated in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Key shifts

21. To give effect to the key shifts, the plan sets out a new investment framework which includes a set of critical questions for the council to consider before investing.
22. The investment framework will ensure robust, evidence-based decision-making and ongoing monitoring of benefits for our communities.

23. Performance data will be collected to measure the return on investment. This will be shared with investors and ratepayers.

24. Over time, we expect significant improvement in the quality of evidence and analysis used to inform investment decisions and improve sector capability. This will enable a continuous feedback loop (Figure 2) of refinement and improvement in the investment to deliver better outcomes for Aucklanders.

**Figure 2: Continuous feedback loop to refine and improve sport investment**

Public feedback on the draft plan shows strong support

25. Public consultation feedback was highly supportive of the draft plan overall. There was no clear division of views between different groups.

26. The focus on meeting community needs and equity was particularly well received. Responses to questions about specific aspects of the draft plan were also strongly affirmative of the followings:

- the key objective to increase sport participation in Auckland
- the four investment principles: equity, outcome-focused, accountability and financial sustainability
the three targeted groups: high participation sports, emerging sports and low participation communities

• the four key shifts of future council sport investment

• the investment framework.

Table 1: Verbatim quotes from the consultation

| "We support the intention of the plan... (and) the policy objectives it seeks to achieve." | "Get on with it! Good move!" | "Good overall objectives, particularly to target communities of greatest needs (which are often the most underserved)" |

Most negative feedback relates to implementation

27. The negative feedback was mainly concerned about how the plan will be applied in practice, rather than the content of the draft plan. The questions highlighted were:

• How could the plan be applied in the local context and take account of diverse community needs? How will the community be engaged during this process?

• How will the council ensure there is balanced support across the three target groups?

• What are the implications on existing support (such as loans, grants and community lease agreements) and sport facilities?

• What are the impacts for future application processes that introduce additional complexity for sport organisations, especially small clubs run by volunteers?

• Even with the additional $120 million Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund, there is still insufficient funding – how will this be addressed?

Table 2: Verbatim quotes from the consultation

| "We do not believe it is sufficiently clear how the high-level principles might be applied." | "What defines communities of greatest need and how would you target these individuals to join sport?" | "Will the investment be split equally between these three target groups" |

28. The following terms were commonly confused by respondents and were requested to be clarified in the final plan:

• the definitions of sport, community sport, recreation activities and sport facilities

• the meaning of participation – does it relate to quantity (counting players) or quality of participation (intensity, type, frequency of participation and its benefits)?

Staff recommend adopting the plan with minor changes

29. Staff recommend adopting the final plan (Attachment A), which has incorporated the following changes:

Table 3: Summary of changes to the final plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Item 8

### Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removal of explanatory notes and fictional scenarios</td>
<td>Fictional scenarios and explanatory notes were added in the draft plan to help people during the consultation process to understand how the plan could be applied in practice. As the council transitions to implementation of the plan, the scenarios and explanatory notes will be removed so the plan can focus solely on setting the broad direction and framework for future sport investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor editing and design changes</td>
<td>Minor editing and design changes have been made to ensure clarity and logical flow of the final plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Further details of each change are provided in Section 5 of Attachment B.

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

31. Once adopted, the plan will have a direct impact on the council’s internal investment processes, particularly regarding how future projects are assessed and monitored.

32. Parks, Sport and Recreation staff have been engaged throughout the development of the plan. Their feedback has helped shape the key components of the plan such as the investment framework.

33. During the recent public consultation, Parks, Sport and Recreation staff have facilitated engagement with the sport sector through Aktive and have attended many community workshops. As a result, staff have a good understanding of the consultation feedback and the potential implementation issues faced by sport organisations and community groups.

34. A dedicated project team will be set up to implement the plan, consisting of staff from Community and Social Policy, Community Services and Community Facilities. The team will provide operational details, develop guidelines and respond to queries about the plan.

35. The council invests in a wide range of sport projects through grants, community leases, loans and partnerships. A flexible approach is needed to reflect the scale, complexity and risk of different investments. The project team will provide this flexibility.

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

36. Local boards had opportunities to provide feedback at different stages of the plan development. They firstly commented on the discussion document in 2016, then in early 2018 on the key components of the draft plan, and finally in 2019 on the draft plan.

37. Feedback received during the latest engagement was generally supportive of the draft plan. Nineteen local boards formally endorsed the plan, one local board endorsed the key components of the plan and one local board carried the agenda without feedback.

38. Concerns raised were mainly about implementation. Challenges relating to population growth, land supply and budgetary constraints were highlighted. Local boards were particularly interested in how the plan will be implemented to address challenges specific to their areas and populace. Many also provided practical solutions to combat the challenges.

39. Section 4.1 of Attachment B provides local board feedback summary and analysis. Attachment C provides full local board resolutions.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

40. Sport participation contributes directly to the following ‘Māori Identity and Wellbeing’ outcome in Auckland Plan 2050:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori Identity and Wellbeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction 1</strong> – ‘Advance Māori wellbeing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus area 1</strong> – ‘Meet the needs and support the aspirations of tamariki and their whanau’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. According to Sport New Zealand data, weekly sport and recreation participation of Māori in Auckland (73.7 per cent) is lower than European (83.0 per cent) and Pasifika (74.0 per cent), but higher than Asian (67.1 per cent).

42. Research shows pockets of sedentary Māori who do not have adequate opportunities to participate in sport. It also shows Māori have different preferences for sport and recreational activities compared to other ethnic groups.

Consultation feedback requests further details on how Te Ao Māori principles will be applied in practice

43. During the public consultation, letters were sent to 19 iwi in Auckland to invite their feedback on the draft plan. One iwi responded and staff engaged with them separately to gather their feedback.

44. Further feedback was gathered from a written submission from a Māori health organisation and separate meetings with Aktive Māori Advisory Group and nine Māori sport organisations and wellbeing groups.

45. The feedback welcomed the inclusion of Te Ao Māori principles but commented that the draft plan is very light in implementation details. Practical ways to incorporate the principles suggested including:

- quality engagement with Māori from the beginning to determine solutions that work for Māori
- inclusion of Māori representatives in key decision-making
- collaboration and partnerships with Māori in supporting traditional Māori sport and te reo Māori activities in Māori settings
- inclusion of meaningful targets and key performance indicators for Māori.

46. Clarifying operational details of Te Ao Māori principles will be a key focus for the implementation project team. The team will seek further engagement with Māori representatives to incorporate their suggestions above.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

47. Once adopted, the plan will guide all council investment in sport. The implementation cost, including staff cost for the project team will be met within current baselines.

48. An immediate focus of implementation will be to establish a clear and contestable process for the allocation of the $120 million Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund established in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.
49. During the public consultation, local boards and the sport sector expressed concern that even with the additional $120 million, there is insufficient money across Auckland to fund all projects.

50. Staff consider the investment framework set up in the plan will prioritise future investment in areas where the council can add the most value and deliver the greatest benefits for Auckland. There is also likely to be efficiency gains through rigorous assessment and monitoring to free up more funding for investment.

**Ngā rāru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

51. Staff have identified reputational and operational risks associated with the adoption of the final plan. These risks will be mitigated through regular communication and engagement with key stakeholders and internal staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reputational</td>
<td>Sport codes, existing grant recipients and community leaseholders might worry the plan will change arrangements already in place, or ongoing council investment.</td>
<td>Clear communication with key stakeholders, funding recipients and community leaseholders advising that the plan will only guide decisions on future investment, unless a current project is already scheduled for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>The transition to the new investment approach will be operationally complex. It impacts multiple teams across the council, and new business processes, guidance and forms will need to be designed to support it.</td>
<td>A dedicated internal project team will provide implementation details and ensure the transition is as smooth as possible. Changes will be phased in over the next three to five years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. As part of the implementation process, a full risk assessment will be undertaken for individual changes and will be discussed with relevant council departments, key stakeholders and local boards.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

53. Staff will release the final plan (Attachment A) in August 2019 including a public feedback document (based on Attachment B which provides the consultation feedback summary and analysis). Figure 3 below shows the next steps for implementing the plan.
Figure 3: Next steps

**July 2019**
- Set up an internal team to assist implementation across council.
- Apply high-level plan objectives and principles to all new projects.

**August 2019**
- Publish the final plan and public feedback document.
- Develop implementation guidelines for different sport investments

**Sept 2019-2021**
- Implement the final plan in stages.
- Report back on implementation progress within 18 months.
- Review and refine the plan to ensure it is still fit-for purpose and effective in assisting quality decision-making (late 2021)
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Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval of the findings of an indicative business case and the development of a detailed business case for an indoor court facility in Upper Harbour.

Executive summary

2. Development of a destination multisport indoor court facility was selected by the Upper Harbour Local Board as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. Funding of $25.6 million was earmarked for a four-court facility, following indicative and detailed business case processes.

3. Staff have developed an indicative business case to inform decision-making. Preparation of the business case entailed an investigation of community need, an assessment of strategic alignment and an economic analysis.

4. The needs assessment found low projected population growth in the North-West in the short to medium-term. The Massey Leisure Centre also serves around 56 per cent of the current population in the area.

5. There is a weak case for change to invest in the development of a four-court indoor facility as proposed by the Upper Harbour Local Board for their One Local Initiative. The needs assessment does not demonstrate a current community need. It does have strategic alignment to council objectives and would deliver community benefits above the capital and operational costs.

6. Three options were assessed:
   - Option one: Local two full-sized indoor court facility in Massey/Upper Harbour part of the North-West by 2036 (status quo)
   - Option two: Destination multisport four or more full-sized indoor court facility to primarily serve the Whenuapai, Hobsonville and Westgate area of the North-West (One Local Initiative)
   - Option three: Local two full-sized indoor court facility situated near Whenuapai and Hobsonville in Upper Harbour from 2026 (preferred option).

7. The economic case identified that options two and three deliver community benefits above the capital and operational costs.

8. Staff recommend option three as it performed best against assessment criteria, including alignment to growth and future community need, strategic fit and value for money.

9. The Upper Harbour Local Board does not endorse the indicative business case findings. The One Local Board Initiative (option two - destination multisport four court facility) is included in the recommendations outlined in this report for consideration.

10. There is a low financial risk for both option two and three that land and construction costs will increase over time. This risk can be mitigated by detailed costings from a quantity surveyor and assessment through sensitivity analysis. All council projects are subject to financial policy decisions on cost escalation and treatment of inflation.

11. If option three (local two court facility) is approved, work on the detailed business case will commence when the population reaches 98,000, which is likely to be in 2026.
12. If the One Local Board Initiative (option two - destination multisport four court facility) is approved, work will commence on the development of a detailed business case in 2019/2020.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) agree the findings of the indicative business case for the development of a destination, multisport indoor court facility in the North-West that:
   i) there is low population projected in the North-West part of Auckland in the short to medium-term
   ii) the Massey Leisure Centre serves around 56 per cent of the current population in the North-West
   iii) population projections indicate that there could be demand for a local two full-sized indoor court facility in the North-West from 2026
   iv) the North-West is not expected to have sufficient demand for a destination four-court indoor court facility until at least 2036
   v) the optimal location for a new facility to respond to the projected population growth and to fill the future gap in the network requires further investigation
   vi) the provision of indoor courts aligns with Auckland Plan outcomes
   vii) once the population in the North-West increases, the quantifiable benefits of providing either a two or a four-court facility exceed the capital and operational costs required to develop the facility.

b) agree that the development of a four-court indoor facility has a weak case for change and robust strategic alignment with council objectives and would deliver community benefits above the capital and operational costs.

c) EITHER:

   approve the development of a detailed business case for a local two-court indoor court facility (option three) located near Whenuapai and Hobsonville, when the population reaches 98,000, which is likely to be in 2026, based on:
   i) an indicative funding investment of $18.8 million from the $25.6 million earmarked as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028

OR:

   approve the development of a detailed business case, commencing in 2019/2020 for the One Local Board Initiative which is a destination multisport four-court indoor court facility (option two) to primarily serve the Whenuapai, Hobsonville and Westgate area of the North-West to meet future population needs, based on:
   ii) an indicative funding investment of $25.6 million earmarked as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

d) agree that any action to progress an indoor court facility be included in the updated Community Facility Action Plan.
Horopaki

Context

13. Development of a destination multisport indoor court facility was selected by the Upper Harbour Local Board as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

14. The local board proposed a minimum of four full-sized indoor courts to serve the Whenuapai, Hobsonville and Westgate area of the North-West. The proposed multisport facility could cater for a wider variety of sporting codes such as badminton, basketball, futsal, netball, volleyball and potentially squash, tennis and cricket.

15. No decisions have been made on the site for the proposed indoor court facility. The Upper Harbour Local Board had suggested council-owned land at 161 Brigham Creek Road as a potential site.

16. The Finance and Performance Committee approved provisional funding for One Local Initiative projects (resolution number FIN/2018/85).

17. A total of $0.10 million was allocated to the Upper Harbour Local Board for a business case. The business case is developed in two parts: indicative and detailed business cases.

18. Funding of $25.6 million was earmarked for destination indoor court facility, following indicative and detailed business cases processes.

Indicative business cases are a tool to support decision-making

19. Auckland Council uses a three-stage process to investigate large-scale capital projects and new investment in community services or facilities. This approach is based on the business case model developed by the Treasury.

20. The first phase begins with a needs assessment. This entails:
   - research into the profile of the community, including projected growth data
   - a summary of recent social research and any relevant community engagement surveys
   - a community facility stock-take (both council and non-council facilities)
   - a gap analysis which assesses current provision against council policy.

21. An indicative business case considers the merits of a proposed investment. It helps ensure that there is a robust case for change before resources are committed to a project.

22. The indicative business case considers strategic alignment with council objectives, including the Auckland Plan. It also includes an economic case which considers the costs and benefits of various options that may achieve council’s investment goals.

23. A detailed business case can be built upon:
   - a needs assessment which demonstrates a robust case for change
   - a strategic assessment which shows alignment with council objectives
   - an economic case that identifies a preferred option(s) that delivers community benefits and value for money.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

24. Staff have prepared an indicative business case for the destination multisport four court facility that follows the council’s three-stage process. The key findings are outlined below. Attachment A provides a more detailed overview.
25. Table 1 below shows the study area for the needs assessment.

**Table 1: Study area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board</th>
<th>Census Area Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Greenhithe, Unsworth Heights, North Harbour East, Herald, Hobsonville, Whenuapai, Lucken Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Huapai, Riverhead Urban, Kumeu East, Taupaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>West Harbour, Westgate, Massey West, Royal Heights, Waimumu North, Waimumu South, Kingdale, Fairdene, Ulrich, Starling Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. The North-West has a growing and changing population. Growth is expected to accelerate in the next decade, which will create demand for new sport and recreation facilities.

- The North-West has around 4.2 per cent of Auckland’s population. It is estimated to grow from 66,000 people in 2016 to 98,359 people by 2026. The population is expected to reach 120,644 by 2036.
- The population makeup is projected to have more young and Asian people. Both groups tend to play more indoor sport. There are also likely to be more Pacific and Māori people, more people reaching retirement age, and more variation in income and deprivation status.
- The current participation rates for sports played on indoor courts (for example, badminton, basketball, futsal, netball and volleyball,) range between 4-7 per cent for young people. Adult rates are 1-4 per cent.

27. The current council facility can continue to serve the North-West population in the short to medium-term.

- The Community Facility Network Plan proposes a 10-kilometre catchment for destination indoor court facilities. These facilities feature a minimum of four full-sized indoor courts.
- The existing Massey Leisure Centre serves around 56 per cent of the current population in the North-West.
- Based on population projections, the North-West is not expected to have the population to support a local two-court facility until 2026, or a four-court facility from 2036.

28. The optimal location for a new facility to respond to the projected population growth and to fill the future gap in the network requires further investigation. The site at 161 Brigham Creek Road, Whenuapai is a possible location.

29. The provision of indoor courts aligns with Auckland Plan outcomes, as outlined in Table 2 below:

**Table 2: Alignment with Auckland Plan 2050**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Direction or focus area</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1: Belonging and participating</td>
<td><strong>Direction 2:</strong> improve health and wellbeing of all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities</td>
<td><strong>Aligns</strong> through providing sport and recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Focus area 2:</strong> provide accessible services and social and cultural infrastructure that are responsive in meeting peoples evolving needs</td>
<td><strong>Aligns</strong> through providing a multi-purpose facility that can change in response to our changing population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Direction or focus area</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area 6:</td>
<td>focus investment to address disparities and serve communities of greatest need</td>
<td>Aligns through locating the facility where there is high growth, population density or high deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area 7:</td>
<td>recognise the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life</td>
<td>Aligns through quantifying the benefits to the community of the facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**There is a weak case for change for the proposed facility at present**

30. There is a weak case for change for the development of a four-court indoor facility as proposed by the Upper Harbour Local Board for their One Local Initiative. The needs assessment does not demonstrate a current community need.

31. The strategic assessment shows alignment with council plans, strategies and resolutions.

32. The economic case identified that options two and three outlined below deliver community benefits above the capital and operational costs.

**Future provision of indoors courts align with investment objectives and would deliver community benefits**

33. Future provision of a two-court or four-court indoor facility align with critical success factors and council’s investment objectives:
   - Enable our communities: fulfil Auckland Plan outcomes through increased participation in indoor sports by enhancing the current network of facilities.
   - Fit-for-purpose: provide greater efficiencies through investing in multi-use facilities rather than single codes. This will support our diverse communities and provide greater efficiencies.
   - Reduce inequities: between communities through providing facilities where the greatest need exists. This will address disparities in sport and recreation outcomes and ensure a robust network of facilities across Auckland.
   - Do more with less: provide greater value for dollar spend by leverage partnerships.
   - Evidence-based: prioritise indoor court facilities that will have the greatest impact based on evidence backed investment, shifting from ad-hoc mentality.

34. Once the North-West population increases, an indoor facility will deliver positive economic returns to the community.
   - The net benefit of a four-court facility is around $50 million in present day terms. The ratio of benefits to costs is around 2.7 showing that for every dollar of cost, the community gets $2.7 in benefit.
   - The net benefit of a two-court facility is around $32.9 million in present day terms. The ratio of benefits to costs is around 2.8 showing that for every dollar of cost, the community gets $2.8 in benefit.

35. The primary benefits are improved physical and mental health outcomes to users. Other benefits included improved productivity, reduced unemployment and decreased crime.

36. The main costs come from the high capital costs of the facility ($14.9 million for four courts and $11.5 million for two courts).

37. Sensitivity analysis which increased capital costs by 22.5 per cent and reduced benefits by 15 per cent still showed a net benefit of at least $9.7 million.
Investment proposal: Indoor multi-sport facility

The North-West has fewer indoor court facilities compared to other parts of Auckland due to low historical population levels. The area is expected to grow in the next decade, which will create demand for new sport and recreation facilities.

The proposal aligns to Council plans and strategies

Proposal
A multi-use facility to cater to a wider variety of sporting codes including two or possibly four full-sized indoor courts.

Focus investment to address disparities and areas of greatest need
Recognise the value of sports and recreation to the quality of life

Growing population & changing demographic over next 20 years

Population growth by 2036

Total 55,000 in study area

Less European

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Less European</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More Asian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>More Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An existing council facility – Massey Leisure Centre, serves 56 per cent of the current population in the area.

Additional Courts Required in the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gap Analysis</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2036</th>
<th>2046</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>98,359</td>
<td>120,644</td>
<td>135,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population not served by Massey</td>
<td>17,898</td>
<td>35,403</td>
<td>46,912</td>
<td>55,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional courts needed</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two potential solutions were identified from a range of options:

- **LOCAL BOARD OPTION**
  - Four indoor courts in Upper Harbour (North West)

- **REDUCED SCOPE OPTION**
  - Two indoor courts in Upper Harbour (North West)

The local board option has a higher benefit: cost ratio over 30 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA Results Summary over 30 years</th>
<th>Local board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value ($m)</td>
<td>$29.9m</td>
<td>$18.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$79.9m</td>
<td>$51.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$79.9m</td>
<td>$51.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Benefits</td>
<td>$50.0m</td>
<td>$32.9m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CBA Results Summary over 30 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Local board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR)*</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Rate of Return (IRR)*</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback period</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Benefit: cost ratio > 1 is good. *Internal rate of return > 6% is good.

**Cost Benefit Analysis – Local Board Option**

NPV (Net present value) assesses the value of the cash flow over the life of the project in current $. A NPV > 1 is good.

**Cost Benefit Analysis – Reduced Scope Option**

RISKS, CONSTRAINTS & DEPENDENCIES

- Population projections and growth rates are lower than forecast
- Capital costs are higher
- Strong economic case for change, but there is a weak strategic case due to the low current population levels

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Indicative Business Case does not demonstrate that there is a strong strategic case for developing the destination indoor court facility.

- Development of a detailed business case for a local two-court indoor facility when the population reaches 98,000 likely to be in 2026
There are three options for decision-makers to consider

38. The options considered in response to the findings include:

- **Option one:** Local two full-sized indoor court facility in Massey/Upper Harbour part of the North-West by 2036 (status quo)
- **Option two:** Destination four or more full-sized indoor court facility to primarily serve the Whenuapai, Hobsonville and Westgate area of the North-West (One Local Initiative)
- **Option three:** Local two full-sized indoor court facility in situated near Whenuapai and Hobsonville in Upper Harbour from 2026 (preferred option)

**Option one: Local two full-sized indoor court facility in Massey/Upper Harbour part of the North-West by 2036 (status quo)**

39. Option one reflects a previous decision on the North-West Community Facility Provision Investigation to have two indoor courts in the Massey/Upper Harbour part of the North-West by 2036 (resolution number ENV/2018/131).

40. The benefit of this option is that it would respond to the provision gap identified by the North-West Community Facility Provision Investigation. It would also maintain consistency in council decisions.

41. A more recent assessment, with a different catchment area, found an earlier need for a local facility.

42. There is low financial risk associated with option one due to possible increase in land and building costs in the future.

**Option two: Destination multisport four or more full-sized indoor court facility to primarily serve the Whenuapai, Hobsonville and Westgate area of the North-West**

43. Option two reflects the Upper Harbour Local Board’s One Local Initiative to have a destination multisport four indoor courts or more now to primarily serve the Whenuapai, Hobsonville and Westgate area of the North-West.

44. The findings from the North-West Community Facility Provision Investigation played an important role in informing the analysis for option two.

45. As the North-West investigation focused on local provision gaps, staff undertook additional regional provision analysis to draw a larger (but overlapped) study area for a destination facility for the indicative business case.

46. The indicative business case shows the North-West will not have enough population for four indoor courts until 2036.

47. The larger capital cost and ongoing operating cost associated with option two poses higher financial risk.

**Option three: Local two full-sized indoor court facility in situated near Whenuapai and Hobsonville in Upper Harbour from 2026**

48. Council could choose to provide a local (two courts) facility by 2026 as an alternative to the proposal of the Upper Harbour Local Board.

49. Option three would provide a quicker response to the population currently not served by the existing Massey Leisure Centre.

50. Option three would also have lower capital cost and operating costs compared to option two. It may also have a slightly lower capital cost compared to option one due to earlier construction of facility.
Staff have developed criteria to assess the three options

51. Staff developed assessment criteria to enable the comparison of the options.

- Current need: Does a demonstrable community currently exist?
- Future growth: Is the scale of the option proportionate to future population growth?
- Strategic alignment: Is this something we should be doing?
- Value for money: Do the benefits associated with an option exceed its costs?

52. These criteria are unweighted and allow for objective assessment:

53. A summary of the options against the assessment criteria is provided in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Assessment of options against criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current needs</th>
<th>Future growth</th>
<th>Strategic alignment</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option one (status quo)</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local two courts from 2036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option two (One Local Initiative)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination four courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option three (preferred option)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local two courts from 2026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating scale key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ticks</th>
<th>Level to which option meets criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No tick</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. When the criteria are applied, option three (local two court facility from 2026) scores the highest. Option two (destination multisport four courts facility) has a lower score due to low population in the short to medium term.

55. Staff recommend the development of a detailed business case for a local two-court indoor facility (option three) located near Whenuapai and Hobsonville, when the population reaches 98,000. This is likely to be in 2026. Such a facility would deliver positive health and social benefits to the local community.

56. Alternatively, the council could choose to proceed to the detailed business case commencing in 2019/2020 for the One Local Initiative represented in option two (destination multisport four court facility) in anticipation of population growth in the North-West and to deliver services to the populace that is not served by the existing Massey Leisure Centre. This needs to be balanced with the risk of developing an under-utilised facility.

57. The Rodney Local Board proposed an indoor sport facility of two full-sized courts in Kumeu-Huapai as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

58. If the Kumeu-Huapai facility is approved, its catchment will slightly overlap with the catchment for the destination multisport four-court facility under option two.
59. The catchment for the two-court facility proposed under option three is smaller so will not be affected by the Kumeu-Huapai facility.

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

60. Council staff will take actions based on the decision of the Environment and Community Committee.

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

61. The North-West has fewer indoor court facilities (both council and non-council) compared to other parts of Auckland due to lower population historically.

62. A new indoor facility will provide new sport opportunity to respond to the growing and changing population in the future.

63. The Upper Harbour Local Board selected the development of a destination, multisport indoor court facility as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

64. The proposed destination facility aims to serve population across Upper Harbour, Rodney and Henderson-Massey Local Board areas. Rodney Local Board has sought to develop a local facility as part of their One Local Initiative.

65. Two workshop sessions were held with Upper Harbour Local Board in November 2018 and March 2019. Both sessions focused on the study area, the methodology, research, data and documents used for the indicative business case.

66. On 20 June 2019, findings were presented to the Upper Harbour Local Board business meeting. The local board did not endorse the findings due to:

- concerns about the study area and the population growth data
- concerns about whether recent social research and community engagement surveys have been considered
- concerns about alignment with relevant documents such as code plans, Auckland Sport Facilities Priorities Plan and National Facilities Strategy for Indoor Sports.

67. The One Local Board Initiative (option two - destination multisport four court facility) is included in the recommendations outlined in this report for consideration.

68. The full local board resolution [UH/2019/66] is included in Attachment B.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement**

69. The North-West has a higher percentage of Māori (15 per cent) compared to the Auckland average (10 per cent).

70. Within the North-West, the percentages of Māori population vary. The Henderson-Massey area has the highest percentage (22 per cent), followed by Rodney (11 per cent) and Upper Harbour (8 per cent).

71. Māori people in general are more active and younger with a lower socio-economic index compared to other ethnic groups. This means that sufficient, affordable sport opportunities are important to this group.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

72. Each local board identified one priority project through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 process. The Finance and Performance Committee then approved provisional funding for these local board projects (resolution number FIN/2018/85).

73. The Upper Harbour Local Board proposed a destination indoor court facility. A total of $0.10 million was allocated to develop the business case. A total of $0.079 million remains for the development of the detailed business case.

74. Funding of $25.6 million was earmarked for the destination indoor court facility, following the indicative and detailed business case process.

75. There is sufficient One Local Initiative funding available to deliver the indoor court facility.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

76. There are two main risks associated with the two options outlined in the report recommendations. These are shown below in Table 4.

Table 4: Risk identification and mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of risk</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>This risk can be mitigated by obtaining detailed costings from a quantity surveyor and assessment through sensitivity analysis. All council projects are subject to financial policy decisions on cost escalation and treatment of inflation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF the cost of land (if a new site is acquired) and construction costs increase in the future THEN the costs to council will increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>This risk can be mitigated by updating the indicative business case with the 2023 census data and by developing the detailed business case when the population reaches 98,000 for option three. Early demand for additional indoor court capacity would be mitigated by the one local initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF population increases at a slower or faster rate than expected THEN a new facility may be needed earlier or later than anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

77. If option three (local two court facility - preferred option) is approved, work on the detailed business case will commence when the population reaches 98,000, which is likely to be in 2026.

78. If the One Local Board Initiative (option two - destination multisport four court facility) is approved, work will commence on the development of a detailed business case in 2019/2020.
79. This will include site identification and the development of the financial, commercial and management cases.¹

80. Operational funding may need to be allocated for the development of the detailed business case.

81. The timeframe for delivery will depend on a range of factors including:
   - how long it takes to develop and obtain approval for the detailed business case
   - how long it takes to obtain approval and to acquire any additional land
   - the time required to negotiate any partnership or commercial development opportunities.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>Indicative business case findings</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
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<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
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¹ One of the key objectives of the detailed business case will be to identify opportunities to deliver the facilities at lower cost to council. Opportunities to increase revenue, undertake partnerships or obtain sponsorship will be investigated.
Indicative Business Case Summary

Indoor court facility for Upper Harbour (North-West)
Upper Harbour Local Board propose a destination indoor court facility

**Investment proposal**

The Upper Harbour Local Board proposed a destination multisport facility as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. The proposed facility would have four courts or more to serve the growing population in the North-West.

Funding of $25.6 million was earmarked by the Finance and Performance Committee following indicative and detailed business cases processes [Resolution FIN/2018/85].

**Auckland Council’s investment objectives**

- Reduce inequities and improve health and wellbeing of the community
- Address gap in unmet leisure and recreation
- Cater for forecast population growth and changing needs
- Provide fit for purpose facilities

**Investigation of investment proposals**

**Indicative business case**

- Phase 1: Needs assessment
- Phase 2: Strategic case
- Phase 3: Economic case
The proposal aligns with Auckland Council strategies

- **Alignment with Auckland Plan, Local Board plan and Council sports strategies**
  - Park and sports facilities that everyone can enjoy
  - Local Board Plan
  - Council strategies
  - Investment Proposal
  - Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
  - Auckland Sport and Recreation Facilities Network Plan

- **Proposal**
  - A multi-use facility to cater to a wider variety of sporting codes including four full-sized indoor courts or more.

- **Focus investment to address disparities and areas of greatest need**

- **Recognise the value of sports and recreation to the quality of life**

Destination indoor court facility Upper Harbour - indicative business case
The north-west is a future growth area with forecast population growth of 55,000 over next 20 years.

### Population Growth by 2036

- **Total 55,000 in study area**
  - **More Asian**: 27,76
  - **Less European**: 56,44
  - **European**: 38,73
  - **Other**: 24,76

### Projected Population Growth as Percentage of Auckland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study area population</th>
<th>% of Auckland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5,764</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>6,640</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>6,564</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
<td>6,999</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population heatmap 2016**

**Population heatmap 2046**
Parts of the area are more active than the Auckland average. The demand for indoor sport is growing.

Community Facilities Network Plan recommends a destination indoor court facility with a 10 kilometre catchment. These facilities feature a minimum of four full-sized indoor courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Active by area</th>
<th>Upper Harbour</th>
<th>Rodney</th>
<th>Henderson/Massey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indoor sports growing in popularity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Futsal</th>
<th>Netball</th>
<th>Badminton</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study area total 2033</td>
<td>5764</td>
<td>6640</td>
<td>6564</td>
<td>6999</td>
<td>7507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study area total 2043</td>
<td>8876</td>
<td>9780</td>
<td>8887</td>
<td>9974</td>
<td>9997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parts of the North-West are served by existing council facilities, but there is unmet demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Analysis</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2036</th>
<th>2046</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>98,359</td>
<td>120,644</td>
<td>135,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population not served currently</td>
<td>17,898</td>
<td>35,403</td>
<td>46,912</td>
<td>55,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional courts needed</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are other proposals to provide indoor courts in the North West

Rodney Local Board’s One Local Initiative to build a local two-court indoor facility in Kumeu-Huapai

The redevelopment of the Albany Tennis Park to provide additional multisport indoor courts

Henderson-Massey Local Board’s One Local Initiative to build a multipurpose leisure centre, which might include two to four indoor courts.

These proposals are likely to have an impact on the Upper Harbour Local Board’s One Local Initiative.
A local facility is proposed for Rodney – potential overlaps with Upper Harbour proposal

Rodney Local Board have proposed a local facility as part of their One Local Initiative

- A local facility in Rodney would provide indoor court provision for the North-West.
- If the Upper Harbour facility is reduced to a local facility (two-courts) there will be little overlap in catchment areas.
A range of options were identified and two potential solutions identified one has better alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL BOARD OPTION</th>
<th>REDUCED SCOPE OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four indoor courts within North West zone</td>
<td>Two indoor courts within North West zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ancillary facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL BOARD OPTION</th>
<th>REDUCED SCOPE OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twelve changing rooms</td>
<td>Six changing rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function space</td>
<td>Function space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting room</td>
<td>Meeting room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical success factors</th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business need</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential value for money</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier capacity and capability</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential affordability</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential achievability</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment objectives</th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable our communities</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit-for-purpose</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce inequities</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do more with less</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall assessment</th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY
- Strong
- Moderate
- Weak
Both options provide positive economic return

### CBA Results Summary over 30 years (present value terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Present Value ($m)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$29.9m</td>
<td>$18.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$79.9m</td>
<td>$51.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Benefits</td>
<td>$50.0m</td>
<td>$32.9m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results

- **Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR)**: 2.7 / 2.8
- **Internal Rate of Return (IRR)**: 15.3% / 18.0%
- **Payback period**: 9 years / 7 years

### Sensitivity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit: Cost Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Case</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst Case</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best case**: Costs ↓ 22.5%, Benefits ↑ 15%

**Worst case**: Costs ↑ 22.5%, Benefits ↓ 15%

---

**Benefit**: cost ratio > 1 is good
**Internal rate of return**: > 6% is good

**NPV (Net present value)** assesses the value of the cash flow over the life of the project in current $. A NPV > 1 is good
Conclusion and recommendations

The indicative business case demonstrates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A weak strategic case for change</th>
<th>Good alignment with council strategies</th>
<th>Current low population and growth not sufficient for a destination facility in the short term</th>
<th>Population has high levels of activity and are likely to use the facility</th>
<th>Increasing shortfall in indoor court space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A strong economic case for change</td>
<td>Features a number of critical success factors</td>
<td>Good alignment with investment objectives</td>
<td>BCR 2.7 (Local board option)</td>
<td>IRR 15.3% (Local board option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BCR 2.8 (Reduced scope option)</td>
<td>IRR 18% (Reduced scope option)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a weak case for change for the development of a four-court indoor facility. A two-court facility could be reconsidered when the population nears 98,000, which is estimated to be in 2026

1. Development of a detailed business case for a local two-court indoor facility when the population reaches 98,000 likely to be in 2026

BCR - Benefit : cost ratio > 1 is good
IRR - Internal rate of return > 6% is good
A degree of caution is required

1. Demand projections based on current sports participation levels in local area
2. Base case predicated on projected population growth
3. Neighbouring local boards may wish to develop similar facilities with catchment overlap
4. Detailed facility design has not been developed and costs not reviewed by a quantity surveyor
14 **Destination indoor court facility Upper Harbour - indicative business case**

The Principal Policy Analyst and Policy Manager were in attendance via Skype to support the item. The Sport and Recreation Lead Team Leader and the Sport and Recreation Lead were in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2019/66

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member N Mayne:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the report, ‘Destination indoor court facility Upper Harbour – indicative business case’.

b) do not endorse the report findings of an indicative business case for the proposed project ‘Development of a destination multisport indoor facility’, for the following reasons:

i) lack of evidence that research into the profile of the relevant community, including projected growth data, was carried out: the report refers to an undefined area entitled ‘North-West’ with no evidence that this refers to the study area of Hobsonville/Whenuapai and Upper Harbour Local Board area east of the Greenhithe bridge, and provides no evidence of official growth data for this study area which shows a higher than average growth

ii) no evidence of recent social research and any relevant community engagement surveys: no indication of investigation into the demand from relevant sport codes (e.g. basketball); no indication of considerations of public submissions on the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 and Local Board Plan 2017; no indication sector surveys considered, for instance the Sport New Zealand Active New Zealand 2017 survey

iii) lack of evidence that community facility stock-take has been carried out: the report references only the Massey Leisure Centre, without details on which sport codes currently experiencing insufficient capacity in the study area are served by this facility, and with information inconsistent with the 2018 North-West Community Facilities Provision Report, which indicates this facility only serves a catchment of 5km, leaving out many of the communities in the eastern periphery of the actual study area (e.g. Greenhithe)

iv) lack of evidence that a gap analysis which assesses current provision against council policy has been carried out.

c) expect an indicative business case to inform a decision on the local board’s ‘one local initiative’, which is the development of a destination multisport indoor facility, to include:

i) evidence that the proposal has been assessed based on regional prioritisation criteria for investment as outlined in the framework agreed between Auckland Council, Sport New Zealand and sector organisations, under the ‘Auckland Sport Sector: Facilities Priority Plan’

ii) clear definition of study area, with the Hobsonville/Whenuapai area as the centre of the study area, and inclusion of relevant Upper Harbour Local Board area communities such as the communities east of Greenhithe bridge
iii) consideration of relevant sector strategies and plans, including but not limited to:
   A) the previously mentioned ‘Auckland Sport Sector: Facilities Priority Plan’ which states that a total of 21 indoor courts are needed by 2021 and 42 by 2031
   B) the ‘National Facilities Strategy for Indoor Sports’ which indicates the high demand for multi-sport facilities in Auckland currently, which is expected to increase further over the next decades
   C) the ‘Sport New Zealand Future Sport’ report

iv) investigation of relevant sport codes, including feedback regarding insufficient capacity, and strategic documents, such as the ‘New Zealand Basketball Facilities Guide’ which indicates the sport is gaining interest but growth in participation in this sport is currently limited by a critical shortage of access to indoor court space, particularly in Auckland

v) growth data based on official Auckland Council projection models and relationship between growth and demand consistent with Auckland Council’s official position, for instance under the ‘Sport and Recreations Strategic Action Plan’ which acknowledges that growth, intensification and changing population composition will create more pressure on our existing facilities and resources, some of which are struggling to meet demand now

vi) review of relevant public submissions and surveys, in particular but not limited to:
   A) Auckland Council’s 2018-2028 Long-term Plan, from sector organisations such as Aktive – Auckland Sport and Recreation, Sport New Zealand, Sport Waitakere, Sport Auckland, which highlight the current shortfall of 30 indoor courts right now, with a further 24 courts required over the 10-year budget period
   B) the Upper Harbour Local Board Plan 2017, where 35 comments calling for an indoor facility in the local board area, 27 of which specifically mention the need for indoor basketball courts
   C) the Sport New Zealand’s ‘Active New Zealand 2017’ survey, which highlights the growth in sport participation in the North Harbour area and among the growing Asian population.

d) exercise the local board chairperson/deputy chairperson’s speaking rights at the Environment and Community Committee meeting where this matter is considered, to provide input directly to the committee.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SPECIFIC ACTIONS REQUIRED:

Please note resolutions and action accordingly.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval of the indicative business case findings and the development of a detailed business case for a multi-sport facility and upgrades at Karaka Sports Park.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Development of a multi-sport facility and wider park upgrades at Karaka Sports Park was selected by the Franklin Local Board as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. Funding of up to $30 million was earmarked for the multi-sport facility and wider sports park upgrades, following indicative and detailed business case processes.
3. Staff have developed an indicative business case to inform decision-making. Preparation of the business case entailed an investigation of need, an assessment of strategic alignment and an economic analysis.
4. The needs assessment found a current and future need for ancillary infrastructure, such as toilets and changing rooms, and sport field upgrades. There was no need for the full multi-sport facility, including the gym, multifunction/lounge space, bar and kitchen components of the Karaka Sports Park master plan. Upgrades to tennis and netball courts were also not needed in the medium-term.
5. The strategic assessment shows moderate alignment with council’s plans and strategic objectives. This was largely due to weak alignment for the multi-sport facility.
6. Three options were assessed as part of the indicative business case.
   - Option one: No changes to services or facilities (status quo)
   - Option two: Full implementation of the Karaka Sports Park master plan alongside sport field and park upgrades (One Local Initiative)
   - Option three: Partial implementation of the Karaka Sports Park master plan alongside sport field and park upgrades (preferred option).
7. The economic case identified that option three delivers community benefits above the capital and operational costs. A cost-benefit analysis indicates the benefits are 1.1 times the costs.
8. Option two performed poorly against criteria and economic analysis. It has a negative net present value of $14.4 million.
9. Staff recommend the development of a detailed business case based on option three. The Franklin Local Board also endorsed option three. This option has a strong case for change, alignment with council’s plans and strategic objectives, and is based on a sound economic case.
10. There is a medium partnership risk that the Karaka Sports Park Trust may not be able to secure the expected level of funding to assist with the development of the facility. If it can mobilise investment, the trust could provide the funding required for the multi-sport facility.
11. The next step if approved, is to commence the development of a detailed business case in 2019/2020. This will include development of the financial, commercial and management cases.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) agree the findings of an indicative business case for the development of a multi-sport facility and upgrades to Karaka Sports Park which found that:

i) growth projected in the Franklin Local Board area will increase demand for sport and recreation services and facilities - the population is forecast to grow by 58 per cent (172,288) over the next 30 years

ii) the population in the catchment of Karaka Sports Park is more active when compared to all Aucklanders

iii) there are several neighbouring council sports facilities, including two multi-sport facilities

iv) there is a current and future need for ancillary infrastructure, such as toilets and changing rooms, and sport field upgrades

v) there is a current shortfall of lit weekday field time for winter sports of 40 hours per week, which is forecast to grow to a shortfall of 105 hours per week by 2028

vi) the provision of sand-carpeting and lighting of fields at Karaka Sports Park would help address the current and projected shortage of lit field hours

vii) there is no need for the proposed gym space, bar, kitchen and multi-function space

viii) upgrades to tennis and netball courts are not needed in the medium-term

ix) the quantifiable benefits of the One Local Initiative do not exceed costs and have a net cost of $14.4 million

x) the quantifiable benefits of the partial implementation option exceed the costs required for development and have net benefits of $2.1 million.

b) agree that the development of a multi-sport facility at Karaka Sports Park and wider park upgrades (One Local Initiative) has a mixed case for change and strategic alignment with council objectives and would not deliver community benefits comparable to the capital and operational investment required.

c) approve the development of a detailed business case for the partial implementation of the Karaka Sports Park master plan alongside sport field and park upgrades commencing in 2019/20 based on:

i) development of Part A (1400m²) of the multi-sport facility alongside park upgrades

ii) indicative funding of $20.2 million of up to $30 million earmarked as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

Horopaki
Context

Development of a multi-sport facility is a priority for the Franklin Local Board

12. Development of a multi-sport facility at Karaka Sports Park and wider park upgrades was selected by the Franklin Local Board as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

13. The local board worked with the Karaka Sports Park Trust to prepare the Karaka Sports Park master plan in 2014. This plan formed the basis of the Franklin One Local Initiative.
14. The proposed multi-use facility and park upgrades cater for a wide variety of sports codes such as rugby, cricket, netball, tennis, baseball and bowls.

15. The proposal covers a catchment area that includes parts of four local boards – Franklin, Manurewa, Papakura and Otara–Papatoetoe.

16. The Finance and Performance Committee approved provisional funding for One Local Initiative projects [FIN/2018/85 refers].

17. A total of $0.1 million was allocated to the Franklin Local Board for a business case. The business case is developed in two parts - indicative and detailed business cases.

18. Funding of up to $30 million was earmarked for the Franklin One Local Initiative, following the indicative and detailed business case processes.

**Indicative business cases are a tool to support decision-making**

19. Auckland Council uses a three-stage process to investigate large-scale capital projects and new investment in community services or facilities. This approach is based on the better business case model developed by the Treasury.

20. The first phase begins with a needs assessment. This entails:
   - research into the profile of the community, including projected growth data
   - a summary of recent social research and any relevant community engagement surveys
   - a community facility stocktake (both council and non-council facilities)
   - a gap analysis which assesses current provision against council policy.

21. An indicative business case considers the merits of a proposed investment. It helps ensure that there is a robust case for change before resources are committed to a project.

22. The indicative business case considers strategic alignment with council objectives, including the Auckland Plan. It also includes an economic case which considers the costs and benefits of various options that may achieve council’s investment goals.

23. A detailed business case can be built upon:
   - a needs assessment which demonstrates a robust case for change
   - a strategic assessment which shows alignment with council objectives
   - an economic case that identifies a preferred option(s) that delivers community benefits and value for money.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

24. Staff have prepared an indicative business case for the Franklin One Local Board Initiative that follows council’s three-stage process. The key findings are outlined below. Attachment A provides a more detailed overview.

25. Growth projected in the Franklin Local Board area will increase demand for sport and recreation services and facilities. Population in the study area is forecast to grow by 58 per cent (172,288) over the next 30 years, compared to Auckland’s at 48 per cent.

26. The population in the catchment of Karaka Sports Park is expected to grow significantly over the next 30 years from around 6000 in 2016 to 63,000 in 2046. Most population growth is expected in Opaheke-Drury and Pukenekone-Paerata.
   - The age profile of the catchment population is slightly younger than the Auckland average, with more people under 15 years of age (25 per cent compared to 21 per cent for Auckland).
• The ethnicity profile is of the catchment is higher in Māori (20 per cent) and Pacific peoples (27 per cent) when compared to the Auckland average (11 per cent and 15 per cent respectively) with fewer New Zealand Europeans (44 per cent versus 59 per cent in Auckland).

27. The population in the catchment of Karaka Sports Park, which covers parts of the Franklin, Manurewa, Papakura and Otara–Papatoetoe local boards, is more active when compared to all Aucklanders.

Figure 1: Frequency of physical activity in 2016

28. There are several neighbouring council sport facilities, including two multi-sport facilities:
• Franklin Pool and Leisure Centre
• Bledisloe Park
• Papakura Leisure Centre
• Bruce Pullman Park
• Te Matariki Clendon Community Centre Reserve
• Manurewa Recreation Centre
• Papatoetoe Stadium Reserve.

29. The needs assessment found a current and future need for ancillary infrastructure, such as toilets and changing rooms, car parking and sport field upgrades.

30. The Franklin Local Board has a current shortfall of lit weekday field time for winter sports of 40 hours per week, which is forecast to grow to a shortfall of 105 hours per week by 2028.
31. There is varied need for other components of the Karaka Sports Park master plan.

**Table 1: Assessment of the master plan components against need, council and sport code plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Gap in provision or need</th>
<th>Alignment with council plans</th>
<th>Alignment with code plans</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport field sand carpeting and upgrades</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiuse tennis/netball courts and lights</td>
<td>Some need</td>
<td>Some alignment</td>
<td>Some alignment</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling green</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>Some alignment</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sport hub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets/Changing rooms showers/equipment storage (Stage A)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor training arena (Stage B)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifunction space/ lounge (Stage A)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>Some alignment</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central lounge space/ Bar and kitchen (Stage A)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym space (Stage B)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physio/first aid room/office (Stage A)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dependent on use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There is no need for the full multi-sport facility. Gym and indoor court facilities are already available in the catchment and have spare capacity.
- Upgrades to tennis and netball courts are not needed in the medium-term. Additional tennis courts and netball courts may be required by 2031 according to the sport codes' strategic plans.
- Bruce Pullman Park provides for netball competition. Karaka Sports Park is used for training or social games.
- Membership of the bowling club is declining. There were only 25 members in 2018.
32. The strategic assessment shows moderate alignment with council’s plans and strategic objectives. This was largely due to weak alignment for the multi-sport facility, in particular the multifunction/lounge space and bar.
   - Increased health and social benefits brought by increased sport participation aligns with the Auckland Plan 2050 and local board plans.
   - Alignment with the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan vision: ‘Aucklanders, more active, more often.’
   - Weak alignment with the Community Facilities Network Plan.
   - The multi-sport facility features components that are classified as incidental infrastructure or high-performance infrastructure which would not deliver the community sport outcomes sought under the draft Sport Investment Plan.

There is a mixed strategic case for change

33. The needs assessment found a current and future need for ancillary infrastructure, such as toilets and changing rooms, and sport field upgrades.

34. There was no need for the full multi-sport facility, including the gym, multifunction/lounge space, bar and kitchen components of the Karaka Sports Park master plan.

35. Upgrades to tennis and netball courts were not needed in the medium-term.

36. The strategic assessment shows moderate alignment with council’s plans and strategic objectives.
Investment proposal: Sub regional, multi-sports facility at Karaka Sports Park

Karaka Sports Park facilities need upgrading. There is a need for some sports park upgrades based on the current demand and population growth projections (sand carpeting of fields, flood lights, changing rooms and car parking), but not for the full multi-sports facility proposed.

The proposal partially aligns to Council plans and strategies

- Proposal
  Sports park upgrades and improvements - new sports field surfaces, flood lighting and car park. The construction of a new multi-sport facility to cater to a wide variety of sporting codes.

- Focus investment to address disparities and areas of greatest need

- Recognise the value of sports and recreation to the quality of life

- Outdoor space and community facilities that support growth

- Best possible use of existing outdoor space and existing facilities

- Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan

- Community Facilities Network Plan

- Sport Investment Plan [draft]

Growing population and changing demographic projected for Franklin Local Board

- Less European

- 2015: 34, 66
- 2038: 30, 70

Source: Auckland Transport models

Source: Sport New Zealand Insights Tool

Other leisure facilities in the study area

- Forecast increasing shortage in floodlit field hours

- Higher than national average participation for key sports

Source: Auckland Regional Transport forecasts

Source: Sport New Zealand Insights Tool
Two potential solutions were identified from a range of options

**LOCAL BOARD OPTION**
Develop 2960m² facility (changing, gym, indoor cricket and courts), upgrade sports fields and playing surfaces.

**PARTIAL OPTION**
Develop 1400m² facility (no gym or multi-sport), upgrade sports fields and playing surfaces.

Reduced scope option has a higher benefit: cost ratio over 37 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA Results Summary over 37 years</th>
<th>CBA Results Summary over 37 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Present Value ($m)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local Board option</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$40.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$26.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Benefits</td>
<td>$(14.4m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Partial option</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$22.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2.1m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

- Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR)*: 0.64 vs 1.1
- Internal Rate of Return (IRR)*: n/a vs 4.7%
- Payback period: n/a vs 34 years

*Benefit: cost ratio > 1 is good
*Internal rate of return > 6% is good

**Cost: benefit analysis – Local Board option**

**Cost: benefit analysis – partial option**

NPV (Net present value) assesses the value of the cash flow over the life of the project in current $. A NPV > 1 is good.

**RISKS, CONSTRAINTS & DEPENDENCIES**

- Population projections and growth rates are lower than forecast
- Capital costs are higher
- Sports activity rates decline from current levels
- Other facilities within the greater area are developed or redeveloped

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The indicative business case demonstrates that there is a strategic case for developing the sports park, but does not demonstrate a strong economic case.

- Recommended next step is development of a detailed business case for the partial option.
There are three options for decision-makers to consider

37. The options considered in response to the findings include:

- Option one: No changes to services or facilities (status quo)
- Option two: Full implementation of the Karaka Sports Park master plan alongside sport field and park upgrades (One Local Initiative)
- Option three: Partial implementation of the Karaka Sports Park master plan alongside sport field and park upgrades (preferred option).

**Option one: No changes to services or facilities (status quo)**

38. This option would see no new investment into the development at Karaka Sports Park.

39. This option does not address the identified immediate needs for the park. It will constrain use and will not enable the facilities to meet future demand.

40. This option is discounted because there are some areas where the facilities are in immediate need of development:

- six of the eight sports fields have had drainage issues
- changing rooms and equipment storage are insufficient and are currently being supplemented by two portacom shipping container units
- car parking is insufficient and overloaded for some events.

**Option 2: Full implementation of the Karaka Sports Park master plan alongside sport field and park upgrades (One Local Initiative)**

41. This option entails development of a multi-sport facility entailing Parts A (1400m²) and B (1560m²) of the Karaka Sports Park master plan alongside sport field park upgrades and carparking. The full option details are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial sports park and field upgrades</th>
<th>Multisport facility building</th>
<th>Other additional developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sand carpeting for six playing fields</strong></td>
<td><strong>Part A of building: 1400m²</strong></td>
<td>Additional work on playing surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All weather playing/practice surface</strong></td>
<td>□ 4 changing rooms</td>
<td>Additional groundwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cricket nets and score-keeping pavilion</strong></td>
<td>□ Multifunction space</td>
<td>Additional multi-use courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New netball and tennis courts</strong></td>
<td>□ Kitchen and bar</td>
<td>Demolition of some of the existing buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle and pedestrian routes</strong></td>
<td>□ Kiosk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lighting for courts and five additional fields</strong></td>
<td>□ Storage areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car parking</strong></td>
<td>□ Outdoor play area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Car parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A of building: 1400m²</th>
<th>Part B of building: Additional 1560m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Multi-sport indoor training area</td>
<td>□ Fitness gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Additional storage</td>
<td>□ Additional changing rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. The full option details are:
43. The benefits of this option are that it would address issues with the state of the playing fields, as well as insufficient changing rooms and parking. Upgrades to sand carpet fields and lighting would respond to lit field hours shortages. Sport cancellations could be reduced to the target of 10 per cent. It would provide infrastructure for increased and improved utilisation of the park and facilities into the future.

44. However, there is no need for the full multi-sport facility, including the gym, multifunction/lounge space, bar and kitchen components of the Karaka Sports Park master plan. There is no need for Part B of the building.

45. Economic analysis of the costs and benefits of this option suggest that the quantifiable economic and social benefits of this option would be significantly below costs. The proposal has an estimated total cost of $40.4 million and estimated benefits of $26 million for a net cost of $14.4 million.

Option three: Partial implementation of the Karaka Sports Park master plan alongside sport field and park upgrades (preferred option).

46. This option would entail development of ancillary infrastructure, including the toilet and changing room components of part A (1400m$^2$) of the Karaka Sports Park master plan alongside sport field and park upgrades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial sports park and field upgrades</th>
<th>Multisport facility building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand carpeting for six playing fields</td>
<td>Part A of building: 1400 square meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All weather playing/practice surface</td>
<td>□ 4 changing rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket nets and score keeping pavilion</td>
<td>□ Multifunction space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New netball and tennis courts</td>
<td>□ Kitchen and bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle and pedestrian routes</td>
<td>□ Kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting for courts and 5 additional fields</td>
<td>□ Storage areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>□ Outdoor play area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. This option best responds to the identified needs as well as current issues with the park.

49. Economic analysis of the costs and benefits of this option suggest that the quantifiable economic and social benefits of this option would be slightly above costs. The proposal has an estimated total cost of $20.2 million and estimated benefits of $22.3 million for a net benefit of $2.1 million.

Staff have developed criteria to assess the three options

50. Staff developed the following assessment criteria to enable the comparison of the options:

- Current need: Does a demonstrable need currently exist?
- Future growth: Is the scale of the option proportionate to future population growth?
- Strategic alignment: Is this something we should be doing?
- Value for money: Do the benefits associated with an option exceed its costs?

51. These criteria are unweighted and allow for objective assessment.

52. A summary of the options against the assessment criteria is provided in Table 2 below.
Staff recommend the development of a detailed business case based on option three

53. When the criteria are applied, option three (partial implementation of the master plan) scores the highest. It is well aligned to relevant council strategies for sport field provision. It is a proportionate response to need and expected growth pressures. There is a strategic case for change and a sound economic case. Economic analysis suggests that it would deliver sufficient additional benefit to justify these costs. The ratio of benefits to costs are at least 1.1.

Table 2: Assessment of options against criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current needs</th>
<th>Future growth</th>
<th>Strategic alignment</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option one (status quo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>No new facility and service improvements change</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option two (One Local Initiative)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Full implementation of the master plan</em></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option three</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Partial implementation of the master plan</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. Option two aligns with community expectations. However, it is the least aligned to local need or the council’s strategies and practices. It is the costliest option and is not expected to generate sufficient social or economic benefits to justify investment.

55. Option one does not score favourably. It does not address the immediate existing need in Franklin and the surrounding area.

There are some limitations with the data, but these are not material

56. Some research and survey data lacked enough detail to aggregate at the level of the study area. Where data could not be separated, it is presented at local board level or at Auckland level.

57. Population growth is based on projections. There is a risk of growth being significantly higher or lower than forecasted. This would result in increased demand or underutilisation of the facility.

58. The cost-benefit analysis required the use of some assumptions. A key assumption was that demand was a mixture of new demand, current demand increased through closer service provision and current demand switching from other facilities. Only the first two provide quantifiable benefits to council.

59. Other assumptions were made on inflation, the deadweight loss of council investment and consumer surplus. If these assumptions are incorrect it could weaken the economic case for investment. This financial risk has been mitigated by sensitivity analysis.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

60. If approved, council staff will develop the detailed better business case.

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

61. Developments to upgrade Karaka Sports Park and build a sub-regional multi-sport facility will enhance sport and recreation opportunities in Franklin and neighbouring areas.

62. People in Franklin and neighbouring areas are more active when compared to all Aucklanders suggesting any facility will have good usage.

63. The Karaka Sports Park Trust is actively involved in the development and operation of Karaka Sports Park. There is a willingness to work with council in partnership to facilitate development.

64. Development of a multi-sport facility at Karaka Sports Park and wider park upgrades was selected by the Franklin Local Board as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

65. Two workshop sessions were held with the Franklin Local Board in November 2018 and March 2019. These sessions focused on the study area, the methodology, research and data and the documents used for the indicative business case.

66. In June 2019, findings were presented to the Franklin Local Board business meeting. The board:
   • endorsed option three (the staff recommended option)
   • noted some context comments on Bruce Pullman Park, lawn bowls patronage, rugby league usage and the development of facilities in the multi-sport hub that it requested to be provided to committee for consideration
   • requested re-evaluation of some facilities considered as medium-term priorities as part of the detailed business case
   • requested that the committee consider reserving earmarked Long-term Plan 2018-2028 budget pending the requested re-evaluation
   • noted that the detailed business case presented an opportunity to partner and work with the Karaka Sports Park Trust.

67. The full local board resolution is included in Attachment B.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

68. The Karaka Sports Park catchment area has a higher percentage of Māori (20 per cent) compared to the Auckland average (11 per cent).

69. Sport participation contributes directly to the following ‘Māori Identity and Wellbeing’ outcome in Auckland Plan 2050:

   Māori Identity and Wellbeing
   • Direction 1 – ‘Advance Māori wellbeing’
   • Focus area 1 – ‘Meet the needs and support the aspirations of tamariki and their whanau’

70. According to Sport New Zealand data, weekly sport and recreation participation of Māori in Auckland (73.7 per cent) is lower than European (83.0 per cent) and Pacific people (74.0 per cent), but higher than Asian (67.1 per cent).
71. Research shows pockets of sedentary Māori who do not have adequate opportunities to participate in sport. It also shows Māori have different preferences for sport and recreational activities compared to other ethnic groups.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

72. Each local board identified one priority project through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 process. The Finance and Performance Committee then approved provisional funding for these local board projects [FIN/2018/85 refers].

73. The Franklin Local Board proposed a multi-sport facility and upgrades at Karaka Sports Park (the Karaka Sports Park master plan). A total of $0.01 million was allocated to develop the business case. A total of $0.025 million remains for the development of the detailed business case.

74. Funding of up to $30 million was earmarked for the Franklin One Local Initiative, following the indicative and detailed business case processes.

75. The detailed business case will determine if option three is: (1) viable (the financial case); affordable (the commercial case); and (3) achievable (the management case).

76. A partnership with the Karaka Sports Park Trust, which can be investigated as part of a detailed business case presents an opportunity to reduce costs or increase revenue. If it can mobilise investment, the trust could provide the funding required for the multi-sport facility.

77. There is sufficient One Local Initiative funding available to deliver the multi-sport facility and upgrades at Karaka Sports Park.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

78. There are three main risk areas with options two and three are outlined in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of risk</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership risk</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This can be mitigated by capping council investment at $20.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF the Karaka Sports Park Trust is unable to secure expected funding to invest in the proposed multi-sport facility THEN the costs to council will increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>This risk can be mitigated by obtaining detailed costing from a quantity surveyor and are assessed through sensitivity analysis All council projects are subject to financial policy decisions on cost escalation and treatment of inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF costs of the project exceed initial estimates THEN the costs will further exceed the benefits and weaken the economic case for investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of risk</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Staff can update the business case when new growth modelling or new census information becomes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF projected growth rates slow and expected growth does not eventuate</td>
<td></td>
<td>THEN the facility may be underutilised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

79. If approved, work will commence on the development of a detailed business case in 2019/2020. This will include development of the financial, commercial and management cases. Figure 2 below provides an outline of the project timing.

80. The timeframe for delivering the new facilities will depend on a range of factors including:

- how long it takes to develop and obtain approval for the detailed business case
- the time required to negotiate any partnership or commercial development opportunities.

Figure 2: Project timing
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Indicative Business Case Summary

Multi-sports facility and field upgrades for Karaka Sports Park
Franklin Local Board propose a multi-sport facility at Karaka Sports Park

**Investment proposal**

The Franklin Local Board proposed a destination multi-sport facility as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

The proposed development covers several local board areas and would have a new multi-sport facility building (changing rooms, function space, indoor sports etc.), improved fields, new courts and surfaces and new lighting to serve the growing population.

**Auckland Council’s investment objectives**

- Reduce inequities and improve health and wellbeing of the community
- Address gap in unmet leisure and recreation
- Cater for forecast population growth and changing needs
- Provide fit for purpose facilities

**Study area:** 15 minute driving catchment from Karaka Sports Park – spans parts of four local board areas

**Indicative business case**

- Phase 1: Needs assessment
- Phase 2: Strategic case
- Phase 3: Economic case
The proposed facility has mixed alignment with Auckland Council strategies

Alignment with Auckland Plan, Local Board plan and Council sports strategies

Proposal
Sports park upgrades and improvements - new sports field surfaces, flood lighting and car park. The construction of a new multi-sport facility to cater to a wide variety of sporting codes.

- Focus investment to address disparities and areas of greatest need
- Recognise the value of sports and recreation to the quality of life

- Outdoor space and community facilities that support growth
- Best possible use of existing outdoor space and existing facilities
- Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
- Community Facilities Network Plan
- Sports Investment Plan [draft]
The Franklin Local Board is a growth area with forecast population growth of 81,000 by 2046.
Karaka Sports Park is currently well used but investment is required

Karaka Sports Park comprises approximately 17.5 hectares of sport facilities including grass fields, courts, cricket wickets, bowling greens, clubrooms and storage facilities. A number of codes share these facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition Assessment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports Fields</td>
<td>Soil drained, frequent cancellation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Rooms</td>
<td>Insufficient for demand. Two shipping containers used in addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking</td>
<td>At capacity for certain sports – for example touch rugby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sports Codes Using Karaka Park

- Tennis
- Netball
- Cricket
- Baseball
- Bowls & Lawn Bowls
- Rugby

The master plan anticipates football will move to the park in the future.
There are a number of facilities in the study area including two providing multi-sports.

**Facilities in study area**

**Existing multi-sport facilities**

- Bruce Pullman Park - located approximately 12 kilometre drive from Karaka Sports Park.
- The Papakura Netball Centre is located at Bruce Pullman Park, has a number of similar facilities to the proposed master plan and meets existing demand.
- Kolmar is located in Papatoetoe approximately a 20 kilometre drive away.

**Halls for Hire**

- There is a large network of existing council owned community facilities that are available for hire.
- The Karaka War Memorial Hall is located on the edge of the park. The hall is available for bookings and has kitchen facilities. It has a capacity of 160 people in the dining layout.

**Karaka sports park**
There is a surplus of daylight playing field provision but a shortfall of floodlit field hours, which will intensify with growth.

**There is current daytime playing field capacity**

Daylight field capacity by 2028

**Karaka Sports Park activities growing in popularity**

Sports code projections

**Shortfall of floodlit playing field hours - increasing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rugby Combined</th>
<th>Cricket Combined</th>
<th>Netball Combined</th>
<th>Tennis Combined</th>
<th>Touch Junior</th>
<th>Baseball</th>
<th>Bowling Club</th>
<th>Model Aero Club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A range of options were considered and two potential solutions identified, both have varying strategic alignment.

**LOCAL BOARD OPTION**
- Develop 2960m² facility (hanging, gym, multisport)
- Upgrade sports fields and playing surfaces

**PARTIAL OPTION**
- Develop 1400m² facility (no gym or multi-sport), upgrade sports fields and playing surfaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancillary facilities</th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Partial option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than four changing rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-function space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering and hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor play area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sport indoor training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Do nothing" was considered
- There are improvements required today
  - Playing fields drainage issues
  - Lack of lit areas
  - Insufficient changing facilities

**Critical success factors**
- Strategic fit
- Business need
- Potential value for money
- Supplier capacity and capability
- Potential affordability
- Potential achievability

**Investment objectives**
- Spaces & facilities that support growth
- Community well-being
- Enable our communities
- Fit-for-purpose
- Reduce inequities
- Do more with less
- Evidence-based

**Overall assessment**
- [ ] Strong
- [ ] Moderate
- [ ] Weak
Neither option provides a strong economic return with costs exceeding benefits for the Local Board option.

### CBA Results Summary over 37 years (present value terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Partial option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value ($m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$40.4m</td>
<td>$20.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$26.0m</td>
<td>$22.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Benefits</td>
<td>$(14.4m)</td>
<td>$2.1m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results

- **Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR)**: 0.64 / 1.1
- **Internal Rate of Return (IRR)**: N/A / 4.7%
- **Payback period**: N/A / 34 years

### Sensitivity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit: Cost Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Board option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst Case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best case: Costs ↓ 22.5%, Benefits ↑ 15%**

**Worst case: Costs ↑ 22.5%, Benefits ↓ 15%**

NPV (Net present value) assesses the value of the cash flow over the life of the project in current $. A NPV > 1 is good.
Conclusion and recommendations

The indicative business case demonstrates

**Strategic case for change**
- Forecast population growth
- Population has high levels of activity and are likely to use the facility
- Current and increasing shortfall in quality outdoor sports fields and courts
- Mixed alignment with council strategies

**A weak economic case for change**
- Features some critical success factors
- Moderate alignment with investment objectives
- BCR 0.64 (Local board option)
- BCR 1.1 (Reduced scope option)
- IRR n/a (Local board option)
- IRR 4.7% (Reduced scope option)

There is a current shortfall of lit field capacity and increasing demand on the facilities as the population grows. The partial option has a stronger strategic and economic case.

**Recommendations**

1. Development of detailed business case for the partial option
2. Engage appropriate professional services to support detailed business case including quantity surveyor

**Notes**
- BCR - Benefit : cost ratio > 1 is good
- IRR - Internal rate of return > 6% is good
A degree of caution is required

1. Demand projections based on current sports participation levels in local area which may change

2. Base case predicated on projected population growth which may be higher (or lower)

3. Neighbouring local boards may wish to redevelop current facilities or develop new facilities with catchment overlap

4. Detailed facility design has not been developed and costs not reviewed by a quantity surveyor
Resolution number FR/2019/77

MOVED by Member A Cole, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Baker:

That the Franklin Local Board:

a) endorse the following findings of the indicative business case for the development of multi-sport facility and upgrades to Karaka Sports Park:
   i) growth projected in the Franklin Local Board area will increase demand for sport and recreation services and facilities - the population is forecast to grow by 58 per cent (172,288) over the next 30 years
   ii) the population in the catchment of Karaka Sports Park is more active when compared to all Aucklanders
   iv) there is a current and future need for ancillary infrastructure, such as toilets and changing rooms, and sport field upgrades
   v) there is a current shortfall of lit weekday field time for winter sports of 40 hours per week, which is forecast to grow to a shortfall of 105 hours per week by 2028
   vi) the provision of sand-carpeting and lighting of fields at Karaka Park would help address the current and projected shortage of lit field hours
   vii) there is limited justification for council-owned gym space, bar, kitchen and multi-function space
   ix) the quantifiable benefits of the One Local Initiative do not currently exceed costs and have a net cost of $14.4 million
   x) the quantifiable benefits of the partial implementation option currently exceed the costs required for development and have net benefits of $2.1 million.

b) endorse that the development of the full multi-sport facility at Karaka Sports Park and wider park upgrades (One Local Initiative) has a mixed case for change and strategic alignment with council objectives and does not currently deliver community benefits to justify full capital and operational investment by Council.

c) endorse the development of a detailed business case for the partial implementation of the Karaka Sports Park master plan alongside sports field and park upgrades (including parking) commencing in 2019/20 based on:
   i) development of Part A (1400m²) of the multi-sport facility alongside park upgrades
   ii) indicative funding of $20.2 million of up to $30 million earmarked as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

d) request that the following local context comments on initial business case assessment be provided to the committee for their consideration:

   i. Bruce Pullman Park is not a council multi-sport facility as indicated in the business case analysis and that this may have an impact on the assessment of future need for netball practice facilities.

   ii. bowls and lawn bowls patronage and membership has increased since nearby Somerset village has opened, and note that additional senior citizen facilities are planned in nearby growth areas within the catchment that are likely to generate ongoing increases.
iii. the development of a new bowls complex as part of the facility able to operate as a sub-regional multi-club venue aligns with the strategies of Bowls NZ and would enhance the overall Karaka facility.

iv. sportfields at Karaka are now also accommodating Rugby League, meaning sports field upgrades, sand-carpenting, lighting and ancillary infrastructure (changing rooms and car parking) is now overly conservative and required as a matter of urgency to address a current shortfall.

v. Although there may be limited justification for council-owned gym space, bar, kitchen and multi-function space, a partnership approach between council and the Karaka Sports Park Trust and other organisations to provide such facilities could be considered through the detailed business case on the basis that these facilities would enhance the overall facility.

e) request that the Environment and Community Committee consider directing staff to re-evaluate those facilities considered as medium-term priorities as part of the detailed business-case, and to assess the cost of including investment of those facilities.

f) request that the Environment and Community Committee consider reserving earmarked LTP budget pending a refreshed understanding of the medium-term element demand.

g) note that the Karaka OLI is an opportunity to partner in and accelerate a Karaka Sports Park Trust initiative. The board request that staff make this distinction clear in future reports; approaching the detailed business case process and plan project development in a manner that recognises that this is a community partnership opportunity going forward.

CARRIED
Indicative business case: Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park

File No.: CP2019/11865

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval to the findings of the indicative business case and the development of a detailed business case for the redevelopment of Chamberlain Park.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The redevelopment of Chamberlain Park was selected by the Albert-Eden Local Board as its One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. Funding of $22 million was earmarked for the project, following indicative and detailed business case processes.

3. Staff have developed an indicative business case to inform decision-making. Preparation of the business case entailed an investigation of community need, an assessment of strategic alignment and an economic analysis.

4. The needs assessment demonstrates a current and future community need. A gap in neighbourhood park provision has been identified. Projected growth will increase pressure on existing open space and create demand for new sport and recreation facilities.

5. The strategic assessment shows strong alignment with council’s plans and strategic objectives.

6. The economic case identified two options that deliver community benefits comparable to the capital and operational costs required to develop the new sport and recreation facilities.

7. A range of options were considered, and two potential solutions identified:
   - Option one: Partial redevelopment based on implementation of phase three of the approved Chamberlain Park master plan (status quo).
   - Option two: Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park based on full delivery of the approved Chamberlain Park master plan (One Local Initiative).

8. On balance, staff recommend the development of a detailed business case based on option two. The Albert-Eden Local Board endorses this recommendation.

9. It best responds to community needs and strongly aligns with the council’s investment objectives. The proposed new open space and facilities have widespread appeal and will deliver ‘belonging and participation outcomes’ under the Auckland Plan. There is a potential economic case for change. A cost-benefit analysis indicates the benefits are 0.96 times the costs.

10. Project capital costs are estimated to be $29.7 million, which is more than the $22 million earmarked under the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. Increased costs are due to geotechnical issues at Chamberlain Park. Commercial or partnership opportunities and options to reduce these costs, and the financial risk to council, can be investigated as part of a detailed business case.

11. The key difference between option two and option one is quantifiable community benefits are distributed to a wider range of Aucklanders versus a return on investment of $0.40 million over 34 years.

12. The recommended next step is to develop a detailed business case commencing in 2019/2020.
13. There is a high risk of further legal challenges to the redevelopment of Chamberlain Park leading to increased financial and staff costs. This can be minimised by transparent and robust decision-making processes.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) agree the findings of an indicative business case for the redevelopment of Chamberlain Park which found:
   i) projected growth of 143,000 people (32.7 per cent) by 2036 in the Albert-Eden Local Board area leading to increased demand for new sport and recreation facilities
   ii) changing demographics with a decrease in New Zealand Europeans from 48 per cent to 38 per cent and an increase in Asian people from 34 per cent to 41 per cent by 2038
   iii) a gap in neighbourhood park provision in accordance with the Open Space Provision Policy
   iv) a shortfall of 27 field hours growing to 87 field hours by 2028
   v) a reduction in rounds played at Chamberlain Park Golf Course from 82,371 in 2001/02 to 50,239 in 2017/18
   vi) access to open space and new sport and recreation facilities will increase community benefits, in particular physical and mental health benefits
   vii) redevelopment of Chamberlain Park aligns with Auckland Plan outcomes
   viii) the quantifiable benefits of redeveloping Chamberlain Park are $1.2 million less than the capital and operational costs required to provide additional open space, as well as new sport and recreation facilities - a cost-benefit analysis indicates the benefits are 0.96 times the costs
   ix) project capital costs are $29.7 million, which is more than the $22 million earmarked under the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

b) agree that the redevelopment of Chamberlain Park has a robust case for change and strategic alignment with council objectives and would deliver community benefits comparable to the capital and operational investment required.

c) approve the development of a detailed business case for the development of Chamberlain Park, commencing in 2019/2020 based on:
   i) development of a 3.6-hectare neighbourhood park with play area; shared walking and cycling paths and connections; the restoration of Watītikō/Meola Creek; two artificial fields; and a reconfigured nine-hole golf course with driving range and practice facilities (option two)
   ii) indicative funding of $22 million earmarked as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

d) agree that the redevelopment of Chamberlain Park be included in the updated Community Facilities Network Action Plan.
Horopaki
Context

Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park is a priority for the Albert-Eden Local Board

14. Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park was selected by the Albert-Eden Local Board as its One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. Its proposal is based on the phased implementation of the approved master plan for Chamberlain Park.³

15. It proposed reconfiguring the 18-hole golf course into a nine-hole golf course with a neighbourhood park, walking and cycling connections, two-artificial fields and a more diverse golf offering. New golf facilities will include a driving range, a practice area with some facilities targeting beginners.

16. The local board’s objective is to appeal to a wider range of golfers and those interested in taking up the sport. It also seeks to provide access to open space, including a playground, to neighbouring residents. New sport and recreation opportunities will appeal to a range of Aucklanders.

17. The Finance and Performance Committee approved provisional funding for the One Local Initiative projects [FIN/2018/85 refers].

18. A total of $0.100 million was allocated to the Albert-Eden Local Board for a business case. The business case is developed in two parts - indicative and detailed.

19. Funding of $22 million was earmarked for the development. Of this, $8.2 million was allocated to phase three including restoration of Watitikō/Meola Creek. The remainder was earmarked for later phases, following the indicative and detailed business case process.

Indicative business cases are a tool to support decision-making

20. Auckland Council uses a three-stage process to investigate large-scale capital projects and new investment in community services or facilities. This approach is based on the Business Case model developed by the Treasury.

21. The first stage begins with a needs assessment. This entails:
   - research into the profile of the community, including projected growth data
   - a summary of recent social research and any relevant community engagement surveys
   - a community facility stocktake (both council and non-council facilities)
   - a gap analysis which assesses current provision against council policy.

22. An indicative business case considers the merits of a proposed investment. It helps ensure that there is a robust case for change before resources are committed to a project.

23. The indicative business case considers strategic alignment with council objectives, including the Auckland Plan. It also includes an economic case which considers the costs and benefits of various options that may achieve council’s investment goals.

24. A detailed business case can be built upon:
   - a needs assessment which demonstrates a robust case for change
   - a strategic assessment which shows alignment with council objectives
   - an economic case that identifies a preferred option(s) that delivers community benefits and value for money.

³ The aquatic centre has been excluded from this indicative business case as current work is underway to determine the optimal way to deliver aquatic provision in Albert-Eden Local Board.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

25. Staff have prepared an indicative business case for the redevelopment of Chamberlain Park that follows council's three stage process. The key findings are outlined below (see Attachment A for a more detailed overview).

26. Growth projected in the study area, will create demand for new and more diverse sport and recreation facilities, including golf.

- The local population is projected to grow 32.7 per cent from 433,914 to 575,594 people between 2018 and 2038.
- The ethnic make-up of the local board area is changing with a decrease in New Zealand Europeans from 48 per cent to 38 per cent and an increase in Asian people from 34 per cent to 41 per cent by 2038. Other ethnicities remain relatively stable.
- Golf participation in the local board area is 2.5 per cent. New Zealand Europeans participation is 2.9 per cent. Asian, Māori, Pacific Peoples and other ethnic groups have lower rates of 2.5, 0.2, 2.0 and 1.0 per cent respectively.
- Sports preferences are changing with estimated golf participation by Albert-Eden residents falling by three per cent between 2017 and 2018.  
- Chamberlain Park golf course had seen a reduction in rounds played from 82,371 in 2001/02 to 50,239 in 2017/18 despite population growth in the area.
- Many golfers are seeking diversity and flexibility and are seeking shorter and more flexible golfing options.
- Inclusion of the reconfigured nine-hole golf course, driving range and practice area will allow for golfers to have a more diverse range of golf activities. The driving range also improves the financial viability of the development.
- Walking and cycling rates of residents are 57 and 10 per cent respectively.

27. The Albert-Eden Open Space Network Plan identified a gap in neighbourhood park provision based on an assessment against the Open Space Provision Policy.

28. There is a current shortfall in sports field hours of 27 hours, growing to 87 hours by 2028.

- The Albert-Eden Local Board area has a shortage of 75 lit field hours growing to 104 hours by 2028.
- Two artificial fields would provide an additional 90 field hours, meeting the forecasted demand shortfall.

29. Chamberlain Park is an optimal location to respond to the projected population growth and respond to changing community need.

- The Albert-Eden Local Board area has a shortage of available land making any open space acquisition for sport fields expensive. Current open space could be utilised to meet growing demand.
- Offering a mixture of sport and recreation opportunities will allow a wider and more diverse section of the population to utilise public open space.

30. Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park would increase community access through the inclusion of a neighbourhood park.

- The neighbourhood park would provide an informal recreation space for a wide variety of users by including a playground and nature play as well as a barbeque area.
- Park usage projections shows growth from an initial 15,909 usage hours in year one to 23,824 usage hours in year 34.

---

4 Sport NZ Insight tool.
• Provision of walking and cycling connections aligns with the key focus areas and moves of the Albert-Eden Open Space Network Plan.

31. The development of Chamberlain Park aligns with Auckland Plan outcomes, see Table 1 below.

32. **Table 1: Alignment with Auckland Plan 2050**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Direction or focus area</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1: Belonging and participation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Direction 2:</strong> improve health and wellbeing of all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities</td>
<td>Aligns through providing sport and recreation facilities for under-serviced and rural communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Focus area 2:</strong> provide accessible services and social and cultural infrastructure that are responsive in meeting peoples evolving needs</td>
<td>Aligns through providing a multi-purpose facility that can change in response to our changing population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Focus area 6:</strong> focus investment to address disparities and serve communities of greatest need</td>
<td>Aligns through providing the facility where there is an identified community need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Focus area 7:</strong> recognise the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life.</td>
<td>Aligns through quantifying the benefits to the community of the facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**There is a robust strategic case for change for the proposed facility**

33. The needs assessment demonstrates a current and future community need.

34. The strategic assessment shows strong alignment with council plans, strategies and resolutions.

35. The economic case identified two options that deliver community benefits. Both options align with council’s investment objectives and critical success factors.

36. There is a potential economic case for change. A cost-benefit analysis indicates the benefits are 0.96 times the costs. This shows that the community benefits are comparable to the capital and operational costs required to develop the new sport and recreation facilities.

37. Typically, investors seek a ratio of more than one. Commercial or partnership opportunities and options to reduce council’s costs can be investigated as part of a detailed business case.
Investment proposal: Development of Chamberlain Park

The Albert-Eden Local Board adopted the Chamberlain Park Master Plan in 2015. The master plan responds to the need of open space and sports field provision in the area. This will allow a more diverse section of the community to use the public space.

The proposal aligns to council plans and strategies

Proposal
Development of Chamberlain Park in line with the master plan – providing a multi-purpose golf facility and two new sports fields, along with neighbourhood park, cycle and walk paths.

- Focus investment to address disparities and areas of greatest need – areas of high deprivation in catchment.

Growing population and changing demographics over next 20 years

Population growth by 2038
- 32.7%
- Total 434,000 in catchment area currently

Albert-Eden Local Board activity participation

Albert-Eden has highest shortfall of field hours in Auckland

The proposal provides increased benefit to the community

Indicative business case: Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park
From a range of masterplan options two potential solutions were identified

**LOCAL BOARD OPTION**
Nine-hole golf course with driving range and practice facilities, two sports fields, neighbourhood park, cycle and walking paths

**STATUS QUO OPTION**
Reconfigured 18-hole golf course with neighbourhood park, cycling and walking paths

Local Board option has a lower benefit: cost ratio over 30 years but delivers significant community benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA Results Summary over 30 years</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board option</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status quo option</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value ($m)</td>
<td>Total Costs: $33.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit: Tenant</td>
<td>Total Benefits: $32.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Benefits</td>
<td>$(1.2m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA Results Summary over 30 years</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board option</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status quo option</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Rate of Return (IRR)+</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Benefit: cost ratio > 1 is good +Internal rate of return > 6% is good

NPV (Net present value) assesses the value of the cash flow over the life of the project in current $. A NPV > 1 is good

**RISKS, CONSTRAINTS & DEPENDENCIES**
- Population projections and growth rates are lower than forecast.
- Capital costs are higher.
- Preferred option does not show strong economic case for change.
- Possible further legal challenges.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**
The Indicative Business Case demonstrates a strong strategic case for developing Chamberlain Park.

**Recommended next step is the development of a detailed business case on the Local Board One Local Initiative**
A range of options were considered, and two potential solutions identified

38. Staff assessed two options as a part of the investigation:

- Option one: Partial redevelopment based on implementation of phase three of the approved Chamberlain Park master plan (status quo).
- Option two: Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park based on full delivery of the approved Chamberlain Park master plan (One Local Initiative).

Option one: Partial development of Chamberlain Park (status quo)

39. The status quo entails the development of a 3.6-hectare neighbourhood park on the western end of the site, 850 metres of shared paths and connections and restoration of Wātūtī/Meola Creek. This aligns with stage three of the master plan.

40. The neighbourhood park would provide a diverse range of play opportunities through a playground and nature play. There would be a barbeque area and space for informal recreation.

41. Under this option the golf course would remain at 18 holes. Three holes would be shortened or reconfigured to fit the reduced land area following the creation of the neighbourhood park. These changes may reduce golfers’ enjoyment of this part of the course. The other 15 holes would remain the same.

42. This option does not align with council’s investment objectives. It would provide a return on investment of $0.40 million over 34 years

Option two: Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park (the One Local Initiative)

43. Option two includes the components outlined in option one, as well as two artificial fields and a diverse golf offering. This includes a reconfigured nine-hole golf course, driving range and practice area to appeal to a wider range of golfers. There are an extra 2100 metres of shared paths and connections. This option aligns with the full master plan, excluding an aquatic facility.

44. The golf course would be redesigned to provide a better golfing experience. It would meet the handicap rating requirement with a par of 34 to 36 - typical for a nine-hole course.

45. This option has strong strategic alignment. It provides a broad range of sport and recreation opportunities and delivers community benefits.

46. There are higher costs with this proposal and subsequently a weaker economic case.

Option two aligns strongly with investment objectives and would deliver greater community benefits

47. Option two aligns with critical success factors and council’s investment objectives:

- Enable our communities: fulfil Auckland Plan outcomes through increased participation in sports and recreation by enhancing the current network of facilities.
- Reduce inequities: between communities through providing facilities where the greatest need exists. This will address disparities in sport and recreation outcomes and ensure a robust network of facilities across Auckland.
- Fit-for-purpose: provide greater efficiencies through investing in multi-use facilities rather than single codes. This will support our diverse communities and provide greater efficiencies.
- Public benefits and outcomes: golf courses are currently only accessible to those who pay to play golf. Better access to golf courses for other activities such as walking and running will deliver greater benefits to more Aucklanders from council’s investment.
- Aucklanders more active, more often: create a hierarchy of golf courses that offer a pathway to participation, regardless of experience, membership and club traditions, increasing participation particularly among women, young people and a wider range of ethnicities.
48. The quantified benefits of option two (Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park) are comparable to the capital and operational costs required to develop the facility.

49. The net benefits of option two are -$1.2 million in present day terms. The ratio of benefits to costs are at least 0.96.

50. The primary benefits of option two are the improved physical and mental health outcomes to users. Other benefits include increased productivity, reduced unemployment and decreased crime.

51. These benefits are distributed to a wider range of the community instead of primarily being for golf users. By optimising the public space and increasing the sport and recreation activities offered, a more diverse section of the population can enjoy Chamberlain Park.

52. The capital cost of option two is estimated to be $29.7 million. The costliest element is the two-artificial sport fields at $16.2 million. This is due to the lava field under Chamberlain Park which means that considerable earthworks are needed to create a flat platform. Typically, two-artificial sport fields would cost around $4.2 million.

53. The cost of the sports field should be weighed against the cost of acquiring new land for open space in the Albert-Eden Local Board area.

Staff recommend the development of a detailed business case based on option two

54. Staff recommend the development of a detailed business case based on option two (Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park). There is a robust strategic case for change and which will deliver community benefits as quantified in the economic case.

55. The detailed business case will determine if option two is: (1) viable (the financial case); affordable (the commercial case); and (3) achievable (the management case).

56. Commercial or partnership opportunities and options to reduce costs or increase revenue can be investigated as part of a detailed business case.

There are some limitations with the data, but these are not material

57. Population growth is based on projections. There is a risk of growth being significantly lower than forecast. This would result in underutilisation of the facility.

58. The cost-benefit analysis required the use of some assumptions. A key assumption was that demand was a mixture of: new demand, current demand increased through closer service provision or current demand switching from other facilities. Only the first two provide quantifiable benefits to council.

59. Other assumptions were made on inflation, the deadweight loss of council investment and consumer surplus. If these assumptions are incorrect it could weaken the economic case for investment. This financial risk has been mitigated by sensitivity analysis.

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

60. If approved, council staff will prepare the detailed business case.

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

61. Development of Chamberlain Park will enhance sport and recreational opportunities in the Albert-Eden Local Board area and neighbouring areas.

62. People in the Albert-Eden Local Board area are highly active when compared to the Auckland region suggesting any facility will have high usage.

63. The Albert-Eden Local Board selected the development of Chamberlain Park as its One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.
64. The views of the local board on the findings of the indicative business case were sought and are included in this report. The local board supports the report’s recommendation to develop a business case for the full development of Chamberlain Park (One Local Initiative).

65. The Albert-Eden Local Board at its meeting on 26 June 2019, resolved to Resolution ES/2019/107:

a) receive the findings of an indicative business case for the redevelopment of Chamberlain Park which found:
   
i) projected growth of 143,000 people (32.7 per cent) by 2036 in the Albert-Eden Local Board area leading to increased demand for new sport and recreation facilities
   
ii) changing demographics with a decrease in New Zealand Europeans from 48 per cent to 38 per cent and an increase in Asian people from 34 per cent to 41 per cent by 2038
   
iii) a gap in neighbourhood park provision in accordance with the Open Space Provision Policy
   
iv) a shortfall of 27 field hours growing to 87 field hours by 2028
   
v) a reduction in rounds played at Chamberlain Park Golf Course from 82,371 in 2001/2002 to 50,239 in 2017/2018
   
vi) access to open space and new sport and recreation facilities will increase community benefits, in particular physical and mental health benefits
   
vii) redevelopment of Chamberlain Park aligns with Auckland Plan outcomes
   
viii) the quantifiable benefits of redeveloping Chamberlain Park are $1.2 million less than the capital and operational costs required to provide additional open space, as well as new sport and recreation facilities – an indicative cost-benefit analysis indicates the benefits are 0.96 times the costs

b) note that the board has not been provided the full indicative business case and has relied on the summary provided in the staff report to provide feedback

c) endorse that the redevelopment of Chamberlain Park has a robust case for change and strategic alignment with council objectives and would deliver community benefits comparable to the capital and operational investment required

d) endorse the development of a detailed business case for the development of Chamberlain Park, commencing in 2019/2020 based on:
   
i) development of a 3.6-hectare neighbourhood park with play area; shared walking and cycling paths and connections; the restoration of Watītikō/Meola Creek; two artificial fields; and a reconfigured nine-hole golf course with driving range and practice facilities
   
ii) indicative funding of $22 million earmarked as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028

e) request staff to work closely with the board during the development of the detailed business case for the development of Chamberlain Park to refine the scope to ensure that the development can be implemented for the lowest possible cost

f) delegate to Chairperson Haynes to provide views on the Albert-Eden Local Board One Local Initiative to the Environment and Community Committee currently scheduled for 10 July 2019.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

66. The Māori population in the study area is low at only seven per cent of the population. The population will remain stable as the local board population grows.

67. Māori participation in sport and recreation for the local board area is 79 per cent. This is the same as the rate for the local board area over-all.

68. Māori participation in golf in Tāmaki Makaurau is 2.5 per cent, higher than Māori in Albert-Eden golf participation of 0.2 per cent.

69. Māori in the local board will benefit from the more diverse sport and recreation offering as they play golf at a rate less than the general population.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

70. Each local board identified one priority project through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 process. The Finance and Performance Committee then approved provisional funding for these local board projects [FIN/2018/85 refers].

71. The Albert-Eden Local Board proposed the development of Chamberlain Park. A total of $0.100 million was allocated to develop an indicative business case. There remains $0.078 million for the development of the detailed business case.

72. Funding of $22 million was earmarked for the development. Of this, $8.2 million was allocated to deliver the status quo option. The remainder was earmarked for later delivery stages, following the indicative and detailed business case process.

73. Project capital costs are estimated to be $29.7 million. This creates a budget risk for council, however, there is sufficient One Local Initiative funding available to redevelop Chamberlain Park.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

74. There are two main risk areas with option two as outlined in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Risk identification and mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of risk</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF there are further legal challenges THEN financial and staff costs will increase</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This can be minimised by transparent and robust decision-making processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF costs of the project exceed initial estimates THEN the costs could exceed the benefits</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>This risk is assessed through sensitivity analysis and can be mitigated by obtaining detailed costing from a quantity surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All council projects are subject to financial policy decisions on cost escalation and treatment of inflation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

75. If approved, work will commence on the development of a detailed business case in 2019/2020. Figure 1 below sets out the project timing. This will include development of the financial, commercial and management cases.  

76. The timeframe for delivering the new facilities will depend on a range of factors including:
   - how long it takes to develop and obtain approval for the detailed business case
   - the time required to negotiate any partnership or commercial development opportunities.

Figure 1: Project timing
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---

5 One of the key objectives of the detailed business case will be to identify opportunities to deliver the facilities at lower cost to council. Opportunities to increase revenue, undertake partnerships or obtain sponsorship will be investigated.
Albert-Eden Local Board propose to develop Chamberlain Park

**Investment proposal**

Albert-Eden Local Board adopted the 2015 master plan for Chamberlain Park [AE/2015/127]. The master plan includes developing a more diverse golf offering, and provides for new sports fields, cycle ways and walking paths.

**Key investment objectives**

- Reduce inequities and improve health and wellbeing of the community
- Address gap in unmet leisure and recreation
- Cater for forecast population growth and changing needs
- Provide fit for purpose facilities

**Investigation of investment proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative business case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal strongly aligns with Auckland Council strategies

Supports Auckland Plan, Local Board plan and Council sports strategies

Redevelopment of Chamberlain Park in line with the master plan – providing a multi-purpose golf facility and two new sports fields, along with neighbourhood park, cycle and walk paths.

Aquatic facility has been excluded due to current work determining the optimal way to delivery this in Albert-Eden Local Board.

- Focus investment to address disparities and areas of greatest need – areas of high deprivation within catchment

- Albert-Eden Local Board Plan 2017
- Healthy and Active Communities
- Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
- Sports Facilities Investment Plan [draft]
- Golf Facilities Investment Plan [draft]
Catchment area is a future growth area with forecast population growth of 143,000 over next 20 years.
Albert-Eden has the largest projected sports field capacity shortfall in Auckland and a shortage of neighbourhood parks

There is growing unmet demand for sports fields

Shortfall in neighbourhood parks

The Albert-Eden Local Board has 230 hectares of parks and open space

The Albert-Eden Open Space Network Plan identified a significant shortfall in neighbourhood park provision when compared to the open space provision policy

There will be a gap of 87 field hours per week by 2028 in the Albert-Eden local board area. Neighbouring Waitematā local board area has the same projected shortage of 87 hours. This impacts the network, increasing demand pressure on the Albert-Eden Local Board area.
The development responds to the projected demand in a financially viable manner and increase the benefits to the community.

**Increased access will result in an increase in community physical and mental health benefits**

**Increased access will result in an increase in benefits to the community**

The graphs show the benefits in dollars, comparing the status quo and the local board option.
Redevelopment will result in increased access and numbers using Chamberlain Park

Purchase of additional land for parks is expensive and does not optimise current open space

- Albert-Eden Local Board has a high demand for land and the communities are well established making any open space acquisition for sport fields expensive
- Current open space needs to be utilised to meet growing demand
- Providing a wider sport and recreation offering will allow a wider and more diverse section of the population to utilise public open space

**Increased additional usage projected for park & pathway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Neighbourhood park</th>
<th>Cycling/walking pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>15,909</td>
<td>7,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 34</td>
<td>23,824</td>
<td>10,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decreased rounds being played at Chamberlain Park**

- [Graph showing decreased rounds from 1996 to 2018]
A range of options were considered and two potential solutions identified - both have good strategic alignment

**LOCAL BOARD OPTION**

Nine hole golf course with driving range and practice facilities, two sports fields, neighbourhood park, cycle and walking paths

**STATUS QUO OPTION**

Reconfigured 18-hole golf course with neighbourhood park, cycling and walking paths

Stage three of the master plan

**“Do nothing” option**

“Do nothing” was used to compare the two options above against. The status quo option reflects previous decisions in relation to implementing the Chamberlain Park master plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical success factors</th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Status Quo Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business need</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential value for money</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier capacity and capability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential affordability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential achievability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment objectives</th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Status Quo Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable our communities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit-for-purpose</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce inequities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public benefits and outcomes</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aucklanders more active, more often</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall assessment                            |                     |                   |
|                                               | Strong              | Moderate          | Weak              |

**KEY**

- **Strong**
- **Moderate**
- **Weak**

Environment and Community Committee

10 July 2019
The benefits of developing Chamberlain Park are comparable to the capital and operational costs

### CBA Results Summary over 34 years (present value terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Status Quo option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Present Value ($m)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$33.5m</td>
<td>$5.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$32.3m</td>
<td>$5.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Benefits</td>
<td>$(1.2m)</td>
<td>$0.4m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Status Quo option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR)*</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Rate of Return (IRR)+</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback period</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sensitivity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Status Quo option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Case</td>
<td>$25.9m</td>
<td>$5.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>$(1.2m)</td>
<td>$0.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst Case</td>
<td>$(23.4m)</td>
<td>$(3.5m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Best case:** Costs ↓ 22.5%, Benefits ↑ 15%
- **Worst case:** Costs ↑ 22.5%, Benefits ↓ 15%

---

*Benefit: cost ratio > 1 is good
+Internal rate of return > 6% is good

NPV (Net present value) assesses the value of the cash flow over the life of the project in current $. A NPV > 1 is good
Conclusion and recommendations

The indicative business case demonstrates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A strong strategic case for change</th>
<th>Marginal economic case for change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good alignment with council strategies</td>
<td>Features a number of critical success factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High population growth and increasing demand for golf and outdoor sports in catchment</td>
<td>Good alignment with investment objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population has high levels of activity and are likely to use park with increased access</td>
<td>BCR 0.96 (Local board option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current and increasing shortfall in sports fields</td>
<td>BCR 1.07 (Status Quo option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR 3.6% (Local board option)</td>
<td>IRR 4.6% (Status Quo option)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff recommend the project proceed to detailed business case based on the local boards One Local Initiative at 10 July 2019 Environment and Community Committee.

**Recommendations**

1. Development of detailed business case based on the local boards One Local Initiative

2. Engage appropriate professional services to support Detailed Business Case including quantity surveyor

*Benefit: cost ratio > 1 is good*
*Internal rate of return > 6% is good*
A degree of caution is required

1. Preferred option does not show strong economic case for change
2. Base case predicated on projected population growth
3. Potential for further legal challenges
4. Detailed facility design has not been developed and costs not reviewed by a quantity surveyor
Redevelopment of War Memorial Park, Manurewa - Indicative Business Case

File No.: CP2019/11644

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval of the findings of the indicative business case and the detailed design/business case for the redevelopment of War Memorial Park, Manurewa.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Sports field upgrades and the construction of a multi-purpose community facility at War Memorial Park were selected by the Manurewa Local Board as its One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. Funding of $17 million was earmarked for the project, following indicative and detailed business case processes.
3. Staff have developed an indicative business case to inform decision-making. Preparation of the business case entailed an investigation of community needs, an assessment of strategic alignment and an economic analysis.
4. The needs assessment demonstrates a current and future need for additional sports field capacity, but not a new local community centre.
5. Three options were assessed:
   - Option one: Service improvements to two existing quarter-size sports fields (status quo)
   - Option two: A small local community centre, a new quarter-size floodlit artificial practice turf and service improvements to all other sports fields (4.5 full-size equivalent sports fields) (One Local Initiative)
   - Option three: Reduced scope with service improvements to four full-size equivalent sports fields (preferred option).
6. The economic case identified that option three delivers community benefits above the capital and operational costs. A cost benefit analysis indicates the benefits are at least 1.73 times the costs. Option two performed poorly against criteria and economic analysis.
7. Options one and option three performed best against assessment criteria, including strategic fit, alignment to community need, alignment to future growth and value for money.
8. The key trade-offs between option one (status quo) and option three (preferred option) are:
   - Option one may not fully address local demand at War Memorial Park or Manurewa but avoids the risk of overprovision. It may require Manurewa AFC to expand to a third site to access sufficient training capacity.
   - Option three risks some over provision of winter field capacity within Manurewa but will fully address local demand at War Memorial Park. This will eliminate current risks associated with field overuse while also avoiding the need for Manurewa AFC to expand to a third site.
9. Staff recommend option three. This option demonstrates a strong case for change, provides greater future certainty, and is based on a sound economic case.
10. Staff note that the privately-owned Manurewa AFC clubrooms have been deemed as unsafe and require demolition as a matter of public safety.
11. In formal feedback on the findings of the indicative business case at its 20 June 2019 meeting, the Manurewa Local Board resolved that staff develop a detailed business case for the Manurewa Local Board One Local Initiative, commencing in 2019, to renew the Manurewa AFC building to be used as a multi-purpose facility that supports existing sports users and community uses, a new floodlit artificial turf and service improvements to all other sports fields located on War Memorial Park, Manurewa, based on funding of $17 million earmarked for allocation as part of the 10-year Budget 2018-2028.

12. This resolution is included in the recommendations outlined in this report for consideration.

13. If option three (upgrade four full-size fields) is approved, work will commence on the development of a design case in 2019/20.

14. If the renewal of the Manurewa AFC building to be used as a multi-purpose facility that supports existing sports users and community uses, a new floodlit artificial turf and service improvements to all other sports fields located on War Memorial Park, Manurewa is approved, development of a detailed business case will commence in 2019/20.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) agree the findings of an indicative business case for the redevelopment of War Memorial Park, Manurewa which found that:
   i) there is limited growth projected in the Manurewa Local Board area, which will constrain demand for new community, sport and recreation facilities
   ii) there are currently 12 community centres and community halls within the study area
   iii) there is no current gap for a new community facility in the Manurewa Local Board area
   iv) current population projections do not indicate a need for additional community facilities before 2046
   v) over the long-term, the strongest case for additional community facility capacity is likely to be in Wiri - this is due to the growth associated with Transform Manukau
   vi) there is a current gap of 120 hours of lit winter sports field capacity in the Manurewa Local Board area, of which 49 hours relates to football capacity
   vii) the provision of sand-carpeting and lighting of fields at War Memorial Park would address the projected demand for additional sports field capacity
   viii) the provision of additional sports field capacity aligns with Auckland Plan outcomes
   ix) the quantifiable benefits of providing additional sports field capacity exceed the capital and operational costs required to develop the additional capacity.

b) agree that the development of a new local community centre has a weak case for change, moderate alignment with council strategic objectives, and would not deliver community benefits above the capital and operational costs.

EITHER:

c) approve the development of a design case commencing in 2019/2020 based on option three comprising sand-carpeting and lighting improvements of four full-size equivalent sports fields and the allocation of $2.9 million of $17 million earmarked as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.
OR:
approve the development of a detailed business case commencing in 2019 for the Manurewa Local Board, One Local Initiative [resolution MR/2019/104: f(i) refers] to, to renew the Manurewa AFC building to be used as a multi-purpose facility that supports existing sports users and community uses, a new floodlit artificial turf and service improvements to all other sports fields located on War Memorial Park, Manurewa, based on funding of $17 million earmarked for allocation as part of the 10-year Budget 2018-2028.

Horopaki Context

The redevelopment War Memorial Park is a priority for the Manurewa Local Board

15. The redevelopment of War Memorial Park, Manurewa was selected by the Manurewa Local Board as its One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

16. The park currently features eight sports fields (4.75 full-size equivalent sports fields), four cricket wickets and a children’s play space. It is currently home to a football club (Manurewa AFC), a cricket club and a bowls club.

17. The existing Manurewa AFC clubrooms have fallen into disrepair and pose a risk to public safety.

18. The local board proposed:

- construction of a new multi-purpose community facility, offering bookable space capable of hosting small meetings, events and social gatherings for local community groups and sports clubs
- service improvements to the park’s existing sports fields, including conversion of the existing main training field into a floodlit artificial turf, as well as sand-carpeting and lighting all other fields.

19. The proposed community facility would be classified as a small local community centre under the Community Facilities Network Plan and would seek to replicate the successful aspects of a similar local community centre, the Manu Tukutuku – Randwick Park Sports and Neighbourhood Centre, Manurewa.

20. Although it was anticipated that the park’s existing sports clubs would be among the future users of the facility, they would not enjoy any special priority or claim to exclusive use of any part of the building. Rather, they would book it on the same terms as other users.

21. The flexible and open-access nature of the facility was seen as a core aspect of the proposal, as council does not fund dedicated sports clubrooms, sports administration buildings, or generic community venues-for-hire.

Funding was allocated in the Long-term Plan to prepare an indicative business case

22. In May 2018, the Finance and Performance Committee approved provisional funding for these local board projects [resolution FIN/2018/85].

23. A total of $0.10 million was allocated to the Manurewa Local Board to develop an indicative business case. The business case is developed in two parts – indicative and detailed business cases.

24. Funding of $17 million was earmarked for delivery of the Manurewa One Local Initiative, following indicative and detailed business case processes.
Indicative business cases are a tool to support decision-making

25. Auckland Council uses a three-stage process to investigate large-scale capital projects and new investment in community services or facilities. This approach is based on the Better Business Case model developed by the Treasury.

26. The first phase begins with a strategic needs assessment. This entails:
   • research into the profile of the community, including projected growth data
   • a summary of recent social research and any relevant community engagement surveys
   • a community facility stock-take (both council and non-council facilities)
   • a gap analysis which assesses current provision against council policy.

27. An indicative business case considers the merits of a proposed investment. It considers strategic alignment with council objectives, including the Auckland Plan. It also includes an economic case which considers the costs and benefits of various options that may achieve council’s investment goals.

28. A detailed business case can be built upon:
   • a needs assessment which demonstrates a case for change
   • a strategic assessment which shows alignment with council objectives
   • an economic case which identifies a preferred option that delivers community benefits.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

29. Staff have prepared an indicative business case for a local community centre and sports field capacity upgrades at War Memorial Park that follows council’s three stage process. A detailed overview is provided in Attachment A to this report. The key findings are outlined below.

30. War Memorial Park is well-used and well-loved by its surrounding community.
   • Council research in 2016 found 100 per cent satisfaction amongst existing users of War Memorial Park.
   • 44 per cent of users live within 10-minutes’ walk of the park, with 88 per cent of these living within five-minutes’ walk.
   • 56 per cent of users visit the park at least once a week.

31. There is limited growth projected in the study area which will constrain demand for new community, sport and recreation facilities.
   • The population living within five kilometres of War Memorial Park is projected to grow by 19 per cent from 83,344 to 99,290 people between 2016 and 2046.
   • Future growth within the Manurewa Local Board area is expected to be concentrated within the Transform Manukau development area, to the north of War Memorial Park. This area includes the Manurewa suburb of Wiri.

32. There is no service gap in the provision of relevant community facilities.
   • There are currently 12 community centres and community halls within the study area.
   • These facilities provide good coverage across Manurewa and neighbouring areas, with minimal service gaps.
33. Provision of an additional local community facility is not required.
   - Existing facilities have latent capacity to serve future growth, indicating there is no need for additional capacity at present. This finding confirms the results of an earlier council study.\(^6\)
   - The best utilised of these facilities in Manurewa is Wiri Community Hall. This is used 60 per cent of the time. Most other facilities are used less than 40 per cent of the time.
   - Current population projections do not indicate a need for additional capacity before 2046. Over the long-term, the strongest case for additional community facility capacity is likely to be in Wiri. This is due to the growth associated with Transform Manukau.

34. There is a current gap for lit winter sports field capacity in the Manurewa Local Board area.
   - There is a current gap of 120 hours of lit winter sport field capacity of which 49 hours relates to football.
   - Use of existing football fields varies across Manurewa. Some are overused, while others have spare capacity.
   - Manurewa AFC, which operates from War Memorial Park and neighbouring Jellicoe Park, is currently utilising 157 per cent of those parks existing capacity. Overuse risks damage to playing fields and acts as a constraint on the operation of the club.

35. Provision of additional sports field capacity would respond to current demand.
   - Sand-carpeting and lighting can improve the capacity of the average playing field by around 10 hours per week.
   - As part of the council’s Winter Sports Field Capacity Programme:
     - Funding has been allocated for the upgrade of two fields at Mountfort Park, Manurewa.
     - The upgrade of a further two fields at War Memorial Park is being investigated.

36. The provision of additional sports field capacity aligns with Auckland Plan outcomes.

**Table 1: Alignment with Auckland Plan 2050**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Directions and focus areas</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Belonging and Participation</td>
<td><strong>Direction 1:</strong> Foster an inclusive Auckland where everyone belongs.</td>
<td>Aligned. Provides facilities for residents to engage in sport and recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Direction 2:</strong> Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing disparities in opportunities.</td>
<td>Aligned. Ensures equitable access to sport and recreation facilities for parts of Manurewa and neighbouring local boards that are already facing capacity constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Focus Area 1:</strong> Create safe opportunities for people to meet, connect, participate in and enjoy community and civic life.</td>
<td>Aligned. Provides enough safe, shared spaces and places that are flexible in how individuals, whānau and communities can use them and that are easily accessible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^6\) The study, *The Manurewa and Manukau Central Community Needs Assessment 2016*, found no need for a new community facility, instead recommending investment in existing facilities.
### Outcome 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Directions and focus areas</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area 2</td>
<td>Provide accessible services and social and cultural infrastructure that are responsive to meeting people’s evolving needs.</td>
<td><strong>Aligned.</strong> Responds to immediate need around winter sports field capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area 6</td>
<td>Focus investment to address disparities and serve communities of greatest need.</td>
<td><strong>Aligned.</strong> Manurewa has some of the highest levels of absolute deprivation in the Auckland region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area 7</td>
<td>Recognise the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life.</td>
<td><strong>Aligned.</strong> Responds to immediate needs around football training fields.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outcome 2

**Māori identity and wellbeing**

| Direction 1 | Advance Māori wellbeing. | **Aligned.** The area has a high proportion of Māori, and football is the second most popular sport amongst local Māori. |

#### Outcome 3

**Homes and places**

| Direction 4 | Provide sufficient public spaces that are inclusive, accessible and contribute to urban living. | **Aligned.** Improves the amenity of an existing park. |

37. **The Manurewa AFC clubrooms pose a public safety risk to current park users.**

   - The existing Manurewa AFC clubrooms have fallen into disrepair and pose a risk to public safety. The clubrooms are owned by the Manurewa AFC and are situated on the upper level of the park’s grandstand, a council building.

   - The club pays a ground rent to council. The lease is being rolled over on a month-to-month basis. On the expiry of the lease, the clubrooms will revert to council ownership.

   - The clubrooms are likely to require demolition in the interest of public safety.

**There is a strategic case for sports field capacity improvements at War Memorial Park, but not a community facility**

38. **The needs assessment demonstrates a current need for additional sports field capacity, but not a community facility.**

39. **A summary of the strategic assessment is shown in Figure 1 (see page 7). It shows moderate alignment with council plans and strategies.**

40. **The economic case is summarised in Figure 2 (see page 8). It identified two options that deliver community benefits above the capital and operational costs. Both options align with council’s investment objectives and critical success factors.**
Manurewa Local Board area has a current gap of 120 hours a week for floodlit sports fields. An investigation was also undertaken of the need for future community facilities within the Memorial Park catchment based on population projections.

The proposal aligns to Council plans and strategies

- **Proposal**
  - Football fields to be redeveloped, including floodlighting and sand carpeting, as well as an artificial practice surface. A new community centre to be developed to replace irreparable football clubrooms.
  - Focus investment to address disparities and areas of greatest need
  - Recognise the value of sports and recreation to the quality of life

- **Investment Proposal**
  - **Auckland Plan**
  - **Local Board Plan**
  - **Council strategies**
  - Park and sports facilities that everyone can enjoy
  - Actively connecting everywhere, every day
  - Manurewa Open Space Network Plan
  - Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
  - Community Facilities Network Plan
  - Sports Investment Plan

The population living within five kilometres of War Memorial Park is projected to grow 19 per cent from 83,344 to 99,290 people between 2016 and 2046. This rate of growth is lower than the 48 per cent population increase across the wider Auckland region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>European</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study area**: 15 minutes driving distance from War Memorial Park. Service gaps indicated in yellow.

**Current community facilities provide good coverage across the study area**

**High Māori and Pacific population compared to Auckland, increasing Asian in future**

**Over 70 hours a week shortfall in sports fields**

---

**Environment and Community Committee**
**10 July 2019**

**Figure 1: Summary of strategic alignment**
Two potential solutions were identified from a range of options

**LOCAL BOARD OPTION**
- Build small community facility, install one artificial practice turf, upgrade all other fields, including new floodlighting

**REDUCED SCOPE OPTION**
- Upgrade four fields, including floodlighting

Reduced scope option has a higher benefit: cost ratio over 30 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA Results Summary over 30 years</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value ($m)</td>
<td>$2.1m</td>
<td>$3.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$2.9m</td>
<td>$13.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$5.0m</td>
<td>$9.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(3.5m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA Results Summary over 30 years</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR)*</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Rate of Return (IRR)+</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback period</td>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Benefit: cost ratio > 1 is good
+Internal rate of return > 5% is good

**Cost: benefit analysis – Local Board option**

**Cost: benefit analysis – Reduced scope option**

NPV (Net present value) assesses the value of the cash flow over the life of the project in current $. A NPV > 1 is good

**RISKS, CONSTRAINTS & DEPENDENCIES**

- Population projections within War Memorial Park catchment are either lower or higher than forecast
- Football participation rates decline from current projections
- Increased usage rates of nearby community facilities reducing spare capacity
- Capital costs are higher

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Indicative Business Case demonstrates that there is a potential strategic and economic case for option 2 – developing sports fields

- Recommend development of a design case for sand-carpeting and lighting improvements to service four full-size equivalent sports fields
There are three options for decision-makers to consider

41. Staff assessed three options as part of the investigation:
   - Option one: Service improvements to two existing quarter-size sports fields (status quo).
   - Option two: A small local community centre, a new quarter-size floodlit artificial practice turf and service improvements to all other sports fields (4.5 full-size equivalent sports fields) (One Local Initiative).
   - Option three: Reduced scope with service improvements to four full-size equivalent sports fields (preferred option).

42. The demolition of the Manurewa AFC clubrooms is considered likely under all future scenarios.

Option one: Service improvements to two existing sports fields (status quo)

43. Under this option, the council would progress with sand-carpeting and lighting improvements to two existing quarter-size fields including the main training area. This option would be funded from existing budgets and would not draw on One Local Initiative funding.

44. This would deliver service level improvements to approximately 10 per cent of the park’s playing surfaces and would deliver a 20 per cent increase in playing-hour capacity.

45. This option represents the level of likely investment in War Memorial Park under the council’s Winter Sports Field Capacity Programme.

46. It is unclear whether this option will fully meet current needs:
   - Manurewa AFC is currently operating across two sites (War Memorial Park and Jellicoe Park) and is using 157 per cent of its allocated field capacity. Upgrading only two fields at War Memorial Park will not deliver enough local capacity to address overuse. This means that Manurewa AFC will need to be allocated additional field capacity at a third site within Manurewa.
   - Upgrading four fields (two at War Memorial Park and two at Mountfort Park) would normally yield 40 hours additional playing capacity, nine hours short of current demand.

47. Some cricket capacity at War Memorial Park may be compromised by this option. Sand-carpeting only some winter sports fields at War Memorial Park could result in different playing surfaces within the park. This may compromise the performance of one cricket wicket, or 25 percent of the park’s existing cricket capacity.

Option two: New facility and service improvements to all existing sports fields (One Local Initiative)

48. Under this option, the council would construct a small local community centre, convert one existing quarter-size playing field into a lit artificial practice turf and provide sand-carpeting and lighting upgrades to all other sports fields (4.5 full-size equivalent fields). This reflects the outcome sought by the local board in its One Local Initiative.

49. The indicative cost of delivering this option is $13 million of One Local Initiative funding.

50. The benefits of this option are that:
   - it would fully address local field capacity constraints faced by Manurewa AFC at the War Memorial Park
   - the community centre would take immediate pressure off adjacent Wiri Community Hall, a highly utilised venue-for-hire. It would also help meet future population growth in Wiri over the next 30 years
   - consistent treatment of all sports fields under this option would support retention of 100 per cent of the park’s existing cricket capacity.
51. However, this option would result in an over-provision of both community space and sports field capacity. It would also be the most expensive of the three options assessed.

**Option three: Service improvements to four existing sports fields (reduced scope option)**

52. Under this option, council would invest in sand-carpeting and field lighting upgrades for four full-size equivalent sports fields. This would result in service level improvements to approximately 80 per cent of the park’s playing surfaces and an up to 90 per cent increase in playing hour capacity.

53. The indicative cost of delivering this option is $2.9 million of One Local Initiative funding.

54. This option risks nominal over provision of sports field capacity within the Manurewa Local Board area. However, it would resolve current issues of sports field overuse at War Memorial Park and remove the need for Manurewa AFC to expand to a third site.

55. The lack of a new community facility under this option means it is unlikely to satisfy public expectations for the development of the park. This presents a reputational risk to council.

**Staff have developed criteria to assess the three options**

56. Staff developed the following assessment criteria to enable the comparison of the options:

   - Current need: Does a demonstrable community need currently exist?
   - Future growth: Is the scale of the option proportionate to future population growth?
   - Strategic alignment: Is this something we should be doing?
   - Value for money: Do the benefits associated with an option exceed its costs?

57. These criteria are unweighted and allow for objective assessment.

**Options one and three are best aligned with the assessment criteria**

58. A summary of the options against the assessment criteria is provided in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current needs</th>
<th>Future growth</th>
<th>Strategic alignment</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option one (status quo)</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Service improvements to two quarter-size sports fields</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option two (One Local Initiative)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>New facility and service improvements to all sports fields</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option three (reduced scope option)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Service improvements to four full-size equivalent sports fields</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating scale key**

- No tick: Does not meet
- ✓ ✓ Low
- ✓ ✓ ✓ Fair
- ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ High
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59. When the criteria are applied, option three (upgrade four full-size fields) scores the highest. While it could result in some overprovision of football field capacity, it is well aligned to relevant council strategies for sports field provision. It is a proportionate response to address issues of overuse at War Memorial Park. Economic analysis suggests that it would deliver sufficient additional benefit to justify these costs.

60. Option one (upgrade two quarter-size fields) is next best option. This option is well aligned with relevant council policies and is low-cost to implement. While it avoids the risk of overprovision, it is unclear whether it would fully satisfy current and future need within Manurewa. It would not directly address current capacity constraints at War Memorial Park.

61. Option two (new facility and upgrade all fields) is best aligned with local community expectations. However, it is the least aligned to local need or the council’s strategies and practices. It is the costliest option and is not expected to generate sufficient social or economic benefits to justify investment.

**Option three, which delivers positive economic returns to the community, is recommended**

62. Options two (new facility and upgrade all fields) and option three (upgrade four full-size fields) were subject to economic analysis to identify benefits above the status quo.

63. The primary benefits are improved physical and mental health outcomes to users. These are $7.5 million for option two, and $4.5 million for option three. Other benefits include improved productivity, reduced unemployment and decreased crime.

64. The net benefit of option three is over $2.1 million in present-day terms. The ratio of benefits to costs is at least 1.73.

65. The high capital cost of delivering a new community facility hampers the performance of option two. It would deliver net benefits of negative $3.5 million in present-day terms. This option has a benefit-to-cost ratio of 0.73.

66. Staff recommend the development of a design case based on option three. There is a robust strategic case for change and a sound economic case.

67. Alternatively, the council could choose to proceed to the detailed business case based on the Manurewa Local Board One Local Initiative [resolution MR/2019/104: f(i) refers] made at its 20 June 2019 meeting to renew the Manurewa AFC building to be used as a multi-purpose facility that supports existing sports users and community uses, a new floodlit artificial turf and service improvements to all other sports fields located on War Memorial Park, Manurewa.

**There are some limitations with the data, but these are not material**

68. Some research and survey data lacked enough detail to aggregate at the level of the study area. Where data could not be separated, it is presented at local board level or at Auckland level.

69. Population growth is based on projections. There is a risk of growth being higher than forecast. That would result in additional pressure on existing facilities. The final timing and scale of growth in Wiri is uncertain, as it depends on future decisions by Panuku Development and the Crown for the joint development of the Transform Manukau area.

70. The cost-benefit analysis required the use of some assumptions. A key assumption was that demand was a mixture of new demand, current demand increased through closer service provision and current demand switching from other facilities. Only the first two provide quantifiable benefits to council.

71. Other assumptions were made on inflation, the deadweight loss of council investment and consumer surplus.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

72. Council staff will take action based on the decision of the Environment and Community Committee.

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

73. Redevelopment of War Memorial Park will enhance sport and recreational opportunities in northern Manurewa and neighbouring areas.

74. Residents of Manurewa and neighbouring areas are less active when compared to all Aucklanders. Sports field capacity constraints may be a contributing factor to this.

75. Football is the single most popular sport within the study area, and War Memorial Park has the best utilised sports fields.

76. Feedback from Manurewa residents shows a willingness to spend more time in parks if more facilities, events and programmes were provided, and if the safety of parks was improved.

77. The Manurewa Local Board selected the redevelopment of War Memorial Park as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

78. Workshop sessions were held with Manurewa Local Board in August 2018, March 2019 and June 2019. These sessions focused on the study area, the methodology, research, data, documents and processes used for the indicative business case.

79. On 20 June 2019, findings were presented to the Manurewa Local Board business meeting.

80. The local board endorsed the findings of staff on the need for service improvements to the fields at War Memorial Park.

81. The local board did not endorse the findings of staff on the lack of need for a new community due to:
   - concerns about the study area and the population growth data
   - concerns that the views of the community were not adequately considered
   - concerns that the range of alternative options considered was too limited
   - concerns that accommodation for the existing sports users of War Memorial Park was not adequately considered.

82. The board resolved [resolution MR/2019/104: (f) refers] that staff develop a detailed business case for the Manurewa Local Board One Local Initiative, commencing in 2019, to renew the Manurewa AFC building to be used as a multi-purpose facility that supports existing sports users and community uses, a new floodlit artificial turf and service improvements to all other sports fields located on War Memorial Park, Manurewa, based on funding of $17 million earmarked for allocation as part of the 10-year Budget 2018-2028.

83. This resolution is included in the recommendations outlined in this report for consideration.

84. The full local board resolution is included as Attachment B to this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

85. Twenty-one per cent of the population of the study area identify as Māori. This is significantly higher than the 10.7 per cent of the population who identify as Māori across Auckland.

86. Manurewa’s Māori population is slightly more active than the wider local board population (25.7 per cent inactive), and near the average for the wider Auckland region (24.7 per cent).
87. Football is the second most popular sporting activity amongst Manurewa’s Māori communities, with 6.8 per cent participation.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

88. Each local board identified one priority project through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 process. The Finance and Performance Committee then approved provisional funding for these local board projects [resolution FIN/2018/85].

89. The Manurewa Local Board proposed a redevelopment of War Memorial Park, including a new community facility. A total of $0.100 million was allocated to develop an indicative business case. Only $0.025 million has been spent to-date.

90. Funding of $17 million was earmarked for the redevelopment of War Memorial Park, subject to approval of the indicative and detailed business cases.

91. There is enough One Local Initiative funding available to deliver the redevelopment.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

92. There are three main risks associated with the two options outlined in the report recommendations. These are shown below in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Risk identification and mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputational risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF the council chooses not to invest in a community multisport facility THEN council’s reputation could be impacted in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF costs of the project exceed initial estimates THEN the costs could exceed the benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF population growth rates exceed projections THEN demand for additional facilities may come sooner than expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

93. If option three (upgrade four full-size fields) is approved, work will commence on the development of a design case in 2019/20.
94. If the Manurewa Local Board One Local Initiative [resolution MR/2019/104: f(i) refers] to renew the Manurewa AFC building to be used as a multi-purpose facility that supports existing sports users and community uses, a new floodlit artificial turf and service improvements to all other sports fields located on War Memorial Park, Manurewa is approved, development of a detailed business case will commence in 2019/20.

95. Operational funding may need to be allocated for the development of the detailed design or business cases.

96. The timeframe for delivery will depend on how long it takes to develop and obtain approval for the design case or detailed business case.
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Indicative Business Case Summary

Redevelopment of Manurewa War Memorial Park
Manurewa Local Board propose to redevelop War Memorial Park

**Investment Proposal**

The Finance and Performance Committee earmarked $17 million of funding for the redevelopment of War Memorial Park [Resolution FIN/2018/85], following indicative and detailed business case processes.

The proposed development included sand carpeting and floodlighting of 4.75 full-size equivalent sports fields, an artificial practice surface and a new community centre.

**Key Investment Objectives**

- Reduce inequities and improve health and wellbeing of the community
- Address gap in unmet leisure and recreation
- Cater for potential future need
- Provide fit for purpose facilities

**Investigation of investment proposals**

**Indicative business case**

- Phase 1: Needs assessment
- Phase 2: Strategic case
- Phase 3: Economic case
The proposal aligns with some Auckland Council strategies

Supports Auckland Plan, Local Board plan and Council sports strategies

Proposal
Football fields to be redeveloped, including floodlighting and sand carpeting, as well as an artificial practice surface. A new community centre to be developed to replace irreparable football clubrooms.

Focus investment to address disparities and areas of greatest need

Recognise the value of sports and recreation to the quality of life

✓ Park and sports facilities that everyone can enjoy
✓ Actively connecting everywhere, every day
✓ Manurewa Open Space Network Plan
✓ Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
✓ Community Facilities Network Plan
✓ Sport Investment Plan [draft]
Population within five kilometres of War Memorial Park will grow by 19% (9500 people) by 2046
Population has high proportion of Māori and Pacific, and high levels of deprivation

The proposal meets desired outcomes around addressing inequities, however, this needs to be balanced against the fact that facilities in Manurewa are not well utilised at present.
Manurewa has a significant shortfall of weekday floodlit fields in Auckland. Football has the highest shortfall.

**Shortfall in weekday sports fields floodlighting**

**Shortfall in floodlighting capacity - Manurewa**

- Council’s Winter Sport Field Capacity Programme
  - Sand-carpeting and lighting upgrades to four fields is minimum level of investment required to meet future football demand in Manurewa
  - Funding has been approved for redevelopment of two fields at Mountfort Park
  - Minimum requirement redeveloping two fields at War Memorial Park
No service gap in the provision of community facilities

Current facilities provide good coverage with minimal service gaps

Use of Council facilities

- There are 12 Council-owned or supported facilities within study area
- These facilities are under-utilised
- The average utilisation rate for community centres within Manurewa is 36 percent.
- Forecast population growth is likely to take place in the Northern part of the Manurewa catchment – current facilities are mostly located in Central and Southern Manurewa
- There is potential for future community facilities for Wiri and Papakura North

Study area:
15 minutes driving distance from War Memorial Park
Yellow area indicates service gaps near Auckland Botanic Gardens
A range of options were identified and two potential solutions identified – a reduced scope option has good alignment

**LOCAL BOARD OPTION**

New community facility, artificial practice turf, sand-carpeting and floodlights for 4.75 full-size equivalent fields

To be provided at Council-owned War Memorial Park

**REduced SCOPE OPTION**

Four full-size equivalent sports fields with sand-carpeting and floodlights

**Critical success factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Local board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business need</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier capacity and capability</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential achievability</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investment objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Local board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable our communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit-for-purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce inequities</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do more with less</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall assessment**

- **Strong**
- **Moderate**
- **Weak**
Local Board option would not deliver positive economic returns

CBA Results Summary over 30 years (present value terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value ($m)</td>
<td>$13.0m</td>
<td>$2.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$13.0m</td>
<td>$2.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$9.4m</td>
<td>$5.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Benefits</td>
<td>$(3.5m)</td>
<td>$2.1m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

- Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR) 0.73 vs. 1.73
- Internal Rate of Return (IRR) 1.2% vs. 9.2%
- Payback period N/A vs. 13 years

Sensitivity Analysis

- Best Case: Cost Ratio 1.4 vs. 3.4
- Base Case: Cost Ratio 0.7 vs. 1.7
- Worst Case: Cost Ratio 0.3 vs. 0.8

Best case: Costs ↓22.5%, Benefits ↑15%
Worst case: Costs ↑22.5%, Benefits ↓15%

Cost : benefit analysis – Local board option

Cost : benefit analysis – Reduced scope option

Benefit : cost ratio > 1 is good
Internal rate of return > 6% is good

NPV (Net present value) assesses the value of the cash flow over the life of the project in current $. A NPV > 1 is good
Conclusion and recommendations

The indicative business case demonstrates

A strategic case for change for reduced scope option

- Some alignment with council strategies
- Shortfall in provision of floodlit sports fields in the area
- Good provision of community facilities with spare capacity
- Projected population growth in northern Manurewa may see need for community facilities in the future

An economic case for change for reduced scope option

- Features a number of critical success factors
- Good alignment with investment objectives
- BCR 0.73 (Local board option)
- BCR 1.73 (Reduced scope option)
- IRR 1.2% (Local board option)
- IRR 9.2% (Reduced scope option)

The reduced scope option with sports field upgrades only demonstrates higher value for money

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Development of design case commencing in 2019/20 for sports field upgrades

2. Engage appropriate professional services to support design case, including quantity surveyor

Benefit : cost ratio > 1 is good
Internal rate of return > 6% is good
A degree of caution is required

1. Demand projections based on current sports participation levels in local area
2. Current provision and usage of community facilities does not support new facility being built
3. Potential for oversupply of football fields with proposed Mountfort Park redevelopment
4. Detailed design has not been investigated and costs have not been reviewed by a quantity surveyor
Indicative business case: Redevelopment of War Memorial Park, Manurewa

Resolution number MR/2019/104

MOVED by Chairperson A Dalton, seconded by Member R McLean:

That the Manurewa Local Board:

a) receive the staff report on the indicative business case for the Manurewa Local Board One Local Initiative, redevelopment of War Memorial Park, Manurewa.

b) note that the board has not been provided the full indicative business case and has relied on the summary provided in the staff report to provide feedback.

c) note that:

i) Finance and Performance Committee Resolution number FIN/2018/85 adopted the following recommendation regarding earmarking of funding to be allocated for the board’s One Local Initiative proposal:

Manurewa Local Board Manurewa War Memorial Park redevelopment including a multipurpose facility and upgrade of sports fields - Revised rationale and recommendation:

A) addresses community asset need and identified shortfall in sports field capacity

B) allocate funding for business case to identify investment options to increase sports field capacity and investment in new built facility to support existing sport users and potential additional sports and community uses - FY19

C) local board to allocate funding to support development of community led masterplan – FY19

D) detailed design and consents for sports field works - FY19

E) earmark funding for sports field physical works, subject to assessment and detailed design work in FY20

F) earmark funding for design and consents for new built facility in FY20, and delivery in FY21-22, subject to scope, estimated costs, potential other funding sources and timing in business case.

ii) based on the staff report, the board considers that:

A) the indicative business case goes beyond the committee’s request to “identify investment options” and report on the “scope, estimated costs, potential other funding sources and timing” of the One Local Initiative proposal. It instead revisits the rationale for the proposal.

B) the indicative business case does not reflect either the committee’s expectations as set out in the resolution above or the understanding of the board regarding the process to be followed. OLI proposals that were recommended to the committee for earmarking of funding were considered to have
already demonstrated a case for change, a financial case and assessed options to determine value for money.

iii) the community led masterplan and detailed design and consents for sports field works have not been completed as requested by the committee.

d) endorse the findings of the staff report on the indicative business case supporting the need for service improvements to the fields at War Memorial Park to address the projected demand for additional sports field capacity, and provides the following feedback:

i) the shortfall of weekday floodlit sports field capacity in Manurewa has been known since at least October 2017. At that time, there was only one local board area with a larger shortfall than Manurewa.

ii) there is still a need for the shortfall in sports field capacity in Manurewa to be addressed through the sports field renewal process, regardless of the outcome of the One Local Initiative process.

e) do not endorse the findings of the staff report on the indicative business case regarding the need for additional community facilities in Manurewa and provides the following feedback:

i) the findings of the indicative business case are limited due to the data used by staff. The board notes the following limitations.

A) population information that has been used is of a historical nature and the results of the 2018 Census are not yet available.

B) population growth projections are less reliable for smaller populations and over longer time periods.

C) resource consent and building consent data has not been used to assess levels of housing intensification in the area. The area surrounding War Memorial Park includes Terraced Housing and Apartment Building zoning, and the board is aware of several resource consent applications proposing intensive housing development in this area.

D) the “12 community centres and community halls within the study area” include venues-for-hire and community houses that are not comparable with the facility proposed by the board. Five of the twelve are not located within the Manurewa Local Board area. It is not appropriate to consider usage of these venues-for-hire and community houses to determine whether there is demand for the facility proposed by the board, as they do not meet the same needs as the One Local Initiative proposal.

ii) according to the current population growth projections, the population of the Manurewa Local Board area is projected to be over 100,000 within 30 years. Manurewa will still be one of the most populous local board areas and it is important to provide for the future needs of this population.

iii) despite the expected higher rate of population growth in Wiri over the next 30 years, the projected population of the War Memorial Park catchment area will still be considerably larger than that of Wiri during that time. The board does not believe that it is reasonable to meet the needs of either of these communities at the expense of the
iv) in areas where projected population growth is lower than average, assets will still need to be renewed or replaced over time, and new assets will need to be built. An approach that determines asset investment based on population growth alone would not allow for building and renewing assets in these areas. For this reason, the board believes that factors other than population growth must also be considered when making decisions on investment in assets.

v) the board embraced the intent of the council’s empowered communities approach when it began working on this project in 2016, and anticipated staff would take this approach into account when conducting the indicative business case. However, engagement with the local community, local schools, park users, sports clubs and other stakeholders has not been carried out as a part of the indicative business case, and the views and aspirations of the community have not been taken into consideration. Feedback received during engagement for the Manurewa Local Board Plan 2017 and 10-year Budget 2018-2028 indicated strong community support for this proposal.

vi) the report does not provide evidence that the indicative business case included consideration of the social impacts of failing to provide a new facility for this community.

vii) the description of the proposed facility as a “small community facility” used in the indicative business case is not consistent with the board’s proposal, which was for a multi-purpose facility that supports existing sports users and community uses. Using the narrow definition of a “small community facility” in the Community Facilities Network Plan has constrained analysis of the available options in the following ways:

A) the need to provide accommodation for the existing sports users of War Memorial Park (Manurewa AFC, Manukau City Cricket Club and Homai Bowling Club) has not been considered. Options one and three do not include accommodation suitable for use by the sports clubs.

B) options that lower the cost of construction, such as the use of containers or pre-fabricated buildings have not been considered.

C) alternative options that include accommodation for the existing sports users have not been considered. As these have not been considered, the board is unable to assess their merits relative to the three options included in the indicative business case. Options that have not been assessed include (but are not limited to) the following options.

1) a multi-purpose facility that provides accommodation for the existing sports users and a shared community space, service improvements to some or sports fields without a new floodlit artificial turf.

2) a lower cost facility that provides accommodation for Manurewa AFC only and a shared community space, a new floodlit artificial turf and service improvements to all other sports fields.
3) a lower cost facility that provides accommodation for Manurewa AFC only and a shared community space, service improvements to some or sports fields without a new floodlit artificial turf.

4) a multi-purpose facility that provides accommodation for the existing sports users without a shared community space, a new floodlit artificial turf and service improvements to all other sports fields.

5) a multi-purpose facility that provides accommodation for the existing sports users without a shared community space, service improvements to some or sports fields without a new floodlit artificial turf.

6) a facility that provides joint accommodation for Manurewa AFC and Manukau City Cricket Club without a shared community space, a new floodlit artificial turf and service improvements to all other sports fields.

7) a facility that only provides joint accommodation for Manurewa AFC and Manukau City Cricket Club without a shared community space, service improvements to some or sports fields without a new floodlit artificial turf.

f) request that:
   i) staff develop a detailed business case for the Manurewa Local Board One Local Initiative, commencing in 2019, to renew the Manurewa AFC building to be used as a multi-purpose facility that supports existing sports users and community uses, a new floodlit artificial turf and service improvements to all other sports fields located on War Memorial Park, Manurewa, based on funding of $17 million earmarked for allocation as part of the 10-year Budget 2018-2028.

   ii) Community Facilities lead discussion with the local community, local schools, park users, sports clubs and other stakeholders and seek agreement with Manurewa AFC regarding the future of the Manurewa AFC building.

   g) delegate to Chairperson Angela Dalton and Member Joseph Allan to provide views on the Manurewa Local Board One Local Initiative to the Environment and Community Committee currently scheduled for 9 July 2019.

   h) request that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all local boards for their information.

CARRIED
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek agreement to the findings of the indicative business case and for the development of a detailed business case for a local indoor courts facility in Kumeu-Huapai.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Development of a local indoor court facility was selected by the Rodney Local Board as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. Funding of $22.4 million was earmarked for the project, following indicative and detailed business case processes.

3. Staff have developed an indicative business case to inform decision-making on future community investment. Preparation of the business case entailed an investigation of community need, an assessment of strategic alignment and an economic analysis.

4. The needs assessment demonstrates a current and future community need.

5. The strategic assessment shows strong alignment with council plans, strategies and resolutions.

6. The economic case identified two options that deliver community benefits above the capital and operational costs.

7. Three options were assessed:
   - Option one: indoor court provision of one-to-two courts in Rodney by 2026 (status-quo)
   - Option two: two full-sized indoor courts with indoor cricket nets and squash courts in Kumeu-Huapai (One Local Board Initiative)
   - Option three: two full-sized indoor courts in Kumeu-Huapai.

8. Growth is projected in and around Kumeu-Huapai. This will create demand for new sport and recreation facilities. There is a current and growing gap in indoor court provision in the area. Provision of a local facility with two full-sized indoor courts by 2021 would respond to projected demand and aligns with the Community Facilities Network Plan.

9. Options two and three feature critical success factors and meet Auckland Council’s investment objectives. Both options also deliver confirmed health and social benefits to the community. A cost-benefit analysis indicates the benefits are at least 1.6 times the costs.

10. Staff recommend the development of a detailed business case based on options two and three rather than a single preferred option. There is a robust strategic case for change and a sound economic case. The Rodney Local Board endorsed the development of a detailed business case for indoor courts based on options two and three.

11. The next step recommended is to develop a detailed business case commencing in 2019/2020.

12. There is a medium partnership risk that the Kumeu Squash Club may choose not to invest in the proposed local indoor court facility. This is mitigated by assessing both options two and three in the detailed business case.
Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) agree the findings of an indicative business case for the development of a local indoor court facility in Kumeu-Huapai, which found that:

i) there is significant growth projected in the Kumeu-Huapai area of Rodney Local Board, which will create demand for new sport and recreation facilities

ii) there is a current gap of one indoor court growing to two by at least 2021 in the Kumeu-Huapai area

iii) provision of a local facility with two full-sized indoor courts from 2021 would respond to the projected demand and aligns with the Community Facilities Network Plan

iv) Kumeu-Huapai is an optimal location to respond to the projected population growth and to fill the future gap in the network

v) the provision of indoor courts aligns with Auckland Plan outcomes

vi) the quantifiable benefits of providing a local facility with two full-sized indoor courts exceed the capital and operational costs required to develop the facility.

b) agree that there is a robust strategic and economic case for investment in the development of a two-court indoor facility in Kumeu-Huapai.

c) agree the development of a detailed business case for indoor courts, commencing in 2019/2020 based on:

i) an indicative funding investment of $22.4 million earmarked as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028


d) agree that the development of a detailed business case for indoor courts in Kumeu-Huapai be included as a priority action in the Community Facilities Action Plan.

Horopaki

Context

Development of a local indoor court facility is a priority for the Rodney Local Board

13. Development of a local indoor court facility was selected by the Rodney Local Board as their One Local Initiative for funding as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

14. The local board proposed two full-sized indoor courts with provision for indoor cricket nets and squash courts. The proposed multi-use facility could cater for a wider variety of sporting codes such as netball, badminton and futsal.

15. The proposed site at Huapai Domain was identified in a feasibility study commissioned by Rodney Local Board. It is council-owned open space. No additional land is required to deliver the project.

16. The Finance and Performance Committee approved provisional funding for One Local Initiative projects [FIN/2018/85 refers].

17. A total of $80,000 was allocated to the Rodney Local Board for a business case. The business case is developed in two parts - indicative and detailed business cases.
18. Funding of $22.4 million was earmarked for the local indoor court facility to service Kumeu-Huapai, following the indicative and detailed business case processes.

**Indicative business cases are a tool to support decision-making**
19. Auckland Council uses a three-stage process to investigate large-scale capital projects and new investment in community services or facilities. This approach is based on the Business Case model developed by the Treasury.

20. The first phase begins with a needs assessment. This entails:
   - research into the profile of the community, including projected growth data
   - a summary of recent social research and any relevant community engagement surveys
   - a community facility stocktake (both council and non-council facilities)
   - a gap analysis which assesses current provision against council policy.

21. An indicative business case considers the merits of a proposed investment. It considers strategic alignment with council objectives. It includes an economic case which considers the costs and benefits of various options that may achieve council’s investment goals.

22. A detailed business case can be built upon:
   - a needs assessment which demonstrates a robust case for change
   - a strategic assessment which shows alignment with council objectives
   - an economic case that identifies a preferred option(s) that delivers community benefits and value for money.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice**
23. The key findings of the indicative business case for a local indoor court facility are outlined below (see Attachment A for a more detailed overview).

24. There is significant growth projected in the Kumeu-Huapai area, which will create demand for new sport and recreation facilities.
   - The local population is projected to grow 35 per cent from 16,880 to 22,908 people between 2016 and 2031.
   - Sport preferences are changing with an increase of 4300 indoor court users forecast by 2033. This is in addition to increased demand driven by population growth.

25. There is a current gap of one indoor court growing to two from 2021.
   - Population data suggest that there is a current gap in indoor court provision in the study area, growing to two-courts by 2021.
   - There are no multi-sport indoor court facilities available to the public in the study area.
   - Provision is being met by an active population in undersized community facilities. This confirms the need for fit-for-purpose indoor courts.

26. Provision of a local facility from 2021 would respond to the projected demand and aligns with the Community Facilities Network Plan.
   - The plan notes that a leisure facility can provide services to a population of approximately 18,000. The study area population is projected to be 17,902 by 2021.
   - The plan proposes that two indoor courts serve a five-kilometre urban catchment. Currently there are no public indoor courts in study area.
   - The plan also proposes that an indoor court facility within a 30-minute drive, or roughly one indoor court per 9000 people in rural areas. There is currently no rural provision.
27. Kumeu-Huapai is an optimal location to respond to the projected population growth and to fill the future gap in the network.
   - The proposed facility will service both the rural and urban populations of the area as defined by the Community Facilities Network Plan. There are no fit-for-purpose multi-sport indoor court facilities available to the public in the study area.
   - Kumeu-Huapai is zoned as future urban zone in the Unitary Plan.
   - The proposed facility would be able to serve rural communities such as Muriwai and Helensville.
   - Kumeu-Huapai and rural residents are travelling to Massey-Leisure centre for indoor-court provision. This facility is nearing capacity and was intended to serve a different catchment.

28. The provision of indoor courts aligns with Auckland Plan outcomes, see Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Direction or focus area</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1: Belonging and participating</td>
<td>Direction 2: improve health and wellbeing of all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities</td>
<td>Aligns through providing sport and recreation facilities for under serviced and rural communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus area 2: provide accessible services and social and cultural infrastructure that are responsive in meeting peoples evolving needs</td>
<td>Aligns through providing a multi-purpose facility that can change in response to our changing population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus area 6: focus investment to address disparities and serve communities of greatest need</td>
<td>Aligns through providing the facility where there is an identified community need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus area 7: recognise the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life.</td>
<td>Aligns through quantifying the benefits to the community of the facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a robust case for change for the proposed facility

29. The needs assessment demonstrates a current and future community need.

30. The strategic assessment shows strong alignment with council plans, strategies and resolutions.

31. The economic case identified two options that deliver community benefits above the capital and operational costs. Both options align with council’s investment objectives and critical success factors.
Investment proposal: Indoor multi-sport facility

The Kumeu/Huapai area currently has no public indoor sport facility. An investigation suggests there is a need for an indoor court facility based on the current population and growth projections.

The proposal aligns to Council plans and strategies

Proposal
A multi-use facility to cater to a wider variety of sporting codes including two full-sized indoor courts with provision for indoor cricket nets and squash courts.

- Park and sports facilities that everyone can enjoy
- Focus investment to address disparities and areas of greatest need
- Recognise the value of sports and recreation to the quality of life
- Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
- Community Facilities Network Plan
- Sports Investment Plan

Growing population and changing demographic over the next 20 years

Population growth by 2031

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>European</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 22,000 in study area

Less European

Growing older

- 2013: 43 yrs
- 2038: 45 yrs

No fit-for-purpose indoor facilities in area

Significant growth in indoor users forecast over the next 20 years

- 2021
- 2026
- 2031
- 2036

Study area: 5 kilometres of Kumeu-Huapai, plus 30 minute drive time from rural areas

Source: Auckland Regional Transport forecasts
Two potential solutions were identified from a range of options

**LOCAL BOARD OPTION**
- 2 indoor courts with provision for squash & cricket

**REDUCED SCOPE OPTION**
- 2 indoor court facility (no squash or cricket)

Reduced scope option has a higher benefit: cost ratio over 30 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value ($m)</td>
<td>$22.3m</td>
<td>$17.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$85.7m</td>
<td>$32.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Benefits</td>
<td>$13.4m</td>
<td>$14.6m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CBA Results Summary over 30 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Rate of Return (IRR)</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback period</td>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefit: cost ratio > 1 is good
Internal rate of return > 6% is good

**Cost : benefit analysis – Local Board option**

NPV (Net present value) assesses the value of the cash flow over the life of the project in current $. A NPV > 1 is good

**RISKS, CONSTRAINTS & DEPENDENCIES**

- Population projections and growth rates are lower than forecast
- Capital costs are higher
- Sports activity rates decline from current levels
- Kumeu Rackets Club may not wish to invest in the new facility

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Indicative Business Case demonstrates that there is a strong strategic and economic case for developing the indoor court facility.

**Recommended next step is development of a Detailed Business Case for both options**
Staff assessed three options, but only two options address the identified provision gap

32. Staff assessed three options as a part of the investigation:
   - **Option one**: Indoor court provision of one-to-two courts in Rodney by 2026 (status quo)
   - **Option two**: Two full-sized indoor courts with indoor cricket nets and squash courts in Kumeu-Huapai (One Local Board Initiative)
   - **Option three**: Two full-sized indoor courts in Kumeu-Huapai.

Option one: Indoor court provision of one-to-two courts in Rodney by 2026 (status quo)

33. The status quo entails the development of key moves to address a future gap in recreation and leisure, with the provision of one-to-two courts in the Rodney area by 2026.

34. This is in accordance with the findings of the North-West Community Facility Provision Investigation approved by the Environment and Community Committee on 16 October 2018 [ENV/2018/131 refers].

35. This option has been discounted because a more recent assessment, with a different catchment area, found both a need and a provision gap centered around Kumeu-Huapai. A key difference was that the scope of the North-West Community Facility Provision Investigation did not include the wider rural population in this part of Rodney.

36. The facility proposed under options two and three will service both the rural population and the urban Kumeu-Huapai area.

Option two: Two full-sized indoor courts with indoor cricket nets and squash courts in Kumeu-Huapai (One Local Board Initiative)

37. Option two was developed by the Rodney Local Board as their One Local Initiative. It entails two full-sized indoor courts with provision for indoor cricket nets and squash courts.

38. This option has strong strategic alignment. It also provides a broad range of sport and recreation opportunities. However, there are higher costs with this proposal.

Option three: Two full-sized indoor courts in Kumeu-Huapai

39. This option consists of a standard local indoor court facility with two full-sized indoor courts.

40. The benefits of this option are lower costs that respond directly to the identified need.

41. It would deliver fewer community benefits than option two.

Options two and three align with investment objectives and deliver community benefits

42. Options two and three align with critical success factors and council’s investment objectives:
   - enable our communities: fulfil Auckland Plan outcomes through increased participation in indoor sports by enhancing the current network of facilities.
   - fit-for-purpose: provide greater efficiencies through investing in multi-use facilities rather that single codes. This will support our diverse communities and provide greater efficiencies.
   - reduce inequities: reduce inequities between communities through providing facilities where the greatest need exists. This will address disparities in sport and recreation outcomes and ensure a robust network of facilities across Auckland.
   - do more with less: provide greater value for dollar spend by leveraging partnerships.
   - evidence based: prioritise indoor court facilities that will have the greatest impact based on evidence backed investment, shifting from an ad-hoc mentality.

43. Both options deliver positive economic returns to the community.
44. The net benefits of options two and three are over $13 million in present day terms. The ratio of benefits to costs are at least 1.6 showing that for every dollar of cost the community gets $1.60 in benefit.

45. The primary benefits are improved physical and mental health outcomes to users. These exceed $23 million for options two and three.

46. Other benefits included improved productivity, reduced unemployment and decreased crime.

47. The main costs come from the high capital costs of the facility ($15 million).

48. Sensitivity analysis which increased capital costs by 30 per cent still showed a net benefit of at least $8.9 million.

**Staff recommend the development of a detailed business case based on options two and three**

49. The development of a detailed business case for options two and three is recommended. There is a robust strategic case for change and a sound economic case.

50. There is a medium partnership risk that the Kumeu Squash Club may choose not to invest in the proposed local indoor court facility. This is mitigated by assessing both options two and three in the detailed business case.

51. The detailed business case will determine which of the options is: (1) viable (the financial case); affordable (the commercial case); and (3) achievable (the management case).

**There are some limitations with the data, but these are not material**

52. Population growth is based on projections. There is a risk of growth being significantly lower than forecasted. This would result in underutilisation of the facility.

53. The cost-benefit analysis required the use of some assumptions. A key assumption was that demand was a mixture of new demand, current demand increased through closer service provision and current demand switching from other facilities. Only the first two provide quantifiable benefits to council.

54. Other assumptions were made on inflation, the deadweight loss of council investment and consumer surplus. If these assumptions are incorrect it could weaken the economic case for investment. This financial risk has been mitigated by sensitivity analysis.

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

55. If approved council staff will undertake the detailed business case.

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

56. Development of a local indoor court facility will enhance sport and recreational opportunities in Kumeu-Huapai and neighbouring areas.

57. People in Kumeu-Huapai and neighbouring areas are highly active when compared to all Aucklanders suggesting any facility will have high usage.

58. The Rodney Local Board selected the development of a local indoor court facility as their One Local Initiative and has previously shown support for multi-sport facilities [RD/2019/6].

59. On 13 June 2019, the findings of the indicative business case were presented to the local board. The views of the local board on these findings were sought through this report.
60. The Rodney Local Board at its meeting on 20 June 2019, resolved to [Resolution RD/2019/1]:

   a) **endorse the findings of an indicative business case for the development of a local indoor court facility in Kumeu-Huapai,** which found that:

      i) **there is significant growth projected in the Kumeu-Huapai area of Rodney Local Board,** which will create demand for new sport and recreation facilities

      ii) **there is a current gap of one indoor court growing to two by at least 2021 in the Kumeu-Huapai area**

      iii) **provision of a local facility with two full-sized indoor courts from 2021 would respond to the projected demand and aligns with the Community Facilities Network Plan**

      iv) **Kumeu-Huapai is an optimal location to respond to the projected population growth and to fill the future gap in the network**

      v) **the provision of indoor courts aligns with Auckland Plan outcomes**

      vi) **the quantifiable benefits of providing a local facility with two full-sized indoor courts exceed the capital and operational costs required to develop the facility.**

   b) **endorse that there is a robust strategic and economic case for investment in the development of a two-court indoor facility in Kumeu-Huapai.**

   c) **endorse the development of a detailed business case for indoor courts,** commencing in 2019/2020 based on:

      i) **an indicative funding investment of $22.4 million earmarked as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028**

      ii) **two preferred options, option two: two full-sized indoor courts with indoor cricket nets and squash courts in Kumeu-Huapai and option three: two full-sized indoor courts in Kumeu-Huapai.**

   d) **endorse that the development of a detailed business case for indoor courts in Kumeu-Huapai be included as a priority action in the Community Facilities Action Plan.**

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

61. The Māori population in the study area is low at only seven per cent of the population. The population will be relatively stable, only growing to eight per cent by 2038.

62. Māori participation in sport and recreation for the study area is 80 per cent. This is slightly lower than the rate of 82 percent for the study area overall.

63. Māori will benefit from the proposed facility alongside other ethnicities in the area.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

64. Each local board identified one priority project through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 process. The Finance and Performance Committee then approved provisional funding for these local board projects [FIN/2018/85 refers].

65. The Rodney Local Board proposed a local indoor court facility. A total of $0.080 million was allocated to develop the business case. A total of $0.063 million remains for the development of the detailed business case.

66. Funding of $22.4 million was earmarked for the local indoor court facility to service Kumeu-Huapai, following the indicative and detailed business case process.
67. There is sufficient One Local Initiative funding available to deliver the indoor court facility.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

68. There are three main risk areas with options two and three as outlined in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of risk</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership risk</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This is mitigated by assessing both options two and three in the detailed business case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF the Kumeu Squash Club choose not to invest in the proposed local indoor court facility</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This risk can be mitigated by obtaining detailed costing from a quantity surveyor and assessment through sensitivity analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEN the costs to council will increase</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>All council projects are subject to financial policy decisions on cost escalation and treatment of inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Staff can update the business case when new growth modelling or new census information becomes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF costs of the project exceed initial estimates</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>All council projects are subject to financial policy decisions on cost escalation and treatment of inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEN the costs could exceed the benefits</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>All council projects are subject to financial policy decisions on cost escalation and treatment of inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Staff can update the business case when new growth modelling or new census information becomes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF projected growth rates slow and expected growth does not eventuate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>All council projects are subject to financial policy decisions on cost escalation and treatment of inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEN the facility may be underutilised</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>All council projects are subject to financial policy decisions on cost escalation and treatment of inflation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

69. If approved, work will commence on the development of a detailed business case in 2019/2020. Figure 1 outlines the project timing. This will include site identification and the development of the financial, commercial and management cases.\(^7\)

70. Operational funding may need to be allocated for the development of the detailed business case. Other costs can be met within existing funding.

71. The timeframe for delivering the new facilities will depend on a range of factors including:
   - how long it takes to develop and obtain approval for the detailed business case
   - the time required to negotiate any partnership or commercial development opportunities.

---

\(^7\) One of the key objectives of the detailed business case will be to identify opportunities to deliver the facilities at lower cost to council. Opportunities to increase revenue, undertake partnerships or obtain sponsorship will be investigated.
Figure 1: Project timing

- Development of detailed business case
- Report to Finance and Performance Committee for approval of detailed business case and allocation of One Local Initiative funding
- Commence development of site within agreed budget
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Indicative Business Case Summary

Local Indoor court facility for Kumeu-Huapai
Rodney Local Board propose a local indoor court facility for Kumeu-Huapai

**Investment Proposal**

The Finance and Performance Committee earmarked $22.4 million of funding be allocated to a local indoor court facility to service Kumeu and Huapai [Resolution FIN/2018/85]

The proposed facility could cater to a wider variety of sporting codes including two full-sized indoor courts with provision for indoor cricket nets and squash courts

**Key Investment Objectives**

- Reduce inequities and improve health and wellbeing of the community
- Address gap in unmet leisure and recreation (no current public facility)
- Cater for forecast population growth and changing needs
- Provide fit for purpose facilities

**Investigation of investment proposals**

- **Indicative business case**
  - Phase 1: Needs assessment
  - Phase 2: Strategic case
  - Phase 3: Economic case
The proposal aligns with Auckland Council strategies

Supports Auckland Plan, Local Board plan and Council sports strategies

Proposal
A multi-use facility to cater to a wider variety of sporting codes including two full-sized indoor courts with provision for indoor cricket nets and squash courts

✓ Focus investment to address disparities and areas of greatest need

✓ Recognise the value of sports and recreation to the quality of life

✓ Park and sports facilities that everyone can enjoy

✓ Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
✓ Community Facilities Network Plan
✓ Sport Investment Plan [draft]
Kumeu-Huapai is a future growth area with forecast population growth of 22,000 over next 20 years

Population growth by 2036

35% Total 22,000 in study area

Projected Population Growth

Source: Auckland Regional Transport units
Community are more active than Auckland average
There is current unmet demand for court space which is growing

Community Facilities Network Plan provision is one leisure facility (two courts) for every 18,000 people or one court for 9000 in rural areas – requiring two indoor courts from 2021.

**% Active by Area**
- Kumeu-Huapai: 81.6%
- Rodney: 81.1%
- Auckland: 75.6%

**Current and Future Unmet Demand**

**Demand For Court Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed using Sport NZ Insight Tool

Source: Auckland Regional Transport units

Attachment A
No fit-for-purpose facilities currently exist in the Kumeu-Huapai area

**Existing facilities**

- Kumeu Community Hall* - Undersized. Used for social indoor netball.
- Kaipara College – Full-sized indoor court. Not currently accessible to public and outside catchment area.
- Kumeu Racquets Club – Three badminton and three squash courts.
- Kumeu Gym – Hosts social indoor netball and football. Not suitable for competitive sport.

Many local residents drive to other areas – and currently make up 16% of Massey Leisure Centre users.

Massey Leisure Centre is close to capacity.

* Risk of crowding out existing community use

**Study area:**
5 kilometres from Kumeu-Huapai, plus 30 minute drive time from rural areas

**Source:** Auckland Regional Transport units
A destination facility is proposed for Whenuapai — potential overlaps with Kumeu-Huapai facility catchment — still a shortage

Upper Harbour Local Board have proposed a destination facility as part of their One Local initiative.

Population served by both

- If all of the population in the above table go to the Whenuapai facility there is still a shortage of one court, growing to two-courts by 2030.
- If the Whenuapai facility is only a local facility (two-courts or less) there will be no overlap in catchment area.
- A destination facility in Whenuapai could provide some indoor court provision for the study area, pushing demand for a two-court facility back by nine years.
A range of options were identified and two potential solutions identified - both have good strategic alignment

### LOCAL BOARD OPTION
- 2 indoor courts with provision for squash and cricket
- No full-sized indoor courts
- Four squash courts
- Three indoor cricket nets
- To be built on council-owned land at Huapai Domain

### REDUCED SCOPE OPTION
- Indoor courts facility (no squash or cricket)
- Two full-sized indoor courts

### Ancillary facilities
- Six changing rooms
- Function space
- Meeting room
- Office
- Kitchen

### Do nothing option
- “Do nothing” was considered but did not align strategically given current needs are not being met

### Critical success factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business need</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential value for money</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier capacity and capability</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential affordability</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential achievability</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Investment objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable our communities</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit-for-purpose</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce inequities</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do more with less</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall assessment

![Overall assessment key]

**KEY**
- Green: Strong
- Orange: Moderate
- Red: Weak
Both options would deliver positive economic returns

CBA Results Summary over 30 years (present value terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value ($m)</td>
<td>$22.3m</td>
<td>$17.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$35.7m</td>
<td>$32.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$13.4m</td>
<td>$14.6m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Rate of Return (IRR)</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback period</td>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sensitivity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local board option</th>
<th>Reduced scope option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit: Cost Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Case</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst Case</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best case:** Costs ↓ 22.5%, Benefits ↑ 15%

**Worst case:** Costs ↑ 22.5%, Benefits ↓ 15%

NPV (Net present value) assesses the value of the cash flow over the life of the project in current $. A NPV > 1 is good.
Conclusion and recommendations

The indicative business case demonstrates

- A strong strategic case for change
  - Good alignment with council strategies
  - High population growth and increasing demand for indoor sports in the area
  - Population has high levels of activity and are likely to use the facility
  - Current and increasing shortfall in indoor court space

- A strong economic case for change
  - Features a number of critical success factors
  - Good alignment with investment objectives
  - BCR 1.6 (Local board option)
  - BCR 1.84 (Reduced scope option)
  - IRR 8.6% (Local board option)
  - IRR 10% (Reduced scope option)

The reduced scope option demonstrates higher value for money but both options should be explored further particularly as Kumeu Rackets Club may not partner with council and invest in the facility.

COMMENDATIONS

1. Development of Detailed Business Case
2. Engage appropriate professional services to support Detailed Business Case including quantity surveyor

Benefit: cost ratio > 1 is good
Internal rate of return > 6% is good
A degree of caution is required

1. Demand projections based on current sports participation levels in local area

2. Base case predicated on projected population growth

3. Neighbouring local boards may wish to develop similar facilities with catchment overlap

4. Detailed facility design has not been developed and costs not reviewed by a quantity surveyor

5. The Kumeu Squash Club may choose not to invest

Attachment A  Item 13
Provision of land for new civic open space - Takapuna

File No.: CP2019/11634

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve the acquisition / internal asset reclassification of part of the fee simple council owned land at 40 Anzac Street and 34-38 Hurstmere Road in Takapuna for new civic open space.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The acquisition of civic open space is a requirement for central Takapuna as approved by the Planning Committee in March 2018 (resolution number PLA/2018/22).
3. The land will provide for civic open space in Takapuna Metropolitan Centre following Auckland Council’s Open Space Provision Policy.
4. The proposed spatial arrangement for the new public space, of approximately 3200m², is in a location that follows the preferred outcome of the community consultation which is to connect Lake and Hurstmere roads. The spatial arrangement is shown in Figure 2 in the body of this report and Attachment A.
5. The spatial arrangement for the new civic space has been designed to achieve the best outcomes for the community. Key design principles followed to ensure the delivery of a successful civic open space are:
   - good connectivity
   - appropriate form and function
   - creation of a sense of place
   - a high level of comfort and safety
   - commercial viability and control.
6. The spatial arrangement has been reviewed and is supported by an external independent design advisory body managed through the Auckland Council’s design review team.
7. The spatial arrangement has been assessed by the Parks and Recreation Policy Unit as a high priority for acquisition based on meeting current and future community needs. This assessment confirmed that the spatial arrangement meets all the requirements of the Auckland Council Open Space Provision Policy.
8. The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board support the acquisition at no capital cost of up to 4000m² of land at 40 Anzac Street and 34-38 Hurstmere Road Takapuna, for civic open space as per the Open Space Provision Policy for Metropolitan Centres. The local board has raised some points and expressed a preference for a different spatial arrangement. The full minutes of the meeting are provided as Attachment B to this report.
9. The next step is to start concept design of the civic open space in collaboration with the local board and respecting its governance role and decision-making responsibility.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the acquisition at no capital cost of approximately 3200m\(^2\) of land at parts 40 Anzac Street and 34-38 Hurstmere Road Takapuna for new civic open space shown as the proposed spatial arrangement on Attachment A.

b) delegate to Panuku Development Auckland authority to refine the final boundaries of the new civic open space in accordance with the spatial arrangement on Attachment A in a manner that ensures appropriate design principles are met.

Horopaki
Context

10. The council owned properties of 40 Anzac Street and 34-38 Hurstmere Road Takapuna are part of the Panuku Unlock Takapuna programme. The Panuku High Level Project Plan and authority to dispose of these sites was approved by the Auckland Development Committee in March 2016.

11. The sites are not currently open space.

12. There was a legal obligation, under section 78 of the Local Government Act, to consult on any change of use or ownership of the car park at 40 Anzac Street.

13. Public consultation on the change of use of 40 Anzac Street was undertaken from July to August 2017. Submissions were heard by a hearings panel which provided a recommendation to the Planning Committee to inform its decision making.

14. The Planning Committee approved the change of use of 40 Anzac Street subject to the condition that a town square be developed that follows Auckland Council’s Open Space Provision Policy for civic open space.

15. Community engagement was undertaken from March to June 2018 to seek views on where the town square should be located within the site boundaries of 40 Anzac Street and 30-38 Hurstmere Road. From this engagement a few location options were determined which were then critiqued by design experts to arrive at two location options that were able to be delivered by council.

16. Public consultation and a representative survey were undertaken to determine which of these two options were preferred by the community. These two options were presented with a third option to retain the status quo of 40 Anzac Street.

17. The results of the public consultation and the representative survey showed strong support for the option of a town square to be located from Lake Road to Hurstmere Road as shown in Figure 1 below. Of the 5,385 public consultation submissions, 47% preferred this option. Through the representative survey undertaken, 40% of respondents preferred this option.

18. The full results were presented to the Planning Committee and the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board at a workshop on 22 August 2018.

19. The top reasons stated for selecting this option was views of the beach and Rangitoto, sunny and bright, strong visibility, a nice space that makes good use of the area, better connection and flow and improved community space and environment.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Proposed public civic space

20. The proposed civic space spatial arrangement is shown in Figure 2 below.

21. This arrangement was supported by independent expert design advice that identified the following positive attributes:

- Potential to be developed in a way that would represent a strong response to considerations of local identity
- Spatial definition of the town square space is convincing, with an appropriate level of enclosure, as well as clearly defined openings in a variety of directions
- Well located and convincing thresholds to the square from Hurstmere Road and Lake Road
- Curved shape of building fronting Hurstmere Road provides an appropriately dynamic entry space, while holding the width of the opening at the street edge to within the recommended maximum to avoid unduly interrupting the continuity of the Hurstmere Road frontage
- Plaza space on Lake Road is appropriately sized and shaped to provide invitation to enter the town square from this direction
- Significance of Potters Park is acknowledged with a connecting space of generous width
- Good sun access to a large part of the square while also providing areas of shade also capable of occupation during hot weather
- Potential for a future building with a civic, cultural and/or community focus to benefit from frontages to Lake Road, Potters Park and the town square space, together with visibility from Hurstmere Road across the square
- New buildings define most of the edges of the town square, enabling the development of active edges onto the square and an appropriate character to the defining perimeter of the square.
22. Design principles align with both the Auckland Council Open Space Provision Policy and the Auckland Design Manual. The design ensures the delivery of a successful civic space by:

- providing good connectivity throughout Takapuna including the bus hub
- creating an appropriate form and function
- creating a sense of place
- delivering a high level of comfort and safety, and
- providing commercial viability and control.

**Figure 2: Proposed spatial arrangement of civic public space – Takapuna**

**Acquisition assessment**

23. Acquisition opportunities are assessed against the criteria in the Parks and Open Space Acquisition Policy and the Open Space Provision Policy by the council’s Parks and Recreation Policy Unit.

24. Proposed acquisitions are prioritised according to the highest rating achieved.
25. A summary of the acquisition assessment for the proposed open space is provided in Table 1 below.

### Table 1: Assessment of the proposed civic space in Takapuna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park type: Civic space (large)</th>
<th>Number of new dwelling units: 14,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density: High</td>
<td>Number of new residents(^8): 42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitary plan zone: Business – Metropolitan Centre</td>
<td>Proposed size of acquisition: 3200m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent valuation: N/A</td>
<td>Settlement: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Potential future features:
- Trees
- Public art
- Seating
- Drinking fountain

#### Acquisition Criteria

**Meeting community needs, now and in the future**
- **High priority as:**
  - The proposed approximately 3200m² civic space is centrally-located within the Takapuna Metropolitan Centre and will complement existing civic open space – Hurstmere Green (2453m²) and Takapuna Rose Garden (an approximately 500m² civic space component of Potters Park). It is consistent with the Open Space Provision Policy and will help meet the council’s open space provision targets.

**Connecting parks and open spaces**
- **Medium priority as:**
  - The proposed civic space will connect with Potters Parks and enable pedestrian movement between Potters Park and Hurstmere Green.

**Protecting and restoring Auckland’s unique features and meanings**
- **Not a priority as:**
  - The land has no known ecological, historic heritage, landscape, geological or cultural values of significance.

**Improving the parks and open spaces we already have**
- **Not a priority as:**
  - The land will not improve existing parks or open spaces, but it will complement the existing Hurstmere Green and Potters Park.

#### Development Costs:
- Local boards decide how local open space is developed.
- The development of the Takapuna civic space will cost $5,000,000 and will be funded by Panuku Development Auckland.

#### Operational Costs:
- Estimated maintenance costs for the civic space are $20,000 per annum.
- Maintenance costs are covered by operational budgets provided through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

---

\(^8\) Based on the average household size of 3.0 in Auckland at Census 2013.
Assessment conclusion

26. The site is assessed as a high priority for acquisition based on meeting community needs.

27. The land will provide for civic space centrally located within the Takapuna Metropolitan Centre and will complement existing civic open space already in Takapuna.

28. Council’s Parks and Recreation Policy Unit recommend that up to 3500m² of land comprising the proposed footprint is acquired at no capital cost.

29. Current practice is for council to acquire high and medium priority open space at no capital cost when it is offered to council.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

30. The proposed civic space has been assessed by the council Parks and Recreation Policy Unit confirming that the proposed space meets all the requirements of the Auckland Council Open Space Provision Policy.

31. Operational costs have been provided by staff who will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the open spaces. These have been set on the recommended spatial arrangement.

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

Local impacts and local board views

32. The Takapuna Beach Business Association (TBBA) has written to Panuku to confirm its continued support of the public space layout. The spatial arrangement follows most of the views of the members from August 2018 and the TBBA Board believes that the design maximises the benefits for the local economy and businesses, as well as the community.

33. A workshop was held with the local board on 11 June 2019 to discuss the preferred spatial arrangement option. Panuku received feedback that the local board supported an alternative arrangement which had been provided to it by Mr Reid (RRA). RRA had been engaged by the local board to provide independent planning advice.

34. This alternative arrangement is very similar to the other option in the public consultation. It has been reviewed by Isthmus Group and an independent design review group. It has also been considered by the Parks and Recreation Policy Unit. These reviews all highlight risks of delivery with this alternative public space arrangement.

35. This alternative option does not satisfy the design principles, as well as the recommended proposed option in the following ways:

- **Activated edges** - leading to activity and vitality - the western edge is the rear of the retail uses of Hurstmere Road, the eastern edge retains the blank facade of 488 Lake Road.

- **Visual connectivity** to existing, established busy streets (Lake and Hurstmere roads) as such it feels like a 'hidden' space, one that you would discover rather than one that directly responds to Takapuna. This also creates safety issues, particularly at night.

- **Lack of flexibility** - if a larger 'event' is required in the space the 'overspill' would need to be in Potters Park. For example, a large market event cannot spill into surrounding streets (which would be possible with the recommended proposal).

- **Dimensions** – 30 metres allows people to see and recognise facial features. The dimensions of this space all exceed that and are more akin to a 'spectator' event such as a sporting arena.

- **Response to context** - the Rangitoto axis is not recognised within the arrangement. This axis is a requirement of the Unitary Plan.
• It is a single large space which is not the character of the spaces within the Takapuna town centre which tend to be of a smaller scale. A single space wouldn't accommodate a variety of settings for everyday activity in the Takapuna context.

36. Panuku looked at how the intentions of the alternative proposal could be implemented into the proposal. This resulted in an amended version of the spatial design which opened more to Potters Park. This amended plan was presented to the local board at the 18 June business meeting and the one presented to the Environment and Community Committee in this report.

37. The local board resolved at the business meeting to support the acquisition at no capital cost of up to 4000m$^2$ of land at 40 Anzac Street and 34-38 Hurstmere Road Takapuna, for civic open space as per the Open Space Provision Policy for Metropolitan Centres. It also resolved that it does not support Panuku’s design for public open space.

38. Panuku met with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the local board on 27 June 2019 to discuss the resolutions. One of the key points raised was the desire for the buildings to the north of the proposed public space by reduced heights to ensure the public space is sunny and bright. Panuku will require this and control this through a development agreement with the selected developer that will develop the residual land around the new public space.

39. Panuku, supported by design expert advice of Isthmus Group, the independent design advisory body and the Parks and Recreation Policy Unit, are not recommending that the alternative proposal provided by the local board is chosen as it does not best provide appropriate design outcomes.

 Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

40. The proposed plan for the new civic open space has been discussed with mana whenua at hui held on the 27 May 2019, 1 November 2018 and 11 June 2018.

41. There is support for the creation of permanent public space in this area in the location proposed.

42. Mana whenua would like to ensure design is responsive to the history and culture of the area. Further hui will be held to work on this as the concept design progresses for this space.

 Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

43. The land is not being legally acquired as the freehold sites are already owned by Auckland Council.

44. Acquisition of the land for open space purposes will entail asset transfer within the Auckland Council family and there is no requirement for expenditure from the Parks and Open Space Acquisition Budget.

45. The capital expenditure budget to construct the new public space is from Panuku Development Auckland.

46. There is sufficient operational budget available to maintain the public space. This operational budget has been set from the proposed spatial arrangement of approximately 3,200m$^2$. 
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

47. The resulting preferred spatial arrangement for the public space from the public consultation and representative survey (August 2018) has some risks. These risks relate to the resulting wind factor and creating a sense of scale and spatial definition due to the more rectangular shape of the space. These risks are mitigated in the recommended proposal for the new public space by:

- altering the lengths of the space so they are not completely straight. This breaks up the flow of the wind and reduces the wind factor experienced by users of the space.
- creating three contiguous spaces, being a larger square primary space (square) in the centre of two smaller secondary spaces (plaza). This creates a sense of scale in the primary square and allows for the appropriate sense of scale to be experienced depending on whether it is daily use, being used for medium events or for large events.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

48. The site would be subdivided and vested as civic open space following approval by the Environment and Community Committee.

49. The concept design of the space would be created in collaboration with the local board.

50. A preferred concept design would be publicly consulted so feedback from the community could be received to refine the concept design before progressing to developed and detailed design.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. Seek formal endorsement from the Environment and Community Committee for the Heartland Trail to go through the Hūnua Ranges Regional Park.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. The vision is to create a world-class 45km walking and cycling recreational route through the Hūnua Ranges Regional Park linking Clevedon to Kaiaua on the Firth of Thames.
3. The Hūnua Trail would form a recreational walking and cycling trail, with accreditation to be a NZ Cycle Trails ‘Heartland Trail’. It is an economic development and tourism initiative that seeks to improve access to the Hūnua Ranges for recreational use.
4. The initiative is led by Franklin Local Board in partnership with Watercare and Regional Parks, with support from Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED).
5. Preliminary work has been undertaken to develop the Trail concept through the Franklin Local Board. They now request formal endorsement from the Governing Body before progressing the Trail project further.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) endorse in principle the development of a Heartland Trail through the Hūnua Ranges Regional Park.

b) endorse Auckland Council staff to work with the Franklin local board and other entities to continue investigation into the governance, management, maintenance, design and delivery of the trail as outlined in the Hūnua Trail Aspirational Plan.

Horopaki

Context
6. The vision is to create a world-class 45km walking and cycling recreational route through the Hūnua Ranges linking Clevedon to Kaiaua on the Firth of Thames.

7. The Hūnua Trail is an economic development and tourism initiative that seeks to improve access to the Hūnua Ranges for recreational use. The initiative is led by Franklin Local Board in partnership with Watercare and Regional Parks, with support from Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED).

8. The proposed Hūnua Trail route follows private access Watercare service roads from the south-eastern side of the Hūnua Range (Mangatangi Dam) through the upper western section of the regional park. Service infrastructure exists at key points, servicing the existing walking and mountain bike trails. With many Waitakere Ranges tracks closed by kauri die-back, opening the Hūnua Trail offers an alternative to the community to access regional park space.
9. The middle 30km section of the trail winds through the Hūnua Regional Park, offering views and access to an incredible natural environment and bio-diversity only 40 minutes from central Auckland. The trail caters for a range of outdoor pursuits suitable for all fitness levels.

10. The trail could be the first step in creating a multi-recreational playground on Auckland’s doorstep, linking to other trails and businesses, including Kōkako Outdoor Education, Camp Adair, the coastal regional parks, Te Ara Moana Kayaking Trail, a possible future Pohutukawa Coast Trail and the Hauraki Rail Trail (within the Hauraki District).

**Strategic Alignment**

11. The development of this trail would contribute to the Auckland Plan 2050 outcomes. These include Belonging and Participation, Māori Identity and Well-being, Homes and Places, Transport and Access, Environment and Cultural heritage and Opportunity and Prosperity.

12. The development of this trail is consistent with the Regional Parks Management Plan. The trail would also fulfil many of the aspirations set out in the 2017 Franklin Local Board Plan, where a key community priority was to ‘connect with local parks, forests, rivers, waterfronts and streams by walking and cycling tracks, and bridleways where appropriate’. Outcomes for the Franklin Local Board include:

- **A well-cared for natural environment**: enhance, protect and maintain our diverse natural environment and make sure it’s able to be enjoyed.
- **A thriving local economy**: Franklin has a strong economy and attracts people to live, work locally and visit its attractions.
- **An improved transport system**: continue to work towards better public transport and safer roads in Franklin.
- **Growth is dealt with effectively**: make full use of existing outdoor space and community facilities before developing new.
- **Communities feel ownership and connection to their area**: support community participation in helping to shape people’s quality of life, creativity, health and wellbeing.

13. The development of this trail strongly aligns to The Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan. It would deliver on three key priority areas:

- **Participation**: more Aucklanders living physically active lives through participation in informal physical activity, recreation and sport.
- **Infrastructure**: access to open spaces, harbors, coastlines, waterways and a fit-for-purpose network of facilities that enable physical activity, recreation and sport at all levels.
- **Sector development**: a strong and capable sector that delivers quality recreation and sport experiences in a sustainable way and contributes to Auckland’s economy.

**Consultation to date**

14. New Zealand Transport Association (NZTA) has provided formal endorsement for the proposed cycling component of the route to be an accredited ‘Heartland Trail’ within the NZTA NZ Cycle Trail network. The accreditation is provisional on providing clear way finding signage from Clevedon to Kaiaua (via the Mangatawhiri Campground), and Auckland Transport changing a 90-metre section of the Clevedon-Kawakawa Road (from Clevedon Town Centre) from open road status to a 50km speed restriction.
15. A portion of the proposed trail is within the Waikato jurisdiction of the Hauraki District Council. Both the Hauraki District Council and Waikato Regional Council have participated in the development of this initiative. The Hauraki District Council have supplied a letter of support for the NZTA accreditation process. The proposed trail would meet the Hauraki Rail Trail extension to Kaiaua which is beneficial to the Hauraki District Council. Once formal endorsement from the Environment and Community Committee is received, formal endorsement will be sought from the Hauraki District Council.

16. The Southern exit of the proposed trail is over an easement on private land (Olsen farms-Workman road). The project group has requested a legal review in regard to verifying land titles and guidance as to how any land ownership issues would need to be addressed. This will continue to be investigated following formal endorsement from this Committee.

Ecological Considerations

17. The Hūnua Ranges is the largest tract of regenerating and mature indigenous forest on the mainland in the Auckland Region covering 25,000 hectares (almost 18,000 hectares in parkland). It has extensive Kauri lands and is currently Kauri Dieback free. The area is home to the kōkako recovery project and Kōkako Management Area. In 1994 only one breeding pair remained, but through the Hūnua kōkako recovery project the population has increased to over 100 pairs in 2019. The pest-controlled area also provides benefits to other species, including kākā, hochsetter’s frogs, tomtits, long-tailed bats and bellbirds.

18. The Hūnua Ranges is covered under a Controlled Area Notice. You cannot take footwear, equipment or other items with any visible soil into the Controlled Area in the Hūnua Ranges. Public entering the Hūnua Ranges must use any cleaning stations that are encountered.

19. The Te Araroa Trail section through the Hūnua Ranges is currently closed. This is due to risk reducing measures, closing remote tracks in poor muddy conditions that have Kauri on them to protect Kauri forest from Kauri Dieback. The section of track through the Department of Conservations (DOC) Mangatawhiri forest has been closed since 2017 after major storm events washed out bridges. The Hūnua Trail development could offer an alternative lower risk route.

20. Some sections of the trail pass through Kauri forest to the southern end of the Hūnua Ranges near Mangatangi Dam. The trail through this section is a wide, formed gravelled service road and well maintained. Investment in applicable wash stations to counter kauri die-back will form part of the project plan.

21. The Parks, Sport and Recreation department supports the initiative with the proviso that all possible care be taken not to introduce kauri die-back, and that health and safety risks can be mitigated. Future Kauri dieback mitigation measures will be guided by the future National Pest Management Plan.

The opportunities

22. This trail could generate enhanced use of the Hūnua Regional Park for recreational walkers, hikers, cyclists, locals, domestic and overseas visitors, thereby promoting health, wellbeing and the ranges as a recreational destination.

23. The Trail would be the first New Zealand Cycle Trail Network accredited in the Auckland region.

24. This trail could link to Te Araroa or become part of the ‘Te Araroa’ Walking Trail. The section of Te Araroa through the Hūnua Ranges is closed. Moving the route to join the proposed trail would mitigate risk and offer a better off-road route for users. Discussions with Te Araroa will continue throughout this project.

25. This trail could become part of the Tour Aotearoa cycle route and link to the Hauraki Rail Trail at Kaiaua, capitalising on cross-district synergies and opportunities. It is step one in creating a multi-recreational playground on Auckland’s doorstep, potentially linking to other recreational trails.
26. There is an opportunity to educate visitors about the biodiversity of the Hūnua Ranges and the importance of sustainable access, the management of kauri die-back and what we need to do to protect our natural environment. Noting that the Hūnua Ranges is also a significant water-source, the trail may also provide an opportunity to educate visitors about water supply and conservation.

**Economic Benefits**

27. This trail could generate economic benefit and lift visitor numbers whilst enhancing the visitor experience. It is anticipated that visitors would stay, explore and spend in the local towns and on tourist attractions.

28. The trail would enhance the local connection with walking and cycling and serve as an opportunity for local businesses to developing support services for shuttles, equipment supplies, hire and servicing, accommodation, guided walks, environmental education and eco-tourism.

29. There is the potential to showcase Māori and colonial history at key staging and service points, offering a unique cultural tourism development opportunity.

30. The trail would enable greater collaboration with organisations and neighboring towns to cross-promote events, activities and the existing Hūnua walking trails, encouraging more visitors to the area.

**Governance, Management and Operations Structure**

31. The proposed site for the Hūnua Trail is in the Hūnua Ranges Regional Park, governed by the Auckland Council and is over land leased to Watercare. One entry point is on private land and part of the proposed trail is within the Hauraki District Council jurisdiction.

32. The trail would utilise existing Watercare gravel service roads currently used for forestry and water management. As the basis of the trail exists already, less capital outlay to establish the trail is required. Watercare have provided formal endorsement of the aspirational plan.

33. It is acknowledged that operational requirements may close tracks or the entire park at times. It is expected that an agreement to address operational closures and limit expectations of rights to that entity would be put in place.

34. The Franklin Local Board commissioned a recommendation report on the governance, management and operations structure which was completed by Inovo in August 2018. The report considered the challenges experienced by the Hauraki District and other local government organisations in developing and managing similar recreational enterprises. The report outlined three options with the recommended option being the establishment of a charitable trust to both manage and develop the Hauraki Trail proposition.

35. Council Staff from Parks, Sport and Recreation, Governance and External Partnerships and Legal Services will continue to explore the governance options in consultation with mana whenua and the Franklin Local Board.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

36. Pending formal endorsement from the Environment and Community Committee detailed project planning will be undertaken with a comprehensive business case completed to develop this initiative further.

37. The Parks, Sport and Recreation department supports the initiative with the proviso all possible care be taken not to introduce kauri die-back and the health and safety issues are addressed and mitigated.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

38. Watercare have provided formal endorsement of the aspirational plan.
39. Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED) have supported the
development of this initiative as an economic development and tourism initiative. The Hūnua Trail delivers to the Auckland Visitor Plan 2021, specifically “Place aspiration: Use the economic and intangible benefits delivered by tourism to transform Auckland into a place promoting its unique identity and story that is highly attractive to residents and visitors alike: (brand Auckland - an exciting place where big city sophistication goes hand-in-hand with an outstanding natural playground).”

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

40. The initiative is led by Franklin Local Board in partnership with Watercare and Parks, with support from ATEED.
41. The Hūnua Trail would form a walking trail and an accredited NZ Cycle Trail ‘Heartland Trail’. It is an economic development and tourism initiative that seeks to improve access to the Hūnua Ranges for recreational use.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

42. The Hūnua Ranges are of significant value to Ngāti Whanaunga, Ngā Tai Ki Tāmaki. Ngāti Pāoa and Ngāti Tamaoho.
43. Mana whenua representatives have participated informally in the development of the initiative since inception.
44. Consultation discussions have been held with both Ngāti Whanaunga and Ngā Tai Ki Tāmaki. Ngāti Pāoa and Ngāti Tamaoho both elected to be represented by Ngāti Whanaunga in discussions at this early stage but be sent updated emails and minutes of engagement meetings.
45. If an independent governance structure is put in place for the Hūnua Trail, Iwi have indicated interest in having representative trustees in the Trail governance. They are also interested in the naming of the Trail and to develop supporting or aligned eco-cultural tourism initiatives.
46. The Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan supports the desired outcomes for Māori within the Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau to improve the health and wellbeing of Māori.
47. The Auckland Visitor Plan 2021 Strategic Goal 3 (Develop world-class attractors and experiences) core business action include “Support the development of authentic Māori cultural product and capability in Auckland” and “Promote the protection of Auckland’s biodiversity and natural environment”. The Hūnua Trail aligns well with these actions.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

48. The Franklin Local Board has already invested Local Development Initiatives (LDI) operational expenditure (Opex) in the initial concept development stage and the development of the Hūnua Trail Aspirational Plan.
49. The Franklin Local Board is currently working through ATEED and Inovo to develop the proposed Hūnua Trail as a tourist product. Pending formal endorsement from the Environment and Community Committee, the board have allocated $110,000 LDI Opex in 2019/2020 to further develop the programme of work. $400,000 in LDI capital expenditure (Capex) towards the capital works programme to support the trail development.
50. The local board have requested a rough order of costs from Auckland Transport for improvements to Otau Mountain Road (the Clevedon end of the trail) in anticipation of trail use. This will be funded from the board’s Local Transport Capital fund.

51. Franklin Local board have also allocated $400,000 in LDI Capex towards the capital works programme to support the trail development, including the installation of signs provided through the national cycle trail as part of Heartland Ride accreditation and any minor works necessary to support protection of the environment (including Kauri), property and visitors.

52. The longer-term costs associated with the Trail needs to be determined and it may be a consideration for future funding allocation to this project.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

53. The governance model required to successfully develop, operate and maintain the Hūnua Trail is complex. Further investigation into the possible options and analysis of these options with all the interested stakeholders is required to mitigate this risk.

54. Ineffective engagement and collaboration with mana whenua could prohibit the development of this trail. Prioritising mana whenua engagement and resources into this engagement will assist in mitigating the risk.

55. A partnership with the Hauraki District Council is required for the development of this trail. Engagement to date has been positive and continued engagement with a formal agreement in place will assist in the mitigation of this risk.

56. A partnership with a private landowner may also be required for the initiative. Engagement to date has been positive and continued engagement with a formal agreement in place will assist in the mitigation of this risk.

57. Kauri die-back is a key risk to the Hūnua Ranges in the opening of the Hūnua Trail. The Te Araroa Trail through the Hūnua Ranges is currently closed by kauri die-back. Part of the trail passes through Kauri Forest to the South of the Hūnua Ranges. The road through the forest is well formed, graveled and maintained. There is the potential that additional work may be required to upgrade this section of this road (to meet national standards). Investment in applicable wash stations to counter kauri die-back is part of the project plan.

58. Health and Safety risks will need to be assessed and addressed as part of the project plan to mitigate risk to visitors and ensure a positive visitor experience.

59. There are potential financial risks associated with this project as it is a local board driven initiative on a regional asset. Thorough investigation into the short- and long-term costs of this initiative will be undertaken during the project planning phase following formal endorsement.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

60. Pending formal endorsement from the Environment and Community Committee detailed project planning will be undertaken with a comprehensive business case completed to develop this initiative further.

61. Further investigation into the Governance, Management and Operations of this project will be carried out. Council Staff from Parks, Sport and Recreation, Governance and External Partnerships and Legal Services will continue to explore these options.

62. Further engagement with mana whenua and confirmation of mana whenua aspirations and requirements for the project will be incorporated into the business case.

63. Formal endorsement from the Hauraki District Council for their section of the Trail onwards will be sought.
64. Further investigation into the legalities of use for the private land proposed for the trail is required and an agreement for use established.

65. The physical works requirements need to be confirmed, programmed and budgeted for.

66. The long-term financial implications of this project will be further explored.
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Hunua Trail  What is the plan?

The vision is to create a world-class 45km walking and cycling recreational route through the Hunua Ranges linking Clevedon to Kaiata on the Firth of Thames.

The Hunua Trail is an economic development and tourism initiative that seeks to improve access to the Hunua Ranges for recreational use. The initiative is lead by Franklin Local Board in partnership with Watercare and Regional Parks, with support from ATEED.

The middle 30km section of the trail winds through the Hunua Regional Park, offering beautiful views and an incredible natural environment and bio-diversity only 40 minutes from central Auckland.

The trail caters for a range of outdoor pursuits suitable for all fitness levels.
Proposed Route

Access would start from Clevedon or Karakura, walking, cycling or being taken by shuttle to the gates at either end of the proposed park section (Otahuhu Mountain Road or Warkworth Road).

Half and full-day options are available, with an overnight stay at the Upper Mangatāwhiri Campground halfway point also possible.

Item 15
What are the options?

- 45km starting from Clevedon to Kauaum or Kauaum to Clevedon on public and regional park roads.
- Shuttle to the Otua Mountain Campground to complete in either direction to Clevedon or Kauaum.
- 30km starting from the Regional Park Gate at Otua Mountain Road to the Workman Road gate.
- Shuttle to the mid-point at Upper Mangatawhiti Campground and complete either way to the Regional Park gates.

The diagram shows the distance and routes for each option, with markers indicating the start and end points.
Hunua Trail - CLEVEDON TO KAIAUA 45km

BEGIN IN: Clevedon, Franklin
DESCRIPTION: A 45km route from Clevedon to Kaihua through the Hunua Ranges. Total ascent 1201.84m, maximum elevation 467.57m.

The route follows public roads for approximately 9km to the Otau Moutain Road Regional Park access gate. From there the trail winds through the park, passing the Mangatawhiri and Matangi reservoirs, eventually rejoining public roads at Workman Road, on to Kaihua Road, ending at Kaihua on the Firth of Thames.
Hunua Trail - REGIONAL PARK SECTION 30km

Cleveland, Franklin

DESCRIPTION:
A 30km route from the Otou Mountain Road access gate to the Workman Road access gate through the Hunua Ranges. Total ascent 830.86m, maximum elevation 467.57m.

The route starts at the Otou Mountain Road Regional Park access gate, winding through forestry access roads through the regional park, passing the Mangatowhiri and Matangi reservoirs, eventually finishing on the other side of the park, at the Workman Road access gate.
Recreational Strategic Context

The proposed Hunua Trail route follows private access Watercare service roads through the upper western section of the regional park.

Service infrastructure exists at key points, servicing the existing walking and mountain bike trails. With many Waitakere Ranges tracks closed by kauri die-back, opening the Hunua Trail offers an alternative to the community to access regional park space.

The trail could be the first step in creating a multi-recreational playground on Auckland’s doorstep, linking to other trails and businesses, including Kōkako Outdoor Education, Camp Adair, the future Pohutukawa Coast Trail.

Te Araroa Trail through the Hunua Ranges is currently closed by kauri die-back. The Hunua Trail development could offer an alternative low risk route.
Ecological considerations

- The Hunua Ranges are the largest native forest area in Auckland, covering 25,000 hectares (almost 18,000 hectares in parkland).

- The biodiversity demonstrates efforts to maintain the environment. The area is home to a kōkako breeding programme. In 1994 only one breeding pair remained, but through the Hunua kōkako recovery project the population has increased to 55 pairs. The pest-controlled area also provides benefits to other species, including kākā, hochsetter’s frogs, tomtits, long-tailed bats and bellbirds.

- Auckland Council Regional Parks supports the initiative with the proviso all possible care be taken not to introduce kauri die-back.

- The trail route avoids the kauri stands within Hunua and has been assessed by Regional Parks as being achievable and manageable. Investment in applicable wash stations to counter kauri die-back is part of the project plan.

- The trail will be co-managed with Watercare and Regional Parks.
What are the opportunities?

- Generate enhanced use of the Hunua Regional Park for recreational walkers, hikers, cyclists, locals, domestic and overseas visitors, thereby promoting health, wellbeing and the ranges as a recreational destination.

- Be a shared walking and cycling trail; become the first New Zealand Cycle Trail Network accredited in the Auckland region.

- Link to Te Araroa or become part of ‘Te Araroa’ Walking Trail. The section of Te Araroa through the Hunua Ranges is closed by kauri die-back. Moving the route to join the proposed trail would mitigate risk and offer a better off-road route for users.

- Become part of the Tour Aotearoa cycle route and link to the Huaraki Rail Trail at Kaitaia, capitalising on cross-district synergies and opportunities.

- Step one in creating a multi-recreational playground on Auckland’s doorstep, potentially linking to other recreational trails.

- Build relationships with Kokako Outdoor Education, Camp Adair and community-based initiatives Clevedon Trails and Friends of Te Wairoa.

- Educate visitors about the biodiversity of the Hunua Ranges and the importance of sustainable access, the management of kauri die-back and what we need to do to protect our natural environment.
Economic Benefit

- Generate local economic benefit and lift visitor numbers, enhance visitor experience

- Visitors are expected to stay or visit local towns and to spend on various goods, services and tourist attractions

- Enhance the local connection with walking and cycling

- Opportunity for local businesses to develop support services for shuttles, equipment supply, hire and servicing, accommodation, guided walks, environmental education and cultural eco-tourism

- Potential to showcase the Māori and colonial history at key staging and service points

- Build on Franklin as a destination by targeting visitors to Auckland

- Collaborate with organisations and neighbouring towns to cross-promote events.

- Promote the existing Hunua walking trails, encouraging more visitors to the area and the regional park.
Strategic Fit

Franklin Local Board Aspirations

Each local board develops a three-year plan, a reflection of what elected members have heard from their community. Feedback gained both formally and informally has been instrumental in shaping this.

Development of the Hunua Trail Plan has the potential to fulfil a number of the aspirations set out in the 2017 Franklin Local Board Plan, where a key community priority was to “connect with local parks, forests, rivers, waterfronts and streams by walking and cycling tracks, and bridleways where appropriate”.

Implementation of the Hunua Trail concept contained within this plan will also deliver on a number of the aims of the Auckland Plan 2012 and the Draft Auckland Plan 2050 with the following focus points:

- belonging and participation
- Māori identity and well-being
- homes and places
- transport and access
- environment and cultural heritage
- opportunity and prosperity

Te Whakaringa 1:
He tūranga tūwharuru
Outcome 1:
A well-cared for natural environment
Enhance, protect and maintain our diverse natural environment and make sure it’s able to be enjoyed.
You have told us you want to connect with the outdoor areas with tracks for walking, cycling and where appropriate horse riding.

Te Whakaringa 2:
He tūranga tūkapapa
Outcome 2:
A thriving local economy
Franklin has a strong economy and attracts people to live, work locally and visit its attractions.
"Do want to explore Franklin’s tourism potential?"

Te Whakaringa 3:
He wairaka tūwharuru
Outcome 3:
An improved transport system
Continue to work towards better public transport and safer roads in Franklin.
"Better road safety for cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders via paths and road improvements."

Te Whakaringa 4:
He tūranga tūrakanga
Outcome 4:
Growth is dealt with effectively
Make full use of existing outdoor space and community facilities before developing new.
"Use target rate for trails development, management and maintenance."

Te Whakaringa 5:
Te tūranga tūtikōhoro
Outcome 4:
Support community participation in helping to shape people’s quality of life, creativity, health and wellbeing.
"More mountain bike tracks and pump tracks are needed!"

Extract from Franklin Local Board Plan 2017
Linkages

In developing this plan a number of related council and non-council initiatives have been considered:

- Wairua River Restoration

- Clevedon Trails, part of the Clevedon Sustainable Development Plan - supported by Clevedon Community and Business Association (CCBA), Walking Access Commission and Auckland Council

- Auckland Transport (AT) proposals and initiatives such as the Auckland Cycle Network (CAN)

- New Zealand Transport Authority (NZTA) proposals such as the Southern Corridor Improvements Project

- New Zealand Transport Authority (NZTA) Ngā Haeranga NZ Cycle Trail Network

- AC Regional Parks Management Plan

- AC Local Paths Plan (formerly Greenways Plan)

The board also gave direction that a collaborative approach was to be used, working in partnership with the community
How

The Process

The Hunua Trail Plan had its genesis in a World Class Cycling and Recreation Opportunities Discussion Summary 2016 commissioned by Franklin Local Board. The Hunua Trail concept was developed further in a staged process outlined below:

Phase One - Completed
Public input and identification of connections:

- Identify stakeholders and roles
- Establish working group to consult on initial concept
- Feedback collated to enable community engagement
- Research feasibility with key stakeholders
- Consultation with IWI
- Project team and steering group site visits
- Research collated from NZ Cycle Network.

The Franklin Local Board assisted in identifying key stakeholders and roles from the community to be included in the working group, including:

- Watercare
- Regional Parks
  - Auckland Council
- NZTA
- Auckland Transport
- Pohutukawa Bike
- Walking Access
- ATEED.
Phase Two - Current
Refinement of proposals:
- production of the Draft Hunua Trail Aspirational Plan document
- public engagement on the plan
- feedback collated and assessed for consideration by Franklin Local Board
- develop recommended project structure, ownership and management
- develop and submit NZ Cycle Network accreditation application
- commission a health and safety audit of the proposed route
- planning documents relevant to the area such as geospatial maps and typographical information collected and reviewed
- site visits to existing cycleways/walkways to gain understanding of how the trail can be best implemented.

Phase Three - September to December 2018
Adoption of Aspirational Plan:
- review of the Hunua Trail Aspirational Plan by steering group
- further refinement
- adoption of the plan by Franklin Local Board.

Phase Four - TBC
Implementation:
- implementation of the Aspirational Plan
- implementation of the trail
- opening of the trail.

Access to the land, funding and availability of necessary resources will determine the implementation programme dates.
When

Implementation
Once public feedback has been canvassed and the Franklin Local Board formally adopts the updated Aspirational Plan the Hunua Trail Project will commence with:

- establishing the governance and operating structures for the trail
- engaging with communities for support services
- developing promotions and marketing in support of the trail
- implementing the physical works required for the trail - signage, safety barriers, modifications to gates, cleaning stations, pick-up and drop-off zones.

It is anticipated project planning will be completed in 2019 with the trail opening in late 2019.

Partnership

Successful implementation of the plan will rely on a co-ordinated approach between the community, the steering group, Franklin Local Board, Hauraki District Council, mana whenua, Auckland Council Regional Parks, Watercare and community and cultural policy departments, as well as Auckland Transport and the New Zealand Transport Authority.

The Walking Access Commission is also able to play a role, including providing leadership and advice, facilitating resolution of disputes and publishing maps and information. Future detailed planning will take into consideration best practice guidelines, which include:

- Local Paths Design Guide (Auckland Council)
- New Zealand Cycle Network Trail Design Guide (NZTA)
- Auckland Transport Code of Practice

Related best practice documents will be considered in the development of the project. All relevant Unitary Plan controls and area-specific policies will be referred to.
Governance

The Hunua Trail Project to deliver a long-term recreational trail for walking and cycling will be managed by a dedicated trust. The trust will be invited to appoint representatives.

Some key partners may have representation on the trust board.

Other representatives will be appointed by Auckland Council council, but will be independent and will have aligned skills to deliver on the trust’s objectives.

Key Stakeholders

Ongoing community engagement, stakeholder collaboration and partnerships are key to the successful implementation of the plan. Likely stakeholders, other than those previously mentioned, include:

- Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED)
- Cycle Action Auckland
- Bike Pohutukawa
- The Walking Access Commission
- Local residents and business associations.

Grass-roots community involvement is important to ensure the success of the plan. Local knowledge-sharing and volunteering will be needed to provide community ownership, care and responsibility. Community involvement could take the form of developing aligned businesses supplying supporting services.
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Submission to Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To endorse Auckland Council and Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) submission to the Ministry for the Environment on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Since February 2018, Auckland Council has led the development of Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, with extensive cross-sector collaboration. This included collaboration with the New Zealand Government in developing the framework and the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill in parallel.

3. In July 2018, Auckland Council submitted a response to the Zero Carbon Act, covering its position with additional input around the strength of the Act and the critical importance of a just transition.


5. The purpose of the amendment bill is to provide a framework by which New Zealand can develop and implement clear climate change policies that contribute to the global effort under the Paris Agreement to limit the global average temperature increase to 1.5° Celsius above pre-industrial levels.

6. The main components of the bill include a new 2050 target and emissions budgets, establishment of an independent Climate Change Commission and the inclusion of adaptation.

7. A draft submission from Auckland Council and CCOs was prepared with input across council departments, CCOs and discussions with mana whenua (Attachment A). Main points include:

- Support the establishment of an independent body to oversee and advise on New Zealand’s climate change commitments.
- Advocate for a single target approach of net zero emissions (inclusive of all gases) by 2050. However, due to the current lack of scientific consensus on the correct warming impact of methane, the submission focusses on the split target approach.
- Support the use of emissions budgets and plans, and the visibility and predictability that three consecutive five-year emissions budgets provide.
- Support the inclusion of adaptation in the bill and the 6-year refresh of a national climate change risk assessment and adaptation plan to ensure the most significant risks are addressed in responsible timeframes.
- Recommendation for stronger consideration of a just and equitable transition.
- Recommendation for stronger inclusion of Te Ao Māori expertise and appropriate representation of Māori.
- Advocate for a close partnership and support for local government.
- Recommend funding support to be provided from a national level for local implementation of resilience measures.
- Concerns raised about the ambiguity and limited consequences for failure to reach the 2050 targets and emissions budgets.
Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) endorse the draft Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill submission.

b) authorise the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Environment and Community Committee and an Independent Māori Statutory Board Member to make minor revisions and approve the final submission before the deadline of 16 July 2019.

c) request to speak to the submission and appoint a member of the Governing Body to appear before the Select Committee on behalf of Auckland Council.

Horopaki

Context

Previous decisions

8. Previous decisions made by the Committee in relation to climate change include:
   - Resolution number ENV/2018/134
     a) endorse Auckland Council’s submission to the “Proposed Improvements to the NZ Emissions Trading Scheme”
   - Resolution number ENV/2017/117
     a) endorse the key themes to the Productivity Commission’s low emissions economy inquiry issues paper as the basis for council’s submission
   - Resolution number ENV/2018/93
     a) endorse the draft Zero Carbon Bill submission

Auckland Context

9. Climate change poses a significant issue for all of Auckland, and it will impact our most vulnerable. The recent declaration of a Climate Emergency highlights how critical it is to take urgent action to transition towards a net zero future. Taking action on climate change mitigation and adaptation offers a range of co-benefits to put us on a path toward a cleaner, fairer and more prosperous Auckland, while inaction raises serious risks to infrastructure, economy and health.

10. Auckland Council has led the development of Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, with extensive cross-sector collaboration. The framework is currently being prepared for public consultation starting in July 2019.

11. Collaboration with Central Government has underpinned this work, including:
   - a series of collaborative workstreams, including sharing of team resources.
   - a joint effort in hosting the Auckland Climate Symposium in March 2019, where the Ministry for the Environment hosted parallel session presentations and maintained a strong presence at the event.
   - continued sharing of resources, including the alignment of climate change risk assessments.
Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill

12. The amendment bill (Attachment B) seeks to provide a transparent transition to a low-emissions, climate-resilient society by establishing the policy architecture for long-term certainty. The bill has four main components:

- **Establishing a Climate Change Commission** – The Commission’s role is to provide expert advice and monitoring of progress to help keep successive governments on track to meeting long-term goals.

- **Setting new emissions targets** – The new target aligns with the Paris Agreement commitments, climate science and potential economic impacts and opportunities. The target is set to:
  - reduce all greenhouse gases (except biogenic methane) to net zero by 2050.
  - reduce gross emissions of biogenic methane within the range of 24 to 47 per cent below 2017 levels by 2050, including a 10 per cent reduction below 2017 levels by 2030.

- **Emissions budgets** – The emissions budgets act as stepping stones towards the long-term target of 2050. Three budgets will be in place at any one time, with a plan outlining the required transition for each emissions budget.

- **Adapting to climate impacts** – Adaptation is included in the bill, comprising of a national climate change risk assessment (to be updated every 6 years), a national adaptation plan and adaptation reporting power for specific organisations, including local government.

13. Auckland’s approach to the development of its climate action framework aligns with the amendment bill, for instance, both include:

- a commitment to addressing climate adaptation and mitigation.
- an Independent Advisory Group to check and challenge the work.
- review of emissions targets to align with limiting warming to within 1.5 °Celsius.
- intent to set targets and/or carbon budgets by sector to meet the 2050 target.

14. Submissions for the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill close on 16 July 2019. The next stage for the bill is to be reviewed by the Select Committee.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

15. Submissions to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill are currently being accepted on the New Zealand Parliament website. Auckland Council’s submission (Attachment A) focusses on the points outlined below.

Climate Change Commission

16. Auckland Council supports the role of an independent body to oversee New Zealand’s climate change commitments. As stated in the previous response to the Zero Carbon Act, we agree the commission should function independently of political cycles, ensuring it has a clear remit to support the work of local government.

17. We support ambitious targets built on sound scientific evidence to ensure we reach the 1.5°Celsius emissions reduction pathway. Auckland Council stands behind its last response to the Zero Carbon Act of a single target approach of net zero emissions (inclusive of all gases) by 2050. We do, however, acknowledge that there is currently a lack of scientific consensus around the correct warming impact of methane. The submission therefore focusses on the separated target approach.
18. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report, to reach the 1.5°C Celsius target by 2050, a reduction of 11-30 percent in methane is required by 2030 from 2010 emission levels. Therefore, Auckland Council recommends a minimum 11 per cent reduction in methane emissions from the 2010 level and supports the higher end of the methane reduction range - 47 per cent - in gross biogenic methane emissions by 2050.

19. In the development of the draft submission, the rural sector and agricultural representatives were consulted regarding the feasibility of achieving the targets outlined in the bill, specifically for nitrous oxide and methane. We concluded from those discussions and academic evidence that the 10 per cent reduction in biogenic methane is an achievable target with current technologies and sustainable farming practices. The 24-47 per cent reduction, however, will require transformation within the sector.

20. The draft submission acknowledges that all sectors require transformational change and will need support in the transition to net zero emissions. A strong focus on enabling innovation opportunities to thrive, such as using incentive funding and innovation hubs, is essential. We recommend that the government creates well-defined channels to enable and foster new and innovative approaches towards a just transition.

Emissions budgets

21. The draft submission supports the establishment of emissions budgets and plans to reach the targets. The visibility of three-year emissions budgets at any one time provides predictability and progress on emissions reductions through political cycles. The draft submission expresses concern for the potential resourcing burden of local data collection and reporting inflicted upon local governments to support the budgets and plans. We propose open timelines and allocation of funding from central government to ensure this information can be provided.

Adaptation

22. The inclusion of climate adaptation with a 6-year refresh in the amendment bill is strongly supported. This is an approach that Auckland Council has used in the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Framework. The draft submission advocates for the alignment of approaches between national and local government when undertaking risk assessments and ensuring that there is funding support to local government for the implementation of resilience measures. Placing the funding onus on local government will make it difficult for adaptation measures to succeed.

23. The submission supports adaptation reporting power as a requirement for the reporting of climate risks and recommends it to be mandatory. Auckland Council published its climate change risk assessments in early 2019, starting the open and transparent sharing of information to enable communities to make climate ready decisions. We propose the inclusion of insurance companies in reporting organisations, and suggest the reporting power scope includes climate mitigation.

Additional considerations

24. The submission expresses concern on the lack of inclusion of Te Ao Māori throughout the bill. In selecting the Climate Change Commission, the Minister needs to have “regard for” the technical knowledge and expertise of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Te Ao Māori and we advocate that this should be a mandatory requirement. There should also be appropriate representation of Māori at governance and executive levels in the response to climate change.

25. There is an ongoing partnership with Mana Whenua of Tāmaki Makaurau in the development and implementation of Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri-Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, and we believe this partnership must be upheld at a national level.
26. The draft submission expresses concern around the ambiguity and limited consequences for failure to reach the 2050 targets and emissions budgets. It is unclear whether the bill can hold sectors to account for the inaction towards local, national and international commitments. We propose that if there was an award of costs for failure to meet the target, it must be of an adequate level to act as a financial driver for climate change action.

27. It is critical that the transition to a net zero future is just and equitable. This involves strong collaboration with communities and sectors, ensuring that jobs, safe transport options, affordable healthy food and clean energy supplies are maintained and accessible to all. It is important that everyone is adequately supported and prepared for future climate change challenges.

28. We stress the importance of strong ongoing partnerships between local and central government for climate action. We would like to see further participation of local government in the development of the amendment bill and look forward to working in partnership to deliver a zero carbon and climate resilient New Zealand.

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

29. The draft submission includes views from Auckland Council and Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs).

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

30. The submission timeline is insufficient to enable local boards to provide formal feedback. Local boards were notified of the amendment bill and the key themes for submission with a memo on 21 June 2019 and will be provided with a draft of the submission on 2 July 2019.

31. The Chief Sustainability Office held cluster workshops on Auckland’s Climate Action Framework with local boards in June and the amendment bill was highlighted during these presentations.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

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

33. Given the diverse climate sensitivities that exist for Māori across Auckland and New Zealand there is a clear need to know more about the implications (and risks) of a variable and changing climate on different iwi/hapū/whānau. This underpins our support for the inclusion of climate adaptation in the amendment bill and the new 2050 emissions targets. There is strong ongoing collaboration with Mana Whenua in the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, and it is important this is reflected at the national level.

34. The Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum, which represents the nineteen iwi of Tāmaki Makaurau, is developing an independent submission.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

35. There are no direct financial implications as a result of making a submission on the bill.

36. There are, however, long-term financial implications as a result of this bill and the impacts of climate change. These will be explored in Auckland’s Climate Action Framework.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

37. The greatest long-term risk is not setting up the policy architecture to address climate change. This creates the potential for unpredictability and impacts on society and the economy. There are also various models noting financial, legal, infrastructure, health and other impacts associated with climate change.

38. Lack of substantive action based on an ineffective policy framework creates opportunity costs for Auckland and New Zealand, as other nations/cities outperform and compete for a global share of innovation dollars in the development of clean tech and climate solutions.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

39. Consultation on the bill closes on 16 July 2019. The bill will be reviewed by the Select Committee and the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill is expected to be in force in 2020.

40. Auckland Climate Action Framework actions will have links to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill as they continue being developed, refined and delivered.

41. Public consultation on Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework will start in July.
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Responding to flood safety risk in Piha

File No.: CP2019/11623

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve preferred options in response to flood safety risk in Piha.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Extreme rainfall events on 3 February and 28 April 2018 caused significant flooding at Piha.

3. On 12 March 2019, public engagement on eight options to mitigate flood safety risk in Piha were approved. These options mitigate flood safety risk collectively to residents, the wider Piha community and visitors. They draw from an independent assessment of the Piha flood problem, risk, its causes and mitigation options.

4. The options respond to the problem: in the future the Piha stream will be subject to flash flooding, and unsafe flooding may occur frequently. There is a high flood safety risk for a small number of properties and people in certain locations during extreme rainfall events in Piha.

5. Staff recommend an intervention package of initiatives, combined from Option one to three as:

| Current situation to keep people away from flooding | Option one: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo) |
| Enhancing readiness and response to flooding | Option two: Increase flood warning time |
| | Option three: Enhance ways of warning people |

6. This suite of options responds to mitigating flood safety risk, have a positive impact on the community and are cost effective. Option one: status quo scored highest against assessment criteria. Option two and three also scored favourably.

7. Public feedback supported Options one to three in order to enhance readiness and response to flooding. Fifty-seven per cent of submitters supported Option one: status quo.

8. Overall the community, mana whenua and local board members did not support significant engineering works, particularly options four, five, six, seven and eight. They all scored poorly against assessment criteria in terms of their achievability in the short-term and impact on the natural environment.

9. The preferred intervention package contributes to mitigating risk to life and injury by helping to keep people away from, and enhance their readiness and responsiveness to, flooding events.

10. There is a low reputational risk that some residents may be concerned that the options do not go far enough to mitigate the flood safety risk and that council should do more. This can be mitigated by clear communication and support about the reasons for the preferred options and initiatives planned and underway.

11. The key trade-off between the recommended intervention package, of Options one to three and Options five to eight is: the preferred approach will not significantly reduce the volume or velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event so do not mitigate flood safety risk as effectively.
12. A report closing the loop on feedback received from the Piha community and the council decision on options will be developed from the document in Attachment A. It is anticipated that this will be provided to the community after council decision-making on 10 July 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) confirm that council will continue to meet its legislative obligations in Piha for flood management under the Local Government Act 2002, the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Building Act 2004.

b) approve a combined intervention package of initiatives to respond to the flood safety risk in Piha from options one to three, outlined in Table 1 below, and as detailed in Attachment A to this report:

Table 1: Combined intervention package of initiatives

| Current situation to keep people away from flooding | Option one: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo) |
| Enhancing readiness and response to flooding       | Option two: Increase flood warning time  |
|                                                    | Option three: Enhance ways of warning people |

c) agree that staff close the loop on feedback received from the Piha community about the flood options, based on the committee decision and Attachment A to this report.

d) request that staff as delegated by the Chief Executive report back in the new council term on a scope for developing a region wide, long-term policy position responding to adverse natural weather events.

Horopaki
Context

13. On 3 February and 28 April 2018, extreme rainfall events in Piha caused significant flooding.

14. On both occasions high water depths and velocities resulted in emergency evacuations and flooding of residential properties on Glenesk, Seaview and Beach Valley Roads. Access along Glenesk Road was also cut-off by flooding.

15. After these events Auckland Council undertook flood modelling. It also carried out floor level surveys and inspections of affected properties to confirm the level of flood risk.

16. Tonkin and Taylor produced an independent assessment of the Piha area to further understand the flood risk and its causes. They also developed a range of practicable options to mitigate flood risk.

17. These analyses concluded that the Piha stream is subject to flash flooding, and that unsafe flooding may occur frequently.

18. On 28 February 2019, a joint workshop of the Environment and Community Committee and the Waitakere Ranges Local Board was held to explain the Tonkin and Taylor findings (released publicly as part of the minutes to the workshop).
19. On 12 March 2019, the Environment and Community Committee approved [CP2019/02333] public engagement on a long list of eight options. The options were developed to enable discussion with the Piha community about flooding readiness, response and physical protection options.

20. A detailed analysis to respond to Piha flood risk is contained in Attachment A. It provides a detailed description of the flooding problem, options and public views. It is the basis for the advice provided in this report.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Problem Definition

Flooding is a natural hazard that occurs frequently across Auckland

21. According to current estimates, 10 per cent of all buildings in Auckland lie within areas that will flood during a 100-year rainstorm. Approximately 15,000 buildings are predicted to flood in such an event.

22. Extreme rainfall is variable across the region. This means that we can expect localised flooding somewhere in Auckland once every three to five years from a 100-year event.

Piha differs from the region in its flood safety risk and flooding frequency

23. Piha differs from other parts of the region in terms of the flood safety risk and the frequency of flooding.

24. Piha stream is subject to flash flooding. The high frequency of events, fast catchment response time (40-50 minutes) and locations of buildings, bridges and roads in the floodplain means that there is a high flood safety risk in certain areas.

25. Glenesk Road is likely to flood on an annual basis. Overtopping of some access bridges can be expected every other year. Flooding of approximately 10 buildings is likely in a five-year event, increasing to approximately 21 buildings in a 100-year event. Of these the residents of five habitable buildings have the highest likelihood of physical contact with flood waters.

There are four groups of people that may have a flood safety risk:

- residents with habitable floors within the floodplain
- residents whose access is restricted by flooding in Glenesk Road
- members of the wider Piha community
- visitors to Piha.

26. The risk of drowning or injury is likely to be associated with people who encounter fast flowing and deep waters, such as when driving or wading through floodwaters. The risk profile of these groups of people varies based on their vulnerability, behaviour during the flood and the physical characteristics of the flood at their location.

27. The level of risk is likely greater at night when people may be asleep or unprepared to evacuate their homes at short notice. Darkness may make it more difficult for people to safely evacuate.

28. There are increased risks for children, elderly people and people with disabilities.

Options

29. A range of options respond to the problem definition and help mitigate flooding risk to the Piha community. A long list of possible options was developed (see Table 1 below).

30. Four of the options entail major physical flood protection and control works in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002.
Table 1: Long list of options

| Current situation to keep people away from flooding | • Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo) |
| Enhancing readiness and response to flooding | • Option 2: Increase flood warning time  
• Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people  
• Option 4: Raise Glenesk Road |
| Physical protection works to help keep flooding away from people | • Option 5: Build a dam(s) to contain flood water  
• Option 6: Build a tunnel to divert flood water  
• Option 7: Widen the stream to increase water flows  
• Option 8: Clear/dredge the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flows |

31. The scope of the options focuses on flood safety risk to people and not on the other impacts such as property damage, costs of evacuation, or disruptions to infrastructure.

32. The options do not impinge on private property rights or responsibilities.

33. Implementing most of the options will be difficult. They will come at a cost to either individuals, the community or the region. The trade-offs are financial, social and environmental.

Public engagement on options

34. Engagement on the options took place between Friday 29 March and Tuesday 30 April 2019. A range of engagement activities were undertaken including public submissions, a public meeting and workshop with Waitākere Ranges Local Board members. Mana whenua were contacted. Individual meetings were held with a small number of the most affected homeowners.

35. In response, the council received the following community feedback:

- 35 public submissions
- local board member views
- mana whenua views
- views from approximately 45 residents at the public meeting
- individual homeowner views from some of the most at-risk residents.

Fifty-seven per cent favoured the status quo represented in Option one

36. Feedback on the eight options presented for consideration by the community preferred Option one: local responses to minimise the impact of storm events. Slightly more than half of the submitters, 57 per cent favoured the status quo as shown in Table 2 below.
37. Most who supported Option one: local responses to minimise the impact of storm events also commented that:
   - Option two: increase flood warning time and Option three: enhance ways of warning people, should progress as well
   - it is seen as the most practical, least invasive and cost-effective option
   - effectiveness relies on council maintenance of the stream.
38. Feedback indicated that many felt that these options were a proportional response to the flood risk problem that would have a positive impact in the community.

**Significant engineering solutions received less support**
39. The engineering solutions were less favoured. Thirty-four per cent selected one of more of the options four to eight. Submitters generally wanted to keep the impact on the current environment to a minimum. This view was also favoured in the public meeting.
40. Submitters suggested that these options were an overreaction to the problem, would have other unintended consequences, a negative environmental impact and would likely not gain consent.

**Sample of verbatim quotes from submissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The effectiveness of option 1 (status quo) depends on ongoing commitment to stream inspections, CCTV and road/drainage maintenance.</th>
<th>There should be an audible warning system in the valley with a 30-minute warning given once sensors have determined a flood is imminent.</th>
<th>The critical option is to improve Mobile Phone signal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options 4 – 8, we do not support any of these options, which in our view are completely unrealistic.</td>
<td>Personally, no appetite to fund the major infrastructure options - 4/5/6 - through rate levies.</td>
<td>I think that the best outcome would be for the council to purchase the homes of those affected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forty per cent of submitters want more consultation, support, and more options put forward

41. In addition to the options provided, around four in 10 people (40 per cent of those who gave feedback) would like more consultation, more support, and more options than put forward. They generally thought more could be done to manage flood risks. Other options included:

- clearing waterways
- increase stop banks
- heighten waterways
- pipes
- making sure the stream is clear
- creating a wetland.

42. Staff suggest that council response is to continue to proactively:

- support the Piha community and visitors to understand and plan for flood safety risk to avoid known dangers
- informing and supporting the community to engage in the range of key initiatives like the environmental restoration work programme for Piha stream that responds to the range of other suggested options from submitters, already planned or underway (status quo)
- progressing data collection, information sharing, education, engineering and environmental restoration options across the region and within the Piha community to respond to adverse natural weather events.

Need for long-term response to adverse natural events like flooding

43. An underlying theme emerged during engagement with the Piha community. There is confusion about the roles and responsibilities of public and private interests and varying levels of public confidence in responses to weather events such as flooding.

44. Improving understanding and alignment of roles and responsibilities between central and local government, insurers, social service providers and private individuals will provide certainty and increase confidence.

45. The impact of climate change and the expected rise of adverse natural weather events illustrate the importance of long-term coordinated planning.

46. Staff recommend that council develop a clear policy position to respond to the risks and impact of adverse natural weather events. Development of the policy position will draw on evidence about the nature, scale and impacts of adverse weather events over the short, medium and long-term. It would also support debate with Aucklanders. Decisions could then be made about responses, the triggers for responses, roles, responsibilities and costs. Staff recommend that the scope of a region wide long-term policy position be reported back to the relevant committee for consideration in the new council term.

Twenty-nine per cent of submitters suggested the option to acquire properties

47. Ten submitters, 29 per cent suggested the option to acquire properties. Concern was expressed that the long list of options would not adequately address the flood risk problem. They suggested purchasing the most at-risk properties should be considered.

48. Political decision making by both the Environment and Community Committee and Waitākere Ranges Local Board has focused on options that mitigate flood safety risk collectively to residents, the wider Piha community and visitors. The options did not consider potential individual property options such as acquisition or grant funding.
49. Staff suggest that the council continues to balance its statutory roles and the private property rights, responsibilities and privacy of individuals.

**Option assessment**

50. Staff developed assessment criteria to enable the comparison of all options. These criteria are unweighted and allow for objective assessment. A summary is provided in Table 3:

**Assessment Criteria**

*Effective*: provides an effective response to the flood safety risk

- *Achievable*: is able to be implemented in the short to medium-term
- *Environment*: helps preserve and protect the natural environment
- *Social*: supports a resilient Piha community
- *Cost*: is cost effective for council, landowners and the Piha community given their roles and responsibilities in response to flooding.

**Table 3: Option assessment table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Increase flood warning time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4: Raise Glenesk Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5: Build a dam(s) to contain flood water</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6: Build a tunnel to divert flood water</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff recommend an intervention package combined from options one-three

51. Staff recommend an intervention package of initiatives combined from Option one to three as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current situation to keep people away from flooding</th>
<th>Enhancing readiness and response to flooding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Option one: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo)</td>
<td>• Option two: Increase flood warning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Option three: Enhance ways of warning people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. Option one (status quo) scores highest against the assessment criteria. Option two and three also score favourably.

53. This suite of options responds to mitigating flood safety risk, have a positive impact on the community and are cost effective. All three of the recommended package of options were the most supported during engagement with the community, and the Waitākere Ranges Local Board members.

54. All three options partially mitigate risk to life and injury by helping to keep people away from and enhance their readiness and responsiveness to flooding events. They do not eliminate risk and they all rely on the awareness and behaviour of people to mitigate flood safety risk. The technology components of Options two and three still require trialling and feasibility testing.

55. Collectively they will not significantly reduce the volume or velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event.

56. All options (five to eight) that required major physical protection works scored highest against the assessment criteria for their impact on reducing flood safety risk.

57. They all score poorly in terms of the achievability in the short-term and impact on the natural environment. The environment criteria is particularly important to the Piha community and Mana Whenua.

58. It recognises the national, regional, and local significance of the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area. Te Runānga o Ngati Whatua were concerned about these options. This was due to the likely detrimental impact these options would have on the environment and the cultural heritage of the Waitākere Ranges.
59. The key trade-off between the recommended intervention package of Options (one to three) and Options five to eight is that preferred approach will not significantly reduce the volume or velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event, so do not mitigate flood safety risk as effectively.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

60. The council group is working collaboratively to best manage this flood risk and support the outcome of a resilient Piha. This includes working on the implementation of activities to increase the understanding and management of the flood risk such as through depth markers, signage and regular refreshment of road markings to ensure residents and visitors are aware of the flood risk.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

61. On 18 April and 20 June 2019, staff held workshops with the members of the Waitākere Ranges Local Board. These workshops provided the members with an opportunity to provide their views on the long list of options and update them on community facilities impacted by the floods.

62. The local board members supported a combination of Options one, two and three and the environmental stream restoration work programme. The members did not support the engineering solution in options four to eight.

63. The views of the local board members were closely aligned to the messages that were received from the community during the engagement process.

64. At the 20 June 2019 workshop, amendments were recommended to Attachment A. These changes involved actions such as improving the language used in the options, explaining the options more clearly and adding more detail on the engagement results. These changes will be picked up in Attachment A and made before the engagement feedback document is sent back to the community.

65. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board’s views on the Piha flooding recommendations were presented at their business meeting on 27 June and are tabled at this Environment and Community Committee meeting.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

66. Staff contacted Te Kawerau ā Maki and the three Ngāti Whātua iwi organisations on the long list of options.

67. Te Runānga o Ngāti Whātua supported the long list of options but noted that they would seek further engagement if any of options 4 to 8 were to proceed. This was due to the likely detrimental impact these options would have on the environment and the cultural heritage of the Waitākere Ranges.

68. Te Kawerau ā Maki did not formally respond on the long list of flood options. They have, however previously been involved in the environmental restoration work programme for the Piha stream and the development of the Piha Watercourse Assessment report which include a series of recommendations. Te Kawerau ā Maki supported its recommendations and emphasised that land has mauri, so any river soil or material removed from the stream needs to be relocated and/or reused within the Piha area.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

69. The implementation of the recommended intervention package of options (Options one - three) will be met from existing budgets. Staff are undertaking studies to assess feasibility of Option three: enhanced warning system. Depending on the total cost, consenting requirements and current budgets a future decision on funding arrangement may be required.

70. If any of the options four to eight are also preferred, they will require unbudgeted expenditure ranging between $1.2 million to $49 million. Funding decisions can be made within the Annual Plan and/or the Long-term Plan processes.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

71. Key risks associated with the recommended intervention package, combining Options one-three are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reputational</td>
<td>There is a low risk that some residents may be concerned that the options do not go far enough to mitigate the flood safety risk and that council should do more.</td>
<td>Clear communication and support to residents and the Piha community on the positive impact expected from the recommended options, continue to implement initiatives, monitor and gather information on flood risk levels in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>There is a low risk implementation of some of the options will experience delays as they provide new services that council will learn more about as they operate for the first time.</td>
<td>Robust project management to ensure the development of the new services is as smooth as possible. The options will be implemented as a package rather than individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>There is a low risk the technology used in an enhanced warning system may provide false warnings of flood events that diminish trust in it.</td>
<td>Staff will work with experts to determine who should receive potential warnings and the appropriate level these should be activated at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation / consents</td>
<td>There is a risk of delay to implementation of some of the options due to resource consent, landowner approval processes and stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>Early consultation and appropriate feasibility assessments to minimise delays will be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

72. A report closing the loop on feedback received from the Piha community and the council decision on options will be developed from the document in Attachment A. It is anticipated that this will be provided to the community after council decision-making on 10 July 2019.
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Responding to Piha Flood Risk: Detailed Analysis

Summary

1. Extreme rainfall events on 3 February and 28 April 2018 caused significant flooding at Piha.
2. In response to high flood safety risk in Piha, eight options with varying levels of flood safety risk mitigation have been identified.
3. They draw from an independent assessment of the Piha flood problem, risk, its causes and mitigation options.
4. The options include existing and new initiatives to keep people away from floods, enhance readiness and responses to floods and keep floods away from people.
5. The options respond to the problem: in the future Piha Stream will be subject to flash flooding, and unsafe flooding may occur frequently. A high flood safety risk exists for a small number of properties and people in certain locations during extreme rainfall events in Piha.
6. The scope of the options focuses on flood safety risk to people and not on the other impacts such as property damage, costs of evacuation, or disruptions to infrastructure. They do not impinge on private property rights or responsibilities.
7. On 12 March 2019 public engagement on eight options to mitigate flood safety risk in Piha was approved.
8. Public feedback generally supported options to enhance readiness and response to flooding, specifically options one to three. Fifty-seven per cent of submitters supported Option one: status quo.
9. The community, mana whenua and local board members do not support significant engineering works particularly options four, five, six and eight.
10. Staff recommend an intervention package of initiatives combined from option one to three as follows:

| Current situation to keep people away from flooding | Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo) |
| Enhancing readiness and response to flooding | Option 2: Increase flood warning time |
| | Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people |

11. Option one: status quo scores highest against the assessment criteria. Option two and three also score favourably.
12. This suite of options responds to mitigating flood safety risk, have a positive impact on the community and are cost effective. All three options in the recommended package of options were the most supported during engagement with the community, and members of the Waitākere Ranges Local Board.
13. All three options partially mitigate risk to life and injury by helping to keep people away from and enhance their readiness and responsiveness to flooding events. They do not eliminate risk and they all rely on the awareness and behaviour of people to mitigate flood safety risk. The technology components of options two and three still require trialling and feasibility testing.
14. All options (five to eight) that required major physical protection works scored highest against the assessment criteria for their impact on reducing flood safety risk.
15. They all score poorly in terms of the achievability in the short-term and impact on the natural environment. The Environment criteria is particularly important to the Piha community and Mana Whenua.

16. The key trade-off between the recommended intervention package of options combining options one to three and options five to eight, is that the preferred approach will not significantly reduce the volume or velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event so do not mitigate flood safety risk as effectively.

**Background**

17. Extreme rainfall events in Piha on 3 February and 28 April 2018 caused significant flooding.

18. On both occasions high water depths and velocities resulted in emergency evacuations and flooding of residential properties on Glenesk, Seaview and Beach Valley Roads. Access along Glenesk Road was also cut-off by flooding.

   **The flood safety risk in Glenesk Valley is high for a small number of people**

19. After these events, Auckland Council undertook flood modelling. It also carried out floor level surveys and inspections of affected properties to confirm the level of flood risk.

20. Tonkin and Taylor produced an independent assessment of the Piha area to further understand the flood risk and its causes. They note that the stormwater catchment for Piha is large, covering approximately 1100 hectares, across steep terrain. This catchment generates large flows and high-water velocities.

21. The time for the flood waters to peak in Piha is within 40 to 50 minutes of rainstorm events. This constitutes ‘flash flooding’. The speed by which flooding occurs accentuates the risk to people.

22. Tonkin and Taylor concluded, that risk of drowning or injury from these frequent events is likely to arise from people who come into contact with fast flowing deep waters. For example, driving and wading through floodwaters.

23. Tonkin and Taylor also found that the majority of private bridge structures are not consented. During large flood events they would be unsafe for use and structurally unstable. One bridge was deemed dangerous.

24. These analyses conclude that the flood safety risk is high at some locations during extreme rainfall events.¹

**Flooding is a natural hazard that occurs frequently across Auckland**

25. According to current estimates, ten per cent of all buildings in Auckland lie within areas that will flood during a 100-year rainstorm. Approximately 15,000 buildings are predicted to flood such an event.

26. Extreme rainfall is variable across the region. This means that we can expect localised flooding somewhere in Auckland once every three to five years from a 100-year event.

27. Piha differs from other parts of the region in terms of the flood safety risk and the frequency of flooding.

   ‘Local solutions to local problems’ is the accepted approach to flooding

28. According to the Ministry for the Environment the generally accepted approach to managing natural hazards in New Zealand, including flooding, is ‘local solutions to local problems.’

---

¹ For example, rainfall events which occur once every five to 10 years on average.
29. Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined for local and central government as well as individuals and landowners.

30. Auckland Council acts in dual capacities as a regional council and territorial authority (see Appendix 1).

31. The council operates under a legislative framework for flood risk management that enables rather than requires specific levels of flood protection to be achieved.

32. Regional councils maintain records of river flows, lake levels, rainfall and past floods. They model water flows, so they can warn of future flooding. They manage rivers and catchments and control land-use activities through the Resource Management Act 1991. Regional councils issue flood warnings and provide emergency management.

33. Territorial authorities collect information on flooding. They are responsible for controlling buildings and the effects of land use to reduce flood risk. The key tools are set out in the Building Act 2004 and Resource Management Act 1991 (see Appendix 2).

34. For Auckland Council some of the key tools include:
   - rules in the Unitary Plan based on hazard maps that manage where and what activity is allowed
   - minimum floor levels under the Building Act 2004 and Resource Management Act 1991
   - advice to warn people about flood hazards through Land Information and Project Information Memoranda
   - community emergency readiness and response planning and information.

35. The council also has a legislative role under the Building Act 2004 to assess and respond after a flooding event if a property and building is insanitary or dangerous.

36. Central government works through legislation and other policy-settings to enable local government. The police and the fire service help manage local events.

37. Central government also provides assistance following a large flood event to communities and councils to assist recovery. For example, the Earthquake Commission may provide natural disaster insurance to residential property owners in certain situations.

38. Individuals and landowners need to understand their level of flood risk and make decisions about the safety of themselves, their families and their property.

**Council does not provide stormwater infrastructure in rural areas such as Piha**

39. Piha is zoned as Rural – Waitākere Ranges Zone or Residential – Rural and Coastal Settlement Zone under the Unitary Plan.

40. Council provides formal storm water management and systems in urban areas of Auckland. This infrastructure does not extend to rural areas.

**Problem definition**

41. This problem definition set out a simple statement of the current flooding problem and who it affects.

---

**Problem definition**

Piha stream is subject to flash flooding. The high frequency of events, fast catchment response time (40-50 minutes) and locations of buildings, bridges and roads in the floodplain means that there is a high flood safety risk in certain areas.

Glensk Road is likely to flood on an annual basis. Overtopping of some access bridges can be expected every other year. Flooding of approximately 10 buildings is
likely in a five-year event, increasing to approximately 21 buildings in a 100-year event. Of these the residents of five habitable buildings have the highest likelihood of physical contact with flood waters.

There are four groups of people that may have a flood safety risk:

- residents with habitable floors within the floodplain
- residents whose access is restricted by flooding in Glenesk Road
- members of the wider Piha community
- visitors to Piha.

The risk profile of these groups of people varies based on their vulnerability, behaviour during the flood and the physical characteristics of the flood at their location.

The level of risk is likely to be greater at night when people may be asleep or unprepared to evacuate their homes at short notice. Darkness may make it more difficult for people to safely evacuate.

There are increased risks for children, elderly people and people with disabilities.

42. The problem statement focuses on flood safety risk to people; however, it is important to note that there are other impacts:

- property damage, both structural and to contents
- the cost of evacuation and providing for the welfare needs of those affected by flooding
- disruption to users of roading infrastructure, which further impacts on economic activity.

43. Several options outlined in this document may help minimise these impacts.

Private property options

44. This report primarily focuses on options that mitigate flood safety risk collectively to residents, the wider Piha community and visitors.

45. The scope of the options does not impinge on private property rights or on the private responsibilities and choices of individual property owners. For this reason the purchase of properties, an option raised by parts of the community, was not presented as part of the eight options for community engagement.

46. Private property owners may wish to consider options to reduce the impact flooding has on their property.

47. These can include building or property improvements that are not legally required under the Building Act 2004 or the Resource Management Act 1991.

48. Raising the floor level of buildings out of the 100-year floodplains is one example. This was outlined in the Tonkin and Taylor report.

49. The only exception is council’s role under the Building Act 2004 relating to insanitary and dangerous buildings as a result of flooding. The Tonkin and Taylor report sets out their assessment of affected properties.

50. The council will make every effort to balance its statutory responsibilities with the rights of property owners.
A range of collective options

51. A range of options respond to the problem definition and help mitigate flooding risk to the Piha community. They include existing and new initiatives focussed on collective approaches to:
   - help keep people away from floods
   - enhance our readiness and response to floods
   - physical works to keep floods away from people.

52. A long list of possible options has been developed to enable discussion between the council, landowners and the Piha community (see Table 1 below).

53. A number of the options can and may need to be combined. Implementing most of the options will be difficult. They will come at a cost to either individuals, the community or the region. The trade-offs are financial, social and environmental.

54. Four of the options entail major flood protection and control works in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002.2 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current situation to keep people away from flooding</th>
<th>Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing readiness and response to flooding</td>
<td>Option 2: Increase flood warning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 4: Raise Glenesk Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical protection works to keep flooding away from people</td>
<td>Option 5: Build a dam(s) to contain flood water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 6: Build a tunnel to divert flood water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 7: Widen the stream to increase water flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 8: Clear/dredge the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. Options five and seven have sub-options.

56. Dams could be built to retain floodwaters from either the Glenesk and Piha streams under Option five. A single large dam could cover both tributaries.

57. Stream widening under Option seven has been modelled for a two-year and a 10-year storm event.

58. There is an interdependency between Options seven and eight. The value of clearing the stream depends on widening the stream.

59. Several options could be implemented. Only the large infrastructure projects (Options five, six and seven) are considered mutually exclusive.

60. All of these options and their likely impact are discussed in detail below.

61. Staff considered an option to increase the planting of native flora across the catchment to increase its capacity to absorb rainwater. Evidence shows that plants native to Aotearoa New Zealand retain more water than exotics.

---

2 These are defined as physical structures that are owned by local authorities and are designed to protect urban and rural areas from flooding from rivers and includes ancillary works such as channel realignment or gravel removal.
3 There are non-financial performance measures and reporting requirements for major flood protection and control schemes under the Act.
62. This option was dismissed because the Waitakere Ranges is the catchment for Glenesk Valley. This area is already heavily planted with native vegetation. Any additional planting would have a minimal impact on flooding in Piha.

**Assessment criteria**

63. Staff developed assessment criteria to enable the comparison of all options. These criteria are unweighted and allow for objective assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent to which each option:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Effective: provides an effective response to the flood safety risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Achievable: is able to be implemented in the short to medium-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Environment: helps preserve and protect the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Social: supports a resilient Piha community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Cost: is cost effective for council, landowners and the Piha community given their roles and responsibilities in response to flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. All options are compared against the status quo in order to understand any additional benefits or impacts.

65. The first criterion focuses on the impact an option will have on reducing the flood safety risk.

66. The second criterion considers the likelihood of successfully implementing the option - can it be implemented within three years? The three-year delivery timeframe is proposed because of the frequency of flooding. Implementation in the short-term will reduce the flood safety risk and maximise the impact of the option.

67. The third criterion considers the impact on the natural environment. It recognises the national, regional, and local significance of the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area and legislative framework to promote and protect it.

68. The fourth criterion considers the social consequences of an option – what will be the lasting impact on social fabric of the Piha community? Staff consider the likelihood of a positive outcome.

69. The fifth criterion focuses on the cost of the option. This analysis identifies costs and benefits and seeks to ensure that they reflect the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders. Each of these stakeholders will need to make their own assessments as to whether the benefits outweigh the costs and make decisions accordingly.

70. The assessment considers the impact of all the criteria and notes further discussion with all affected parties will be vital.
Keep people away from flooding

Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo)

71. Council has discharged its statutory responsibilities and has implemented several discretionary local projects to minimise the impact of flooding in response to the 2018 storm events. A summary of key actions includes:
   - flood notations on Land Information Memoranda for properties in Glenesk Valley
   - installation of rain gauges and stream monitoring sites to better understand the hydrology of the Piha catchment
   - Emergency Management community resilience planning
   - installation of flood risk and depth signage
   - installation of closed-circuit television cameras to help identify debris build up and monitor river levels
   - pre-storm removal of debris, maintenance of culverts and post event repair of road assets
   - environmental restoration work programme for Piha stream and Piha Watercourse Assessment recommendations.

Regulatory

72. Council has included flood notations on Land Information Memoranda for properties in Glenesk Valley since 2000. These memoranda, which provide a summary of the information that council holds on a property, note the potential risk of flooding and in some cases reported instances of flooding.

73. Table 2 below outlines the notations and the timeframes in which they were made.

Table 2: Flood risk notations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flooding / overland flow paths</th>
<th>Number of properties</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential risk of flooding / overland flow paths</td>
<td>12 properties in Glenesk Road, Piha Mill Camp</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential risk of flooding / overland flow paths</td>
<td>1 property in Beach Valley Road, 1 property in Glenesk Road, 1 property in Seaview Road, Piha Art Gallery, Campground and Fire Station</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported incidence(s) of flooding / stormwater issues</td>
<td>2 properties in Glenesk Road</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential risk of flooding / overland flow paths</td>
<td>6 properties in Glenesk Road, 3 properties in Seaview Road</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. This information informs landowners, and prospective landowners, of the level of flooding risk. It allows them to make decisions relating to their property and to have evacuation plans in place.

Data collection and modelling water flows

75. In its capacity as a Unitary Authority, council commissioned Tonkin and Taylor to undertake an independent assessment of the Piha area to understand flooding risk and its causes.

76. Since 2018, council has enhanced monitoring systems for rainfall and flood events in Piha:
- a vertical pointing rain radar and tipping bucket rain gauge upstream at the Rangers hut (installed)
- a vertical pointing rain radar downstream (to be installed)
- stream gauges at Seaview Road Bridge and Piha Mill Camp Bridge (installed)
- flow and level gauge in the stream adjacent to Glenesk Road (to be installed, subject to landowner approval).

77. Improved local rainfall records and information can be included in the hazard register and inform Land Information Memoranda.

Emergency management

78. Auckland Transport has installed flood risk and depth signage at Piha. These signs inform residents, the wider community and visitors of the potential for flash flooding.

79. Auckland Emergency Management is facilitating resilience planning for the wider Piha area. This includes evacuation planning and coordination with emergency response agencies.

Stormwater

80. Council has been undertaking regular inspections to manage flood risk. This includes removing debris from Piha Stream prior to storm events.

81. Installation of closed-circuit television cameras is planned to further assist with the identification of debris between inspections as well as to help monitor flood levels.

82. These are discretionary activities, which council would not normally undertake in rural areas.

Asset management

83. Auckland Transport carries out regular, and pre-storm, maintenance of all culverts and post event repairs of roading assets.

Environmental Restoration

84. An environmental restoration work programme for Piha Stream is also included as part of this option.

85. Morphum Environmental Ltd (Morphum) was engaged by Auckland Council to undertake an options assessment for a series of erosion mitigation measures for lower Piha Stream in the vicinity of the Art Gallery and Education Facility. This work was commissioned prior to the flood events as part of a stream restoration project.

86. A report entitled Piha Watercourse Assessment has a series of recommendations. A summary of the recommended actions is presented in a map (see Appendix 3).

87. The key opportunities identified to improve environmental outcomes at the site include riparian planting to improve bank stability, shading, water quality functions, and minor physical works to increase potential engagement of the floodplain and connectivity between the riparian zone and the channel.

Financial implications

88. The total costs of the above local projects is $0.80 million. These costs are being met within current baselines through prioritisation.

Risks

89. There are no delivery risks associated with the local projects. Any decrease in risk relies on the behaviours and responses of individuals before, during and after flooding events.
Option assessment: Local projects (status quo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

90. The suite of current actions can decrease risk to life and injury for all four ‘at risk’ groups. It does not eliminate the risk.

91. The decrease in flood safety risk is expected to be the result of improved flood profile information, monitoring, warning alerts, maintenance systems, community preparedness and a better understanding of the level of risk.

92. Council provision of information will partially reduce risk by alerting owners and prospective owners to the likelihood of flooding and possible flood levels.

93. Any risk reduction relies on individual approaches, understanding and tolerance to risk. People may underestimate or ignore the risk level. The ability for people to react and get to safety will not be assured.

94. People will also be able to plan ahead and make decisions for themselves, their families as well as their property or prospective property. Depending on the individual decisions made, the council will still be vulnerable to significant criticism if property is damaged, risk to life and injury occurs.

95. Improved warning signage and guidance on what to do (and not to do) in a flooding event will also partially reduce risk. Educating members of the community and visitors to avoid known dangerous behaviours such as driving or wading in fast flowing waters will help mitigate the risk to life and/or injury.

96. Stream gauging will only partly mitigate the risk. Short warning times will remain. At least two hours notice of potentially high flood risk is ideal for safe evacuation.

97. Removing debris from waterways when flooding is forecast, if required, will help to reduce the severity and impacts of an event.

98. Emergency warnings will not reach the whole community given that the text message system is voluntary. Children and elderly people may represent a higher percentage of those that do not receive these warnings.

99. Emergency management planning for communities in the wider Piha area will empower residents and businesses to be better prepared and to put appropriate plans in place. These could include specific strategies for children, elderly and people with disabilities.

100. This option will not reduce the volume or velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event.

Ability to be implemented

101. All the actions have been or are being implemented.

Preserves the natural environment

102. There are no expected additional adverse environmental outcomes under this option. This option may have slight environmental benefits by helping to keep the river free from debris.
Supports a resilient Piha community

103. This option supports a resilient Piha community by increasing local knowledge and understanding of flood risk. It empowers the community to develop a collective response.

104. Residents will have a clear understanding of the level of risk that they and the wider community is potentially exposed to. This enables them to make informed decisions.

105. Some community concerns may not be assuaged. The flood safety risk may be too high for some residents. The impact of future flooding may also be unacceptable to residents and their insurers.

Cost of the option

106. The costs of the above local projects are being met within existing baselines. They are being implemented in accordance with council’s statutory functions and its flood management responsibilities. Accordingly, they deliver broad public benefits.

107. There are no additional costs to landowners or the Piha community.
Enhancing readiness and response to flooding

Option 2: Increase the flood warning time

108. Council could seek to develop and install an enhanced warning system as part of its emergency management function. This would be a discretionary activity with public benefits.

109. The current warning-time is approximately 50 minutes. The objective would be to increase this to two hours, if possible. Increasing the reach of any warnings to all four ‘at-risk’ groups would be another objective.

110. The proposed option entails developing a predictive warning system, which draws upon specialist weather forecast modelling and stream monitoring, rather than relying on rainfall alone.

111. This system would depend on technical inputs from the MetService and Weather Radar New Zealand. Their modelling would be supported by data collected from the vertical pointing radar, rain gauges and water velocity sensors implemented under the status quo.

112. Initial assessments of this option indicate that the proposed system could generate false warnings. These could be up to 50 per cent of all warnings. This could undermine the value of the system. People may decide not to evacuate in an emergency if they have previously responded to prior false warnings. This may make it unsuitable as a public warning system.

113. The proposed system, despite the potential for false warnings, would still assist emergency services. It would increase preparedness and enable them to prioritise high risk properties for evacuation. For this reason, it warrants further investigation.

Financial Implications

114. The estimated cost of the predictive warning system is $0.30 million. Annual operational costs are expected to be up to $0.05 million. These costs are being met within current baselines.

Risk

115. There is a medium delivery risk associated with the implementation of this option. The predictive warning system may not be effective.

Option assessment: Increased warning time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

116. This option will lead to a slight reduction in the flood safety risk. The decrease is expected to be the result of improved preparedness of emergency services. There would also be an increased likelihood of reaching all affected people, for example, elderly and visitors. This option will not reduce the volume or velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event.

117. To be fully effective the system would need to increase the warning time and the accuracy of the warning. This will need to be assessed in terms of feasibility.
Ability to be implemented

118. This option could be implemented within the short-term.

119. Trials of the predictive warning system will be required to improve reliability before it could become operational.

Preserves the natural environment

120. There are no adverse environmental outcomes under this option.

Supports a resilient Piha community

121. This option does little to support a resilient Piha community. The flood safety risk may be too high for some residents, who may choose to leave Piha.

122. The impact of future flooding may also be unacceptable to their insurers.

Cost of the option

123. The estimated cost of the predictive warning system is $0.30 million. Annual operational costs are expected to be up to $0.05 million.

Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people

124. Council could seek to improve communications technology to increase the reach of any warning system. Currently council relies on a text-based service, which people subscribe to at no cost.

125. This would be a discretionary activity as part of council’s emergency management function with a mix of public and private benefits.

126. The proposed option entails expanding the text-based service. This would be in response to limitations with existing landline and cell phone coverage in Piha. This is due to gaps in coverage caused by the Waitakere Ranges and rural service levels.

127. Preliminary assessments have been made of ways to enhance telecommunications in Piha. Implementation could entail using a telecommunications booster to increase signal strength.

128. It may be possible to locate this technology in Piha, for example at the fire station, and to use it to relay signals to the existing cell phone tower.

129. If feasible, this service would provide enhanced reception across Piha. This would increase coverage and provide more reliable options to alert residents of flooding.

130. An additional cell phone tower is another way of increasing coverage.

131. Improved communications would have wider benefits for residents and visitors.

132. The introduction of a recorded voice warning is another feature of this option. This will help visitors and new residents, who may be unaware of the danger, understand the flash flooding risk. It could be much more effective than a siren.

Financial Implications

133. Staff are undertaking studies to assess feasibility. Implementation options and costings for improving the cell coverage in the Piha catchment. Depending on the total cost and any consenting requirements and current budgets a future decision on funding arrangement may be required.

Risk

134. There is a low delivery risk that landowner approval will not be granted for the location of the booster technology at the fire station.
Option assessment: Enhanced warning system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

135. This option will lead to a small reduction in the flood safety risk. Improved communications may enable people to get to safety earlier. There would also be an increased likelihood of reaching all affected people, for example, elderly and visitors. This option will not reduce the volume or velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event.

136. To be fully effective an increase in warning time is also needed. Staff are undertaking studies to assess feasibility.

137. There would be a significant residual safety risk that people wade through rapid and deep water or seek to evacuate in cars.

Ability to be implemented

138. This option could be implemented within the short-term.

139. Trials of the telecommunications booster will be required to improve reliability before it can become operational. Future decision is required on a new cell tower before implementation is undertaken.

Preserves the natural environment

140. There are no adverse environmental outcomes under this option.

Supports a resilient Piha community

141. This option supports a resilient Piha community by improving communications with local residents. It would enhance current community resilience and emergency plans.

142. The flood safety risk may be too high for some residents, who may choose to leave Piha.

143. The impact of future flooding may also be unacceptable to their insurers.

Cost of the option

144. There are costs associated with the enhancement to telecommunications. The public benefits of this investment would be limited to storm events. This should be reflected in where costs lie.

145. Improved communications would have wider benefits for the fire service as well as private benefits for residents and visitors. These stakeholders would be able to use the improved cell phone coverage and increased reliability in their day-to-day activities.

146. Trialling of the booster should allow telecommunications companies to identify the properties and areas that will benefit from any service improvement.

Option 4: Raise Glenesk Road

147. Auckland Transport could undertake transport engineering works to raise the height of Glenesk Road.

148. This would be a discretionary activity with primarily public benefits. It would allow the road to be used by emergency services and by Piha residents to evacuate during an extreme rainfall event.
149. The proposed option is to raise approximately 560 meters of Glenesk Road by approximately one metre. This would make the road usable up to a 10-year storm event.

150. Replacement of 20 metres of culverts and an existing bridge would be required.

151. This option would require the upgrade of approximately 30 driveways.

152. It is also proposed that new vehicle bays are built to prevent vehicles floating away in a flood event.

**Financial implications**

153. The estimated capital costs to raise Glenesk Road is $1.2 million. This expenditure is unbudgeted.

**Risks**

154. This option would create a low financial risk to Auckland Transport. It may put other planned capital expenditure at risk.

155. There are high delivery risks associated with the implementation of this option. It relies on landowners investing in new accesses and vehicle bays.

**Option assessment: Raising Glenesk Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness of the response**

156. This option would lead to a small decrease to the risk to life to three 'at risk' groups. This option may marginally increase the flooding risk.

157. Raising the road will reduce the risk of flooding preventing emergency services access.

158. Those who have restricted access in a flood event will see the most benefits. It will provide for safer evacuation for houses on the uphill side of the road.

159. Raising the road along with the construction of new bridges and safe vehicle bays may assist with the evacuation of houses within the floodplain. It may also accentuate flooding.

160. Reinforcing bridge structures reduces the risk of bridge damage or collapse.

161. Building safe vehicle bays reduces the risk that vehicles could float away in a flood event.

**Ability to be implemented**

162. Implementation of this option is dependent on landowners undertaking private works.

**Preserves the natural environment**

163. This option will have a low environment impact. It entails the replacement, and raising, of existing structures.

**Supports a resilient Piha community**

164. This option is expected to have a moderate positive impact on the Piha community.

165. Private works to improve accesses and parking bays are likely to viewed as unnecessary and costly. Landowners may not have the financial resources to undertake these works. This would add to existing stress levels.
166. This option would minimise disruption to users of roading infrastructure.

Costs of this option

167. Raising the road would provide public benefits. It would improve access for emergency services. It would also facilitate the evacuation of Piha residents.

Physical protection works to help keep flooding away from people

Option 5: Build a dam(s) to contain flood water

168. Council could consider major engineering works to construct a storage dam or dams to retain floodwaters and reduce peak flows during extreme rainfall events.

169. This would be a discretionary activity with primarily private benefits.

170. Council does not currently have any flood protection and control works of comparable size and scale. If approved, this option this would represent a significant policy shift.

171. Tonkin and Taylor set out four main dam sub-options. The key aspects of each proposal is outlined in Table 4 below.

172. Dams could be built to retain floodwaters from either the Glenesk and Piha streams. Both dams could be constructed. A single large dam could also cover both tributaries.

Table 4: Dam options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Dam Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single dam - Piha tributary</td>
<td>Stores water from a 100-year storm event from Piha Stream. The resulting flow from Glenesk Stream would be 54 m³/s.</td>
<td>27 metres high, 147 metres long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single dam - Glenesk tributary</td>
<td>Stores water from a 100-year storm event from Glenesk Stream. The resulting flow from Piha Stream would be 54 m³/s.</td>
<td>30 metres high, 205 metres long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two dams - Piha and Glenesk tributaries</td>
<td>Each dam stores water from a 100-year storm event. Any compensatory release would be 20 m³/s.</td>
<td>Refer above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single dam - Tributary confluence (Piha Mill Camp)</td>
<td>Stores water from a 100-year storm event. Any compensatory release would be 20 m³/s.</td>
<td>21 metres high, 180 metres long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

173. This information is indicative only. The size, scope, location and functionality of any proposed dam would require detailed investigation if this option was considered feasible.

174. Any of these sub-options would be considered ‘large dams’ under the Building Act 2004. They would require building and resource consents under the Resource Management Act 1991.

175. Each sub-option would likely be classified as ‘high potential impact’ category dams under the Building Act 2004. This means that they would need to meet the highest design and construction specifications. For example, the dam or dams would have to be able to withstand any seismic or volcanic event. They would also have to pass the probable maximum flood.

---

4 A large dam means a dam that retains three or more metres depth and holds 20,000 or more cubic metres volume of water.
Financial Implications

176. The estimated capital costs for this option are:
• single dam at Piha tributary: $17-22 million
• single dam at Glensk tributary: $22-28 million
• two dams at Piha and Glensk tributaries: $49 million
• single dam at tributary confluence: $12-18 million.

177. There would also be significant annual operational expenditure required. High potential impact category dams require considerable operational support, maintenance and rigorous dam safety management.

178. Both the capital and operational expenditure is unbudgeted.

179. Development of infrastructure of this scale would typically be debt-funded by council and the costs recovered by way of a targeted rate payable by the Piha community.

180. The council’s debt ceiling may mean that there is insufficient funding available to deliver this infrastructure in the long-term. This is due to existing commitments to growth-related projects.

Risks

181. This option would create a high financial risk to council. It would put other capital expenditure at risk.

182. There are high delivery risks associated with this implementation of this option. It is dependent on the willingness of the Piha community for a targeted rate.

Option assessment: Build a dam(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

183. A well-located and constructed dam or dams to retain floodwaters could effectively eliminate the flood safety risk as well as other impacts from flooding.

184. All Piha residents and visitors would be safe under this option.

Ability to be implemented

185. The engineering feasibility of large dams is highly dependent on geology. The volcanic origins of the Waitakere Ranges may make it unsuitable for construction. Material availability might be another problem.

186. There is a high delivery risk in that the proposed construction plans may not gain consent under the Resource Management Act 1991.

187. Piha is also covered by the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008, which sets out additional environmental protections.

188. The combination of these factors will likely result in a lengthy timeframe for completion.

Preserves the natural environment

189. All of the dam sub-options would have a significant environmental impact.

190. Extensive clearance of native bush would be required for both the construction area and for access ways.

191. The dam or dams would have a significant negative visual amenity impact.
Supports a resilient Piha community

192. This option is likely to increase the confidence of residents during an extreme rainfall event. Residents could stay in their properties and would not need to worry about flood safety risks.

193. The community will be more confident in making informed decisions on future developments in the area.

194. Construction of a dam and its environmental impacts could be viewed negatively by some members of the community.

195. Rain water retained by the dam would need to be kept low in preparation for any storm event. There would not be any benefit to the community from increased drinking water supply. The ability to generate hydroelectricity would also be limited.

Cost of this option

196. The costs of this option are high and likely to outweigh the benefits of flood risk mitigation.

197. These costs would largely be borne by landowners in Piha. This is because flood protection and control schemes deliver private benefits to the properties they protect.

198. Council is a landowner in the area. It could derive some benefit from a flood protection and control scheme. However, council would need to weigh the costs versus benefits and may conclude that the removal of assets is more cost effective.

199. There would be some public benefits from reducing the flood safety risk. The costs of this option would need to be weighed against other options.

Option 6: Build a tunnel to divert flood water

200. Council could consider major engineering works to construct a flood flow diversion tunnel for Piha stream.

201. This option would be a discretionary activity with primarily private benefits.

202. If approved, the construction of a major flood protection and control scheme would represent a significant policy shift.

203. Tonkin and Taylor considered a flood flow diversion tunnel from Piha stream to Whekatahi Creek. It would entail boring a 1.4-kilometre long tunnel with a diameter of four to five meters.

204. This tunnel would divert floodwaters from Piha Stream in a 10-year storm event and above. However, it would increase flows and likely flood risk in areas around Whekatahi Creek.

Financial Implications

205. The estimated minimum capital cost is $45 million. The actual cost would be dependent on geology.

206. Annual operational expenditure would also be required.

207. Both the capital and operational expenditure is unbudgeted.

208. Council may not have the capacity to debt-fund construction even if there is support from the Piha community for a targeted rate to meet all capital and operational costs.

Risks

209. This option would create a high financial risk to council. It would put other capital expenditure at risk.

210. There are high delivery risks associated with the implementation of this option. It is also dependent on the willingness of the Piha community for a targeted rate.
Option assessment: Build a tunnel to divert flood water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

211. This option would divert flood waters in an extreme rainfall event. It would significantly decrease the flood safety risk to all Piha residents and visitors.

212. There would be an increased risk to people living near, or visiting, Whekatahi Creek.

Ability to be implemented

213. This option may be impractical to implement. Consenting will be extremely difficult. The physical works may be impossible due to volcanic rock.

Preserves the natural environment

214. This option would have a significant environmental impact. It would entail boring through the Waitākere Ranges. Clearance of native bush would be also required.

Supports a resilient Piha community

215. Piha residents could stay in their properties and concerns about flood safety risks would be reduced.

216. The environmental impacts could be viewed negatively by the community.

Cost of this option

217. The costs of this option are high and likely to outweigh the benefits of flood risk mitigation.

218. These costs would largely be borne by landowners.

219. While there would be some public benefits from reducing the flood safety risk, the costs of this option may be preclusive.

Option 7: Widen the stream to increase water flows

220. Council could consider engineering works to widen and lower Piha Stream. This would allow floodwaters to quickly drain into the Tasman Sea.

221. This would be a discretionary activity with primarily public benefits.

222. Tonkin and Taylor considered two design models. They cover two and 10-year storm events.

223. Implementation requires the relocation and replacement of a number of built structures, including all public and private bridges, as outlined in Table 5 below.

224. Construction within the streambed and floodplain as well as sensitive receiving environments is complex. There is a risk that this option may not be effective.
Table 5: Stream widening options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm event</th>
<th>Implementation requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-year storm event</td>
<td>• Widen the top width of the channel from 18 to 21 metres upstream of Seaview Road bridge and downstream to 28 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Replacement of three vehicles bridges and nine pedestrian bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relocation/replacement of two sheds (18 and 30-32 Glenesk Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relocation/replacement of one tree house and one water tank (50 Glenesk Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year storm event</td>
<td>• Widen the top width of the channel from 24 to 36 metres upstream of Seaview Road bridge and downstream to 50 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Replacement of three vehicles bridges and nine pedestrian bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reconstruction of the Piha Mill Camp driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction of 600 metres of retaining wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relocation/replacement of five sheds (18, 30-32 and 50 Glenesk Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relocation/replacement of one tree house and one water tank (Glenesk Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relocation/replacement of nine cabins, one tennis court, one building and one water tank at the camp ground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial implications

226. The estimated capital cost to widen the stream to cope with a two-year storm event is between $22 and 25 million. The cost range increases to $31-36 million for a 10-year storm event. Some annual operational expenditure may be required.

227. Both the capital and operational expenditure is unbudgeted.

228. Council may not have the capacity to debt-fund construction even if there is support from the Piha community for a targeted rate to meet all capital and operational costs.

Risks

229. This option would create a high financial risk to council. It would put other capital expenditure at risk.

230. There are high delivery risks associated with this implementation of this option. It is also dependent on the willingness of the Piha community for a targeted rate.

Option assessment: Widen the stream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

231. Stream widening and lowering the channel would provide a moderate decrease to the flood safety risk for all four ‘at risk’ groups.

232. This option would result in floodwaters being discharged more effectively and lower stream levels in an extreme rainfall event.

233. Increasing stream depth will alter water flows and increase water velocities in an extreme rainfall event. This increases the risk if someone, most likely a child, was to fall into the stream.

234. This option does not eliminate the risk for extreme rainfall events. There is a residual risk of extreme rainfall events that could exceed the capacity of the stream.
Ability to be implemented

235. Construction within the streambed and floodplain and sensitive receiving environments is complex. There is a risk that the desired outcome will not be achieved.

236. Implementation of this option requires removal of some existing structures. Landowners would need to agree to these works.

237. Consenting the works is likely to present some challenges, but these could be overcome if there is support from the community.

Preserves the natural environment

238. Both options would have a moderate environmental impact. This could be mitigated by planting.

239. Increasing water velocities could increase erosion downstream.

Supports a resilient Piha community

240. Residents could stay in their properties and concerns about flood safety risks would be reduced.

241. The environmental impacts could be viewed negatively by the community.

Cost of this option

242. The costs of this option are high. There would be public benefits from reducing the flood safety risk.

Option 8: Clear/dredge the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flows

243. Council could consider engineering works to increase the stream velocities of Piha Stream from Seaview Road Bridge through the lagoon area to the Tasman Sea.

244. This would be a discretionary activity with primarily public benefits.

245. This option would entail forming a larger and deeper stream channel through a combination of excavation and dredging. It would also involve removal of the sandbar and sediment build-up in the lagoon.

246. The works would cover approximately 800 metres. Tonkin and Taylor estimate that 12,000 metres$^3$ of soil, sediment and sand would need to be removed.

247. This option would require ongoing excavation and dredging to be effective. This could be required on an annual or more frequent basis.

248. Further modelling and study of sediment levels over time will be required if this option is supported.

Financial implications

249. The estimated initial costs of this option are $3.5 - 4.5 million. There would also be annual costs from ongoing excavation and dredging. These costs are unbudgeted.

Risks

250. There are low delivery risks associated with obtaining consents for the works. This could be overcome if there is support from the community.
Option assessment: Clear/dredge the stream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slight change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

252. This option would lead to a small change in the flood safety risk, primarily for visitors to Piha.

253. Modelling by Tonkin and Taylor indicates that this option would help reduce stream flood levels between Seaview Bridge and the coastal marine area by 0.5 to 0.85 metres in a 10-year rainfall event.

254. It would have no discernible impact on flooding at the Piha Domain Campgrounds.

255. Tonkin and Taylor also notes that sandbar clearance would have a negligible effect to water levels upstream of Seaview Bridge.

256. This option will not reduce the volume and velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event.

Ability to be implemented

257. Dredging has been previously undertaken in the Piha area.

258. This option would require ongoing maintenance. There is a risk that the desired outcome will not be achieved or maintained due to tidal, wave, wind and fluvial processes.

Preserves the natural environment

259. This option will have a low long-term impact on the environment.

260. Increasing water velocities could increase erosion in the coastal marine area.

Supports a resilient Piha community

261. If implemented in conjunction with option 7, Piha residents could stay in their properties and concerns about flood safety risks would be reduced.

262. This option would also help to flush contaminated water from the lagoon. Poor water quality from run-off and septic tanks is a long-standing community concern.

Costs of this option

263. The main public benefits would be from improvements in water quality. This is not the primary objective.
Community Engagement on Options

264. Engagement on the options took place between Friday 29 March and Tuesday 30 April 2019. A range of engagement activities were undertaken to encourage Piha residents, Glenesk Road homeowners and the wider community to have their say. This included:

- **Public**: The general public and resident views were collected through email submissions and the council’s have your say online portal. This process was advertised via leaflet drops, email correspondence, posters and promotion in prominent Piha public spaces such as the Arataki Visitors centre. Staff held a public meeting in Piha on 14 April to gather community views.

- **Local Board**: Workshop with the Waitākere Ranges Local Board on 18 April to discuss the long list of options and seek member views.

- **Mana whenua**: Staff contacted Te Kawerau ā Maki and the three Ngāti Whātua iwi organisations on the long list of options.

- **Individual homeowners**: Meeting with a small number of the most affected homeowners on an individual basis.

265. In response, the council received the following community feedback:

- 35 public submissions
- local board member views
- mana whenua views
- views from approximately 45 residents at the public meeting
- individual homeowner views from some of the most at-risk residents.

266. A report outlining the results of the engagement is included as Appendix 4.

Mana Whenua

267. Te Runānga o Ngāti Whātua supported the long list of options but noted that they would seek further engagement if any of options 4 to 8 were to proceed. This was due to the likely detrimental impact these options would have on the environment and the cultural heritage of the Waitākere Ranges.

268. Te Kawerau ā Maki did not formally respond on the long list of flood options. They have however previously been involved in the environmental restoration work programme for the Piha stream and the development of the Piha Watercourse Assessment report which include a series of recommendations.

269. Te Kawerau ā Maki supported its recommendations and emphasised that land has mauri, so any river soil or material removed from the stream needs to be relocated and/or reused within the Piha area.

Waitākere Ranges Local Board

270. On 18 April and 20 June 2019 staff held workshops with the members of the Waitākere Ranges Local Board. These workshops provided the members with an opportunity to provide their views on the long list of options and update them on community facilities impacted by the floods.

271. The local board members supported a combination of Options one, two and three and the environmental stream restoration work programme. The members did not support the engineering solution in options four to eight.

272. The views of the local board members were closely aligned to the messages that were received from the community during the engagement process.
273. At the 20 June 2019 workshop, amendments were recommended to Attachment A. These changes involved actions such as improving the language used in the options, explaining the options more clearly and adding more detail on the engagement results. These changes will be picked up in Attachment A and made before the engagement feedback document is sent back to the community.

274. This Waitematā Ranges Local Board formal view on Piha flooding mitigation options is being sought at their 27 June 2019 meeting.

**Community feedback**

**There was a common view on the options at the community meeting**

275. Staff held a public meeting on Sunday 14 April 2019 in Piha to gather community views on the long list of options. This meeting was attended by approximately 40 residents and covered the long list of options and other alternative options put forward by the public. The majority of the meeting attendees favoured options 1-3 and opposed options 4-8.

276. The meeting also helped inform staff on community concerns on areas of the stream that are prone to blockages, the location of signage and flood modelling equipment, risks visitors to Piha may face on popular walking tracks, emergency response systems in place and other matters.

57 per cent favoured the status quo represented in option one

277. Feedback on the eight options presented for consideration by the community preferred option one: local responses to minimise the impact of storm events. Slightly more than half of the submitters - 57 per cent favoured the status quo as shown in Table 6.

**Table 6: Feedback on options presented for community consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 - Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (continuation of current support)</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 - Increase flood warning time</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 - Enhance ways of warning people</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 7 - Widen the stream to increase water flow</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 8 - Clear / dredge the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flow</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 - Raise Glenesk Road</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5 - Build a dam(s) to contain flood water</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6 - Build a tunnel to divert flood water</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base: n=35**
278. Most who supported Option one: a local response to minimise the impact of storm events also:
- wanted Options two: increase flood warning time and option three: enhance ways of warning people, to progress as well
- seen as most practical, least invasive and cost-effective options
- mentioned that effectiveness relies in council maintenance of the stream.

Table 7: Sample of verbatim quotes from submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The effectiveness of option 1 (status quo) depends on ongoing commitment to stream inspections, CCTV and road/drainage maintenance.</th>
<th>There should be an audible warning system in the valley with a 30-minute warning given once sensors have determined a flood is imminent.</th>
<th>Option 1-4 are clearly the best options within the report and some/all of these options should be promoted for implementation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The critical option is to improve Mobile Phone signal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

279. Feedback indicated that many felt that these options were a proportional response to the flood risk problem that would have a positive impact in the community.

Significant engineering solutions received less support

280. The engineering solutions were less favoured. Thirty-four per cent selected one of more of the options four to eight. Submitters generally wanted to keep the impact on the current environment to a minimum. This view was also favoured in the public meeting.

281. Submitters suggested that these options were an overreaction to the problem, would have other unintended consequences, a negative environmental impact and would likely not gain consent.

Table 8: Sample of verbatim quotes from submissions

| Options 4 – 8, we do not support any of these options, which in our view are completely unrealistic. | Personally, no appetite to fund the major infrastructure options - 4/5/6 - through rate levies. Don’t approve the environmental impacts of 5/6. Concerns option 4 would have unintended consequences on the behaviour of floods. For options 7 and 8, the level of uncertainty around outcomes is too high to risk | The physical protection works put forward appear unsustainable (i.e. dredging), to transfer the problem elsewhere (i.e. tunnel) and/or to have the potential for other significant adverse effects (i.e. tunnel, stream widening, dams............) |
Forty per cent of submitters want more consultation, support, and options than put forward.

282. In addition, instead of the options provided, around four in ten people – 40 per cent of those who gave feedback would like more consultation, more support, and more options than put forward. They generally thought more could be done to manage flood risks.

283. Ten submitters - 29 per cent suggested the option to acquire properties. Concern was expressed that the long list of options would not adequately address the flood risk problem. They suggested that council should consider purchasing the most at-risk properties.

284. These submitters outlined the hardship some residents had endured to date. They suggested that private property purchases of the most at-risk houses could also contribute to restoring wetlands that would help mitigate future flooding events.

285. Other suggestions included clearing waterways, increase stop banks, heighten waterways, raise houses, pipes, making sure the stream is clear, creating a wetland and raising the bridge.

Table 9: Feedback on other options suggested by submitters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More consultation/ Council support/ more options/ not thorough enough</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire properties</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge streams/ clear waterways/ clean pipes/ open stream mouth</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase stop banks/ heighten waterways/ raise houses/ repair choke points</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on climate change/ low impact options</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream maintenance/ slow drainage/ plant build up</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and drainage areas</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include risk on property documentation and insurance</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert Systems/ traffic management</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of money/ check expenditure</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address sand flow/ sand dunes</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Sample of verbatim quotes from submissions

Flood protection and control are Council’s responsibility, as is ensuring the safety of its ratepayers, yet we have been without a habitable home for over a year, paying for a mortgage while also renting and there is no end in sight.

I would hope council would do the right thing in this matter as swiftly as possible by purchasing homes.

A point to note. I didn’t purchase in Glen Esk due to known flood risks. I actually paid more for a home that didn’t have a flood risk and this pay more rates for the exact level of service that the Glen Esk people get, so I really don’t think I as a rate payer should have to bail out those whom took a risk and brought cheap. So please do not feel you need to buy back affected flooded properties. That’s what insurances are for. Its akin to buying back properties effected if a tidal wave occurred.
Response

Response to suggestions for more consultation, support, and suggested options: clearing waterways, increase stop banks, heighten waterways, raise houses, pipes, making sure the stream in clear, creating a wetland and raising the bridge.

286. Council will continue its efforts to support the Piha community and visitors to understand and plan for flood safety risk to avoid known dangers. This supports individuals to make informed decisions on the level of risk that is acceptable for them, their families and property.

287. Council will engage in proactive communication to inform and support the community on the range of key initiatives already planned or underway (status quo) that meet many of the other options suggested by submitters. These include:
- installation of rain gauges and stream monitoring sites to better understand the hydrology of the Piha catchment
- Emergency Management community resilience planning
- installation of flood risk and depth signage
- installation of closed-circuit television cameras to help identify debris build up and monitor river levels
- pre-storm removal of debris, maintenance of culverts and post event repair of roading assets.

288. The environmental restoration work programme for Piha Stream respond well to the range of other suggested options from submitters. Piha Watercourse Assessment recommendations include:
- riparian planting to improve bank stability, shading, water quality functions,
- minor physical works to increase potential engagement of the floodplain and connectivity between the riparian zone and the channel.

289. The council will also keep identifying and progressing a range of data collection, information sharing, education, engineering and environmental restoration options across the region and within the Piha community to respond to adverse natural weather events.

290. Future options to manage flooding events that council can pursue also exist under the Resource Management Act 1991. The Unitary Plan will be an important part of the long-term response to natural weather hazards in the Auckland region.

Need for long-term response to adverse natural events like flooding

291. An underlying theme emerged during engagement with the Piha community. There is confusion about the roles and responsibilities of public and private interests and varying levels of public confidence in responses to weather events such as flooding.

292. Improving understanding and alignment of roles and responsibilities between central and local government, insurers, social service providers and private individuals will provide more certainty and increase confidence.

293. The impact of climate change and the expected rise of adverse natural weather events illustrate the importance of long-term coordinated planning.

294. Staff recommend that council develop a clear policy position to respond to the risks and impact of adverse natural weather events. Development of the policy position will draw on evidence about the nature, scale and impacts of adverse weather events over the short, medium and long-term. It would also support debate with Auckland’s. Decision could then be made about responses, the triggers for responses, roles, responsibilities and costs. Staff recommend that the scope of a region wide long-term policy position be reported back to the relevant committee for consideration in the new council term.
295. The development of the policy position will draw on evidence about the nature, scale and impacts of weather events, over the short, medium and long-term. It would also support debate and decisions with Aucklander’s about responses, the triggers for responses, roles, responsibilities and costs.

296. To start this process staff have recommended that the scope of developing a region wide long-term policy position responding to adverse natural weather events be reported back to the relevant committee for consideration in the new council term.

*Response to suggestions that council acquire properties or raise houses*

297. During engagement feedback it was suggested that council consider purchase or modification of private property that is most at-risk in a flood event.

298. The suggested options would primarily focus on providing private benefits for a very small number of directly affected people.

299. Political decision making by both the Environment and Community Committee and Waiuku Ranges Local Board has focused on options that mitigate flood safety risk collectively to residents, the wider Piha community and visitors. The options did not consider potential individual property options such as acquisition or grant funding.

300. The council needs to carefully balance its statutory responsibilities with the rights and responsibilities of property owners. Staff advice that the council continues to keep this balance between its statutory roles and the private property rights, responsibilities and privacy of individuals.
Summary of options against key criteria

301. The summary of the eight options assessed against the criteria is provided in Table 11:

Table 11: Options assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo)</th>
<th>Option 2: Increase flood warning time</th>
<th>Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people</th>
<th>Option 4: Raise Giensk Road</th>
<th>Option 5: Build a dam(s) to contain flood water</th>
<th>Option 6: Build a tunnel to divert flood water</th>
<th>Option 7: Widen the stream to increase water flows</th>
<th>Option 8: Clear the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Slight change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo)

Option 2: Increase flood warning time

Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people

Option 4: Raise Giensk Road

Option 5: Build a dam(s) to contain flood water

Option 6: Build a tunnel to divert flood water

Option 7: Widen the stream to increase water flows

Option 8: Clear the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flows
Staff recommend an intervention package combined from options one to three

302. Staff recommend an intervention package of initiatives combined from options one to three as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current situation to keep people away from flooding</th>
<th>Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing readiness and response to flooding</td>
<td>Option 2: Increase flood warning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

303. Option one: status quo scores highest against the assessment criteria. Option two and three also score favourably.

304. This suite of options responds to mitigating flood safety risk, have a positive impact on the community and are cost effective. All three of the recommended package of options were the most supported during engagement with the community, and the Waitākere Ranges Local Board.

305. All three options partially mitigate risk to life and injury by helping to keep people away from and enhance their readiness and responsiveness to flooding events. They do not eliminate risk and they all rely of the awareness and behaviour of people to mitigate flood safety risk. The technology components of options two and three still require trialling and feasibility testing.

306. Collectively they will not significantly reduce the volume or velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event.

307. All options (five to eight) that required major physical protection works scored highest against the assessment criteria for their impact on reducing flood safety risk.

308. They all score poorly in terms of the achievability in the short-term and impact on the natural environment. The Environment criteria is particularly important to the Piha community and Mana Whenua.

309. It recognises the national, regional, and local significance of the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area. Te Rūnanga o Ngati Whataua were concerned about these options. This was due to the likely detrimental impact these options would have on the environment and the cultural heritage of the Waitākere Ranges.

310. The key trade-off between the recommend intervention package of options significantly combining options one to three and options five to eight is the preferred approach will not significantly reduce the volume or velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event so do not mitigate flood safety risk as effectively.
Appendix 1: Roles and Responsibilities

Central Government

Works through legislation and other policy settings to enable local government actions. The police and the fire service help manage local events. Provides assistance following a large flood event to communities and councils to assist recovery (e.g., natural disaster insurance to residential property owners).

Local Government - Auckland Council

Operates under a legislative framework for flood risk management that enables rather than requires specific levels of flood protection be achieved. Legislative role under the Building Act 2004 to assess and respond after a flooding event if a property and building is insanitary or dangerous.

Auckland Council acts in dual capacities as a regional council and territorial authority

Regional Council

- Maintain records of river flows, lake levels, rainfall and past floods.
- Model water flows so they can warn of future flooding.
- Manage rivers and catchments and control land-use activities through the Resource Management Act 1991.
- Issue flood warnings and provide emergency management.

Territorial Authorities

- Collect information on flooding.
- Responsible for controlling buildings and the effects of land use to reduce flood risk.

Key tools

- Unitary Plan rules based on hazard maps that manage where and what activity is allowed.
- Advice to warn people about flood hazards through land information and project information memoranda.
- Community emergency readiness and response planning and information.

Individuals and Landowners - Auckland Residents

Need to understand their level of flood risk and make decisions about the safety of themselves, their family and their property.
## Appendix 2: Legislative framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Power to require residents to leave their home temporarily during a flood?</th>
<th>Power to require residents to leave their homes permanently due to the risk of a flood event?</th>
<th>Can the Council compulsorily acquire the land due to the significant flood risk?</th>
<th>Compensation required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Act 2004</td>
<td>Yes, if Council is satisfied that the building is an 'insanitary building' in accordance with section 122(1)(a)(i) and section 124(2)(d) of the BA</td>
<td>Yes, if Council is satisfied that the building is an 'insanitary building', section 122(1)(a)(i) and section 124(2)(a) and (b) allow the Council to put up a hoarding and attach a notice to warn people not to approach the building.</td>
<td>No, Council cannot compulsorily acquire land or buildings. The Council can force buildings which are 'insanitary buildings' to be made sanitary which can include being partly or completely demolished or moved under sections 124(2)(c) and 126. The Council could also take action to fix insanitary conditions if 'immediately' required under section 129 of the BA.</td>
<td>No, unless the Council is sued in tort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management Act 1991</td>
<td>Yes, under section 330(2) of the RMA, the Council can enter onto any place (without prior notice) and can take action, or direct the occupier to take the action immediately necessary to mitigate any actual or likely adverse effect of an emergency, if the Council forms the reasonable opinion that an adverse effect on the environment requires immediate preventative or remedial measures or any sudden event causing or likely to cause loss of life, injury or serious damage to property will occur to a natural or physical resource within its jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Potentially, by issuing an abatement notice or seeking an enforcement order from the Environment Court under sections 17(3), 32(1)(a)(ii), 314(1)(a)(ii) or 314(1)(da) of the RMA. The most useful power is likely to be section 314(1)(da). In our view the use of these powers are not likely to be appropriate to require the permanent removal of residents due to the risk of flooding.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No, unless the Council is sued in tort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Act 1981</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes, although the Council would not be requiring the land due to the significant flood risk, but rather on the basis that it is required for a 'local work'. In order to use the land acquisition process in the PWA, the Council would need to positively use the land for the purpose of a local work (directly or indirectly).</td>
<td>Yes, in accordance with the Part 5 of the PWA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002</td>
<td>Yes, under section 89, while a state of emergency is in force, a constable or Group Controller may direct the evacuation of any premises or place if, in their opinion, it is necessary for the preservation of human life. Section 90 also allows a constable or Group Controller to requisition land while a state of emergency is in force if it is necessary for the preservation of human life. Once that person was in control of the land, they could require any residents to leave the property.</td>
<td>No. These e</td>
<td>No, the land can only be requisitioned if it is necessary for the preservation of human life, and will only remain under the control of a constable or Group Controller while a state of emergency is in force.</td>
<td>Yes, if land is requisitioned under section 90, the Council will be liable to pay compensation to any person having an interest in that property in accordance with section 107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Acts 1974, 2002 and Auckland Council 2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes, in accordance with the PWA process. Note that the Council does have functions in relation to land drainage and storm water.</td>
<td>Yes, as per the PWA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Background and consultation process

Background
Piha stream is subject to flash flooding. The high frequency of events, fast catchment response time (40-50 minutes) and locations of buildings, bridges and roads in the floodplain means that there is a high flood safety risk in certain areas. Auckland Council and Tonkin + Taylor have assessed a long-list of options that mitigate flood safety risk collectively to affected households, the wider Piha community and visitors. They include existing and new initiatives focussed on collective approaches to:

- help keep people away from floods
- enhance community readiness and ability to respond to floods
- help keep floods away from people through physical works.

The decision to be made by the Environment and Community Committee (influenced by Waitākere Ranges Local Board) is: Which option or combination of options will best address the Piha flood safety risk.

Consultation process
To help make this decision, Auckland Council undertook a range of community engagement activities between 29 March and 30 April 2019. Auckland Council sought to determine preferences for the specific options and gather the community’s views.

Auckland Council consulted with directly affected residents in the floodplain, wider Piha residents and stakeholders, and people across Auckland in the following ways:

- One-on-one meetings and correspondence with directly affected residents and property owners
- Posters advertising the engagement process in local shops around Piha
- Information on the options distributed around the local area (e.g. the Piha Library, Waitākere Ranges Local Board office and Amtaki Visitor Centre) and communicated directly with stakeholder groups, tramping clubs and the like
- A public engagement meeting in Piha (Barnett Hall) on 14 April – with approximately 40 attendees
- A feedback form on the council’s website and distributed throughout the local community and to stakeholders
- Email correspondence and submissions.
The feedback form presented the list of options as shown below and described these in more detail in the supporting material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current situation to keep people away from flooding</th>
<th>Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (continuation of current support)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing readiness and response to flooding</td>
<td>Option 2: Increase flood warning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 4: Raise Glenesk Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical protection works to help keep flooding away from people</td>
<td>Option 5: Build a dam(s) to contain flood water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 6: Build a tunnel to divert flood water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 7: Widen the stream to increase water flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 8: Clear/dredge the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultation process gathered a total of **35 pieces of public feedback**, including 28 online submissions, seven hard copy / email submissions, plus notes from the public consultation meeting.

Buzz Channel has collated and analysed the feedback and prepared this report.

**Preferred options for managing flood safety risk**

Submitters responded to the eight options provided in the feedback form and selected which option(s) they most prefer as a way of managing flood safety risk at Piha. The preferred options are outlined in detail below. In general, submitters preferred the options that provide enhanced readiness and response to flooding, over the ‘harder’ engineering solutions, which were mostly viewed as being too invasive and/or creating negative environmental impacts.

Submitters also took the opportunity to suggest other ways the council could manage flood safety risk, and these are also discussed in more detail below. Some believe the proposal is not thorough enough, and simply moves the risk to another area instead of solving it. Others felt the council should acquire the affected properties, assess the bridge and its effect on the flooding, create a wetland/drainage area, or increase stream maintenance/clearing.
Suggested options

Which is your preferred option(s) for managing flood safety risk in Piha?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 - Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (continuation of current support)</td>
<td>57% (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 - Increase flood warning time</td>
<td>51% (n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 - Enhance ways of warning people</td>
<td>43% (n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 - Raise Glenesk Road</td>
<td>11% (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5 - Build a dam(s) to contain flood water</td>
<td>3% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6 - Build a tunnel to divert flood water</td>
<td>0% (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 7 - Widely the stream to increase water flow</td>
<td>20% (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 8 - Clear / dredge the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flow</td>
<td>17% (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 9 - Some combination of the above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 10 - No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: n=35

Current situation – local responses to minimise the impact of flooding:
Option 1 57% (n=20)
As shown above, option 1 was the most supported, with slightly over half of submitters preferring this option. Most of those who supported this option also wanted the council to progress options two and three as well – as a combined effort to minimise the impacts of flooding. These were seen as being the most practical, least invasive and most cost effective (compared to options 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) and would improve warning times. However, submitters would like to see an enhancement of this current option mentioning that its effectiveness relies on the council providing maintenance to the stream.

“The effectiveness of option 1 (status quo) depends on ongoing commitment to stream inspections, CCTV and road/drainage maintenance. Lack of maintenance of Council assets has arguably contributed to the extent of flooding in the past. Community acceptance of option 1 as a solution or part of a solution requires certainty of Council commitment to undertaking and funding these activities.”

Enhancing readiness and response to flooding:
Options 2 and/or 3 54% (n=19)
The options that enhanced Piha’s readiness and response to flooding were also popular, and overall 54% of submitters supported one or both of these. Some submitters, and some at the public meeting, mentioned that a multi-pronged approach including some of these options may be the best approach. In line with this, the general view from the public meeting was more supportive of these ‘softer’ approaches to flood management than the engineering options.

“Options 1 - 4, are clearly the best options within the report and some / all of these options should be promoted for implementation.”

“I believe the council should look at options other than pure engineering such as plantings, reinstating wetlands that have been taken over for other uses. Some of the individual houses should be raised along with other natural options.”
Option 2: Increase flood warning time | **51% (n=18)**
Half of submitters said they prefer option 2 as the approach to flood safety risk in Piha. Some mentioned ways in which there could be an alarm system to warn residents ahead of time.

"There should be an audible warning system in the valley with a 30-minute warning given once sensors have determined a flood is imminent. There are a lot of visitors in the area who may not have cell phones to receive a warning. It is only about 30-minute to the popular waterfall so that should be enough warning."

"Why can't you repair and maintain the Seaview Road bridge high water alarm and trigger it to do two things. One activates the Fire Siren in a manner that indicated flood. i.e. have it pulse on then off then on then off continuously. It's not that expensive. At the same time this happens it could also trigger the Cell phone civil defence warning system in a localised way to warn all phones connected to the nearby cell towers only that a flood may occur and to then activate one's private evacuation plans to suit. It wouldn't be that hard or expensive as tech is currently in use, the siren is across the road, and flooding at its very worst didn't wash away all of Glen Esk valley. The other options above are just stupid. Let's keep things realistic. We don't have a wall to prevent tidal waves and they are far more destructive than a flood. I feel council and its contractors have over reacted to this whole situation. After all council permitted building on known flood plains and were happy to collect rates etc on these areas. So, a basic alarm system would suffice. Individuals can raise house heights via insurances if needed."
Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people | 43% (n=15)
Option 3 is preferred by 43% of submitters. A few mentioned that even helping to improve the mobile coverage/signal in the area would allow phones to be used as a way of warning people. Enhanced warning systems and mobile coverage was also widely supported at the public meeting.

“The critical option is to improve Mobile Phone signal. At 67 Glenesk Road we have virtually no signal. We have been in contact with our providers on many occasions and basically we are ignored.”

A submission from the Piha Tennis Club reflects the support for less invasive options:

“At most, we may have a clean-up to do after a 1 in 50/100-year flood. Yet, some of the ‘solutions’ proposed in the various reports we have been provided with would mean the end of the Club. We support Options 1 - 3, including increasing flood warning times and boosting cell phone coverage. With an app they would be able to monitor the situation and know when to suggest their children evacuate the property. We recommend that the appropriate apps be developed as a priority.

Options 4 – 8, we do not support any of these options, which in our view are completely unrealistic. For example, option 7 (a 50m wide channel from the head of the valley to the ocean) is said to involve the ‘removal or relocation of the tennis courts’. Given that there is no other flat public land available to which we might relocate that is not already in use, this would mean the end of tennis and netball in Piha. We think the Council should assist the people directly affected in Glenesk Road, some of who play tennis and netball. However, as a basic principle, we do not consider that any options should be adopted to mitigate flooding effects upstream of the bridge that would put at risk properties downstream of the bridge where no risk exists currently. We also oppose Option 8, which envisages dredging the stream downstream of the bridge to the ocean. This too would also put the tennis courts at risk. Although the option 8 diagram in the Tonkin and Taylor report does not illustrate it, deepening the stream adjacent to the tennis club will inevitably widen it considerably – over time, doubling the stream depth could easily double its width so that it will end up encroaching on the tennis club playing surface at the closest point to the stream. It will also represent a similar threat to all property on both sides of the stream, including the Piha RSA and the Piha Bowling Club.”

Physical protection works to help keep flooding away from people:
Options 4, 5, 6, 7 and/or 8 | 34% (n=12)
The options involving physical works and engineering solutions were less popular, and overall a third (34%) selected one or more of options 4, 5, 6, 7 and/or 8. Submitters generally wanted to keep the impact on the current environment to a minimum, and this sentiment was reflected at the public meeting.

“The physical protection works put forward appear unsustainable (i.e. dredging), to transfer the problem elsewhere (i.e. tunnel) and/or to have the potential for other significant adverse effects (i.e. tunnel, stream widening, dams). Given the potential scale of these impacts, the implementation costs and the relatively small number of properties impacted by flooding, my preference is for a combination of the soft options (Options 1, 2 and 3) to be implemented.”
“There seemed to be an emphasis on heavy engineering based theoretically possible solutions. The failure to present any historic material on how the stream, wetlands & water flow, etc. used to function (way back) appeared to me to be a major flaw in the process of arriving at a full suite of potential Glen Esk Road flood remediation measures.”

“Personally, no appetite to fund the major infrastructure options - 4/5/6 - through rate levies. Don’t approve of the environmental impacts of 5/6. Concerns option 4 would have unintended consequences on the behaviour of the floods. For options 7 and 8, the level of uncertainty around outcomes is too high to risk.”

“Regarding Option 7 and 8, as a resident that borders the stream downstream of the Seaview Road bridge, I am concerned that option 7 and 8 do not give enough consideration to the effects on these areas of the stream. This area contains a large sand dune that is already showing significant erosion. It is almost certain that increased volumes/velocities will accelerate the rate of erosion in this area. If options 7 and 8 are to be considered, erosion mitigation measures will need to be a part of the solution - most probably some form of bank armouring.”

### Other options suggested by submitters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More consultation/ Council support/ more options/ not thorough enough</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire properties</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge streams/ clear waterways/ clear pipes/ open stream mouth</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase sloping banks/ heighten water ways/ raise houses/ repair choke points</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on climate change/ low impact options</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream maintenance/ slow drainage/ plant build up</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and drainage areas</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include risk on property documentation and insurance</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert Systems/ traffic management</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of money/ check expenditure</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address sand flow/ sand dunes</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: n=35

In addition (or instead of) the options provided above, around four in ten submitters mentioned that they would like more consultation, more support, and more options from the council, beyond the options listed in the consultation material. There is a general sentiment that more could be done to manage flood risk as the options suggested might not be suitable.
“Flood protection and control are Council’s responsibility, as is ensuring the safety of its ratepayers, yet we have been without a habitable home for over a year, paying for a mortgage while also renting and there is no end in sight.”

“Options 1-4 do nothing to address Council’s responsibility to offer flood protection and control - they are ineffectual to that end. In fact, option 4 is more likely to add to the flooding problem for those residents living stream-side. Options 5-8 are cost prohibitive and also at least 2 of them would be highly unlikely to achieve consent in the Waitakere Ranges.”

“We would 100% had not purchased this property had the Auckland Council records of these floods been correctly displayed on our LIM.”

“Please urgently help the Glenesk residents that have been impacted by flooding.”

“Council has put 8 options in this form that will either never happen or don’t help in any way to alleviate flooding.”

“Do not waste our rates on consultants’ ideas that are so farfetched. Ask the locals first before you invest in such projects.”

One of the top preferred options, outside of the eight suggested, is that of the Council acquiring the affected properties and removing them and/or creating a wetland in their place to reduce the impacts of flooding. This was mentioned by 29% (n=10) of submitters and was raised through the one-on-one conversations between council staff and affected residents.

“None of the options suggested can guarantee that the most affected properties will be safe in the future. The most logical solution, practically, environmentally and economically, is for Council to acquire the properties that are most affected, remove the houses (insurance), and convert the land into a wetland reserve… It has been mentioned that Council is concerned about setting a precedent of acquiring homes within flood zones. This is not accurate as not every flood zone is equal. This flood zone is quite unique in that in a flood event:
- properties are inundated with flood waters rushing at a life-threatening depth and velocity,
- there is a very real risk that someone could lose their life (there has already been at least one near miss that I know about)
- emergency personnel have no way of reaching properties
- flooding occurs as a flash flood so warning signals seem like an ineffective mitigation.”

“Removing the impediments (homes) and increasing the flow-path is the only viable option, which offers a guarantee of safety for the residents and their property and is the most cost-effective option for all concerned. Therefore, the purchase of the few properties at most risk, should at least be offered to those residents.”

“None of the options above are suitable, we would like Council to purchase properties and use them as wetland/stormwater overflows. We do not want any option that will take years to complete. Acquiring properties is...
- Wanted by the most affected residents
- The quickest solution to the problem
- The safest for those residents that have been swept under their house and had to call 111 for help that cannot get through the floodwaters
- Most in-line with Councils policies.”

“I would hope that the council does all in its power to do the right thing in this matter as swiftly as possible by purchasing the homes.”

“Even if the option I have suggested [land acquisition] is not the correct solution, it is such an obvious potential solution that it appears that Council have consciously omitted it from the list of options. It seems disingenuous that Council would put forward a list of 8 Options and not include something along the lines of ‘land acquisition’ as an option.”

“These poor residents have been through enough and still have no closure. I think that the best outcome would be for the council to purchase the homes of those affected (if that is what they want) so that the residents can move on. Should the council then wish to proceed with making the homes safer by raising roads/properties etc... they can do so in their own time-frame, and then on-sell once they are safe.”

“I believe that expanding the scope to include the option to make purchases of the affected houses that are flooded every 5 or so years should be officially explored. With the fear of regular floods for the owners, along with ever increasing insurance premiums, there comes a time, now, when this option should be scoped out in tandem with the others and opened up to the community for discussion.”

One submitter, however, was opposed to this idea and thought the affected residents’ insurance should cover them. This was supported by another at the public meeting who suggested that the reaction to the flooding issue is perhaps over the top and a homeowner issue.

“A point to note: I didn’t purchase in Glen Esk due to know flood risks. I actually paid more for a home that didn’t have a flood risk and this pay more in rates for the exact level of service that the Glen Esk people get, so I really don’t think I as a rate payer should have to bail out those whom took a risk and brought cheap. So please do not feel you need to buy back effected flooded properties. That’s what insurances are for. It’s akin to buying back properties effected if a tidal wave occurred.”

Other suggestions included clearing the waterways, pipes, making sure the stream is clear, creating a wetland, and heightening the waterways / raising houses / the bridge. Options such as cleaning the waterway (removing debris at bends in the river and the bridge), restoring the wetland, and raising the bridge were also discussed / favoured at the public meeting.

“We can only suggest that the logical options appear to be - clearing of debris in the river from Piha Mill Camp all the way down to the estuary... this I would suggest could be done by locals/residents voluntarily with the council providing transport to dispose/dump any trees/vegetation/rubbish needing to be taken away, and possible improved/increased flood warning systems put in place.”

“Council should keep the stream clear from fallen trees, etc. If locals keep streams clear, then Council should assist them by removing debris pulled out and cleared from the stream.”
“The previous council took away a massive area of ponding and wetland to build a car park. It is to the right when you drive to the bowling club. It should be restored, and the majority of the problems would disappear.”

“The water needs to be slowed and soaked by plants at the start, the park would make an excellent wetland.”

“The Seaview Road bridge is an important public asset when it comes to community resilience and is impacted by flood events, as well as potentially contributing to the nature of floods. I would like to see this considered as part of the option assessment. When the bridge is unavailable, there is no access to the large, northern area of the Piha Community and more significantly access is cut off for the Fire Service and First Response unit. While this impact is only temporary, it does occur at a time when access for emergency services is critical. There is also the potential for the bridge to be structurally damaged during a flood event, which would lead to longer restrictions to access. This does not appear to have been assessed.”

“Build an overflow pipe before the bridge near the fore station to allow flood water to go directly ahead instead of around the back of the Art Gallery.”

“I am surprised that option of creating stop banks to hold flood waters and allowing for natural outflows was not examined. The Hikurangi Flood Management Scheme, built by the Whangarei District Council is an outstanding example of this.”

“I believe certain properties should be removed (stream side) to allow for the flow of water out to sea. The sand build up needs to be monitored and cleared on an ongoing basis as well.”
### Profile of Submitters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of the wider Piha community (resident/property owner/business in Piha)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident/property owner with habitable floors within the floodplain</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring resident whose access is restricted by flooding in Glenesk Road</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor to Piha</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: n=35, 1 was left blank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diverse</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: n=35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: n=35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha/NZ European</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: n=35
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To receive an update of progress and to endorse the proposed next steps of the strategic approach to sediment programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Strategic Approach to Sediment programme was developed by staff during 2018 and endorsed by the Environment and Community Committee in December 2018 (ECC2018/169). This was in recognition of the need to develop regional scale mechanisms to drive a reversal of the environmental decline caused by sediment runoff into freshwater and coastal receiving environments.

3. This report outlines progress of the programme to date. It has reached into council’s regulatory, operational and planning activities to identify the underlying factors affecting our environmental performance for sediment. In its first phase, the programme focused on sediment caused by Auckland’s significant growth. The key to long term success in improving the mauri of streams, rivers, lakes and coastal waters is identifying ‘leverage points’ for change and understanding that change will not be immediate, nor will it occur in a linear fashion.

4. Through a series of detailed, systemic analyses we have uncovered initial barriers to environmental improvements for sediment. Building on existing knowledge and experience, combined with council’s many initiatives already in place to address sediment issues, we are introducing appropriately scaled interventions to overcome these barriers. We are also working with wider stakeholders on opportunities to share responsibility and accountability for reducing sediment runoff into our waterways to meet mana whenua, wider community and central government expectations for clearer waters and thriving ecosystems.

5. The report also sets out the next implementation steps of the programme, which is to embed the system changes required.

6. It is also noted that, in addition to these implementation steps, staff will develop the scope of strategic solutions to address sediment from other sources (the current focus has been on land disturbing activities), over the course of 2019/20.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the progress update on the Strategic Approach to Sediment programme.

b) endorse the next implementation steps of the programme as summarised in this report and set out in Attachment A of the agenda report.
Horopaki
Context
7. The Strategic Approach to Sediment programme endorsed in December 2018 is divided into six distinct work areas as outlined in Attachment 1. The aim is to achieve the following outcomes and benefits:
   - drive a reversal of the environmental decline caused by sediment runoff into freshwater and coastal receiving environments
   - recommend appropriate measures to address the prevention of sediment runoff in all of Auckland’s relevant strategies, policy instruments and interventions
   - provide a clear definition of what the council group needs to monitor and how that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of policies and interventions
   - recommend optimal coordination of the full range of council group resources (staff and money) in minimising the impacts of erosion and sediment on Auckland’s freshwater and coastal receiving environments
   - encourage those who contribute to sediment problems to become part of the solutions.
8. Excess sedimentation of our waterways is a major environmental issue across Aotearoa/New Zealand. It is a complex issue to resolve as there are multiple sources of sediment, which are difficult to accurately separate and attribute to a single cause. Designing for long term change in part of a system requires intervention at multiple scales.
9. Through a detailed, systemic analysis of each part of the system, this programme has examined council’s regulatory, operational and planning processes to clearly identify these scales and appropriate opportunities to intervene.
10. The next stage is to work collaboratively to embed the changes required, firstly within council’s processes and then more broadly across wider stakeholder groups.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
A better understanding of what we know and what we need to know
11. The programme identified the need to address gaps in our knowledge and understanding of sediment and to assess how we could address those with data, research and intelligence. Also, to develop a clearer understanding of what council needs to monitor and how to link this information to an evaluation of policies and interventions.
12. Progress to date includes:
   - greater understanding and characterisation of sediment sources and sedimentation triggers. The Freshwater Management Tool under development will further inform our understanding and be able to simulate the effects of mitigation strategies.
   - development of the Integrated Sediment Monitoring Framework that, amongst others, identifies areas where further work is needed. Importantly, the Framework sets out the critical link between compliance monitoring and actual outcomes of land disturbing activities. This is particularly significant given the anticipated requirements of the amended National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and new National Environmental Standards for Freshwater Management (NES-FM).
   - collaboration on several research programmes, for example:
     - to better understand the link between catchment processes, estuarine sedimentation and thresholds for different impacts
     - assessment of the economic costs and environmental benefits of scenarios to reduce catchment sediment loss
initiatives already underway – for example a GEMS (Geomorphically Effective Management Solutions) toolbox – that, together with the results of this sediment programme, will help Auckland Council respond to central government expectations and requirements anticipated through its Essential Freshwater Package.

Circular economy and soil – a regenerative systems approach

13. Work was done to apply circular economic principles to the management of land for food production, and ways sediment runoff could be reduced.

14. The study highlighted a range of farming practices technologies and management approaches that can reduce the amount of sediment entering waterways. This includes, for example, remote monitoring of sediment runoff, regenerative farming practices and Mātauranga Māori approaches.

15. This work also connected several council and central government work programmes underway (listed in Attachment 1). Together, these provide many opportunities to include interventions and promote practices that will help reduce sediment flows to waterways.

Achieving shared outcomes in our strategic approach to growth

16. Both the Committee and community have raised concerns about sediment runoff from development. In response, the programme has focused on identifying points of influence and interventions to address this.

17. The Auckland Plan 2050 promotes a quality compact form. Better environmental outcomes are one of the potential benefits of this approach.

18. Regional strategies, plans and policies related to land development were examined for gaps and opportunities for reducing excess sediment. Potential opportunities include:

- the inclusion of increased and consistent technical feedback loops in strategic planning processes to ensure environmental constraints and opportunities are considered throughout strategy development processes
- incorporation of ‘shared outcomes’ that deliver an integrated perspective across all four wellbeings and provide direction to lower level documents
- robust consideration of ‘avoid’ at a strategic level, so that there is less reliance on later regulatory methods to mitigate environmental effects.

19. The analysis and recommendations of this work will be accounted for in work related to the Auckland Plan 2050 Development Strategy.

Improving compliance

20. The effectiveness of the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part) (Unitary Plan) provisions in minimising the impact of land-use activities on sensitive receiving environments will be fundamental to delivering on the Auckland Plan 2050.

21. A comparison of legacy planning provisions with current provisions for regional and district earthworks in the Unitary Plan identified:

- potential areas for improvements to the existing provisions
- potential amendments to operational procedures to improve compliance whilst using the existing provisions in the meantime.

22. One clear issue that has emerged is the separation of the regional and district land disturbance chapters in the Unitary Plan. The intent in the separation was that implementation would be clear and administratively efficient for both applicants and council. Evidence shows, however that the practical consequences of the separation, without clear links between the two chapters, provides opportunity for misinterpretation and confusion both within council and for those operating under the Unitary Plan.
23. The finding of this study will now be:
   - included within the Section 32 evidence assessment for the plan change requirements for NPS-FM implementation
   - used to address monitoring gaps in the context of the Integrated Sediment Monitoring Framework and incorporated within the Unitary Plan Monitoring Project
   - implemented as amendments to operational procedures (as related to current Unitary Plan provisions) prior to plan changes related to the NPS-FM.

Understanding and achieving best practice through the application of GD05


25. Sediment runoff from construction sites will only improve by developing a sense of shared responsibility and accountability between the industry and the regulator. To achieve this, the following actions are proposed:
   - use GD05 as a basis to provide streamlined erosion and sediment control planning guidance for the industry
   - advocacy to central government for national-level industry qualifications and accreditations across the full range of construction industry stakeholders
   - prepare case studies to assess the effectiveness of various devices under different conditions, including extreme site and weather conditions, as well as opportunities to use innovative techniques
   - hold a series of industry workshops to gain insights into how to achieve best practice, analyse where improvements can be made in industry practice, understand impediments and discuss potential incentives.

Achieving compliance on small sites

26. Around 13,500 small sites are being developed annually across the region, which result in around 600 hectares of land disturbing activity.

27. A step-change is required to improve sediment runoff from these sites to complement current, targeted enforcement action and education. The aim of this work is to put in place a robust end-to-end monitoring procedure for this problematic part of the construction industry.

28. Progress to date includes:
   - From August 2019, Building Inspectors will check for sediment controls as part of their inspection regimes at all stages of the inspection process up to the Post-line inspection. Results will be reported back to the Licensing and Regulatory Compliance teams for appropriate enforcement action to be taken.
   - The ‘Close the Gap’ initiative (running for the winter works season from May to August 2019) to establish cost-effective mechanisms to ensure sediment controls are in place on all small sites prior to first land disturbance activity.
   - Proposed ‘End of pipe’ monitoring for sediment on selected small site subdivisions within Howick, Upper Harbour and Hibiscus and Bays Local Board areas. These results, which are linked to subdivisions - where targeted initiatives compliance is being undertaken - will provide early indication of the need for increased enforcement action.
32. There are also planned initiatives to involve a broader range of building industry interests, innovative tools and field days, to facilitate further industry environmental training relevant to small site activities.

Working with industry, business and the wider community

33. In addition to the series of industry workshops and training events, sharing a coordinated regional sediment narrative will be done through council’s Watershed Story Maps and other appropriate media. Staff are also fostering strategic partnerships with organisations such as the Sustainable Business Network (and their work through GulfX) to engage communities and businesses in achieving better sediment outcomes.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

34. Initial discussions have been started with Panuku about opportunities to:
   - include the importance of sediment control as part of wider environmental training within foundation level training modules that support Homestar ratings
   - develop Homestar credits for evidence of appropriate contractor education
   - include requirements for best practice erosion and sediment control in development agreements and request for proposal documentation.

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

35. Local boards, where major small site subdivisions are located, have expressed concerns about the impact of sediment from construction sites. Three local boards (Howick, Upper Harbour and Hibiscus and Bays) indicated that they would like to participate in the ‘Close the Gap’ initiative by funding ‘end of pipe’ monitoring for sediment. Subject to resolutions from the local boards, this work will go ahead from July 2019.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

36. Reducing sedimentation and sediment runoff into waterways will contribute to the reversal of the environmental decline of, and enhance the mauri of, major waterbodies in Tāmaki Makaurau. In turn, this will enhance the ability of mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga over their respective rōhe.

37. The examination of strategic planning processes within Work Area 2 of this programme clearly supports the need to embed Te Ao Māori concepts such as kaitiakitanga into our thinking and decision-making. It supports a focus on the inter-relationships between the natural environment and people.

38. Certain activities under the Unitary Plan, including some earthworks, require applicants to undertake a Cultural Values Assessment (CVA) to provide information on effects on mana whenua values. Large scale earthworks (or smaller scale earthworks in sensitive areas) typically require a CVA to be provided. In 2018/19 RIMU undertook a review of the effectiveness of how council’s consenting departments are working with mana whenua. The report put forward 52 recommendations to improve existing systems, processes, guidance and training for both council staff and mana whenua involved in consenting processes. As a result, the CVA Review Project was established. This partnership between Auckland Council Regulatory Services and mana whenua includes a series of five co-design wānanga with attendance from mana whenua and council staff.

39. It is anticipated that the findings and recommendations of this review will be implemented, once agreed by the project steering group, starting early in 2020.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

40. Investigations and actions to date have focused on achieving interventions through existing budgets. To the extent possible, this will continue to be the approach for phase 2 going forward. Several scoping projects to fill gaps identified in phase 1 will feed into Long-term Plan (LTP) 2021 processes.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

41. The risks to council are:

- Reputational: not delivering on the Auckland Plan 2050 Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcome Direction 3: Use Auckland’s growth and development to protect and enhance the natural environment or Focus area 3: Account fully for the past and future impacts of growth. Growth-related land use change is a key part of the sediment narrative.
- Environmental: continued environmental degradation, and statutory obligations not met, for example to control the use of land for maintaining water quality and associated ecosystems under s30(1)(c) of the Resource Management Act, Unitary Plan and requirements under the NPS-FM.
- Financial: from not realising savings by working collaboratively to achieve shared outcomes. Reduced economic opportunities for the region.
- Social and Community: lack of buy-in from communities, mana whenua and industry partners if council is not seen to be progressing sediment improvements at a regional scale.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

42. Next steps for the programme are outlined in Appendix 1 of Attachment 1, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Area</th>
<th>Next Step / Intervention</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scope Freshwater Management Tool v2 to include scenarios for developing land</td>
<td>Oct 2019 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish priorities and costs for further research recommendations for LTP 2021</td>
<td>Oct 2019 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Embed findings and recommendations into work related to Auckland Plan 2050 and AUP(OP) plan changes for NPS-FM implementation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Complete the ‘Close the Gap’ initiative</td>
<td>May to August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use the findings to achieve better compliance and monitoring of small sites</td>
<td>Sept 2019 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develop case studies to assess effectiveness of sediment control devices under different conditions</td>
<td>Sept 2019 to March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop and encourage the use of consistent, transparent guidance, for example:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finalise draft Guidance Note – Earthworks</td>
<td>August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop supporting material for GD05.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Item 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Area</th>
<th>Next Step / Intervention</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced training for targeted council staff</td>
<td>July 2019 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate for national-level industry qualifications and accreditations</td>
<td>July – Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Run a series of industry workshops</td>
<td>Sept 2019 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community and mana whenua workshop in partnership with the Sustainable Business Network</td>
<td>August 2019 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and NPS-FM delivery (as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. In addition, over the course of 2019/20, staff will develop the scope of strategic solutions to address sediment from other sources (the current focus has been on land disturbing activities), for example, through strategic approaches to planting and blue-green networks.
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A. Background and context

1. The Strategic Approach to Sediment programme (the programme) was endorsed by the Environment and Community Committee in December 2018 (ENV/2018/169). Building on existing knowledge and experience, the aim of the programme is to undertake a systemic analysis of Auckland’s sediment issues to develop an implementation-focused, co-ordinated work programme across council to reduce sediment runoff from land into Auckland’s streams, rivers, lakes and coastal waters.

2. The programme aims to achieve the following outcomes and benefits:
   - drive a reversal of the environmental decline caused by sediment runoff into freshwater and coastal receiving environments
   - recommend appropriate measures to address the prevention of sediment runoff in all of Auckland’s relevant strategies, policy instruments and interventions
   - provide a clear definition of what the council group needs to monitor and how that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of policies and interventions
   - recommend optimal co-ordination of the full range of council group resources (staff and money) in minimising the impacts of erosion and sediment on Auckland’s freshwater and coastal receiving environments
   - encourage those who contribute to sediment problems to become part of the solutions.

3. Excess sedimentation\(^1\) of our waterways is a major environmental issue across Aotearoa/New Zealand. It is a complex issue to resolve as there are many sources of sediment, each requiring multi-targeted interventions if we are to achieve long-term change.

4. Designing for long-term change in part of a system requires intervention at multiple scales (Biddulph et al. 2017). Identifying the key levers for change requires detailed analysis of the systemic issues. There are many initiatives already investigating solutions to different sediment sources across council\(^2\), for example, sediment from in-stream erosion is also identified as a significant source of sediment, which is being addressed in Auckland by Healthy Waters Waterways Planning team.

5. Both the Committee and community have raised concerns about sediment runoff from development. In response, the programme has focused on identifying points of influence and interventions to address this. The findings are reported on below.

6. In subsequent phases of the programme, further work will be needed to examine gaps and opportunities for strategic solutions to address sediment from other sources, for example in the urban environment through better design and implementation of green infrastructure, and in the rural environment through initiatives such as strategic planting, the development of farm environment plans, examination of operational practices in the horticultural industry and strategic approaches to blue-green networks.

7. Central government direction on many of these issues will be consulted on over the next six months through the Essential Freshwater Package, including the prospect of a sediment attribute in the National Objectives Framework (NOF) for the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM).

---

\(^1\) Excess sedimentation is sediment amounts or fluxes that compromise ecosystem function beyond that which is acceptable with the National Objectives Framework (NOF) for the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM), cultural values, community values or all three. (Ellis et al. 2018)

\(^2\) APSR (August 2018) Auckland’s Sediment Story: Policies, Trends and Initiatives
B. Outcomes for Māori

8. Reducing sedimentation and sediment runoff into waterways will contribute to the reversal of the environmental decline of, and enhance the mauri of, major water bodies in Tāmaki Makaurau over the longer term. This will in turn enhance the ability of mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga over their respective rōhe.

9. The examination of strategic planning processes within Work Area 2 of this programme clearly supports the need to embed Te Ao Māori concepts such as kaitiakitanga into our thinking and decision-making. This supports a focus on the inter-relationships between the natural environment and people. Work Area 2 also identifies the requirement to consider and address environmental impacts within our strategic planning processes in order to protect and enhance the natural environment for our future generations.

10. In October 2018, the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum stated that mana whenua recognise that protecting and enhancing te mauri o te wai is the primary goal of managing Auckland’s waterways. To achieve healthy waters, the Kaitiaki Forum seeks the integration of the way we manage land use activities, the design and building of roads and water infrastructure, and care for natural ecosystems. This view is consistent with the strategic approach to sediment presented in this report and reflected in the findings of Work Area 2 that emphasizes the need for a more holistic approach to strategic planning.

11. The Cultural Values Assessment Review Project, established as a partnership between Regulatory Services and mana whenua, includes a series of five co-design wānanga with attendance from mana whenua and council staff to work through recommendations to improve existing systems, processes, guidance and training for both council staff and mana whenua involved in consenting processes.

12. To meet the cultural monitoring requirements of the Network Discharge Consent and the NPS-FM, Healthy Waters have developed the Wai Ora Monitoring Framework. This cultural landscape monitoring tool is one aspect of this and involves working in partnership with mana whenua to culturally evaluate relevant water bodies over time to help develop a framework to prioritise action. This has started with a pilot project at Oruarangi Creek.

C. Work Programme Progress

13. The approved programme is divided into six distinct, but related, work areas. Progress and outcomes of each work area is outlined below along with proposed next steps.

Work Area 1: Better Information

AIM: Identify the gaps in our knowledge and understanding, and how we address those through use of data, research and intelligence.

14. When considering water quality and ecosystem health, sediment is a particularly complex contaminant to characterise. Sources of sediment are difficult to pinpoint as they can be many and influenced by multiple land (geology) and climatic characteristics as well as multiple sources of disturbance/activity, which increase the generation and transport of sediment. In addition, it is not just the load or concentration of sediment that is important, but a range of other properties such as grain size and particle shape and the duration of exposure. Within the marine environment, the effect of sediment is further complicated by determining where the sediment is transported to and deposited as well as the remobilisation of existing sediment.

15. Auckland Council is making significant progress in its understanding and characterisation of the sources of sediment and triggers of sedimentation in the region, as outlined below. This improved knowledge will assist council in ensuring that the effectiveness of existing policies is appropriately reviewed and updated to keep up with evolving environmental, economic and social conditions.

Freshwater Management Tool

16. Our understanding of the current state and assessments of the future state (based on a range of possible scenarios) for a range of pollutants across the region, including sediment, will be greatly enhanced by the Freshwater Management Tool (FWMT). This is an integrated contaminant load model and in-stream concentration model currently being built by Healthy Waters to help council meet
the requirements of the NPS-FM. The FWMT simulates flow and contaminant loss from the land to waterways, throughout the entire region at 15-minute intervals, before distributing these to 3,000 km of streams. This enables highly resolved accounting throughout the region for water quality objectives.

17. The model also simulates the effects (and costs) of various mitigation strategies from stormwater devices through to good practice adoption and land use diversification, enabling optimal strategies to be defined for future water quality goals. Combined, the FWMT will assist in providing robust evidence to inform freshwater quality objectives, policies and rules in regional planning instruments, as well as helping to define the costs involved and strategies for council to achieve these objectives through the Long-term Plan 2021 and other processes.

18. The FWMT is being developed iteratively, configuring the model first for the whole region and across six major contaminants (nutrients [N, P], sediment, heavy metals [Cu, Zn] and faecal indicator bacteria [E. coli]). Version 1 of the FWMT, which is due for completion in April 2020, has been developed to determine the episodic and long-term effects of erosion (bankside & overland) of a “developed” rather than “developing” parcel of land. The tool thereby determines what investment is needed in mitigation strategies for such “steady-state” or future changes from shifting pastoral to developed land cover, to create instream and downstream sediment outcomes that meet proposed objectives in the future AUP. This addresses what long-term investment is needed or the maximum extent of development in future for water quality outcomes to be supported. It does not current address the rate of development. Developing land has a greater sediment footprint than developed land, albeit for the short-term.

19. The FWMT allows us to strategically assess the effectiveness of methods to control sediment generated from different “developed” land uses, throughout the region. As part of the model development the costs and effectiveness of both structural devices and land management practices on long term sediment generation are being analysed. This will help council identify the most cost-effective methods to control sediment from “developed” land.

20. There is potential for the FWMT to be made to simulate the effects of “developing” land, with added resourcing and time (envisioned for 2020/21) as part of version 2. This would be extremely useful for determining the maximum rate, rather than extent, of development to ensure short-term increased erosion risk during the construction phase of development does not exceed long-term targets for water quality. Scoping for the requirements for the modifications to the FWMT to enable this to happen will begin in the coming months and will closely align with the findings and recommendations of this work programme.

Next Steps

Within the scope of version 2 of the Freshwater Management Tool, investigate options and costs to include the capability to estimate sediment discharges from developing land at a catchment scale.

Gap Analysis and Recommendations for Further Research

21. Auckland Council is leading or collaborating on several research programmes which seek to further our understanding of sediment, for example:

i. Recent research into sediment loading to the Kaipara Harbour has highlighted the importance of stream bank erosion as a key source of sediment being transported to the coast from the land. Work is currently underway by Healthy Waters to develop a GEMS (Geomorphically Effective Management Solutions) toolbox to improve how we manage stream bank erosion in our region and identify areas particularly prone to stream bank erosion processes where the GEMS toolbox can be applied to its best effect.

ii. The Kaipara Harbour Sediment Mitigation Study, commissioned jointly by the Ministry for the Environment, Northland Regional Council and Auckland Council, was completed in January 2018. The study sought to assess the economic costs and environmental benefits of a range of scenarios for reducing catchment sediment loss. The modelling undertaken required several assumptions to be made about mitigation efficiencies and costs. Following the completion of that report, efforts have been made to obtain more refined cost estimates for particular mitigation scenarios.
The catchment erosional-economic model developed is now being used to simulate further land and riparian management scenarios, encompassing differences in baseline annual average sedimentation rates (1 mm/yr & 2mm/yr), scope of riparian management (targeted planting by stream order and land cover) and scope of land management (targeted afforestation and wetland regeneration on highly erodible land). Outcomes from this will help better understand the relative importance of policy direction and mitigation options for land holders to adopt.

The Natural Environment Strategy unit has recently received a contracted report that provides further information on costs associated with planting, nursery production and riparian activities such as fencing. This will be of use for broader sub-catchment assessments of environmental remediation and estimated costs, and available for informing next steps, whether as a technical input, or as a generally available information source for a range of interests.

 iii. As part of the development of a potential sediment attribute in the National Objectives Framework, MFE have a sediment work programme which includes impact testing of proposed sediment attributes and investigating the potential sediment load from earthworks. Auckland Council staff have provided technical input to these research programmes.

 iv. NIWA’s ‘Managing Mud’ research programme concerns the sources, characteristics, dynamics and fate of fine sediment in Aotearoa/New Zealand’s rivers and estuaries and will provide knowledge, methods, and tools to assist implementation of policies to reduce sedimentation and associated impacts. This research programme was presented to the Environment and Community Committee on 12th February 2019. RIMU are collaborating on this research with NIWA and Ngai Tai ki Tamaki.

22. Given the complexity of the sediment issue there remain many research questions such as:
   - further understanding different modes of impact by sediments (including suspended sediment concentration and seabed mudiness), multiple stressors, cumulative effects, and thresholds for freshwater and marine receiving environments (estuaries)
   - further understanding of different pathways for sediment loss (overland and bankside), relationships with erosional rate and effects of management actions
   - further research into the relationships between annual sedimentation rate and the health/condition of estuaries
   - development of standardised methodology for fine scale monitoring
   - better linking estuarine sedimentation and its effects on catchment processes.

   **Next Steps**

   Establish priorities and costs for further research recommendations for LTP 2021 processes.

**Work Area 2: Strategy and Policy**

**AIM:** Examine the gaps and opportunities for improving the management of sediment in regional strategies, plans and policies across the council group, and where council can influence central government direction on sediment.

23. The intensity of Auckland’s current and projected urban growth increases the risk of excess sedimentation of Auckland’s freshwater and coastal receiving environments. Activities within this Work Area examined regional strategies, plans and policies for land development to identify the gaps and opportunities for reducing this risk across a broad range of interventions.

**Sediment in strategic land development processes**

24. Strategic land development processes provide early opportunities to avoid and/or reduce environmental degradation by incorporating principles and considerations that would minimise the risk of erosion and sediment control from the outset.

25. Through an assessment of a representative range of council strategic spatial planning documents and supporting information, which reflect the process undertaken to influence growth in both brownfield and greenfield areas, this work area sought to identify gaps and opportunities in strategic
land planning and development processes for housing and transport to better include erosion and sediment control principles.

26. The analyses identified recurring gaps across the different processes and outputs and drew out opportunities to improve sediment outcomes, as well as broader environmental outcomes.

27. Key findings fall under four headings as set out below.

Structure planning

28. Structure planning is a design-led process is a creative process that considers the place, the community (current and future) and the context to derive options that can be assessed against criteria (including environmental). The result is a framework to guide the development or redevelopment of an area by defining the future development and land use patterns, areas of open space, the layout and nature of infrastructure (including transportation links), and other key features and constraints that influence how the effects of development are to be managed. Constraints and opportunities are identified for structure plan areas through the production of a series of technical reports, including environment, which are used to guide the development of the final structure plan. In relation to sediment impacts, the environment topic report provides valuable information such as current stream quality, soil typology and susceptibility to erosion and areas of specific concern due to current level of erosion/sediment load or other degradation.

29. Structure plans aim to manage the effects and demands of development of larger areas held in multiple ownership in an integrated, holistic and orderly way. There is recognised best practice on how to develop a structure plan. The process used will depend on the scale and complexity of the area, the issues to be managed, the anticipated level of stakeholder and public interest, and the purpose for which the structure plan is to be used. Potential opportunities to improve sediment and broader environmental outcomes within the structure planning process include:

- the inclusion of increased and consistent technical feedback loops in strategic planning processes to ensure environmental constraints and opportunities are provided for in the strategy development processes
- maintaining transparent, public access to the technical reports after publication of the final structure plan to ensure developers are aware of relevant environmental constraints and considerations within the area at the earliest stage.

Shared outcomes

30. The incorporation of specific sediment provisions may not be appropriate in high level strategic documents, however, these strategic documents should include ‘hooks’ in the form of shared outcomes that can provide direction to lower-level documents. Shared outcomes aim to provide an integrated perspective to improve outcomes across the four wellbeings (social, economic, cultural and environmental). For example, avoiding development on areas with steep topography achieves shared outcomes as follows:

- environmental effects are limited as the volume of earthworks required to develop the area and the associated impacts is minimised
- economic outcomes are achieved as potential development premiums are reduced
- cultural outcomes are achieved as natural land features are maintained
- social outcomes are achieved through maintaining the visual amenity associated with the natural landscape.

31. An initial conclusion is to incorporate ‘shared outcomes’ within high level strategic documents that deliver an integrated perspective across all four wellbeings and provide direction to lower level documents.

Environmental constraints

32. Adverse effects on the environment to a certain degree appear to be accepted as the starting point across most of the documents analysed. Rather than using these strategic processes and final documents to avoid effects on the environment, mitigation, primarily through AUP(OP) provisions, is often the accepted aim or outcome. Methods to avoid adverse environmental effects as a first
consideration, are often provided within the supporting documents, but seldom included or detailed within the final plans. This results in an over-reliance on later regulatory methods.

33. Opportunities to address this issue include robust consideration of ‘avoid’ at a strategic level, so that there is less reliance on later regulatory methods to mitigate environmental effects.

Environmental effects assessments

34. Where development scenarios are assessed as having the potential to negatively impact the environment, opportunities are explored to reduce or mitigate these adverse effects. These opportunities or methods are then integrated into the assessment to influence the overall analysis of environmental outcomes. By incorporating certain specified mitigation methods, for example the use of management plans, the environmental impacts of a proposal may be reduced to result in a potential overall neutral or positive environmental outcome.

35. This has a significant bearing on the preferred development outcome, however, the study identified examples where mechanisms for developing, implementing, enforcing and monitoring the proposed management plan is frequently not specifically outlined or followed through in implementation documents. This is an important gap that needs to be addressed to prevent specific negative environmental effects being assessed as reduced through mitigation at such an early stage in the land development process on the presumption of the future development of a mitigation plan for which there is no statutory requirement.

Next steps

The analysis and recommendations of this work will be taken into account in work related to the Auckland Plan 2050 Development Strategy.

Sedimentation: A comparison between Auckland’s legacy provisions and the current provisions under the Auckland Unitary Plan

36. The effectiveness of the AUP(OP) provisions in minimising the impact of land-use activities on sensitive receiving environments will be fundamental to delivering on the Auckland Plan 2050.

37. This work area undertook an analysis of current provisions under the AUP(OP) against the legacy provisions under the previous versions of the AUP and Auckland’s legacy district and regional plans, including how the current provisions evolved through the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) process. The study focused on the chapters addressing land disturbance in relation to development.

38. The assessment identified potential areas for improvement to the existing provisions as well as potential amendments to operational procedures to improve compliance whilst using the existing provisions.

39. The report contributes to a larger assessment of approaches to managing sediment and sedimentation in the Auckland Region and findings will be taken forward in a number of ways.

- Findings relating to the existing provisions have been shared to be included within the s32 evidence assessment as part of the plan change requirements for NPS-FM implementation\(^3\).
- Solutions to fill identified gaps in monitoring will be examined within the context of the Sediment Monitoring Framework that is outlined in Work Area 4.1, and incorporated within the AUP s35 Monitoring Project\(^4\).
- Recommendations for amendments to operational procedures are being followed up as part of Work Area 3: Interventions and Work Area 5: Co-ordinating and Building Capacity, as outlined in the following sections. These focus on practical interventions that could be implemented to maximise the effectiveness and efficiency of the current AUP(OP) provisions prior to any plan changes proposed as part of the NPS-FM implementation process.

---

\(^3\) AUP-Prosvisions Review led by Healthy Waters

\(^4\) AUP Effectiveness s35(2)(b) Analysis led by Plans and Places
Summary of key findings

40. A summary of key areas of concern is provided below with next steps identified within each relevant work area.

Separation of land disturbance chapters

41. As recommended by the IHP, the land disturbance provisions were separated into regional and district chapters under the decisions and operative in part versions of the AUP. The intent in the separation was that implementation would be clear and administratively efficient for both applicants and council. However, evidence shows that the practical consequences of the separation, without clear links between the two chapters, provides opportunity for misinterpretation and confusion both within council and for those operating under the AUP(OP).

42. The result is individual assessment of the chapters based on the scale of land disturbance proposed. This means that if the scale of land disturbance proposed is provided for within the district provisions then the regional chapter and its provisions are not applied. This interpretation reflects the application of the legacy district and regional plans, which were distinguished from one another, and therefore the provisions under each plan were intended to be assessed and applied separately by the respective regional and district council. The AUP(OP), being a Unitary Plan, differs in that the provisions within the plan cover all regional and district functions in accordance with the RMA and the provisions are intended to be assessed and applied together. The key concerns associated with the misinterpretation of the separate chapters are discussed below.

Lack of erosion and sediment control consideration in district level provisions

43. Provisions addressing sediment and erosion control and effects were included in both legacy regional and district plans to ensure that these effects were assessed and addressed in resource consents. Consideration of erosion and sediment controls and effects under the existing AUP(OP) provisions is limited due to the lack of district provisions addressing these matters combined with the lack of guidance and/or reference within the district provisions chapter (E12) to the regional provisions and their applicability to all applications.

44. Discussions with staff assessing resource consent applications for the central isthmus area emphasized the practical consequences of this issue. Planners discussed an inability to impose basic conditions requiring erosion and sediment control to be implemented and maintained for the duration of the land disturbance activity for activities classified as restricted discretionary status under the district provisions. This is because matters of discretion, assessment criteria and other relevant provisions within the district chapter do not address erosion and sediment control and/or effects. In such situations the regional provisions have not been applied in addition to the district provisions as intended.

45. Whilst repeating the provisions in both the regional and district chapters may not be necessary to achieve improved outcomes, including reference between the district and regional chapters would assist with this area of concern. This issue will be addressed as part of the plan changes proposed for NPS-FM implementation. In the meantime, opportunities for training and awareness are included within Work Areas 3, 5 and 6.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

46. Discussions with council planners assessing resource consent applications for the central isthmus area identified the difficulty in assessing the cumulative effects and the lack of guidance on how these effects are to be measured and assessed.

47. In accordance with the RMA, the meaning of effect includes any cumulative effect which arises over time or in combination with other effects. Therefore, regional and district provisions are required to address and consider the cumulative effects of an activity. Provisions are included within the AUP(OP) chapters, which require the cumulative effects of activities to be assessed, often in the form of objectives and policies. An issue identified with this approach, specifically with reference to cumulative effects of erosion and sediment, is the availability of an evidence base to effectively and accurately assess the cumulative effects. The impact of a land disturbance activity on water quality in

\[5 \text{ Part 2.1 Separation of Regional Plan and District Plan Functions (pg.8) of Report to Auckland Council Hearing Topic 041 – Earthworks and Minerals prepared by the IHP.}

\[6 \text{ Part 1, section 3 Meaning of effect} \]
the context of the wider catchment, for example, is difficult to assess and consider without an understanding of all the activities occurring within the catchment that may also impact water quality. This limits the ability for cumulative effects to be included in an overall assessment of an activity’s effects.

48. Methods to address this issue will be included within the AUP Effectiveness Analysis and NPS-FM implementation.

Interpretation of Chapter E: Auckland Wide

49. As a unitary authority Auckland Council is responsible for administering both district and regional consents in accordance with the AUP(OP). Before amalgamation, district and regional consents were processed by the respective councils, providing a transparent distinction between regional and district functions under the RMA. Currently, processing planners operating under AUP(OP) assess both regional and district consent applications and, therefore, are required to understand both regional and district functions and provisions. The required regional functions of AUP(OP) are largely addressed by provisions within Chapter E: Auckland Wide which includes the management and protection of natural resources.

50. Discussions with staff who assess resource consent applications for the central isthmus area revealed that there may be a need for training to improve knowledge and understanding of how and when these provisions are to be applied. The provisions that address environmental effects are often complicated and require technical knowledge to comprehend. In theory, this technical knowledge is provided by the Specialist Input teams. In practice, three levels of potential issues were identified:
   i. this advice is not always sought
   ii. if sought, there may be insufficient time to either provide advice or return the application due to a lack of information within statutory timeframes
   iii. the advice provided may not be given appropriate priority when balanced against other considerations within a complex or bundled consent.

51. This can cause confusion and lead to misinterpretation and misapplication, which can result in a lack of consideration of environmental effects when assessing activities. This issue is explored further within Work Area 5: Co-ordinating and Building Capacity.

Amendments to the National Policy Statement (NPS) and proposed National Environmental Standards (NES) for Freshwater Management

52. Draft versions of these documents are anticipated in September 2019 as part of the government’s Essential Freshwater package. These documents are expected to have significant implications for the timing and extent of plan changes that relate to managing the adverse effects of sediment in the Auckland region. Auckland Council will have the opportunity to consider and submit on the proposed NPS amendments and new NES in the second half of 2019 before the documents are finalised in early-mid 2020.

Next Steps
The findings of this work area will be used to inform future training and guidance material identified within subsequent work areas within the programme.

Circular economy and land use – a regenerative approach to soil conservation

53. The aim of better sediment management is not only to achieve improvements in water quality and ecosystem enhancements, but also to conserve soil on land. This work area investigated opportunities to apply circular economic principles to land use and land use change policies and operations to eliminate or reduce waste externalities, which are resulting in soil loss and adverse effects on fresh and marine waters.

54. The focus of the AUP(OP) is on managing land disturbance activities associated with urbanisation and the consequent erosion and sediment effects. While land disturbance associated with development/urbanisation is highly significant in Auckland given the level of activity being undertaken,
pastoral land is the most extensive type of land cover, making up 48% of the region, and much of this land is erosion prone. Both the AUP Water Quality Management Provisions Review and the S35(2)(b) AUP Monitoring Review identified that land management standards and rules on soil conservation are missing in the AUP(OP). Options to address this gap will be addressed as part of the NPS-FM plan change process.

55. Soil conservation is important because Auckland has a predominance of fine clay soils, and as most streams are soft-bottomed streams that are a natural source of sediment (where for the rest of Aotearoa/New Zealand approximately only 20% of the length of rivers comprise soft-bottomed streams). Soil conservation is also increasingly important because of the severe weather extremes from climate change resulting in high levels of sediment from eroding land and stream banks entering streams and the coastal environment.

56. Following an initial appraisal of literature and case studies, the focus of the work was refined to the management of land for food production, and the ways in which sediment runoff could be reduced during this process. To explore this in the context of Auckland, a workshop was held with council staff to scope how circular economy principles could be implemented to reduce waste generated from the production of food in the region.

57. The key findings from the work identified that there are many opportunities to improve the management of land being used to produce food to reduce waste products (such as nutrients, organic waste etc). There are a range of farming practices, innovative technologies and management approaches that can be used to reduce the amount of sediment entering waterways. These include, but are not limited to, use of technology to remotely monitor sediment runoff, implementation of regenerative farming practices, ‘smart’ land use planning, increased knowledge sharing and implementation of Mātauranga Māori.

58. This work also highlighted and connected several work programmes underway across council that seek to better manage farming and food production activities, to use land in a more regenerative manner, and to investigate the potential for circular economic principles to be implemented. Together, these provide many opportunities to include interventions and promote practices that will help to reduce sediment flows to waterways. These work programmes include:

- an initiative to improve practices and reduce erosion and sedimentation in farm land - in partnership with Horticulture NZ and the Pukekohe Growers Association, council staff from Healthy Waters and Targeted Initiatives ran a field day to educate growers in the Franklin Area about methods to reduce runoff

- Farms and Food of the Future programme - initiated by Innovate Auckland to gain and share knowledge on sustainable farming practices

- draft Auckland Climate Action Framework, endorsed for public consultation by the Environment & Community Committee on 11 June 2019 – proposes actions to apply circular economic principles to land use and land use changes (Key Move 1, Action 5) and establish land management approaches to preserve and enhance healthy, viable soils (Key Move 1, Action 6)

- consideration of rural production and soils in identifying urban growth areas in Auckland - Transport and Infrastructure Strategy Unit, APSR

- Smart Planning for Land Use – Innovate Auckland

- Circular Economy/Ōhanga āmiomio – Strategic Advice, APSR. Scoping work initiated on establishing a strategic approach to circular economy for Auckland and the benefits to delivery of Auckland Plan 2050 outcomes. This involves identifying shared outcomes and key learnings from across council and within central government

- Circular economy/Ōhanga āmiomio - Ministry for the Environment is currently the leading government department on circular economy and seeking a transition for Aotearoa/New Zealand, they are progressing work toward that aim including a circular economy sectoral and regional analysis for Aotearoa/New Zealand which is looking at threats and opportunities.

---
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59. These initiatives support acceptance of the need to alter the way we conceptualise and manage current systems if we are to understand states, trends and routes to remediate pollution by excess sedimentation. The root of the problem is the socio-economic choices we have made in the past, and continue to make, in which the economy, humans and the environment are managed separately. Circular economic thinking provides a framework to evolve socio-economic pathways for desirable changes. Key to long term success will be the identification of 'leverage points' for change and an understanding that change will not be immediate, nor will it occur in a linear fashion (Stroh, 2016).

Work Area 3: Interventions

AIM: Examine current interventions and investigate how key learnings from those can be supported or built upon to improve compliance.

Understanding and achieving best practice through the application of GD05

60. GD05: Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland Region was updated in 2018. It embodies current best practice and knowledge on erosion and sediment control measures and forms the basis of compliance.

61. Conditions on consents are designed for certain weather events and sediment ponds are expected to retain up to 90% of the sediment (when chemically treated) when operating at their best although during extreme weather events discharge of some sediment will occur. Climate change, with more severe weather events at unpredictable times of the year, is a matter than needs to be considered in reviewing the effectiveness of the present erosion and sediment control provisions, and this is referred to within the most recently updated version of GD05.

62. Several factors come into play to ensure the effectiveness of following GD05 requirements:
   - expertise of the applicant in writing Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to ensure that the approach is adequate for the values of the site
   - knowledge, experience (and willingness) of the contractor to appropriately adapt the erosion and sediment controls to ensure that sediment is controlled effectively throughout the course of the build
   - vigilance of the contractor in regularly maintaining and monitoring the mechanisms once installed
   - timely monitoring and compliance by Auckland Council regulatory staff.

63. This work has identified a need for training and upskilling of Auckland’s construction industry to improve both consistency in the quality of Erosion and Sediment Control Plans submitted, as well as in the quality of installation, adaptation and maintenance of controls on site. This is addressed further in Work Areas 5 and 6.

64. A future work stream within phase 2 of this programme will be to use case studies to assess the effectiveness of various devices under different conditions (Work Area 4). This will help inform the effectiveness of GD05.

Achieving Compliance on Small Sites

65. Around 13,500 small sites are being developed annually across the region, which result in around 600 hectares of land disturbing activity.

66. A step-change is required to improve sediment runoff from these sites to complement current, targeted enforcement action and education. The aim of this work is to put in place a robust end-to-end monitoring procedure for this problematic part of the construction industry.

67. To assist with this Auckland Council Building Inspectors will now check for absence, presence, adequacy and effectiveness of appropriate sediment controls as part of their inspection regimes. This started with a requirement at the frame stage (IFG) earlier this year and will be formalized from August 2019 through inclusion of this requirement in the new Neptune work process at all stages of the inspection process up to the Post-line inspection (IPL). These results will be reported back to the Licensing and Regulatory Compliance teams for appropriate enforcement action.

68. Auckland Council’s 120 Building Inspector’s conduct around 170,000 inspections across the full range of construction sites each year and are often the only regulatory staff to visit small sites. This example
of collaboration is a major step forward in increasing the monitoring of small sites for appropriate sediment controls.

Table 1: Targeted Initiatives Small Sites Erosion and Sediment Control activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Enforcement Action Taken</th>
<th>Abatement Notice</th>
<th>Infringement Notice</th>
<th>Instant Infringement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flatbush</td>
<td>Jan-July 2018</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatbush 2.0</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukelkohe</td>
<td>June – Nov 2018</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huapai/Kumeu</td>
<td>Oct 2018 – Jan 2019</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobsonville</td>
<td>June 2018 – Oct 2018</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takanini</td>
<td>Oct – Nov 2018</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orewa</td>
<td>Oct – Nov 2018</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oct 2018 – May 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>1652</strong></td>
<td><strong>703</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. Notwithstanding this progress, as most of these small sites fall under the category of ‘permitted activity’ there are further difficulties with both scale and timing in achieving compliance, for the following reasons.

i. By the time the first building inspection occurs, the largest area of earthworks (the building foundation) has already been opened and is about to be stabilised. Whilst erosion and sediment controls can be required at this stage to manage sediment runoff for the remainder of the build, the absence of erosion and sediment controls from the outset means that this is a potentially high-risk activity, and damage to the environment may have already occurred.

ii. There is no opportunity to develop a resource consent pre-start relationship because consents are often not required for small sites, as many are permitted activities in accordance with the AUP(OP). Where they are required, initiating this relationship relies on the consent holder arranging the meeting with council and this rarely occurs.

iii. There is currently no mechanism for council to become aware of the project start up and stages, i.e. no fail-safe mechanism for finding out when a house lot is (a) first accessed by the construction machinery before installation of a stabilised construction entranceway, and/or (b) soil is first exposed by vegetation clearance or cutting of a pre-stabilised site.

‘Close the Gap’ initiative

70. The ‘Close the Gap’ initiative, which is running for the winter works season from May to August 2019, is seeking to establish cost-effective mechanisms to ensure sediment controls are in place on all small sites prior to first land disturbance activity. The site visits are being directed by the recent issue of a Building Consent, regardless of any contact from the constructor / developer post the granting of a Building Consent or associated Land Use Consent.

71. Funded by Natural Environment Strategy and Healthy Waters, and project managed by Targeted Initiatives, this initiative is a demonstration of the collaborative approach endorsed by the programme.

72. Two full-time compliance officers, backed by a part-time administrator, are:

- seeking to provide evidence of the extent of non-compliance with the requirement to install appropriate erosion and sediment controls prior to first cut
- examining methods and lines of communication between different council departments to improve notification of first cut
- investigating the administrative implications of introducing a mandatory pre-start sediment control inspection, requiring the developer to notify council when they intend to break ground for all permitted activities
- assessing options for a self-certification process if the erosion and sediment control devices are installed by an approved ‘installer’.

73. Further lines of investigation are likely to arise as the project evolves.
On visiting these sites at an early stage, all sites are issued with a letter depending on the stage that the site is at. Early results, shown in Figure 1, are indicating that the non-compliance at this stage of the building process is very high, with almost three quarters of the first phase of investigated sites either having no or inappropriate sediment controls in place. Only 13% of sites had adequate controls in place and these were sent a letter informing owners that their compliance was noted and appreciated. The remaining 14%, where works had not yet started, were also sent a letter advising them of their obligations under the AUP(OP) to meet the appropriate performance standards for erosion and sediment control. All ‘close the gap’ communications contain a website link to the council’s Small Sites Booklet, which provides guidance on how to manage small sites. To complement this programme, and in addition to compliance campaigns on Auckland’s subdivisions, so far this year Targeted Initiatives have also run:

- 12 Tool Box Talks with developers
- 2 Small Sites Field Days attended by approximately 150 builders / contractors

The following activities are planned for later this year:
- targeted training of all 120 Building Inspectors in preparation for their participation in notifying absence/presence/adequacy of appropriate erosion and sediment controls at all inspections up to and including the Post-line inspections (IPL)
- 30-40 Tool Box Talks with developers
- talks with the Master Builders’ Federation
- displays of ESC techniques relevant to small sites will be included at the Sediment Field Day in September
- exploration of innovative use of satellite imagery indicating changing land use to assist with targeted monitoring and enforcement
- developing options for industry environmental training requirements (see WA5 and WA6).

In addition, it is proposed to introduce ‘end of pipe’ monitoring for sediment on selected small site subdivisions within Howick, Upper Harbour and Hibiscus and Bays local board areas. Howick, Upper Harbour and Hibiscus and Bays Local Boards have indicated that they will fund this work. Subject to resolutions from the local boards, this work will go ahead from July 2019.
Conclusions

77. The recently released independent report on regional council compliance, monitoring and enforcement (CESIG, 2018) identified that monitoring compliance of permitted activities is problematic for virtually all councils across Aotearoa/New Zealand, especially in regions such as Auckland, where significant reliance is placed upon permitted activities being managed by way of standards. The scale and intensity of Auckland's growth means that our regional response needs to be more innovative than merely employing more compliance staff.

78. The report also highlighted cost recovery mechanisms from non-compliant permitted activities as an issue for most councils that would benefit from clearer central government guidance. The 'Close the Gap' initiative will assist in providing robust data on mechanisms to address this for sediment control on small sites that may be useful for better management of other permitted activities where compliance issues have been identified.

79. Priority is being given to establishing how sustained improvements can be achieved by embedding recommendations within existing processes.

Next Steps

Use the findings of the ‘Close the Gap' Initiative to achieve better compliance and monitoring of small sites, with minimal increase of council’s enforcement burden.

Apply the key findings to the compliance, monitoring and enforcement of all permitted activities where compliance issues have been identified.

Work Area 4: Monitoring and Evaluation

AIM: Define what council needs to monitor and how that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of policies and interventions.

Integrated Sediment Monitoring Framework (Mountains to Sea/Source to Sink)

80. Monitoring is a systematic process that involves the planned and repeated collection of data, its analysis, interpretation and reporting. Monitoring provides evidence to inform council of appropriate management actions, assess the effectiveness of those actions and identifies emerging issues.

81. For sediment, it is important that monitoring is integrated, from understanding the multiple sources of sediment, monitoring the activities which generate sediment discharge and the effectiveness of mitigation and intervention measures in eliminating or reducing that sediment generation, through to measuring the outcome in the receiving environments. Figure 2 conceptualises the points at which information on sediment can be gathered.

Receiving Environment Monitoring

82. For freshwater receiving environments (rivers and lakes) Auckland Council monitors the amount of sediment in the water (turbidity and suspended sediments) using monthly grabs at 36 streams covering a range of catchment types. However, this generally measures background levels of sediment in streams during baseflow rather than event based (storm) loads. To do this, we have continuous turbidity monitoring at several stream sites to reflect a more refined understanding of changes in sediment over smaller spatial scales. Auckland Council is also involved in a national programme working towards a methodology to measure the natural accretion of sedimentation to lake beds.

83. For the coastal receiving environment, we currently collect grain size information from around 90 sites across the region that allow us to track changes in mudiness. There are theoretical thresholds derived from experiments (conducted in our region near our monitoring sites) and using council data that allow us to infer likely changes to ecology based on the percentage of mud.

84. Historical sedimentation information derived by aging sediment cores taken from east coast harbours and estuaries shows that over the last 170 years or so sedimentation rates have increased from less than 1mm per year to an average of 5.1mm per year. Staff are now trialing methods of measuring annual sedimentation rates and developing methods to measure the aerial extent of mudiness, that is, how far a muddy footprint extends within a harbour or estuary.
Figure 2: Integrated Sediment Monitoring Framework
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85. While we have measures of sediment (% mud) in marine and freshwater environments and how this has changed over time, linking this to the source of sediment is more difficult. Within a catchment there are multiple sources of sediment input, as well as sediment already in the system from previous land disturbance (e.g. legacy of original land clearance). In addition, with the marine environment, sediment can be extremely mobile and moved around by waves and currents. Linking outcomes in the marine environment to sediment sources requires further review of the freshwater monitoring network to ensure a wide variety of potential inputs to marine receiving environments are covered.

86. Additional growth pressure also means council needs to capture more monitoring data from urbanising catchments. To address this need, council currently has two sites located in developing catchments: firstly, a recently installed monitoring site in Drury South where the entire catchment land use will change, as well as localised monitoring in Waiiti, where a part of a catchment is being developed. Staff are in the process of considering further locations for integrated monitoring.

87. Anticipated amendment proposals to the NPS-FM in September this year will likely include a proposed sediment attribute within the National Objectives Framework, which may prescribe turbidity and deposited fine sediment as variables that must be reported and therefore measured. In addition, Auckland Council needs to adopt the appropriate NEMS (national environmental monitoring standards) methods for measuring sediment in fluvial environments. This will ensure all data across Aotearoa/New Zealand is collected using the same methods, techniques, quality control and laboratory analysis. We will review our monitoring programmes subsequent to this future direction from central government.

88. National-scale legislative change to stock exclusion and a requirement for farm environmental planning on rural land are also expected and may mean Auckland Council would need to monitor/model and report on changes to erosion arising from potential mitigation practices (e.g. stock exclusion, retirement, wetland regeneration, hill country erosion control). Erosion from rural land will be a focus in further phases of the Strategic Approach to Sediment programme.

Land Use Change Monitoring

89. Traditionally, Auckland Council has used a range of databases to measures changes in land cover including the Land Cover Database (LCDB), AgriBaseTM (2012), Statistics Aotearoa/New Zealand census and MPI Agricultural Production Survey. These collect data using different methods and at different temporal scales and dates and therefore, are not always comparable. Generally, they also measure land cover change at relatively coarse scales and over long time periods. Staff are currently trialing methods to characterize fine scale changes in catchments surrounding freshwater monitoring sites. The increasing availability of satellite imagery and ongoing development of image recognition technology will provide the opportunity to develop even finer spatial and temporal scale methods of monitoring change. This also links to opportunities to use satellite imagery for improved monitoring for compliance mentioned in Work Area 3 above.

90. The development of the Fresh Water Management Tool (see Work Area 1: Better Information) will also improve our understanding of land use change. The FWMT uses long term regional monitoring data to establish the relationships which inform the model and enable it to make predictions. The model will require further ongoing validation monitoring and will also inform priority areas for monitoring based on likelihood of sediment generation or current information gaps in our monitoring programme. It is anticipated that we will need to introduce more targeted (to specific land covers) monitoring in small catchments to help validate gaps in modelling outputs. This will form part of the scoping for version 2 of the FWMT referred to under Work Area 1.

Regulatory Processes and Operations

91. The critical link between measuring changes in land use and sediment delivery and effects in aquatic receiving environments is monitoring the compliance and outcome of land disturbing activities which generate sediment, be they permitted activity or restricted discretionary.

92. Three key reviews of the AUP(OP) provisions for managing sediment are currently underway as outlined in Work Area 2. The full results of the NPS-FM Water Provisions Review and the s35 AUP Monitoring Programme will be reported to their respective Committees in accordance with the timescales of the wider programmes that they sit within. It is anticipated that they may identify
deficiencies or gaps in compliance monitoring that need to be addressed in addition to those identified as part of this programme.

93. While these evaluations are being peer-reviewed for wider publication, early results have triggered several initiatives in monitoring small sites, where a direct link between monitoring and collection of information relating to the effectiveness of council activities is already clearly evident. For example, data gathered from Building Inspectors’ inspections and the Closing the Gap initiative will provide better monitoring of small sites, particularly for permitted activities, as outlined in Work Area 3: Interventions.

94. Targeted ‘end of pipe’ water quality monitoring of sediment loads from three small sites developments is proposed to be funded by the Howick, Upper Harbour and Hibiscus and Bays Local Boards (confirmation is expected in July 2019). These results, which are linked to subdivisions where targeted initiatives compliance is being undertaken, will provide early indication of the need for increased enforcement action. This monitoring data along with data on activity compliance can be used to refine scenario testing in the FWMT.

95. In addition, more concerted monitoring and evaluation is required to validate the effectiveness of specific sediment retention and mitigation devices under different conditions. This was identified as required within the work programme endorsed in December 2018 but was delayed to align with work to establish the effectiveness of stormwater devices and form part of the scoping for Version 2 of the FWMT.

### Next Steps

Develop case studies to assess the effectiveness of various devices under different conditions, including extreme site and weather conditions, as well as opportunities to use innovative techniques. This will help inform developers when more stringent measures are required to achieve effective control of discharges from sites.

### Work Area 5: Co-ordinating and Building Capacity

**AIM:** Establish what skills and resources are needed for the council group to make informed decisions and to implement and enforce policies. Phase 1 will develop a clear understanding of options to deliver as much as possible within existing resources.

96. Keeping pace with consenting and monitoring activities subject to the AUP(OP) provisions is a challenge for both council and the construction industry.

97. This work area reviewed how functions relating to sediment are split across the council group, particularly in relation to managing construction earthworks and its impacts. Recommendations for next steps were combined with the findings of the AUP(OP) Review, outlined under Work Area 2.

### Needs identified

1. **Improve consistency of interpretation and application of AUP(OP) Provisions**

98. Inconsistent interpretation of provisions between the different area service centres, specifically the provisions within the regional and district land disturbance chapters, contributes to variability in assessment of consents across the region. Guidance on interpretation for resource consenting purposes is often provided by officers in Team Leader or Principal positions in the differing area service centres within the regulatory services departments. To improve the consistency of interpretation of provisions, guidance on interpretation must be consistent across all area service centres.

99. Actions being carried out to implement this recommendation are set out below.

- Finalise the draft Guidance Note – Earthworks, for internal and external release as a matter of priority. The internal version is due to be released at the end of July 2019, with the external version to be available shortly after. This should be followed up with appropriate training across
all the service centres to ensure consistency in interpretation and general resource consenting for erosion and sediment controls across the region. This could also include staff from other departments such as those within the Chief Planning Office and Healthy Waters, to provide further information on the intended application of the AUP(OP) provisions, in particular, the regional provisions.

- Targeted training for different regulatory service teams such as compliance monitors, processing planners and development engineers. The content of the training may require altering to reflect the intended audience to ensure the information is targeted and relevant to specific functions of each group (see below).

**II. Improve understanding and awareness of sedimentation impacts**

100. Discussions with relevant staff have highlighted a need to improve consistency of technical understanding and knowledge around erosion and sediment control measures and the adverse environmental effects of sediment in order to advance:

- the standard of erosion and sediment control plans that are submitted as part of resource consent applications
- the consistency with which such plans are assessed by consenting planners
- the choice, installation and maintenance of controls implemented on site
- the assessment of erosion and sediment controls for compliance.

101. Managing erosion and sediment controls on site is complicated and requires a high level of technical competency to assess against the best practice methods provided in GD05 at both the resource consenting and compliance stage. As this is the method by which compliance is assessed in New Zealand, this puts considerable onus on the responsible compliance officer, especially when faced with inadequate practices on site.

102. Following the completion of GD05 and adoption into the AUP(OP) there is now a need to roll out a training and guidance programme. Engineering and Technical Services has developed a draft basic training module, which is due to be finalised in the coming months and rolled out within the context of a broader training and awareness scheme for a number of the Guidance Documents.

103. In the context of weighing up the need for a more formal certification process, a review is also underway of training and certification requirements in other jurisdictions such as Florida (USA) and Canada for ESC plan preparers and checkers.

**III. Improve Staff and Knowledge Retention and Capacity**

104. Keeping pace with consenting and monitoring activities subject to the AUP(OP) provisions is a challenge for council with consequent high demands on staff. The high staff turnover rate within council’s regulatory service departments is resulting in the loss of officers with valuable technical expertise and experience.

105. Options to retain staff and knowledge include:

- initiating further investigations into the reasons for the turnover rate to identify options for improving the retention
- investigating options and developing methods such as effective exit interviews to retain knowledge from experienced staff leaving council.

**IV. Improve understanding of regional functions**

106. Through the course of this work, it was identified that most consenting planners are trained and experienced in district, rather than regional planning. This gap provides an opportunity to improve the understanding of Auckland Council’s regional council functions, specifically associated with the interpretation and application of provisions that address effects on the natural environment.

107. Options to implement this recommendation include:
• enhanced training to improve interpretation and increase the awareness of these provisions for processing planners
• increase capacity of specialist teams who provide technical advice and assessments for consent applications
• work with accredited planning courses under NZPI to review the curriculum to encourage the inclusion of environmental considerations and regional functions
• work with New Zealand Planning Institute – Auckland Branch to offer training on environmental considerations and regional functions as part of Continuous Professional Development.

Interventions proposed

Internal Regulatory Practices and Processes

I. Enhanced Training - Internal

108. As a unitary council, resource consent planners and compliance officers have different expertise and background knowledge. Some planners are more familiar with regional plan rules and others are trained in district plan rules. Similarly, compliance officers are area-based rather than subject-based. Although guidance, practice notes and trainings are provided, with over 40,000 consents processed per year it is not easy to avoid inconsistency. For example, some planners or compliance officers always seek advice from specialists when assessing environmental effects, even for permitted activities, others may just seek advice for activities that require consent and underestimate the cumulative effects of permitted activities.

109. As part of this programme, a thorough review has been conducted of the training methods and materials provided to internal regulatory staff around erosion and sediment control. Working with the Practice and Training Team, as well as recipients of the training, several enhancements have been identified to fine tune the training delivered to make it more specific to the role that each user group plays in the regulatory process. Table 2 outlines the benefits and impact of providing enhanced, user-specific training to each user group.

Table 2: Benefits and impact of enhanced, user-specific training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Information Advisors (PIA)</td>
<td>• As PIA provide general planning guidance to customers this provides opportunity to educate and advise customers on the required standards before they begin development, even if their activity is permitted. It also ensures that customers are directed to appropriate guidance before enforcement methods are implemented.</td>
<td>All developers specifically those in initial scoping stages (before first cut) and developers who may only require building consent due to the earthworks being permitted under AUP(OP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Check Planners</td>
<td>• Ensures that plan check planners are aware of and implementing the correct requirements for erosion and sediment control measures for permitted activities. This would ensure that erosion and sediment control measures were being considered at application stage.</td>
<td>Developments which require building consent but do not require resource consent for land disturbance due to being under the permitted threshold, however certain AUP(OP) standards still apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Target</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Engineers</td>
<td>• Training will incorporate both requirements under GD05 as well as under the Unitary Plan.</td>
<td>All development requiring a resource consent for small to medium scale land disturbance activities will be impacted. This captures medium scale earthworks that requires a district resource consent as the application is checked over by a development engineer. Also captures proposed earthworks which is within the permitted threshold yet requires resource or building consent for other activities which requires development engineer assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensures that adequate information on erosion and sediment control is received with resource consent applications in accordance with the requirements of GD05 and the Unitary Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improves quality of erosion and sediment control information and plans conditioned with granted resource consents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Consent Planners</td>
<td>• Ensures consistency of awareness of council’s regional functions.</td>
<td>All development requiring a resource consent for land disturbance activities will be impacted however, specifically this captures medium to large scale development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity to encourage a wider environmental perspective to be applied in order to consider cumulative effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improves quality of resource consents including more informed and appropriate conditions of consent to minimise effects associated with erosion and sediment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows planners to screen material provided regarding erosion and sediment control before requesting advice from the specialist teams and allows for applications to be returned if it is lacking information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training will increase the consistency of consent processing and AUP(OP) interpretation across the differing area service centres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Officers</td>
<td>• Ensures that monitoring officers are aware of erosion and sediment control requirements so that they can adequately monitor resource consent conditions as well as be aware of any non-compliance on site which is not related to the resource consent.</td>
<td>All development requiring a resource consent which is monitored will be impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspectors</td>
<td>• Ensures that building inspectors are aware of erosion and sediment control requirements when visiting a site to the level that they are able to identify whether the erosion and sediment control methods are compliant. This corresponds with the addition of erosion and sediment control measures to the inspection checklist.</td>
<td>All development requiring a building consent will be impacted and this specifically captures development on smaller sites where resource consent monitoring is not to be undertaken as proposed earthworks is below the permitted threshold in accordance with AUP(OP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic and advanced GD05 Training</td>
<td>• The training will improve compliance with GD05 and could be utilised by various departments and in various roles. This training could also be linked with other internal and external training programmes where suitable.</td>
<td>All developers will be affected as council’s expectations on erosion and sediment control will rise due to better understanding and if the training is able to be used externally then developers will benefit from a better understanding of council’s expectation/ best practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Approach to Sediment: Work Programme
II. Develop and encourage the use of up-to-date consistent, transparent guidance

110. A stocktake of available Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) specific guidance available to internal staff revealed that there is an opportunity to rationalize the guidance available and develop appropriately targeted guidance for staff at all stages in the process for regulating construction earthworks.

111. A parallel stocktake for guidance available externally also revealed that while there is a good level of guidance available to external stakeholders, some minor updates regarding contact details, regulatory framework and obligations, better cross referencing between documents and a discussion of further resources would enhance the usability and effectiveness of these resources.

112. Accessing the correct guidance on Auckland Council’s website can also be confusing as available ESC guidance is not held in the obvious locations, for example the best management practice documents are located in the Stormwater Section of the website rather than the Resource Consents or Building Site management pages. Improving accessibility of these resources would particularly benefit small scale land disturbance activities that do not require consent.

113. Options to implement this recommendation include:
   - update and improve accessibility and visibility of guidance documents both externally and internally
   - using guidance documents to direct developers’ attention to the wider environmental impacts associated with erosion and sediment as well as outlining the legislative requirements to install controls and the potential council penalties.

Next Steps

Finalise the draft Guidance Note – Earthworks, for internal and external release as a matter of priority. The internal version is due to be released at the end of July 2019, with the external version to be available shortly after.

Develop supporting material for GD05 introducing the document, addressing how it should be approached, breaking down the sections or providing additional media or further information.

External Practices and Processes

114. Two key issues arise in relation to industry practices that would contribute to improved sediment outcomes from the construction industry:
   - improved quality of applications for earthworks, in particular, Erosion and Sediment Control Plans (ESCP)
   - better practices on all levels of sites.

115. In theory, an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) and an Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) should be supplied with all applications for a resource consent, which proposes earthworks. In practice, these plans are often seen as an after-thought and poorly prepared. In many cases applicants defer to offering a condition rather than providing the necessary information upfront. When an ESCP is provided, it often doesn’t follow best practice (GD05). This raises the question of who pays for the time taken to upskill the applicant’s specialist.

116. There is also a natural tension between the applicant and council as applicants want to minimise costs associated with constructing erosion and sediment control devices. Applicants also often want to maximise the open area to be worked, but in order to minimise potential effects council wants to control extent of the catchment which is exposed, staging of works, timing and duration and term of consent. Another consequence of poorly prepared plans is that they have often not been matched to the specific site conditions, which means that the contractor employed to manage the earthworks starts with an ESCP that is not fit for purpose.

117. This appears to be less of an issue for large and medium to large sites, where a suitably qualified consultant is usually employed to develop the plan. This tension speaks to the need for enhanced
training in the preparation of ESCPs, however, with around 2000 small to medium sites for which district-level earthworks consents are issued each year this can be problematic.

118. On site practices have also been identified as problematic, either through inappropriate choice of sediment control devices, failure to adapt as the works evolve, or inadequate maintenance of devices.

119. Both issues speak to the need to achieve a more consistent level of skills in erosion and sediment control in Auckland’s construction industry.

**Proposed Interventions**

**Enhanced Training – External**

**Current State**

120. At present, building industry training providers in New Zealand do not require any compulsory training for Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) or Environmental Management on construction sites. In order to qualify as a Licensed Building Practitioner (LBP)\(^9\) and carry out Restricted Building Work, building professionals must demonstrate a range of theoretical and practical competencies, however, ability to recognise and manage environmental issues, including erosion and sediment runoff, is not a competency required by all licence classes, and existing Unit Standards that count towards LBP registration may or may not cover environmental management to a satisfactory level. Formalised ESC training focusing on the practices described in GD05\(^10\) is offered by some environmental consultancies and can be accessed by the construction industry, though this may have limited appeal and uptake due to the lack of formally recognised accreditation for successful completion of associated coursework.

121. In terms of regulator training, in addition to the small site focused training offered by Targeted Initiatives (see Work Area 3), Auckland Council currently offers four GD05-based ESC courses of half a day or less as well as an annual industry field day. These courses are internally developed and facilitated, and do not provide formal certification or accreditation to participants. Many other councils offer similar internal and external guidance documents and training schemes based on Auckland’s GD05 (and its predecessor - TP90), including Greater Wellington, Hawkes Bay, and Waikato Regional Councils, and Environment Canterbury.

122. Despite the unified uptake of guidance documentation, there is no consistent national approach to training, and there have been issues with low numbers of external construction industry members attending council-facilitated training courses, likely due to timing (held during working hours) and lack of accreditation or certification offered for successful completion of coursework. This is difficult to address, as gaining the certification required to become an accredited training provider of NZQA qualifications is a time and cost intensive process (Geethshun, Feeny & Ridley, 2012).

123. This overall lack of consistency has long been recognised and there have been significant cross-sector efforts to design and implement standardised ESC and Environmental Management training targeting building professionals, ESC designers and practitioners, and regulators. This has been slowed by lack of political appetite, amalgamations of regulatory bodies, and the absence of educational frameworks. Work by Connexis and the legacy Auckland councils progressed as far as developing and registering NZQA training content (Unit Standards 27201 and 27202 [BECA Ltd &

---

\(^9\) Since 2009, The New Zealand Government has required that building practitioners be licenced to carry out or supervise restricted Building Work (RBW). The LBP scheme includes seven licensing classes that are based on occupations that are crucial to a buildings performance, including Brick & Block laying, Carpentry, Design, External Plastering, Foundations, Roofing, Siting (management). To become an LBP, a practitioner must demonstrate that they meet each of the competencies required by the licensing class. The LBP scheme promotes, recognises, and supports professional skills and behaviour in the building industry, encourages competent building practitioners to carry out quality work, and to give consumers the information they require to make informed decisions when engaging building practitioners.

\(^10\) GD05 Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland Region, providing technical guidance for the selection, design and use of ESC practices and measures for land disturbing activities in an Auckland context.

---

[^9]: Strategic Approach to Sediment: Work Programme

[^10]: Page 21 of 26
Environmental Communications Ltd, 2016), but it does not appear that these unit standards have ever been incorporated into any industry qualifications as core components.

Implications
124. As such, there is currently no standardised, compulsory ESC or environmental management training required by ESC practitioners or regulators. Construction professionals, designers, builders and project managers, on small and residential construction sites do not have a consistent appreciation of the environmental effects of sediment and contaminants, or the importance of ESC and environmental management practices, when they should take place, and what best practice looks like. While some environmental effects can be managed through regulation and enforcement, without appropriately trained on-site professionals managing environmental risks and selecting and installing ESC’s early on, contaminants including sediment, paint, and building debris can directly and indirectly discharge to receiving environments. While a single site may not generate large volumes of sediment or contaminants, the cumulative effects of multiple poorly managed sites can be significant at a catchment scale (BECA Ltd & Environmental Communications Ltd, 2016).

Opportunities
125. Offering training that provides participants the opportunity to attain qualifications and accreditation through achievement of unit standards may provide a strong incentive to the construction industry, particularly those in the early stages of their training or careers who are seeking to gain LBP certification (Geertshuis, Feeny & Ridley, 2012).

126. The ESC, regulatory, and wider environmental management sectors in New Zealand are characterised by strong cross-sector partnerships, and opportunities currently exist to ensure that ESC designers, providers, and regulators receive consistent training and certification covering ESC design, installation, and maintenance, contaminant control, and construction waste minimisation. The time is right to revisit establishing ESC and environmental management as a compulsory competency across all LBP licence classes and developing (or adapting) and implementing a compulsory, nationally recognised unit standard that provides the required skills and knowledge. Professional and educational frameworks now exist11. Public and political awareness of the environmental effects of unprecedented growth is high and several central government initiatives to improve the quality of marine and freshwater are currently in the pipeline. This is crucial to the success of a standardised, compulsory unit standard, as individual councils should not be responsible for coordinating and implementing such a programme; unified direction needs to come from central government.

Next Steps
Increase uptake of erosion and sediment control training for the construction industry through advocacy to central government for national-level industry qualifications and accreditations across the full range of construction industry stakeholders.

---

11 In addition to the LBP scheme, MBIE's Government Regulatory Practice Initiative (G-Reg) has recently been established to build the capability and professionalism of regulatory staff in central and local government agencies and organisations across New Zealand. One of the ways in which they aim to achieve this is through NZQA recognised qualifications (to a diploma level), facilitated by Skills NZ. The level three and four qualifications have recently been incorporated into the Auckland Council's Regulatory Compliance unit's core training framework. While much of the content of the G-Reg qualification is general and transferable across the public sector, Skills NZ may be an appropriate framework for delivery and accreditation of recognised, consistent ESC Design and Practice Qualifications.
Work Area 6: Communication and Engagement

AIM: Look at how and with what messages we engage council, mana whenua, partners and wider stakeholders.

127. One of the key outputs of this work area is to develop a shared and coordinated regional narrative for sediment, pulling together our latest understanding of sediment sources and the effectiveness of interventions. This will be an iterative process as myriad historic and new targeted, regional and national studies and research activities add valuable insight to this complex and challenging story. Opportunities to share this story are being developed through the Watershed Story Maps and other appropriate media.

128. To further this, staff are developing strategic partnerships with organisations such as Sustainable Business Network, which through their GulfX project, is taking a multi-pronged approach in its mission to restore the mauri of the Tikapa Moana/Hauraki Gulf, including a focus on sediment through its Million Metres Streams Project.

Working with Mana Whenua

129. Certain activities under the AUP(OP) require applicants to provide a Cultural Values Assessment (CVA) to provide information on effects on mana whenua values. Large scale earthworks (or smaller scale earthworks but in sensitive areas) typically requires a CVA to be provided. The applicant can either engage with mana whenua directly prior to lodging their consent application to obtain this information or can use the council’s facilitation service during the consenting process.

130. In 2018-19 RIMU undertook a review of the effectiveness of how council’s consenting departments are working with mana whenua. The report put forward 52 recommendations to improve existing systems, processes, guidance and training for both council staff and mana whenua involved in consenting processes. As a result, the CVA Review Project was established. This partnership between Auckland Council Regulatory Services and mana whenua includes a series of five co-design wananga with attendance from mana whenua and council staff.

131. It is anticipated that the findings and recommendations of this review will be implemented, once agreed by the project steering group, starting early in 2020.

Next Steps

Next steps are outlined in Table 3.

Table 3: Proposed stakeholder interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Proposed Intervention</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Anticipated Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction industry</td>
<td>A series of workshops to encourage the construction industry to be part of the solution through voluntary compliance, innovation and identifying tools required to achieve this.</td>
<td>To emphasise the importance of erosion and sediment control measures, ensure that industry is aware of council’s requirements and that council provides the right tools to assist in achieving better outcomes. Additionally, to challenge best practice and encourage innovative solutions.</td>
<td>Targeting planners, project managers, engineers and other professionals involved in land development to understand opportunities and barriers from varying perspectives in order to improve the quality of information in resource consent applications received and raise awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Target</td>
<td>Proposed Intervention</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Anticipated Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Partner with Sustainable Business Network and GulfX to develop a series of community workshops around sediment.</td>
<td>The workshops would provide a community and mana whenua perspective on erosion and sediment control. This perspective can be applied to our practices and processes relating to erosion and sediment.</td>
<td>Incorporating a Te Ao Māori perspective will further emphasise the importance of protecting our waterways and wider environment and provide another perspective on the issues that communities may identify with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate cultural values from watershed story</td>
<td>Mana whenua and Healthy Waters</td>
<td>Developing the watershed stories has included a partnership with mana whenua to gain their perspective. This perspective can be woven into our practices and processes relating to erosion and sediment.</td>
<td>Incorporating a Te Ao Māori perspective will further emphasise the importance of protecting our waterways and wider environment and provide another perspective on the issues that communities may identify with.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix 1: Summary of Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scope FWMT v2 to include scenarios for developing land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish priorities and costs for further research recommendations for LTP 2021.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Embed findings and recommendations into work related to Auckland Plan 2050 and AUP(OP) plan changes for NPS-FM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Complete ‘Close the Gap’ Initiative (Phase 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Use findings to achieve better compliance and monitoring of small sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develop case studies to assess effectiveness of devices under different conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enhanced Training – Internal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Finalise draft Guidance Note – Earthworks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop supporting material for GD05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Advocate for national-level industry qualifications and accreditations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Industry workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Community and mana whenua workshop in partnership with SBN and NPS-FM delivery (as appropriate).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Develop scope of strategic solutions to address sediment from other sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose of the report
1. To approve the 2019-2022 Community Facilities Regional Work Programmes.

Executive summary
2. The Community Facilities department is responsible for the building, maintaining and renewing of all open spaces and community buildings. Community Facilities prepares and delivers both local work programmes - for which local boards are the decision makers, and regional work programmes - for which the governing body is the decision maker, with responsibility delegated to the Environment and Community Committee.

3. This report seeks approval for the regional work programmes. These include:
   - programmes for parks and facilities for which the governing body is the decision maker, including Regional Parks, Holiday Parks, Auckland Botanic Gardens, Auckland Domain and active Cemeteries
   - regional programmes that the governing body allocates budget to specific projects for which local boards may be the decision maker, including Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sportsfields development (growth).

4. The work programmes provided in Attachments A-D to this report reflect the projects that were presented a workshop with the Environment and Community Committee in May 2019, with minor adjustments based on feedback from the local boards.

5. This report recommends that the committee approves the 2019-2022 Community Facilities Regional Work Programme and associated budget in full for projects commencing in the first year of the programme and in principle for subsequent two years.

6. The work programmes includes projects proposed to be funded from regional programmes, including local and sports field development (growth), coastal and slips prevention programmes that, once approved, will be incorporated into local board work programmes. Local boards have conditionally approved these projects into their work programmes and provided feedback for consideration of the committee.

7. Several projects have been identified in the work programme as “risk adjusted programme (RAP)” projects. These are projects that have budget allocated in the 2020/2021 financial year. Approval is sought for staff to commence work on these projects in the 2019/2020 year so that they can be delivered early if other approved projects are delayed for any reason.

8. To expedite delivery of the work programme, and to manage changes that may be required in a timely way, staff recommend that the committee delegate decision making for amendments to the approved programme to the General Manager Community Facilities.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) Approve the following 2019/2020 (year 1) Community Facilities Regional Work Programme and approve in principle the 2020-2022 Community Facilities Work Programme (years 2 and 3) as detailed in the following attachments to the agenda report:
   i) Attachment A – Regional Park Network Work Programme
   ii) Attachment B – Coastal Renewals Work Programme
   iii) Attachment C – Slips Prevention Work Programme
   iv) Attachment D – Local Parks and Sportsfield Development Work Programme

b) Approve the risk-adjusted programme (RAP) projects identified in Attachments A - D to the agenda report, as projects that may be delivered in advance of the expected delivery year, if required to meet expected financial expenditure for the 2019/2020 financial year.

c) Note that approval of budget allocation in the 2019/2020 year for multi-year projects may commit the committee to the allocation of subsequent years budgets.

d) Note that where budget is allocated to a project in the regional work programme that falls within a local board decision-making allocation (e.g., a local park), that project is included in the local board work programme and the local board then has decision-making responsibility for that project, within the parameters set by the governing body, namely location, scope and budget.

e) Note the feedback provided by local boards for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets in Attachment E to the agenda report.

f) Note that budget allocation for all projects in the 2019-2022 Community Facilities Regional Work Programmes are best current estimates, and amendments may be required to the work programme to accommodate final costs as the year progresses.

g) Delegate to the General Manager Community Facilities authority to approve amendments to the 2019-2022 Community Facilities Regional Work Programme.

Horopaki
Context

9. Community facilities and open spaces provide important community services to the people of Auckland. They contribute to building strong, healthy, and vibrant communities by providing spaces where Aucklanders can participate in a wide range of social, cultural, art and recreational activities. These activities improve lifestyles and a sense of belonging and pride amongst residents.

10. Local work programmes are presented to local boards and regional programmes are presented to the Environment and Community Committee for approval each year. The 2019-2022 Community Facilities Work Programme, detailed in the attachments, contains information on all proposed regional projects to be delivered by Community Facilities.
11. The Community Facilities regional programmes being reported to the Environment and Community Committee include:
   • Regional parks
   • Regional Parks (including Farming and Holiday Places)
   • Holiday Parks
   • Botanic Gardens
   • Auckland Domain
   • Cemeteries
   • Coastal renewals
   • Slips prevention and remediation
   • Local parks and sportsfields development (growth)

12. The governing body has two distinct decision-making roles for these programmes:
   • For the regional parks and cemetery programme, the governing body is allocated full decision making and is responsible for both budget allocation to specific projects and subsequent governance decision making regarding the delivery of those projects.
   • For coastal renewals, slips prevention and remediation and local and sportsfields development budgets, the governing body is responsible for the prioritisation and allocation of budget to specific projects. Where specific projects relate to assets within the local park network, subsequent governance decision making regarding the delivery of those projects is allocated to the relevant local board, who are responsible for delivery within the location, scope and budget defined by the governing body.

13. The programmes and related budgets considered in this report relate only to those for which the Community Facilities department is responsible and accountable. Budgets where responsibility and accountability lie with other parts of organisation are not included in these regional programmes.

14. It should be noted that the Auckland Domain Committee has decision making regarding the Auckland Domain with budget being allocated from the above regional budgets.

15. Staff engaged with the committee regarding the draft programme at a workshop on 14 May 2019.

16. This year’s work programme is a three-year programme to clearly demonstrate the phasing of project delivery and to enable the organisation to prepare for delivery. The work programme is subject to a rolling review and each year the committee will be asked to approve a new three-year work programme.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Regional parks programme
17. The regional parks programme includes all asset investment relating to parks, facilities and activities for which the governing body is the allocated decision maker, apart from active cemeteries, which are considered as a separate programme.

18. These include the Auckland wide network of Regional Parks, the Auckland Botanic Gardens, Auckland Domain, three council operated Holiday Parks, and street gardens.
19. Staff have prepared the recommended programmes through an iterative process, in consideration of service outcomes sought, the condition of existing assets and demands for new assets. The process of prioritisation has included engagement with staff responsible for delivering both assets and services ‘on the ground’.

20. Pressures facing this programme include:
   - Balancing demands across regional portfolio
   - Increasing visitation/use and changing visitor profile and expectations
   - Addressing the impact of historic deferred maintenance.

Regional Park network

21. The Regional Parks programme include the development of basic new visitor infrastructure in particular Te Arai, Te Rau Puriri, Piha, Cascade Falls, as well as renewal of existing assets across the region, especially track renewals.

Botanic Gardens

22. The botanic gardens programme focuses on general small-scale renewal of assets such as glasshouses, roading and car park lighting.

Auckland Domain

23. The Auckland Domain programme includes significant investment for the renewal of Wintergardens and nursery glasshouses and path resurfacing. Future sportsfield renewal and new development of Kari Street and natural play area are also included.

Holiday Parks

24. Priorities for the holiday parks programme include several general renewal projects to address historic deferred maintenance. Investment to increase non-rates revenue generation is also a priority.

Regional street gardens

25. Budget allocation is proposed to renew planting of street gardens across the region, as part of an ongoing programme. The need for street garden improvements has become apparent recently following feedback from local boards and the community.

Consolidated budget and proposed allocation

26. The regional parks programme budget and proposed allocation is summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Regional parks programme budget and allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional park</th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Regional Budget</td>
<td>$11,869,736</td>
<td>$7,014,227</td>
<td>$10,897,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed allocation – Regional Parks</td>
<td>$7,539,170</td>
<td>$2,395,000</td>
<td>$6,128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed allocation – Holiday Parks</td>
<td>$1,470,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$1,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed allocation – Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$1,372,000</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td>$905,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed allocation – Auckland Domain</td>
<td>$2,665,000</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td>$1,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed allocation – Region wide</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total proposed allocation</td>
<td>$14,046,170</td>
<td>$7,105,000</td>
<td>$10,818,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available</td>
<td>($2,176,434)</td>
<td>($90,773)</td>
<td>$79,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cemeteries Programme

27. The cemeteries programme deals with the renewal and development of active cemeteries. Closed cemeteries form part of the local park network and are addressed within local board work programmes. The programme is driven by the intended service outcomes such as demand for lawn burials, as well as asset condition and input from staff ‘on the ground’.

28. Pressures on this programme include the growing demand for burial plots, the modest budget provision available for renewals from 2019/2020 and heritage constraints and implications for some projects.

29. It should also be noted that a separate budget is held for new cemetery land purchase and development of $14.1 million.

30. Key priorities in the cemeteries programme include the Waikumete masterplan for new burial areas, new berms across councils three major cemeteries and the refurbishment of buildings.

31. The cemeteries budget and proposed allocation summarised in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemeteries renewal and development</th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$6,199,319</td>
<td>$2,833,229</td>
<td>$1,763,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed allocation</td>
<td>$3,893,189</td>
<td>$2,685,000</td>
<td>$1,815,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available</td>
<td>$2,306,130</td>
<td>$148,229</td>
<td>$(51,771)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coastal Renewals Programme

32. Projects within the coastal programme (Attachment B) have been identified and prioritised based on asset condition, coastal hazard mitigation and the nature of the use or function of existing assets.

33. Current pressures on this programme include the budget availability and the scale of work required, continued community expectation for coastal protection structures and mitigating climate change impacts.

34. The proposed programme is predominately made up of renewals of coastal protection structures e.g. seawalls, however there are some access structure works proposed e.g. boat ramps, wharfs and stairs.

35. In future, the programme will be guided by Coastal Compartment Management Plans.

36. The coastal budget and proposed allocation is summarised in Table 3. There remains some capacity in years two and three of the programme to accommodate new projects or where there are necessary cost escalations for existing projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coastal renewals</th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$9,941,705</td>
<td>$8,730,000</td>
<td>$9,305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed allocation</td>
<td>$9,362,074</td>
<td>$6,777,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available</td>
<td>$579,632</td>
<td>$1,953,000</td>
<td>$5,305,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slip Prevention and Remediation Programme

37. The focus in the slips prevention and remediation programme (Attachment C) is on remediating existing slips prioritised according to risk and use.

38. The current slips programme includes projects arising from previous storm events and needs to remain responsive to future events. There is a focus on completing priority projects that have already commenced. The programme is under pressure from a general expectation for repair/remediation in all circumstances, the cost and technical challenge for some slips and mitigating climate change impacts.

39. The slips budget and proposed allocation is summarised in Table 4. At this point future years budget remain largely unallocated as it is intended to develop a proactive preventative programme for high risk areas.

Table 4 – Slips prevention and remediation programme budget and allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slips prevention and remediation</th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed allocation</td>
<td>$1,998,674</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available</td>
<td>$1,326</td>
<td>$1,490,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Parks and Sportsfields Development (growth)

40. The 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 (LTP) includes the ‘Local Parks and Sportsfield Development’ budget. This budget is often referred to as the ‘growth’ budget, and the projects funded from this budget are often collectively referred to as the ‘growth programme’ (Attachment D).

41. The Local Parks and Sportsfield Development (growth) budget is 75% funded by development contributions and 25% funded by rates. This funding mix means that the programme delivered by this budget must meet the requirements of the Local Government Act for the use of development contributions.

42. The Local Government Act specifies the type of project that development contributions can be used for and requires that projects can only be funded by the development contribution portion of the budget to the extent that the ‘cause’ and ‘benefit’ from the project is attributable to “new and future communities” (i.e. residential growth only).

43. Development contributions also part fund other specific projects in the LTP, many of which are identified as a ‘Long Term Plan Item’ in Attachment D for context. However, the Local Parks and Sportsfield Development (growth) budget provides a general budget source that allows council more flexibility in allocating budget to projects that meet the changing demands arising from growth.

44. Projects to be funded from the Local Parks and Sportsfield Development budget are prioritised (i.e. included in programme) based on:
   - Alignment with requirements of Local Government Act, including assessment of cause and benefit of projects attributable to growth
   - Alignment with approved governing body or local board priorities
   - Deliver agreed service outcomes
   - Assessment of current provision and existing capacity to meet future need
   - Projects currently committed or with high expectation for delivery.
45. The amount and timing for budget allocation of prioritised projects (i.e. how much budget is allocated when) is based on:
   - Appropriate design to meet the needs of new and future communities
   - The point at which residential growth is occurring
   - Delivery dependencies (e.g. third-party development, other funding sources)
   - Project readiness
   - Overall budget availability.

46. Where and when future growth will take place is predicted based on:
   - Projections from the Auckland Plan, the Future Urban Land Use Strategy and the i11 Auckland Transport (AT) growth model
   - Analysis of resource consent and building consent applications granted
   - ‘On the ground’ knowledge of staff.

47. There are several pressures on this programme, including:
   - the scale and phasing of the budget in the short/medium term which limits the number and extent of projects proposed
   - the expectation for growth investment from developers, local boards and the community
   - challenge of adequately meeting additional need generated by dispersed growth
   - providing for development of new open space in an appropriate timeframe following acquisition.

48. Key priorities and highlights in the proposed programme include supporting areas of major change e.g. Tamaki, Hobsonville, Millwater, ongoing investment in sports field capacity and developing new neighbourhood parks.

49. Any projects that have budget approved in the current 2018/2019 financial year, but are unable to be delivered this year, will be deferred. Deferred budgets will be added to the work programme at a later date. The 2018/2019 projects have been shown in Attachment D.

50. Local boards were asked to provide their formal feedback relating to the growth programme at their June business meetings. A copy of all resolutions is included as Attachment E to this report, along with an initial staff response.

51. Key themes from local board feedback include:
   - support for those projects included in the programme
   - a desire for bringing proposed projects forward for earlier delivery
   - a desire for additional budget allocation to new projects or to expand the scope of existing projects
   - a concern that previously proposed projects are no longer included in the programme
   - a concern that there is insufficient budget available to meet community expectations
   - a concern that historic variation in levels of service is not being addressed through the growth programme.
52. Staff have provided an initial response to feedback received. Staff will undertake further and ongoing refinement of the programme, which will include responding to relevant local board proposal for new or expanded projects, and additional funding allocations.

53. The local parks and sportsfields development budget and proposed allocation is summarised in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5 – Local parks and sportsfields development programme budget and allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local parks and sports field development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programme Delivery considerations

Cost estimates subject to change

54. Budget allocations within the work programme are best estimates only. Project costings are subject to change and refinement as projects progress through the design and delivery process. Greater clarity will be determined around the specific work required and the cost of delivery of that work once the details are defined.

55. The delivery of individual projects is managed within each work programme budget. Where significant changes to project budgets may need to be considered, or if new projects are added to the work programme, changes may be required to the programme to accommodate final project costs as the year progresses.

Risk adjusted programme

56. Several projects have been identified in the work programme as “risk adjusted programme (RAP)” projects.

57. These are projects that have budget allocated in the 2020/2021 financial year (i.e. year two of the three-year programme). Staff propose to commence work in the 2019/2020 year on the delivery of these risk adjusted projects.

58. By progressing these identified projects alongside the 2019/2020 projects in the programme, it is intended that, should projects identified for delivery in year one of the work programme be delayed for any reason, staff will be able to proceed with agreed alternative projects to ensure that the full annual budget is delivered each year.

59. Approval is sought from the committee for staff to commence work on those projects identified in the work programme as risk adjusted programme projects in the 2019/2020 year.

Delegation for approval of changes to the work programme

60. The delivery of the proposed work programme in an efficient and timely manner may require amendments to be made to the agreed work programme during the year. Such amendments could include:

- changes to project scope, budgets, timing
- addition of new projects within available budget
- cancelling or putting approved projects on hold.

61. Any changes to the approved work programme would normally require approval from the committee by resolution at a business meeting. However, the committee can delegate authority to approve some or all amendments to the work programme to the chair, to another member of the committee, or to staff. Such delegation would allow changes to be made
without the timeframes required to provide formal reports and would support the efficient delivery of the work programme.

62. It is requested that the Environment and Community Committee delegate authority to staff to approve changes to the work programme, in this case the General Manager Community Facilities. It is proposed to determine a reporting mechanism to the committee and that any decisions made under delegation would be reported back to the committee through this mechanism.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

63. The 2019 - 2022 Community Facilities regional work programme has been developed in consultation with other council departments such as Parks, Sport and Recreation, Service Strategy and Integration, the Development Programme Office and Engineering and Technical Services. The intent is to improve the integration of our advice to the committee and to overall improve the quality of advice through collaboration and understanding across the council.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

64. The Community Facilities Regional Work Programme projects have been shared with the relevant local boards at workshops in March 2019 with informal feedback being sought. This feedback was shared with the Environment and Community Committee in May 2019.

65. Subsequently updated programmes were shared with local boards on 4 June 2019.

66. All relevant regional work programme projects have now been included in local board work programmes for approval, subject to committee approval. Formal feedback on the regional programmes has also been sought from local boards. A copy of all resolved feedback has been included in Attachment E to this report created. The feedback has been discussed in the Analysis and Advice section of this report and any necessary changes as a result incorporated into the recommendations.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

67. The 2019-2022 Community Facilities Regional Work Programme ensures that all facilities and open space assets continue to be well-maintained assets developed to meet the needs of growth, and that benefit the local community, including Māori. When developing and delivering work programmes, consideration is given to how the activities can contribute to Māori well-being, values, culture and traditions.

68. Where any aspects of the proposed work programme are anticipated to have a significant impact on sites of importance to mana whenua, appropriate engagement will be undertaken.

69. Staff are also attending mana whenua forum’s monthly to receive feedback on specific projects within the 2019-2022 Community Facilities Work Programme.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

70. The proposed work programme can be accommodated within the available budgets. Approval of the work programme does not have significant financial implications, unless projects experience a significant overspend or underspend.

71. A mechanism for regular updates on the delivery of the programme will be determined and updates provided to the committee. These updates will identify progress of projects and
amendments to the approved programme including changes to budget allocation and timing.

72. It should be noted that the budgets for the Botanic Gardens and Auckland Domain are being treated as a part of the regional parks network programme.

73. The overall budget summary is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional parks – developments</td>
<td>$2,240,050</td>
<td>$762,300</td>
<td>$657,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional parks – renewals</td>
<td>$8,630,110</td>
<td>$6,051,927</td>
<td>$8,940,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional parks – Auckland Domain renewals</td>
<td>$99,576</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional parks – Auckland Botanical Gardens</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries – developments</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$2,633,229</td>
<td>$1,263,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries – renewals</td>
<td>$1,199,319</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal asset renewals</td>
<td>$9,941,705</td>
<td>$8,730,000</td>
<td>$9,305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slips remediation and prevention</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local parks and sports fields development</td>
<td>$24,567,913</td>
<td>$35,720,000</td>
<td>$15,147,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

74. Where a work programme activity cannot be completed on time, due to unforeseen circumstances, this will be signalled via a committee update. The risk adjusted programme (RAP) will be used to progress those projects identified as ready to proceed under the RAP.

75. If the proposed Community Facilities regional work programme is not approved at the business meeting, there is a risk that the proposed projects may not be delivered within the 2019/2020 financial year.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

76. Once approved, delivery of activities identified in the Community Facilities regional work programme will commence from 1 July 2019.

77. Progress and updates on work programmes will be reported to the committee via mechanisms to be determined, ideally for each quarter of the financial year.

78. Should there be any changes to regional programmes that affect local board work programmes, these will be reported to the relevant local board.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 19</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Alaka Creek Regional Park - renew potable water supply - entry car park &amp; failing farm water</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 20</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Long Bay Regional Park - renew playground equipment</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 21</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Long Bay Regional Park - renew seat - Office for northern turnaround</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 22</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Long Bay Regional Park - renew pavilion roof - 2015/2016</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 23</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Maturing Regional Parks - renew toilet block and gravel sewerage treatment - Mike Bay</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 24</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Maturing Regional Parks - renew Tungata Point to Mike Bay campground access track</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 25</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Park Sector - renew fencing - 2018/2019</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 26</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Park Sector - renew fencing - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 27</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Park Sector - renew furniture, fittings &amp; equipment - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 28</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Park Sector - renew plant and machinery - 2017/2018 - 2018/2019</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 29</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Park Sector - renew plant and machinery - 2021/2022</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 30</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Park Sector - renew signage incl. marker posts - 2017/2018 - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 31</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Park Sector - renew track surface 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 32</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Park Sector - renew track surface 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 33</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Parks - Maturing Regional Parks</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 34</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Parks - renew bridges</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 35</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Parks - Scotts Homestead Renewals</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 36</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Northern Regional Parks - Te Muri Workshop Renewals</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 37</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Scandrett Regional Park - renew access road and dune remediation</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Activity Details</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Benefits</td>
<td>Lead Dept/Unit or COO</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Funding Contributions 2018/2019 and prior budget</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2021/2022</td>
<td>2022/2023</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 001</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Developments</td>
<td>Long Bay Regional Park - develop reading - Veilchen Park</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>$1,172,911</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>1,237,531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 002</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Developments</td>
<td>Te Arari Regional Park - develop depot and office</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>628,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 003</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Developments</td>
<td>Te Oko Regional Park - develop visitor infrastructure</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 004</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Developments</td>
<td>Te Arari Regional Park - install automatic gates</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 005</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Developments</td>
<td>Te Arari Regional Park - install Pacific Parade toilet</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>418,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 006</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Developments</td>
<td>Te Arari Regional Park - install toilets - Forestry Road car park</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 007</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Developments</td>
<td>Te Arari Regional Park - purchase plant and equipment</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 008</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Improvements</td>
<td>Northern Regional Parks - develop Shakespeare Park - Risk-Adjusted Programme (RAP) Project</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>Regional Renewals FY21/22 - $509,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1,270,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 009</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Improvements</td>
<td>Tauparikaka Regional Park - Andor Ray - landscaping &amp; swimming pool A - Risk-Adjusted Programme (RAP) Project</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>Regional Renewals FY21/22 - $929,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,158,000</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>956,000</td>
<td>2,372,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 010</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Improvements</td>
<td>Waiakairuru Regional Park - develop Moeraki beach track</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>209,000</td>
<td>209,000</td>
<td>209,000</td>
<td>209,000</td>
<td>630,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 011</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Regionalwide Developments</td>
<td>All Holiday Places - purchase equipment - accommodation portfolio</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 012</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Developments</td>
<td>Piri Regional Park - Taitono - install track - Risk-Adjusted Programme (RAP) Project</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>546,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 013</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Developments</td>
<td>Te Rito Puhi Regional Park - develop underpass</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 014</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Developments</td>
<td>Te Rito Puhi Regional Park - MCT - doors - install</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 015</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Developments</td>
<td>Te Rito Puhi Regional Park - Pauanui - install toilets</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 016</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Improvements</td>
<td>Akarana Visitor Centre - develop nature trail - Risk-Adjusted Programme (RAP) Project</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>Regional Renewals FY19/20 - $615,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>228,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 017</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Improvements</td>
<td>Cascade Falls - renew and extend car park area</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>Regional Renewals FY19/20 - $615,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>228,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 018</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Hawke's Bay Renewals</td>
<td>Okahu Bay Regional Park - renew vehicle and pedestrian ford</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>264,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 530</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Shakespeare Regional Park - renew campground toilet &amp; Chlorina Bay toilet block</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$ 960,000</td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
<td>$ 970,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 530</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Shakespeare Regional Park - renew falling potable and farm water lines</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 540</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Tawharanui Regional Park - renew 3 bay and workshop roof</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 541</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Tawharanui Regional Park - renew car parking area</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ 345,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 542</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Tawharanui Regional Park - renew falling potable and farm water lines</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 543</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Tawharanui Regional Park - renew north coast back</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 544</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Tawharanui Regional Park - replace proof fence (2023) exposed areas</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 545</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Mt Muri Regional Park - renew campgrounds facilities</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 546</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Kierandehom Regional Park - refurbish bach</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 290,000</td>
<td>$ 290,000</td>
<td>$ 290,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 547</td>
<td>Regional Parks - North Renewals</td>
<td>Kierandehom Regional Park - renew public toilet inside and out - park entrance</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 548</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Regional Redevelopment</td>
<td>Regional Parks - deliver interpretive projects 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Development FY19/20 - $87,500</td>
<td>$ 178,000</td>
<td>$ 178,000</td>
<td>$ 178,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 549</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Regional Redevelopment</td>
<td>Regional Parks - deliver interpretive projects 2020/2021</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Development FY20/21 - $87,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 178,000</td>
<td>$ 178,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 550</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Regional Redevelopment</td>
<td>Regional Parks - deliver interpretive projects 2021/2022</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Development FY21/22 - $87,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 178,000</td>
<td>$ 178,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 551</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Regional Redevelopment</td>
<td>Regional Parks - renew security including CCTV systems</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Development FY22/23 - $20,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 552</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Antony Regional Park - renew workshop, baths &amp; changing rooms</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 553</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Brook Road House - extensions renewal - Amorita House (4945 Timbert House)</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 554</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Oudin Regional Park - refurbish Beachs</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 555</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Oudin Regional Park - renew car park - Oudin Road</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 556</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Oudin Regional Park - renew picnic area and shelter</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 63,000</td>
<td>$ 83,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Activity Sector</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Benefits</td>
<td>Lead Dept/Unit or GO</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Funding Contributions 2016/17 and prior budget</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2021/2022</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 557</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Hunaus Regional Park - renew Covery Gorge track</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 43,000</td>
<td>$ 116,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 158,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 558</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Hunaus Regional Park - renew trails - 2017/18 - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 104,001</td>
<td>$ 87,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 197,001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 559</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Puakehia Regional Park - renew implement paved roof</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 28,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 28,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 560</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Puakehia Regional Park - renew water reticulation line</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 561</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Southern Regional Park Sector - renew conservation fencing - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 562</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Southern Regional Park Sector - renew fencing 2017/2019 - 2019/2022</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 154,830</td>
<td>$ 90,170</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 563</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Southern Regional Park Sector - renew future, fences, &amp; equipment - 2017/2018 - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 564</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Southern Regional Park Sector - renew trails - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 105,369</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 265,368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 565</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Southern Regional Park Sector - renew plant &amp; machinery - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 16,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 566</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Southern Regional Park Sector - renew plant &amp; machinery - 2021/2022</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 16,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 567</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Southern Regional Park Sector - renew track surface 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 568</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Southern Regional Park Sector - renew track surface 2021/2022</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 569</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Southern Regional Parks - upgrade Tapotapoa track</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 570</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Takawairiki Regional Park - renew access track</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 571</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Takawaki Regional Park - renew main road and retaining walls Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) Project</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$ 149,000</td>
<td>$ 740,000</td>
<td>$ - $ 970,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 572</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Takaharawha Regional Park - rebuild track and boardwalk - Tarata Track</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 32,000</td>
<td>$ 32,000</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 573</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Takaharawha Regional Park - rebuild track and boardwalk - uplift Road</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 28,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 58,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 574</td>
<td>Regional Parks - South Renewals</td>
<td>Takaharawha Regional Park - upgrade depot and renew workshop Risg Adjusted Programme (RAP) Project</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 64,995</td>
<td>$ 428,000</td>
<td>$ 195,000</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$ 684,995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 7</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 77</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 78</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 79</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 80</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 81</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 82</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 83</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 84</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 85</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 86</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 87</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 88</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 89</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 90</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 91</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 92</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West</td>
<td>Remuera Park</td>
<td>Karakatta (At) Upper Hightop - expand car park and arrival area</td>
<td>C/F - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>Regional Developments FY15/16 - $70,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Ref.</td>
<td>Activity Sector</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Benefits</td>
<td>Lead Dept/Unit or GOO</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Funding Contributions</td>
<td>2016/2017 and prior budget</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2021/2022</td>
<td>2022/2023+</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 593</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Pakuroro Beach - renew full facility</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 594</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Te Rau Puti Regional Park - centralise water supply across all properties</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 45,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 595</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Te Rau Puti Regional Park - M&amp;O ex Block - renew water line</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 596</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Te Rau Puti Regional Park - renew and install fencing - 2017/2018 - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 203,311</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 223,311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 597</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Te Rau Puti Regional Park - renew farm road - 2017/2018 - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$ 35,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 598</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Te Rau Puti Regional Park - renew estate system</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 153,670</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 183,670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 599</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Park Sector - renew fencing 2019/2020</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 600</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Park Sector - renew fencing 2021/2022</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 601</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Park Sector - renew furniture, fittings &amp; equipment - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 602</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Park Sector - renew plant and machinery - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 603</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Park Sector - renew plant and machinery - 2021/2022</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 604</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Park Sector - renew track surface 2019/2020</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 605</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Park Sector - renew track surface 2021/2022</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 606</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Parks - Akarana Stream</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 607</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Parks - refurbish Avondale Centre</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 608</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Parks - Re-acquire programme (RAP) Project</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 609</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Parks - renew compliance and directional signage</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 610</td>
<td>Regional Parks - West Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Parks - renew Conwellis loading ramp</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 110</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Vessel Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Parks - renew Paraparaumu Boardwalk RAP Project</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 111</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Vessel Renewals</td>
<td>Western Regional Parks - renew Pina Depot</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,839,170</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,395,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,124,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 112</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Development</td>
<td>All Holiday Parks - develop gaming sites - stage II</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 113</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Development</td>
<td>Mirfins Bay Holiday Park - develop all accessible rear amenity block</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Developments</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 114</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Improvements</td>
<td>All Holiday Parks - renovate and purchase equipment - Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) Project</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 115</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Improvements</td>
<td>Mirfin's Bay Holiday Park - renovate and upgrade fixed accommodation</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 116</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>All Holiday Parks - replace Wi-Fi system</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 117</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Mirfin's Bay Holiday Park - rebuild main amenities block - Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) Project</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$92,877</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,642,877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 118</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Mirfin's Bay Holiday Park - renovate existing internal roadways</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$51,747</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$351,747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 119</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Mirfin's Bay Holiday Park - renew workshop</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 120</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Mirfin's Bay Holiday Park - replace rear amenities block - Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) Project</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$18,300</td>
<td>$348,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$516,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 121</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Orakei Holiday Park - renew 1T cabins</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 122</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Orakei Holiday Park - replace amenities - northern block</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 123</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Orakei Holiday Park - replace amenities - southern block</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 124</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Whangataua and Mirfin's Bay Holiday Parks - replace barrier arms</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 125</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Whangataua Holiday Park - refurbish amenities</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$804,646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$804,646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 126</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Whangateau/Holiday Park - renew utilities, cubbies and caravans</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 127</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Holiday Parks Renewals</td>
<td>Whangateau/Holiday Park - renew office, carpark, drainage and reticulation</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$800,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,473,000</td>
<td>$356,000</td>
<td>$1,829,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 138</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - develop pacific strip - stage 1</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$1,561,325</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$2,401,325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 129</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew threatened native plant - stage 2</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 130</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - upgrade urban free vehicle bridge</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 131</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - demolish and replace glasshouses</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$32,760</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$356,000</td>
<td>$266,000</td>
<td>$622,788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 133</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew child's garden component - 2017/2018 - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 134</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew edible garden paving</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 135</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew electricity to northern depots</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 136</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew glasshouse - calf house</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 137</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew glasshouse equipment - 2017/2018 - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 138</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew interpretive signage - 2017/2018 - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 139</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew interpretive signage - 2021/2022 - 2023/2024</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 140</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew LED lighting</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 141</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew main carpark lighting</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 142</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew minor assets - FPAC 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 143</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew minor assets - FPAC 2021/2022</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 144</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew minor assets - Rose garden</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 146</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew path/clip seal &amp; wording - 2020/2021 - 2022/2023</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 147</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew roof at visitor centre with treatment</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 148</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew roof at visitor centre with treatment - 2021/2022</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 149</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew shrubs, seals and garden structures</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 150</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - renew storage at visitor centre</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 151</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - replace covered courtyard supports</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 26,000</td>
<td>$ 26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 152</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - replace mowem/hutcher</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 153</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Botanic Gardens Renewals</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens - replace palm garden shelter</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Regional Renewals</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Auckland Cemeteries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 154</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries - develop regional terms and seals 2017/2018+</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$ 1,258,000</td>
<td>$ 1,258,000</td>
<td>$ 1,417,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 155</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Southern Cemeteries - develop northern terms 2016/2017+</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$ 137,189</td>
<td>$ 137,189</td>
<td>$ 203,482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 156</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Manukau Memorial Gardens - install solar lighting</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Activity Sector</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Benefits</td>
<td>Lead Dept/Unit or CO</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Funding Contributions 2019/2020</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Weakley Cemetery - develop memorial plan</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$276,409</td>
<td>$2,314,409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Weakley Cemetery - develop Weakley View &amp; Western Lawn B Burial</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$111,974</td>
<td>219,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>WA Museum Plan - Weakley Cemetery - develop Eucalyptus Glade (Field of Memories)</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$11,326</td>
<td>446,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>WA Museum Plan - Weakley Cemetery - develop storage area</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>WA Museum Plan - Weakley Cemetery - develop water line</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$7,335</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>WA Museum Plan - Weakley Cemetery - install/altering signage</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>WA Museum Plan - Weakley Cemetery - replace depot</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$1,485</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries - renew crematorium resource consents</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$50,740</td>
<td>148,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries - renew furniture, fixtures and fittings 2019/2020-2020/2021</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries - renew living programme 2020/2021-2022/2023</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Hyles Park Cemetery - renew washing</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>319,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Manukau Memorial Gardens - full refurbishment - administration building (Ex-Refurbishment Project)</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Manukau Memorial Gardens - full refurbishment - Bob White Function Room (Ex-Refurbishment)</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Manukau Memorial Gardens - renew accessibility access</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$14,900</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>Manukau Memorial Gardens - renew bluestone</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>North Shore Memorial Park - renew bronze memorials</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>North Shore Memorial Park - renew customer care office</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>North Shore Memorial Park - renew mortuary assets - 2017/2018 - 2019/2020</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Developments</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Facility Regional Work Programme Adoption
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 176</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>North Shore Memorial Park - re-vegetate and improve</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 177</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>North Shore Memorial Park - replace storage sheds</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 178</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>North Shore Memorial Park - replace ventilation system - crematorium</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 179</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>Papakura Cemetery - new multi-use facility</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 180</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>Walkworth Cemetery - re-use minor vehicles - 2020/2021 - 2020/2022</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 181</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>Walkworth Cemetery - re-use walking FY17/18 - FY2022</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 182</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>Waitemata Cemetery - replace canopy - stage 2</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Renewals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Auckland Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,685,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 183</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Domain Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Domain - develop/risk-assess Kall - Grandstand</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Domain Developments</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 184</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Domain Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Domain - renew duck pond mechanical services</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Domain Renewals</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 185</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Domain Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Domain - renew lighting programme FY17/18</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Auckland Domain Renewals</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 186</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Domain Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Domain - renew paving FY17/18 - FY19/20</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Domain Renewals</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 187</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Domain Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Domain - renew sand carpets on fields 5, 6, 7, 8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Domain Renewals</td>
<td>$21,700</td>
<td>$21,700</td>
<td>$21,700</td>
<td>$21,700</td>
<td>$21,700</td>
<td>$90,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 188</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Domain Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Domain - replace/renovate pavilion / tennis courts</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Domain Renewals</td>
<td>$1,251,821</td>
<td>$1,251,821</td>
<td>$1,251,821</td>
<td>$1,251,821</td>
<td>$1,251,821</td>
<td>$4,967,283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 189</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Domain Developments</td>
<td>Westpark - renew full facility</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Auckland Domain Renewals</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Programme</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Domain Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Domain - develop Karaka nursery site for general park - stage 1</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Local Parks and Spatialised Development (Growth)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Programme</td>
<td>Regional Parks - Auckland Domain Developments</td>
<td>Auckland Domain - develop natural play and connections - stage 1</td>
<td>Improving current service levels</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Local Parks and Spatialised Development (Growth)</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Regional/Regionwide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,685,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Costs:**

- Auckland Domain: $8,455,000
- Regional/Regionwide: $8,455,000
- Total: $16,910,000
### Environment and Community Committee
10 July 2019

#### Community Facility Regional Work Programme Adoption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID/Ref.</th>
<th>Activity Sector</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Benefits</th>
<th>Lead Dept/Unit or GCO</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Funding Contributions</th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
<th>2022/2023+</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Development - Budget</td>
<td>$2,349,060</td>
<td>$796,169</td>
<td>$467,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Renewals - Budget</td>
<td>$8,836,110</td>
<td>$6,051,297</td>
<td>$8,946,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Development - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$3,262,000</td>
<td>$912,596</td>
<td>$187,590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Renewals - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$4,299,070</td>
<td>$1,582,946</td>
<td>$6,349,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Development - Balance</td>
<td>$(1,622,419)</td>
<td>$(89,260)</td>
<td>$(183,260)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Renewals - Balance</td>
<td>$4,333,440</td>
<td>$4,669,427</td>
<td>$3,393,590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Parks Development - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Parks Renewals - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$1,685,000</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>$1,925,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Parks Development - Balance</td>
<td>$(285,000)</td>
<td>$(28,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Parks Renewals - Balance</td>
<td>$(1,185,000)</td>
<td>$(630,000)</td>
<td>$(1,825,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Botanic Gardens Development</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Botanic Gardens Development - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Botanic Gardens Renewals - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td>$905,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Botanic Gardens Development - Balance</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Botanic Gardens Renewals - Balance</td>
<td>$(707,000)</td>
<td>$(460,000)</td>
<td>$(905,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Development - Budget</td>
<td>$5,009,000</td>
<td>$2,633,229</td>
<td>$1,263,223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Renewals - Budget</td>
<td>$1,199,319</td>
<td>$299,999</td>
<td>$906,690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Development - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$2,265,168</td>
<td>$1,488,994</td>
<td>$1,955,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Renewals - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$989,000</td>
<td>$1,385,000</td>
<td>$665,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Development - Balance</td>
<td>$2,803,681</td>
<td>$2,433,229</td>
<td>$763,223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Cemeteries Renewals - Balance</td>
<td>$216,319</td>
<td>$(888,000)</td>
<td>$(168,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Domain Renewals - Budget</td>
<td>$99,917</td>
<td>$299,999</td>
<td>$1,305,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Domain Development - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Domain Renewals - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$1,160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Domain Development - Balance</td>
<td>$(85,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Domain Renewals - Balance</td>
<td>$(2,100,424)</td>
<td>$(2,000,000)</td>
<td>$446,590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Region-wide - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Region-wide - Balance</td>
<td>$(1,600,000)</td>
<td>$(1,600,000)</td>
<td>$(1,600,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL WORK PROGRAMME - Budget</td>
<td>$18,269,205</td>
<td>$9,047,464</td>
<td>$12,650,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL WORK PROGRAMME - Proposed Allocation</td>
<td>$17,593,069</td>
<td>$9,791,000</td>
<td>$12,633,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL WORK PROGRAMME - Balance</td>
<td>$128,136</td>
<td>$27,464</td>
<td>$27,475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Activity Benefits</td>
<td>Local Board / Stage Allocated / Programmes (MVP)</td>
<td>LB Flex Outcome</td>
<td>Lead Child &amp; or Youth</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Funding Contributions</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2021/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 001</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>17. Pohutukawa Road, Seacliffs - install fencing and planting</td>
<td>improving infrastructure to ensure service levels are maintained</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>WW: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 004</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>18. Bayswater, Beach Access - install fencing and planting</td>
<td>improving infrastructure to ensure service levels are maintained</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>WW: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 005</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>19. Mahurangi Park and Kuratawairangi: remeade footpath</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>WW: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 006</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>20. Paku Park - install caspuch retaining wall</td>
<td>improving infrastructure to ensure service levels are maintained</td>
<td>Henderson-Howick</td>
<td>WW: Natural spaces are valued and sustained</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 008</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>21. Cross Palm Plot, Mt. Bardsley, Paraparaumu</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Kāpiti</td>
<td>WW: A maintained environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 009</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>22. Cross Palm Plot, Mt. Bardsley, Paraparaumu</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Kāpiti</td>
<td>WW: A maintained environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 011</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>23. Paku Park - install gabions wall at entrance - 1 Mania Paata</td>
<td>maintaining infrastructure to ensure service levels are maintained</td>
<td>Pakari</td>
<td>WW: A natural environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 012</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>24. Papakura - site amenities and upgrade</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>WW: Are well-connected and easy to move around</td>
<td>GP: Project Delivery</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$51,576</td>
<td>$143,574</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 013</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>25. Pakaraka - site amenities and upgrade</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Pakari</td>
<td>WW: A natural environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 014</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>26. Pakaraka - Waterway - maintain</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>WW: Are well-connected and easy to move around</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 016</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>28. Pakari (Lighthouse Precinct)</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Pakari</td>
<td>WW: A maintained environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 015</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>27. Pakaraka - Waterway - maintain</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Pakari</td>
<td>WW: A maintained environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 016</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>28. Pakari (Lighthouse Precinct)</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Pakari</td>
<td>WW: A maintained environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 017</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>29. Pakaraka - Waterway - maintain</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Pakari</td>
<td>WW: A maintained environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 018</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>30. Pakaraka - Waterway - maintain</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Pakari</td>
<td>WW: A maintained environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 019</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>31. Pakaraka - Waterway - maintain</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Pakari</td>
<td>WW: A maintained environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 020</td>
<td>Community Facilities Build Matua River</td>
<td>32. Pakaraka - Waterway - maintain</td>
<td>maintaining current service levels</td>
<td>Pakari</td>
<td>WW: A maintained environment</td>
<td>GP: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Stip mediation/ prevention</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slips Prevention - Budget | $2,900,000 | $2,900,000 | $2,900,000 |
Slips Prevention - Proposled Allocation | $1,958,574 | $510,000 | - |
Slips Prevention - Balance | $1,236 | $1,490,000 | $2,890,000 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Activity Benefits</th>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>LE Plan/Outcome</th>
<th>Lead Department on Council Budget</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Funding Contributions 2019/20 &amp; prior years budget</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
<th>2022/2023+</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 107</td>
<td>Double Bay - review and extend existing Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP)</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Manukau</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$181,850</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$69,850</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$156,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 101</td>
<td>Hillary Park - general works to storm water drainage Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP)</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Kapiti</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$75,900</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>$59,850</td>
<td>$6,550</td>
<td>$125,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 102</td>
<td>Ellerslie Beach - address coastal asset issues</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Kapiti</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 103</td>
<td>Pettigrew Road Reserve - revamp foreshore</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Kapiti</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$52,650</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 104</td>
<td>West Esplanade - review coastal assets</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Manapouri-Owhitu</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 105</td>
<td>St George Beach - review access Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP)</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Manapouri-Owhitu</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$25,050</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$253,038</td>
<td>$253,038</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 106</td>
<td>Karraraha Road Esplanade - revamp and improve foreshore</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Manapouri-Owhitu</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 107</td>
<td>Ohuwhai Slating Club - review and improve foreshore</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Manapouri-Owhitu</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 108</td>
<td>Marlborough/Rangitane Reserve - address coastal wall</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Manapouri-Owhitu</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$2,780,305</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>$3,040,265</td>
<td>$3,040,265</td>
<td>$3,040,265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 109</td>
<td>Anderson Beach - review retaining seawall</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Manapouri-Owhitu</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$408,234</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$603,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 110</td>
<td>Stella Top Bay Esplanade - review bollards</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$229,000</td>
<td>$229,000</td>
<td>$229,000</td>
<td>$229,000</td>
<td>$229,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 111</td>
<td>Stella Top Bay Esplanade - revamp coastal site</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$203,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 112</td>
<td>Kereka Heritage - extend rock seawall Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP)</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$468,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 113</td>
<td>Coastal Plan P1/Regional Fees P1</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 114</td>
<td>Crimads Park - review and improve works Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP)</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$1,210,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 115</td>
<td>Aggas Bay Reserve - review seawall seawall</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$1,349,800</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,649,000</td>
<td>$1,649,000</td>
<td>$1,649,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 116</td>
<td>Buckland Beach Reserve - review seawall seawall</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$154,800</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$199,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 117</td>
<td>Point Wells Forests Reserve - review seawall</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$154,800</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$199,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 118</td>
<td>Plutonium End Reserve - review jetty and piers</td>
<td>Monitoring current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Management Plan</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>LE Plan</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>Coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$154,800</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$199,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Activity Details</td>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>LE Plan Outcome</td>
<td>Lead Deputy/Min or Budget Source</td>
<td>Funding Contributions 2018/2019 &amp; prior budget</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2021/2022</td>
<td>2022/2023</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 001</td>
<td>Kumeurua Reserve - renew seawall, boat ramp and carpark</td>
<td>Upgrading and renewal of seawall ramp and carpark</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$307,535</td>
<td>$290,235</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$597,770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 002</td>
<td>Kumeurua Beach - renew king tide pool</td>
<td>Renewal of king tide pool</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$161,919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$423,919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 003</td>
<td>Lake Pupuke - renew northern parking structure</td>
<td>Renewal of parking structure</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$147,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$427,221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 004</td>
<td>Big Bay Reserve - renew coastal path</td>
<td>Renewal of coastal path</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 005</td>
<td>Chibbs Beach - consult and plan for replacement of jetty</td>
<td>Consultation and planning for jetty replacement</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$396,461</td>
<td>$292,524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$688,985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 006</td>
<td>Chibbs Beach - renew seawall</td>
<td>Renewal of seawall</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$305,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 007</td>
<td>Chibbs Beach and adjoining accessways: renew steps and ramp</td>
<td>Renewal of accessways and steps</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 008</td>
<td>Redcross Beach Seashore - renew coastal walkway</td>
<td>Renewal of coastal walkway</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$239,341</td>
<td></td>
<td>$321,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 009</td>
<td>Pohinui Bay - planning and protection</td>
<td>Planning and protection of Pohinui Bay</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$86,607</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$186,607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 010</td>
<td>Pohinui, Wharf - renew timber seawall</td>
<td>Renewal of timber seawall</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 011</td>
<td>Sceat Park Reserve - renew seawall</td>
<td>Renewal of seawall</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$1,422,752</td>
<td>$1,218,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,640,752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 012</td>
<td>South Bay Reserve - renew seawall</td>
<td>Renewal of seawall</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 013</td>
<td>Tawharanui Reserve Wharf remediation - stages 2 and 3</td>
<td>Remediation of Wharf stages 2 and 3</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 014</td>
<td>Henderson Massey - renew coastal structure</td>
<td>Renewal of coastal structure</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>CFT: A protected and enhanced environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$480,100</td>
<td>$638,315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,118,415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 015</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays - renew coastal structure</td>
<td>Renewal of coastal structure</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>CFT: A protected and enhanced environment</td>
<td>CFT: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>$312,907</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$422,907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 016</td>
<td>Stonumui Bay Park - renew seawall</td>
<td>Renewal of seawall</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>CFT: A protected and enhanced environment</td>
<td>CFT: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 017</td>
<td>Takapuna Beach Reserve - renew rock embankment</td>
<td>Renewal of rock embankment</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>CFT: A protected and enhanced environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 018</td>
<td>Western Reserve - renew seawall</td>
<td>Renewal of seawall</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>CFT: A protected and enhanced environment</td>
<td>CFT: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 019</td>
<td>Shingle Drive Reserve - renew seawall and jetty boat ramp</td>
<td>Renewal of seawall and jetty</td>
<td>Flaxland</td>
<td>CFT: A well-cared for natural environment</td>
<td>CFT: Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>$89,013</td>
<td>$140,032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$229,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Activity Benefits</td>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>LB Plan Outcome</td>
<td>Lead Department or CO</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Funding Contributions</td>
<td>2019/2020 &amp; prior year budget</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2021/2022</td>
<td>2022/2023</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 319</td>
<td>Scotch Lading Wharf - review seawall</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Compartments Management Plan</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>RD: Delightful waterfront and environment are cared for, protected and healthy</td>
<td>C.F. Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$14,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$219,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 342</td>
<td>Shelly Beach - review coastal structure</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Compartments Management Plan</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>RD: Delightful, waterfronts and environment are cared for, protected and healthy</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$1,425,380</td>
<td>$1,418,000</td>
<td>$1,425,380</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,850,761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 341</td>
<td>Waitakere Peninsula - review seawall - stage 1 - campground</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Compartments Management Plan</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>RD: Delightful, waterfronts and environment are cared for, protected and healthy</td>
<td>C.F. Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$12,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$214,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 342</td>
<td>Onetangi Beach - replace ramp with new access &amp; kayak slide</td>
<td>Maintaining public recreational areas for sustainable use</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>WK: Waitakere’s environment is treasured</td>
<td>C.F. Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$148,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$148,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$148,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 343</td>
<td>Onetangi Beach - review coastal structure</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Compartments Management Plan</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>WK: Waitakere’s environment is treasured</td>
<td>C.F. Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td>coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 344</td>
<td>Oneroa Domain - review coastal structure</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Compartments Management Plan</td>
<td>Oneroa Domain</td>
<td>WFE: A high-quality built environment that embraces our heritage</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$1,065,381</td>
<td>$668,000</td>
<td>$1,065,381</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,133,761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Item 345</td>
<td>Onetangi Bay to Whiti Road/Oswinwy - review bridge and pathway</td>
<td>Maintaining current service levels in accordance to the Coastal Compartments Management Plan</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>W: The natural environment is valued, protected and enhanced</td>
<td>C.F. Project Delivery</td>
<td>coastal Renewals</td>
<td>$55,740</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$55,740</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$106,741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ports Coastal Asset Renewals - Budget | $2,047,750 | $6,730,000 | $0 | $0,355,340 |
| Ports Coastal Asset Renewals - Proposed Allocation | $0 | $3,565,774 | $6,777,000 | $4,003,535 |
| Ports Coastal Asset Renewals - Balance | $181,652 | $1,813,000 | $0 | $0,355,340 |
Attachment D

Item 19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Benefit Level</th>
<th>Target Impact</th>
<th>Totalenght</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>318.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment D**

**Item 19**

---

**Environment and Community Committee**

10 July 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>FTE Required</th>
<th>Departmental Approval</th>
<th>Council Approval</th>
<th>Estimated Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Date</th>
<th>Actual Start Date</th>
<th>Actual Completion Date</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Project Stage</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project One</td>
<td>Facility Upgrade</td>
<td>Description of the project to improve the facility for community use.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>1 May 2020</td>
<td>30 April 2021</td>
<td>1 May 2020</td>
<td>30 April 2021</td>
<td>Council Funds</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Completed in 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project Two</td>
<td>Community Centre Expansion</td>
<td>Description of the project to expand the community centre for increased community use.</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2.0 FTE</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>1 May 2021</td>
<td>30 April 2022</td>
<td>1 May 2021</td>
<td>30 April 2022</td>
<td>Community Funds</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Not started yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project Three</td>
<td>Sports Field Development</td>
<td>Description of the project to develop a new sports field for community use.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>3.0 FTE</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>1 May 2022</td>
<td>30 April 2023</td>
<td>1 May 2022</td>
<td>30 April 2023</td>
<td>Government Funds</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Not started yet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimated dates and costs are subject to change based on external factors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>Zoning Authority</th>
<th>Zoning Authority Substitute</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost $180,000</th>
<th>Estimated Cost $181,000</th>
<th>Estimated Cost $182,000</th>
<th>Estimated Cost $183,000</th>
<th>Estimated Cost $184,000</th>
<th>Estimated Cost $185,000</th>
<th>Estimated Cost $186,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site T</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$181,000</td>
<td>$182,000</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>$184,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Site U</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$181,000</td>
<td>$182,000</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>$184,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$186,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Facility Regional Work Programme Adoption**

**Attachment D**

**Item 19**
<p>| Sl No | Item 19 | Description | Itemised Cost | Adoption Cost | Adoption Date | Budget | Effect on | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 | Option 4 | Option 5 | Option 6 | Option 7 | Option 8 | Option 9 | Option 10 | Option 11 | Option 12 | Option 13 | Option 14 | Option 15 | Option 16 | Option 17 | Option 18 | Option 19 | Total | Description 19 | Description 20 |
|-------|---------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1     | 19       | Description of Item 19 | Itemised Cost | Adoption Cost | Adoption Date | Budget | Effect on | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 | Option 4 | Option 5 | Option 6 | Option 7 | Option 8 | Option 9 | Option 10 | Option 11 | Option 12 | Option 13 | Option 14 | Option 15 | Option 16 | Option 17 | Option 18 | Option 19 | Total | Description 19 | Description 20 |
| 2     | 20       | Description of Item 20 | Itemised Cost | Adoption Cost | Adoption Date | Budget | Effect on | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 | Option 4 | Option 5 | Option 6 | Option 7 | Option 8 | Option 9 | Option 10 | Option 11 | Option 12 | Option 13 | Option 14 | Option 15 | Option 16 | Option 17 | Option 18 | Option 19 | Total | Description 19 | Description 20 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
<th>Value 6</th>
<th>Value 7</th>
<th>Value 8</th>
<th>Value 9</th>
<th>Value 10</th>
<th>Value 11</th>
<th>Value 12</th>
<th>Value 13</th>
<th>Value 14</th>
<th>Value 15</th>
<th>Value 16</th>
<th>Value 17</th>
<th>Value 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
- **Attachment D:**
- **Item 19:**

**Details:**
- Various environmental initiatives and projects with specific goals and objectives, including:
  - **Community Facility Regional Work Programme Adoption:**
  - **Environment and Community Committee:**
  - **10 July 2019:**

**Status:**
- Various statuses and values related to the above initiatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Budgeted Costs</th>
<th>Proposed Source of Costs</th>
<th>Start Stage</th>
<th>End Stage</th>
<th>Stage(s) of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Park Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrade to park facilities</td>
<td>01/07/2019</td>
<td>30/09/2019</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/07/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Art Festival</td>
<td>Organise an art festival</td>
<td>01/08/2019</td>
<td>30/09/2019</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/08/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Native Planting</td>
<td>Plant native plants in parks</td>
<td>01/09/2019</td>
<td>30/09/2019</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/09/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Heritage Walk</td>
<td>Develop a heritage walk around the city</td>
<td>01/10/2019</td>
<td>30/09/2019</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/10/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 19**

*Attachment D*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project End Date</th>
<th>Project Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>September 2021</td>
<td>May 2021</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>November 2021</td>
<td>October 2021</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table provides a summary of ongoing projects, including their estimated cost and current status. Further details can be found in the attached documents.
### CommunityFacilities: Regional Work Programme (Coastal, Slips and Local and Sportsfield Development Programme) 2019-2022

**Resolved Local Board Feedback**

**Environment and Community Committee Business Meeting 10 July 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Formal Feedback</th>
<th>Community Facilities Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Eden AE/2019/97</td>
<td>e) provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets: i) express dissatisfaction on delays to works on Phyliss Reserve Redevelopment because of council withholding the Growth Fund (ID1983); ii) do not support the Sports Development Fund being transferred to the Growth Fund. iii) request that the funding for Phyliss Reserve Redevelopment and Motu Manawa Marine Reserve Boardwalk be reinstated in the Growth Fund Programme.</td>
<td>In response to resolution: e) i) Feedback noted. ii) Feedback noted. iii) It is important to note there is no current capacity to propose the developments in the 2019/2020 financial year investment programme, however further analysis of all proposed developments will be undertaken on a regional basis and the results will be shared with the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna DTCF/2019/20</td>
<td>i) provides the following feedback to the Environment and Community on projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets: i) notes with concern that to date the local board has not been given any informal direction or the opportunity to provide feedback on the inclusion and / or deferral for each Local Parks and Sports Field Development projects being undertaken in the local board area. ii) supports the Lake Pupuke - renew and develop south walkways &amp; foreshore structure and Sunnynook Park - upgrade various sport fields and lighting projects being included in the 2019/2020 work programme, as they are key local projects as outlined in the local board plan. iii) recommends that the Lake Pupuke - develop walkways - northern parks project continues as part of the 2019/2020 work programme, because:</td>
<td>Feedback noted. In response to resolutions: i) iii) the proposed development of walkways at the northern end of Lake Pupuke has been deferred to enable staff to explore options to achieve the desired outcome. Work to date on this project has highlighted a range of consenting, delivery and cost risks. There is sufficient budget to complete concept design in the current 2018/2019 financial year, which will be carried forward into 2019/2020. Staff will continue to work with the board to identify delivery options. i) iv) the proposed budget allocation for the Allen Hill Reserve sports infrastructure has been deferred to 2020/21 and 2021/22. This timing is largely due to the fact that we are still working through the publicly notified resource consent process for the project. This process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Community Committee 10 July 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facility Regional Work Programme Adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment E Page 326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- delaying this project until the 2020/2021 financial year does not recognize the input or expectations of the local board or community
- it is urgently required to address an identified shortfall in sports field provision for both playing and training in the local area;
- the project is currently in the resource consenting phase and therefore delivery could be undertaken; and
- further delays to this project may have additional detrimental impacts for both the North Shore United Association Football Club, who are based at Allen Hill Stadium, and football in the northern area of Auckland.

- recommends that the Plymouth Reserve (Portion One) walkway and cycleway project, which has been deferred to outer years, be brought forward and included in the 2019/2020 work programme, because:
  - it is an important connection which forms part of the local board’s Greenways Plan;
  - it forms part of the local board’s strategic objective to provide a high-quality and safe cycling and walking connection, and is an alternative to using Lake Road;
  - it aims to reduce the reliance on using cars for short-trips and commuting in the Devonport peninsula; and
  - detailed design for the project is complete and ready for local board approval.

- Plymouth Reserve has not been included in the proposed three-year growth programme. Staff will work with the board to identify funding options for this project in the future.

- It is important to note that the relative priority of all projects in the programme will be reviewed each year, and it is possible that the growth programme may require further reprioritisation decisions should new, high priority projects be identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Franklin FR/2019/85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Franklin Local Board resolved at its 25 June 2019 business meeting to “delegate to the chair to urgently provide feedback by memo for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets”. The memo is attached as an addition to this Attachment E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback noted as attached hereunder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Barrier GBI/2019/64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) note that the inclusion in the 2019/2020 Community Facilities Work Programme of projects that are funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets are subject to approval of the identified budget allocation by the Environment and Community Committee in July 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) delegate to the chair in consultation with the board to provide feedback before 1 July for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback noted as attached hereunder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Henderson-Massey  | 19f) | support the inclusion of the following projects in the Local Parks and Sports Field Development budget:  
  i) Henderson-Massey – investigate options for sports lighting and sports field upgrades  
  ii) Moire Park – upgrade playground and renew park furniture.  
  iii) Request the addition of the following item:  
    A. Moire Park – provision for the essential walkway linking the playground through Moire Park to the Special Housing Area.  
| Hibiscus and Bays | 19f) | provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets:  
  i) acknowledge that Hibiscus and Bays is currently experiencing significant growth and supports continued funding from the above budgets  
  ii) support the use of the above budget to deliver the following projects that are identified within the work programme:  
    A) 2063 Deep Creek Reserve toilet and carpark  
    B) 2120 Metro Park West - develop reserve  
    C) 2372 Beachwood Drive, Hatfield’s Beach - develop play space  
    D) 2263 Freyberg Park - lights on Field 3  
    E) 2064 Red Beach Park - develop sand carpet and flood lights  
  iii) advocate for funding for a new playspace within the reserve at Woodridge Drive at Whangaparāoa Reserve  
  iv) advocate for funding towards an indoor recreational facility within the sporting precinct at Metro Park East, Millwater  
| Howick            | 19f) | provide feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets.  
| Kaipatiki         | 19f) | provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention, and Local Parks and Sports Field Development and Natural Environment Targeted Rate budgets:  
  i) support the contribution to the greenway development works within the "Unlock Northcote" project, noting that this project is highly collaborative and includes contributions from the Hobsonville Land Company, Healthy Waters and Panuku Development Auckland. The Kaipatiki Local Board has endorsed the Northcote greenway design guide and has endorsed the developed design for the school edge portion of the greenway. The Kaipatiki Local Board is pleased with the progress and }
### Mangoer-Ofahuhu MO/2019/84

**Item e)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Momentum behind the project and acknowledges the efforts to date from the many parties involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Support the bush track development projects identified in the 2019 – 2022 Community Facilities Work Programme that have an identified contribution from the Natural Environment Targeted Rate budget. This regional funding will complement the local board renewal funding to better protect our precious Kaun forests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Support the projects identified in the 2019 – 2022 Community Facilities Work Programme funded from the Coastal Renewals and Slips Prevention budgets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mangere-Otahuhu MO/2019/84**

- Local clubs need quality training and competition amenities like floodlights, playing fields (installation of sand carpets) and they need support to improve local sports facilities, these codes include rugby union and rugby league that are traditionally played in the local area of Mangere-Otahuhu. Declining membership numbers can be attributed to poor amenities, that is outside of the club’s control.
- Address population growth and changing sports preferences through regular assessments of, and changes to, programmes, services and facilities. That new sporting codes like Tag football are actual reflection of the local trends in the local area, while supporting local traditional sports such as kikiki, kabadi, boxing and touch football, to be prioritised for funding.
- The Mangere-Otahuhu area is home to a high proportion of young people, who are Maori and Pasifika, and is an area of high deprivation in comparison to the other local board areas in Auckland. The local board calls for the investment plan to prioritise the local area for investment to improve health and social indicators.

**Manurewa MN/2019/111**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Local board feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Coastal Renewals | 023 - Kaimoana Street Esplanade - renew wharf | The local board supports this based on the following:  
- This wharf has historic and placemaking relevance to our local community.
- As part of the beautification process of the area and to facilitate easier access to the water, large area of mangroves were removed.
- Unfortunately, due to lack of maintenance the wharf has slowly begun to fall apart.  
Due to health and safety concerns, the wharf has now been cordoned off to the public.  |

Feedback noted and shared with the appropriate contributing departments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Parks and Sportsfield Development</th>
<th>042 - Manurewa - investigate options for sports lighting and sport field upgrades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>024 - Weymouth boating Club - renew and improve boat ramp</td>
<td>The local board supports this based on the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Weymouth boat ramp renewal has been an ongoing issue for the residents and the Manurewa Local Board for nine years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It has not been effectively maintained by Auckland Council, resulting in numerous complaints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In addition, the boat ramp has a heavy occupancy rate. As well as general members of the public, there are several user groups who access the boat ramp daily including: the Weymouth Boating Club, Te Pou Herenga – Waka Ama, Weymouth Yacht Club, Sea Scouts, the Coastguard and commercial fishermen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is the preferred boat ramp for accessing the Manukau harbour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The local board supports this investigation and requests urgent implementation based on the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The local board was approached by Clendon United AFC in 2016 with concerns about how the lack of winter sports lighting was significantly compromising their ability to train at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In response to this and other sports codes lighting concerns, the local board requested staff identify lighting options. In April 2016 staff provided options specific to Clendon United AFC’s playing and training fields at Mountfort Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It was anticipated this work would be presented for consideration/approval by the board in the 2016/2017 Community Facilities Work Programme. Due to the significant restructure across Community Facilities and Parks, Sport and Recreation this did not proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The board gave direction for staff to identify options to proceed using its Locally Driven Initiatives Capex budget and requested that it be included in the 2017/2018 work programme. Again it was not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• By October 2017, staff had identified that Manurewa had a 121 hour shortfall in lighting capacity for winter training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Maungakiekie-Tamaki** MT/2019/83 | e) provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets:  
   i. Requests that local strategic plans, such as the Greenways Plan, Open Space Network Plan and future reserve management plans, are considered in the growth funding option development process  
   ii. Requests that, in future, the local board is involved in the identification of growth funded projects  
  
  Feedback noted.  
  In response to resolution:  
  f) Both developments have been proposed to the Environment and Community Committee for funding to deliver the sought outcomes. |
| **Orakei** OR//2019/106 | f) provide the following feedback for consideration and Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets:  
   i. advocate to the Governing Body for Growth funding to be prioritised for the Shore Road Reserve – install sand carpet and lighting on field three (ID 2070) to be delivered in the 2019/2020 financial year.  
   ii. advocate to the Governing Body for Growth funding to be prioritised for the Colin Maiden Park – develop site – stage two (ID 2067) to be delivered in the 2019/2020 financial year.  
  
  Feedback noted.  
  In response to resolution:  
  f) ii) there is no current capacity to accommodate these additional projects in the 2019/2020 financial year programme. Further analysis of all proposed developments works will be undertaken on a regional basis and the results will be shared with the local board. |
| **Otara-Papatoetoe** OP/2019/82 | e) provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets.  
   i) support the timing for sports lighting and sports field upgrades (work programme ref 2470) and note that this is identified as a risk adjusted programme (RAP) project due to urgent need in the local board area  
   ii) note that Hayman Park Stage 1 (work programme ref 2065) is close to completion and request further support towards Hayman Park Stage 2 development that remains unfunded.  
  
  Feedback noted.  
  In response to resolution:  
  f) ii) there is no current capacity to accommodate these additional projects in the 2019/2020 financial year programme. Further analysis of all proposed developments works will be undertaken on a regional basis and the results will be shared with the local board. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Feedback Details</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Papakura          | PPK/2019/104   | f) provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets:  
   i) Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets must be funded from the central budget.  
   ii) Local boards do not have the ability to fund capital projects that address Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets. | noted    |
| Puketapapa        | PKTPP/2019/106 | e) provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets:  
   i) requests information about how the growth budget options are developed  
   ii) requests that local strategic plans, such as the Open Space Network Plan, Shade and Shelter Plan, Toilet and Water Fountain Plan, are considered in the growth funding option development process  
   iii) requests that, in future, the local board is involved in the identification of growth funded projects. | noted    |
| Rodney            | RD/2019/71     | f) provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets:  
   i) support the proposed projects and allocation of funding from the above budget lines  
   ii) note that Rodney has had considerable growth in recent years without a corresponding allocation of funding and the proposed projects will address significant gaps in Rodney's parks and sports field development  
   iii) Rodney's coastline is the largest in Auckland and the proposed allocation of slips and coastal funding is appropriate for Rodney projects in order to address the needs of our coastal communities. | noted    |
| Upper Harbour     | UH/2019/70     | f) provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets:  
   i) support the contribution to the following growth projects as identified within the 2019-2022 Community Facilities work programme:  
      A) Luckens Reserve – improve park facilities  
      B) Scott Point – develop sustainable sports part  
      C) Upper Harbour – implement actions from the Greenways Plan  
      D) Alexander Underpass improvement contribution  
   ii) support the bush track development projects identified in the 2019-2022 Community Facilities work programme that have an identified contribution from the natural | noted    |
Environment and Community Committee
10 July 2019
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waiheke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHK/2019/126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) note the projects proposed to be funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets are essential to ensure service provision is maintained and the track network is retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Waitakere Ranges  |
| WTK/2019/82 |
| e) note that the inclusion in the work programme of projects that are funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets are subject to approval of the identified budget allocation by the Environment and Community Committee in July 2019 and the local board supports these projects funded by these budgets are Huia Domain – renew coastal structure, Penihana Park – develop site, Waitakere Ranges - investigate options for sports lighting and sports field upgrades, Withers Reserve - renew footbridge. |
| Feedback noted. |

| Huia Domain - renew coastal structure |
| Renew and upgrade seawall. FY16/17, FY17/18, FY18/19 - consultation, investigation, concept design, consenting and detailed design. FY18/19 & FY19/20 - plan, procure and undertake physical work. |
| Maintaining current service levels |
| ABS: CAPEX - renewals (coastal) |

| Penihana Park - develop site |
| Develop new neighbourhood park to meet the new population growth demand arising from the new Swanson subdivision in the area. |
| Improved open spaces for our community to enjoy |
| ABS: Capex - Growth |

| Waitakere Ranges - investigate options for |
| Investigate and undertake sports field and sports lighting upgrades. |
| Improved open spaces for our |
| ABS: Capex - Growth |
| Item 19 | 
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **sports lighting and sportsfield upgrades** | **community to enjoy** | **AB: CAPEX - Development Slips** |
| Withers Reserve - renew footbridge | Renew pedestrian bridge. FY18/19 - design and consent FY19/20 - plan and undertake required work | Maintaining current service levels |

**Waitemata**

**WTM/2019/121**

f) provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets:

- The local board reiterates its support for the following projects to be funded and completed in financial year 2019/2020:
  - i) Grey Lynn Park - develop new changing rooms (ID 2077)
  - ii) 24 Logan Terrace, Parnell – remediate major slip (ID 3185)
  - iii) Grey Lynn Park – install retaining wall (ID 3292)
  - iv) Newmarket Park – stabilise slope with planting (ID 3195)

**Whau**

**WH/2019/81**

f) the board provides the following feedback to the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets:

- i) Coastal Renewals and Slips Prevention – that there has been no provision in the Whau for both these regional budget categories. It brings to the Committee’s attention the significant erosion currently occurring on the access path leading from Portage Road on to Green Bay Beach – which is not accessible to heavy machinery, potentially expensive if machinery needs to be brought in by barge or low tide. The board is aware that Healthy Waters is delivering a daylighting project in the immediate vicinity in the near future and would ask that Auckland Council look to leverage off their project to attain best outcomes. This would need immediate injection of funds from either the regional Coastal Renewals or Slips Prevention budget. Also, in need of funding for remedial work is a section of the Kurt Brothmer Walkway along the Whau River bank. Due to a slip in 2014, this valued public walkway has remained partially closed.

- ii) Local Parks and sports field development (Growth) – the provision in the Growth fund is a reflection of the significant growth in the Whau area. The board is fully supportive of and thankful for the continued support to progress the To Whau Pathway links under this budget and it hopes for continued support in the future.

Feedback noted.
Franklin Local Board’s Delegated Chair feedback:

Memorandum

26 June 2019

To: Ian Milnes, Manager Work Programme Development, Community Facilities (South)

Cc: Kathryn Martin, Manager Work Programme Development, Community Facilities.
Nina Siers, Relationship Manager Franklin and Howick Local Boards
Councillor Bill Cashmore
Andrew Baker, Deputy Chair, Franklin Local Board

Subject: Franklin Local Board feedback on the proposed 2019/2020 Community Facilities work programme projects (Coastal and Growth)

From: Angela Fuljames, Chair Franklin Local Board

Purpose

1. To provide feedback on community facilities projects funded within the Franklin Local Board area that require approval from Environmental and Community Committee.

Summary

2. The Franklin Local Board resolved at its 25 June 2019 business meeting to “delegate to the chair to urgently provide feedback by memo for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets”

3. The board endorses regional investment in growth and coastal projects within the Franklin Local Board area.

4. The board wish to emphasise the significant sports field and recreational facility capacity issues currently experienced, particularly in the Pukekohe and Beachlands areas, and suggests providing opportunity for boards to nominate growth funded projects in the future for governing body consideration.

5. The board emphasises the need for ongoing regional investment in coastal management noting that the Franklin Local Board area includes expansive coastlines to the east and west.

Context

6. The Franklin Local Board resolved at its 25 June 2019 business meeting to “delegate to the chair to urgently provide feedback by memo for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets”

7. The Franklin Local Board area is the second largest by land area in the Auckland region, and is bordered to the east by the Hauraki Gulf and to the west by the Manukau Harbour and Tasman Sea.

8. The board area is home to 190 local parks and sports fields, one recreation centre, six rural libraries, three pools and 32 community halls (16 of which are community run or led).
9. The population in the board area is expected to increase from 71,100 to 106,800 by 2033. The Karaka catchment in the west is expecting a 1000 per cent increase in population, and Clevedon in the east is anticipating a 600 per cent increase² in population.

10. The Franklin Local Board Plan 2017 outlines five outcomes, four of which underpin the feedback on the proposed regional investment into the regional Community Facilities work programme. These are;
   - Outcome 1: Enhance protect and maintain our diverse natural environment and make sure its able to be enjoyed
   - Outcome 2: Franklin has a strong economy and attracts people to live, work locally and visit its attractions
   - Outcome 4: Make full use of existing outdoor space and community facilities before developing new
   - Outcome 5: Support community participation in helping to shape people’s quality of life, creativity, health and well-being.

Discussion

Growth funded projects

11. The board has reviewed the growth funded projects included in the Franklin Local Board work programme noting that that the Environmental and Community Committee has the delegated authority for approving growth funded projects.

12. Feedback by project is outlined table 1: Franklin Local Board feedback on growth programme below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref ID</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Programme funding</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2923</td>
<td>Bledisloe Park (Pukekohe) – sports lighting and fields</td>
<td>Growth projected for 21/22</td>
<td>Endorse pending agreement with key users (sports clubs) on upgrade plan details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Kahawai/hi Drive Reserve (Beachlands) – develop playground</td>
<td>Growth projected for 20/21</td>
<td>Note that the Kahawai/hi Playground is due to be completed in November 2019. Suggest any unallocated growth funding could be reallocated to improvements to nearby Te Puru Sportspark leveraging from planned local renewals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2585</td>
<td>Pukekohe Stadium upgrade (field 2)</td>
<td>Growth projected for 21/22</td>
<td>Endorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Ray Faussett Reserve (Pukekohe) Playground</td>
<td>Growth projected for 22/23+</td>
<td>Note that development at the Belmont subdivision is advancing rapidly. The board advocates for bringing delivery of this playground forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3022</td>
<td>Te Puru Park (Beachlands) – upgrade sports lighting and field</td>
<td>Growth projected for 21/22</td>
<td>Note that lighting upgrades in particular would enhance an immediate capacity need. This is a multi-code facility and there is a current shortfall. The board advocates for bringing delivery of this project forward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Based on the Karaka Sports Park indicative business case report June 2018.
² Based on projected development plans.
13. The board wish to emphasise that the board area has moved beyond the “anticipation of growth” phase and is now experiencing significant sports field and recreational facility capacity issues, particularly in the Puketapu and Beachlands areas.

14. The board request that growth-funded projects for Te Puru Park (Beachlands) and Ray Faussett Reserve (Puketapu) are brought forward to address existing capacity issues, and that the development of a concept plan for the Belmont development sports park be considered as a growth project noting that a needs assessment for this park has been recently completed.

15. The board requests the opportunity in the future to nominate potential growth funded projects for committee consideration according to criteria and via a process approved by the governing body. This will enable the board to compliment with regional programmes by using local board LDI budget to deliver more projects or projects sooner.

Coastal renewal and slip remediation projects

16. The board notes the projects outlined in table two below Franklin Local Board area coastal renewal and slip remediation projects and that the Environmental and Community Committee has the delegated authority for approving coastal projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3184</td>
<td>17 Pohutukawa Road (Beachlands) – install fencing and planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2373</td>
<td>Big Bay Reserve (Awhitu) – Renew or replace current seawall and ramp as maintaining from the storm damage is no longer sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2113</td>
<td>Clarks Beach Spit – Consent and renewal of unconsented breakwater. Carried over from the 16/17. Previous ID 2199.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2568</td>
<td>Clarks Beach (Wilson access) - renew seawall - Damaged during a storm event and required immediate attention to future proof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2384</td>
<td>Clarks Beach steps and fences – Renew steps and fences along Clarks Beach, Wilson Beach, Irwin Beach, Hals Beach, Knights Beach, Hoskins Beach, Bradley Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Glenbrook Beach Beachfront – Renewal of the Glenbrook Beach Beachfront boat ramp and seawall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Kawakawa Bay – Implement protection of the esplanade bank to prevent further erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3208</td>
<td>Maratapai Beach – Install retaining wall adjacent to Boating Club damage through a slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3215</td>
<td>Pollok Wharf Road Reserve (Awhitu) – Investigation and renewal of the seawall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2079</td>
<td>Sandspit Reserve (Waiuku) – seawall renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2541</td>
<td>Sunkist Bay Reserve – Sunkist Bay Reserve rock seawall renewal and boat ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Tamaki Reserve (Waiuku) – Renewals Stages 2 and 3, Stage 1 delivered ID 2224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. The board endorses the inclusion of these projects and allocation of funding.

18. The board wish to emphasise the need for ongoing regional investment in coastal protection as the Franklin Local Board does not have the resource at a local level to manage the impact of storm damage, coastal inundation and development on coastal environments, noting that the board area includes expansive coastlines to the east and west.
Great Barrier Local Board’s Delegated Chair feedback:

Aotea Great Barrier Local Board feedback on the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets

Aotea Great Barrier Local Board business meeting 21 June 2019
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Resolution number GBI/2019/64

MOVED by Chairperson I Fordham, seconded by Member J Cleave:

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

f) note that the inclusion in the 2019/2020 Community Facilities Work Programme of projects that are funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets are subject to approval of the identified budget allocation by the Environment and Community Committee in July 2019.

g) delegate to the chair in consultation with the board to provide feedback before 1 July for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee in relation to the projects funded from the Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention and Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets.

CARRIED

Feedback as per resolution g):

Aotea Great Barrier Local Board does not have any identified projects in the current regional Coastal Renewals, Slips Prevention or Local Parks and Sports Field Development work programmes.

Aotea Great Barrier Island is already experiencing coastal erosion. It is starting to impact on our roads, playgrounds, urupas, wharves and airfields. The local board is looking to address climate change mitigation by looking at short- and long-term options, with a cross-departmental project team consisting of Auckland Transport, Community Facilities, and Infrastructure and Environmental Services.
Increasing the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Fund

File No.: CP2019/09924

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To increase the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Fund by reallocating funding and revenue linked to incentives for historic heritage.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Regional Historic Heritage Fund (RHHF) is council’s primary incentive for good heritage outcomes on privately-owned historic heritage places. More than two thirds of the Historic Heritage Schedule, over 1500 places, are maintained by private landowners. By looking after Auckland’s heritage, they provide a public benefit to all Aucklanders while bearing the costs of retention, maintenance, and repair.

3. Since its inception in 2014, the budget for the RHHF has been set at $80,000, with a slight increase to $84,000 in the 2018-2028 LTP. During the past four financial years, the budget has been oversubscribed by an average of $350,000. During FY18/19, the fund was oversubscribed by 500%, or $428,171.90. This long-term over-subscription has hindered the effectiveness of the fund, and it also represents a significant under-investment in good outcomes for Auckland’s Historic Heritage.

4. The Heritage Unit has other areas of its budget and programmes that may be reallocated to provide a larger fund in future years. One possible source is unallocated capex funding in the Built Heritage Acquisition Fund. Another is the revenue generated by professional fees for heritage specialists.

5. Officers are proposing to work within their existing budgets to increase the RHHF, so that the solution is cost-neutral and makes the most of existing council resources.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve, in principle, an increase in the Regional Historic Heritage Fund from $84,000 to an amount up to $500,000, subject to reallocation of funding and revenue linked to historic heritage incentives;

b) request staff report back on how this reallocation will be achieved through the Annual Plan.
Horopaki

Context

Policy Basis for Historic Heritage Incentives

6. Historic Heritage, which is considered a “matter of national importance” under the Resource Management Act (RMA) is identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part (AUP) within the Schedule of Historic Heritage Places and Areas (Schedule 14). There are a wide variety of places included in Schedule 14, including buildings, structures, archaeological and cultural sites, trees, landscapes, and areas containing any or all the above. Places can range from high-style architectural landmarks to vernacular buildings to sites with buried features and intangible values. Places can represent multiple aspects of history, and collectively they tell a story of the development of Auckland by Māori, Europeans, and other groups. There are also hundreds of places in the schedule that relate exclusively or predominantly to Māori Heritage.

7. Although Schedule 14 is the main method for the protection of Historic Heritage in the AUP, other schedules and methods have historic heritage value in addition to their primary purpose of covering other matters of national importance. Schedule 12 (Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua), Schedule 10 (Notable Trees), and Schedule 6 (Outstanding Natural Features) are where these overlaps in value are most common.

8. Approximately 68% of Places on Schedule 14 are in private ownership, which means council relies heavily on private owners to proactively maintain and conserve historic heritage for the benefit of present and future generations. This private cost is recognized in the Unitary Plan objectives and policies for the Historic Heritage Overlay (D17) and incentives for private landowners are explicitly recognized as a method for addressing these private costs:

D17.3(2) Encourage and support maintenance and repair appropriate to scheduled historic heritage places through such measures as:

(a) reducing or waiving consent application costs;
(b) providing funding, grants and other incentives; or
(c) providing expert advice.

9. Approximately 90% of Places on Schedule 12 are in public ownership, though this will change as future plan changes identify more Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua on private land. A policy in the Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay (D21) is a clear directive on incentives as well:

D21.3(7) Provide incentives to encourage the protection and enhancement of scheduled sites and places of significance to mana whenua.

10. Other relevant AUP schedules have some policy support for incentives, but the policies in D17 and 21 are clearest in providing for financial incentives such as grants.9

Types of Heritage Incentives Provided by Auckland Council

11. There are a few budget lines in the 2018-2028 LTP that fund Council-owned heritage places outside of the regular renewals budget:

- The Council Heritage Assets Fund, a $6m capex fund earmarked for the conservation of Council-owned heritage buildings. This fund is intended to be a “top-up” of the renewals budget for heritage buildings that require more expensive conservation methods and more frequent interventions to retain their heritage values. The budget for this fund begins in FY 2023 and detailed policy for its distribution is being prepared.

---

9 Outstanding Natural Landscapes/Features: D10.3(7); Notable Trees D12.3(1)
• Sites of Significance Infrastructure Development, a fund proposed by the IMSB and adopted by the Council for the 2018-2028 LTP. This fund was proposed to be $10m over 10 years ($2.5m operational expenditure (opex) and $7.5m capital expenditure (capex)). Its purpose is to fund an infrastructure programme to restore, celebrate and promote access to certain Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua.

12. Council’s financial incentives that support the protection of ‘privately-owned’ Historic Heritage include the following funds:
   • The Regional Historic Heritage Fund (RHHF);
   • The Built Heritage Acquisitions Fund (BHAF);
   • Local Board Grants programmes; and,
   • Free/subsidised technical advice for Resource Consents.

13. The RHHF is one of six regional grant programmes provided by Council under the Community Grants Policy. It is an opex fund. It was created in 2014 through the reorganisation of the Environmental Initiatives Fund (EIF) budget to separate out different areas of funding and tailor the policy, cycles and application process for each. Budgets were determined by reviewing average total allocation of grants in each area over a few prior years of the EIF, and this was included in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan (LTP). The funding policy for the RHHF was developed at the fund’s inception and has been in use ever since. The RHHF is open to Historic Heritage Places which are scheduled in the AUP and prioritises places with demonstrated regional significance. The Grants and Incentives Team manages the RHHF with technical advice and programme support from the Heritage Unit. While most of the Regional Grants are overseen by the Environment and Community Committee, the RHHF is overseen by the Planning Committee. Further information about the performance of the RHHF, including national/international benchmarking, is included as Attachment A.

14. The BHAF is a capex fund developed for purchasing at-risk heritage buildings, applying the necessary protections, and selling the building back into the private market. It is intended to be a revolving fund that is replenished to some degree by the on-sale of purchased assets. The fund was created by council in 2011 in response to some high-profile cases of heritage loss and decay. It is managed by the Heritage Unit and overseen by the Planning Committee.

15. Local board grants are administered separately by each local board for their area. There is a broad policy governing the funding of grants by local boards, but local boards have discretion on funding levels for different outcomes in their area. The Heritage Unit advises on applications for historic heritage grants, but all decisions are made by local boards. On average local boards collectively award a total of $80,000 each year for heritage projects. However, local boards rarely award local grants to individuals.

16. Free and subsidised technical advice has been provided in various forms for resource consents involving historic heritage places for a long time, both by Auckland Council and legacy councils. The method used at present involves not billing applicants’ professional fees for heritage specialists, where the application will result in a good heritage outcome.

Non-Council Funds for Historic Heritage

17. A variety of other funders make grants for Historic Heritage places in Auckland, including:
   • Ministry for Culture and Heritage EQUIP grants
   • Heritage New Zealand Historic Properties Fund
   • Lotteries Fund
   • Private Grantmakers (for example, ASB, Gambling Foundations, Foundation North).
18. Of these non-Council funds, only two make grants to individuals (Heritage EQUIP and the Heritage NZ fund). Most foundations will only make grants to charitable or non-profit organizations. The Heritage EQUIP grants, Heritage NZ funds, and lotteries are available nationwide.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

19. The funding policy for RHHF creates a broad pool of eligible projects covering thousands of privately-owned heritage places across Auckland. While scheduled places are the priority, it recognizes that significant historic heritage may not yet be scheduled and allows them to be eligible for funding in return for a commitment to scheduling and interim protection. It is inclusive of Māori Heritage and of enabling mana whenua to undertake heritage projects on their land or in partnership with other landowners. It includes the seismic rehabilitation of historic town centres as a priority and is open to contributing buildings in Historic Heritage Areas and Business Special Character areas. It allows applications for moveable heritage too, provided they are intended to stay in Auckland.

20. The budget for the RHHF fluctuates a little but is about $84,000 each year (opex), with an average award of $11,000 for 6-10 projects annually. The maximum award is $20,000, but less is routinely offered to each applicant to cover more applications. This limits the ability of the fund to realise the range and extent of positive heritage outcomes provided for in its policy. Over the past four years the fund has received $350,000 on average in funding requests each year, and this is with minimal publicity and targeted outreach to priority groups. The latest round received over $428,000 in funding requests, demonstrating a 500% subscription rate.

21. Heritage Grants usually leverage further investment in historic heritage places beyond the council’s contribution. This is especially true for heritage buildings, where a heritage grant could make feasible a much more comprehensive rehabilitation project that secures the building’s long-term value and contributes to the regeneration of its surrounding area. Numerous studies from the US, Canada, Australia, the UK and elsewhere identify a host of benefits of investment in heritage. These agencies find that every $1 spent by the public on heritage conservation projects leveraged between $20-40 in private investment. Grants alone generally report a private investment ratio of $2-6 for every $1 spent.

22. Analysis of the last four years of awards shows that $267,126 in funding was matched by $549,303 by applicant contributions, which shows a private investment ratio of 2:1. Going by international calculations, this amount may have stimulated an additional $5-10 million in additional private investment in the areas where they happened. While a match isn’t a requirement, the RHHF prioritises applications that include a match of at least 40% of the requested amount. Awards over the past four years have included on average a 67% match from applicants. Additionally, heritage grants mobilise voluntary and in-kind contributions, including free technical advice, volunteer labour, and donation of supplies.

23. At the end of each grant cycle, applicants are asked to provide feedback on their experience with the RHHF. While feedback is positive regarding the level of service they receive from staff in supporting them to prepare applications, many reports being discouraged by the small amount of money that is available. Oversubscription is not unusual for a grant programme, but chronic levels of extreme oversubscription as with the RHHF tends to discourage applicants over time, who see the chances of being funded by the council as remote and too uncertain to justify the time it takes to make an application.
24. Auckland Council has the highest number of heritage places that are eligible for grants, but its grant fund ranks seventh behind most other major cities in New Zealand. Based on the average allocation per place of 20 territorial authorities, the national average amount of heritage funding allocated per eligible place is $352. If Auckland Council allocated this average amount per eligible place, the RHHF would total $545,600. See Attachment A for further detail on national and international benchmarking of the RHHF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local or regional authority</th>
<th>Total funding pool</th>
<th>Number of eligible places</th>
<th>Amount allocated per place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>$697,700</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>$732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td>~ 1300</td>
<td>$515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>$616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson City</td>
<td>$107,798</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>$295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton City</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>$658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanganui District</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>$215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>$83,640</td>
<td>~1550</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. The impact of the RHHF could be improved significantly with greater levels of funding. More funding could improve the impact of the RHHF in several ways:

- Larger awards could increase the per-place investment
- More awards could increase the number of places funded
- More multi-year awards could be made (currently the funding strategy is to prioritize applicants that have not received a grant in the past three years)
- Larger and/or more awards could increase the Council's role in securing good heritage outcomes
- Larger awards could also attract applicants and projects that would create larger spill over effects, both in private investment and community involvement
- A larger fund could also be ringfenced for outcomes, to ensure a variety of heritage places are funded and that Māori Heritage is included

**Options for increasing the RHHF**

26. The Heritage Unit budget contains two potential sources of additional funding for the RHHF, including leftover budget from the BHAF and revenue generated from professional fees. These options are investigated briefly below.

**Option 1: Reallocate a portion of the Built Heritage Acquisition Fund**

27. The BHAF has a Capex budget of $35.5 million over the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan. It is spread over ten years, going from around $2 million per year on average in the first half of the LTP to $5 million per year on average in the second half.

28. The fund has been the catalyst for a small number of high-profile heritage protection projects in the City Centre, including the restoration of the Airedale Cottages, the Thomas Doo Building, and Vos Yard. It also underpinned the restoration work on St. James Theatre. It has operated to a degree as a fund for public-private partnerships with outside developers, where Council acquires and holds the property until there is a party with a commitment to an appropriate development proposal that retains the heritage building.
29. However, the fund’s original intention to be largely self-replenishing has not eventuated. Rather than acquire, schedule/covenant and on-sell at-risk properties, the properties acquired by the fund have required more active management and have used the BHAF in different ways.

30. There are two probable commitments for the BHAF in this LTP. An investment of $15m will be needed to finance the restoration of the St. James Theatre. The other is a $6m investment in acquiring Carlisle House in Grey Lynn, which has long been a target for acquisition on heritage grounds and was what prompted the creation of the BHAF in 2013. This has yet to be reported to Council.

31. With these funds committed, there is potentially $12 million in Capex left in the BHAF within this LTP. No other heritage buildings have been identified for purchase by the fund, though other opportunities could arise in the future. Not all this funding is available at once, but enough is budgeted each year of the LTP to enable a portion to be reallocated to the RHHF.

**Option 2: Heritage Professional Fees Revenue**

32. At present, fees which are on-charged to applicants for resource consents, Notices of Requirement, Outline Plans of Work, and Private Plan Changes generate on average $200,000-300,000 in revenue each year for the Heritage Unit budget. This revenue is currently retained as organisational savings. Because these fees are generated because of activities that could adversely affect heritage, it is appropriate to use it to fund grants for heritage conservation.

**Recommendation on Options**

33. Both options are appropriate sources of increased funding for the RHHF, since they are trying to achieve outcomes for privately-owned historic heritage places. A combination of the two options may be required, depending on the timing of expenditure from the BHAF and the amount available from professional fees, which fluctuate each year with the volume of planning and resource consent activity. For instance, it might be that in the short-term funding from the professional fees are used for a few years while commitments from the BHAF clear. The appropriate balance will be developed in coordination with the council’s Finance team.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

34. An increase to the RHHF would increase the capacity of the Regional Community Grants Programme to respond to chronic oversubscription for historic heritage grants. It would bring the amount budgeted into closer alignment with the other regional funds for arts, events, community, sport & recreation, and environment. This proposal is supported by the teams who administer the regional grants.

35. The means of achieving this increase has been discussed at a high level with the Finance team to understand what kinds of reallocations are possible within the Annual Plan. They support the general approach and will assist with identifying the method that will get the right balance of heritage outcomes and financial prudence.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

36. The RHHF and the BHAF are regional funds, and revenue from heritage professional fees is generated from activity across Auckland. The funding provided by the RHHF complements the funds provided by Local Boards for local heritage projects. The availability of regional funding enables Local Boards to prioritise local projects that may be a lesser priority for the regional fund.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

37. This matter has a direct impact on Māori, because Māori cultural heritage, including Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua are included among the funding priorities for the RHHF. The grant application allows applicants to self-report whether their projects would achieve outcomes for Māori, and staff consider at the assessment phase whether there is a strong case to include it in the overall application score. Over the past 4 years, there have been 9 awards where applicants indicated there would be Māori outcomes, but only 3 of these could be considered to relate directly to Māori history or cultural values. There have been few applicants from mana whenua or Māori communities generally, and only one application has been for a project affecting sites of Māori origin or of significance to mana whenua.

38. The reasons for this low application rate are unclear, but several factors may contribute:

- Although mana whenua are included in the annual outreach for each grant cycle, that communication may not filter through to interested people within iwi/hapu groups.
- Māori cultural heritage involves multiple values beyond historic heritage (including environment, arts & culture, and community), so potential projects may need to be multifaceted in their funding sources.
- Māori cultural heritage often involves landscapes where the extent or boundaries are not mutually understood and there could be difficulty scoping an eligible project.
- Most Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua are on publicly-owned land where the RHHF doesn't apply. Although many are on private land, the Māori cultural values of most archaeological sites in the Historic Heritage Schedule are not well known.
- If they are not the landowner where the site is located, coordinating with other private landowners on an application may prove challenging.
- Lastly, they may share the same frustrations that other applicants have expressed with the chronic oversubscription of the fund.

39. There are other funds and programmes in Council that focus on the recognition of Māori heritage on Council land. One such programme is Te Kete Rukuruku, which identifies Māori names for Council parks and community places with mana whenua, with a broader goal of sharing the stories behind these names through public art, events and education. Improving Māori responsiveness across the council should lead to better management of Māori heritage sites on Council land. Other initiatives that are specific to projects on marae are funded by Te Toa Takatini. Urban marae such as Ruapotaka in Glen Innes are applying for other kinds of regional grants to undertake heritage projects with mana whenua in their local areas.

40. While there is overlap, these other programmes do not cover the physical aspects of kaitiakitanga for privately-owned Māori heritage sites, which is why it is a stated priority for the RHHF.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

41. The proposal is to support an increase in the fund from $84,000 to up to $500,000 per year, using either or a combination of reallocation from the BHAF and revenues from professional fees. The proposal is intended to be cost-neutral within the envelope budgeted for the Heritage Unit within the LTP. The possible approaches will be considered with the Finance team as part of the next Annual Plan.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

42. The following risks were considered at this phase of the proposal:

43. Risks of not acting:

- **Environmental**: the current low amount available in the fund contributes to poor environmental outcomes, in that landowners are not encouraged to take proactive steps to maintain, conserve, and actively protect heritage places in their ownership. The lack of funding also contributes to the resistance of landowners to heritage scheduling, which leads to fewer places on the schedule overall.

- **Reputational**: doing nothing at this point carries a risk to Council's reputation as it raises questions about its commitment to protecting historic heritage. Incentives are an important support to heritage landowners, who are required to follow stricter rules in the Unitary Plan to safeguard heritage as a public benefit for all Aucklanders. Allowing the RHHF to remain chronically low and oversubscribed undermines trust in Council's management of heritage as called for in the AUP and the Auckland Plan.

44. Risks with increasing the fund:

- **Financial**: proceeding with a $500,000 fund that cannot be fully covered by the existing Heritage Unit budget and revenues would create additional costs for Council that are not budgeted. The goal is to be cost-neutral so the total increase to the fund will be capped to what can be reallocated within the Heritage Unit Budget.

- **Equity**: the benefits of an increased fund do not reach heritage places in the greatest need of funding. There is inherently a tension between funding to leverage increased private investment in heritage and funding the greatest need. This is an ongoing risk that the RHHF tries to address by outreach, application assistance, and strong adherence to priorities that seek an equitable result. If the fund is increased the priorities and methods should be reviewed to ensure the benefits accrue where they are most needed.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

45. Council's Heritage Unit and Finance teams will work on determining how to reallocate funding. Next year's RHHF will be increased based on the amount that could reasonably be reallocated. Annual reporting on the ongoing performance of the RHHF would continue to be provided to the Planning Committee as part of the annual approval of awards from the fund.
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Memo

24 June 2019

To: Tanya Sorrell, Team Leader Built and Cultural Heritage Policy

From: Rebecca Freeman, Senior Specialist Historic Heritage

Subject: Regional Historic Heritage Fund - Overview and Benchmarking

Purpose
This report provides an overview of the Regional Historic Heritage Fund (RHHF), including its performance in relation to other grant schemes offered in New Zealand and abroad.

Overview of the RHHF
The Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme was established through the Community Grants Policy adopted in December 2014. In March 2016, the Auckland Development Committee adopted the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme framework which outlined the regional significance criteria and assessment criteria for the grant applications.

The Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme supports the following outcomes:

- regulations in the Auckland Unitary Plan are supported by incentives to protect and conserve significant historic heritage places
- Auckland Council, mana whenua, community organisations, and property owners work together to support kaitiakitanga and stewardship of historic heritage
- Aucklanders see Council investment in historic heritage
- historic heritage grants unlock private and community investment in heritage conservation.

To be eligible for funding through the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme, projects need to meet one of the following eligibility criteria for regional significance:

- historic heritage places that are included in one of the schedules of the Auckland Unitary Plan, including the Historic Heritage Schedule, Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua, contributing sites within a Historic Heritage Area and contributing buildings within a Special Character Area.
- historic heritage places that are unscheduled but demonstrated to be of regional significance, subject to evidence that the site has interim protection through heritage covenants as well as a letter from the applicant confirming support for scheduling the site under the relevant heritage overlay.

Performance of the RHHF

Introduction
When there is a gap between the public value of a heritage place and its private (often market-based) value, public investment has a role to play to ensure that property owners have an incentive to act in a way that conserves heritage. There are counter-incentives at work for owners to maximise the use of land containing heritage places, to demolish and build new rather than comply with Building Act requirements, and to purpose-build instead of adaptively re-use. These counter-incentives are partially nullified through the rules in the Unitary Plan, which

---

1 Report to Planning Committee 4 June 2019
discourage demolition and enable conservation and adaptive re-use. But heritage grants have a
greater role to play in economic development, encouraging the private sector to invest in
beneficial projects.

Numerous studies from the US, Canada, Australia, the UK and elsewhere identify a host of
benefits of investment in heritage. These agencies find that every $1 spent by the public on
heritage conservation projects leveraged between $20-40 in private investment. Grants alone
generally report a private investment ratio of $2-6 for every $1 spent. The value of these
projects in their respective communities are shown to outpace that of a similar amount of new
construction, including in number of jobs created, local income generated, and increased property
values.4

The Regional Historic Heritage Fund5

The budget for the RHHF ranges between $80,000 and $84,000 per year (opex)6. For FY18/19,
the budget was $83,640. The average award is $11,000 for 6-10 projects annually. The maximum
award is $20,000, but less is routinely offered to each applicant in order to cover more
applications.

Applicants are required to indicate their contribution (both financial and in-kind) when applying for
a grant. Over the past four financial years, applicants (both successful and unsuccessful)
indicated an average contribution of $26,648.80, and requested an average of $14,343 in grant
money from Council.7 This equates to private investment of just under $2 committed for every $1
of public money requested.8

In each year since the RHHF became operational in 2016, the fund has been oversubscribed.
During the past four financial years, the budget has been oversubscribed by an average of
$350,000. During FY18/19, the fund was oversubscribed by $428,171.90.

The size of the budget for the RHHF is the suspected cause of the issue of oversubscription (as
opposed to, for example, the eligibility criteria being poorly defined). Applicants (both successful
and unsuccessful) are invited to complete a survey after each funding round, and many of their
comments support this conclusion:

“...I feel it has largely been a waste of time, given the small amount of funds, and no
doubt there are much higher profile applicants”

“...I also wonder if the Heritage Grant’s budget might need to be given a boost, as 80k
across all of Auckland for 12 months isn’t very much...”

“Provide the staff with more funding with Grants so they can provide a higher level of
outcomes for Heritage. The staff are fantastic, but the monies available are very small
for a city the size of Auckland. It was almost embarrassing for the staff to disclose how
much funding was available.”

To investigate the relative size of the budget allocated to the RHHF, bench-marking against
heritage grant programmes offered both nationally and internationally was completed.

---

2 Rypkema; Licciardi and Amirahmusebi. Also see “Measuring the Economics of Preservation: Recent Findings”
3 Ibid. See also Mason. Economics and Heritage Preservation. Published by the Brookings Institution 2005.
4 Ibid
5 Analysis of the number and types of heritage places that apply for an receive funding is included in Table 1.
6 FY15/16 - $80,743; FY16/17 - $80,744; FY17/18 - $82,000; FY18/19 - $83,640
7 Note that this analysis does not include applications where the applicant indicated a contribution of $0, or where
applicants indicated a contribution of more than $400,000, as this was skewing the result
8 Note that the applicant’s contribution is self-reported, and may not accurately reflect the financial value of in-kind
contribution, such as voluntary support.
National bench-marking

Thirty-six city, district and/or regional authorities across New Zealand offer either a heritage-specific fund, or funds for which heritage projects are eligible to apply.

Because different programmes have different criteria and eligibility requirements, they are not directly comparable. Therefore, the following approach was taken to provide a common point of comparison for the RHHF:

The total funding pool amount was divided by the total number of places eligible to apply for the fund. This resulted in the dollar amount allocated by the local or regional authority per place (note that this is not the same as the amount available per place. Some schemes have minimum or maximum grant allowances.)

Caveats:

- Where the total number of eligible places was estimated (i.e. schemes for which places with no formal protection are eligible to apply), the number is noted “~ XX”.

- Where no information on the total funding pool amount and/or total number of places eligible for funding was available, these local and regional authorities were left out of the statistical analysis. They are still included in the table in Attachment 2 for information purposes.

A total of 20 local and regional authorities are included in the statistical analysis, including Auckland Council. A summary table is included below (the full table is in Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local or regional authority</th>
<th>Total funding pool</th>
<th>Number of eligible places</th>
<th>Amount allocated per place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>$83,840</td>
<td>~ 1,550(^a)</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>$697,700</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>$732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td>~ 1300</td>
<td>$515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton City</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>$658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horowhenua District</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui District</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutt City</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiti Coast District</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough District</td>
<td>~ $39,450</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napier City</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>$266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson City</td>
<td>$107,798</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>$295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Plymouth District</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston North City</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown Lakes District</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn District</td>
<td>~ $36,500</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>$224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southland District</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato District</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>$23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiota District</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>$304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>$816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanganui District</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>$215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these 20 local and regional authorities, the national average amount of heritage funding allocated per eligible place is $352.

\(^a\) For Auckland Council, both privately owned scheduled places (~1550) and privately-owned places included in the Special Character Overlay (~31,000) are eligible to apply. Because character places are considered a lower priority for funding and rarely receive funding, they are excluded from this analysis.
If Auckland Council allocated the national average per eligible place, the RHHF would total $545,600.

**International bench-marking**

The approach to international bench-marking was similar to that of national bench-marking, though these programmes are considered less comparable because they may relate to a programme offered at the State or Provincial level, for example. A summary table is included below for information purposes, and a full table is included in Table 3.

The focus of this table is on Australia and Canada, as cities within these two countries, such as Brisbane and Toronto, are often cited as being comparable to Auckland. A total of four international cities are included in this statistical analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local, regional or state/provincial authority</th>
<th>Total funding pool</th>
<th>Number of eligible places</th>
<th>Amount allocated per place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane City</td>
<td>AU$342,000</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>AU$131 (NZ$140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Adelaide</td>
<td>AU$1.3 million</td>
<td>2497</td>
<td>AU$521 (NZ$556)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or Toronto</td>
<td>CA$317,000</td>
<td>14,910</td>
<td>CA$21 (NZ$23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ottawa</td>
<td>CA$300,000</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>CA$888 (NZ$990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these four international cities, the average amount of heritage funding allocated per eligible place is NZ$427.

If Auckland Council allocated $427 per eligible place, the RHHF would total $661,850.

The average between the national average ($352) and international benchmark ($427) is $390.

If Auckland Council allocated $390 per eligible place, the RHHF would total $604,500.
### Table 1

**Analysis of applications: heritage places for which funding was requested**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Type of heritage place</th>
<th>Formal protection</th>
<th>Maori outcomes reported&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings and Structures</td>
<td>Archaeology and Cemeteries</td>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis of recipients: heritage places for which funding was received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Type of heritage place</th>
<th>Formal protection</th>
<th>Maori outcomes reported&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings and Structures</td>
<td>Archaeology and Cemeteries</td>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>10</sup> Note these are self-reported  
<sup>11</sup> Includes moveable objects, displays and exhibitions, artworks, book publication, etc  
<sup>12</sup> Note these are self-reported  
<sup>13</sup> Includes moveable objects, displays and exhibitions, artworks, book publication, etc
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, District or Regional Council</th>
<th>Total amount of Heritage funding available per year</th>
<th>Features of the program</th>
<th>Number of places eligible for funding (approx)</th>
<th>$ amount allocated per place (approx) – note this is not the same as the amount available per place. Some schemes have minimum and/or maximum grants allowances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Auckland Council                  | $83,640                                          | • Maximum grant is $20,000  
• Grants available for scheduled historic heritage or unscheduled historic heritage demonstrated to be of regional significance, subject to evidence that the site has interim protection through heritage covenants as well as a letter from the applicants confirming support for scheduling the site under the relevant heritage overlay  
• Applications open to individual private owners, iwi or Māori groups, community groups, trusts and other organisations  
• Projects can be undertaken on public, private or Māori land.                                                                 | Ca 1550                                       | $34                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Ashburton District Council        | $1.3 million (as at 2017; funding pool is for all community grants, of which heritage is only one part)                                                 | • Natural and Built environment heritage grant  
• Maximum grant is $7,000  
• Up to 50% of project costs                                                                                                                                                           |                                               |                                                                                                                                   |
| Bay of Plenty Regional Council    | $300,000                                         | • Environmental Enhancement Fund (includes natural, historic and cultural heritage/character)  
• Maximum grant is $30,000 (only up to 10% of labour and/or transport costs)                                                                                                                                                  |                                               |                                                                                                                                   |
| Christchurch City Council         | $697,700                                         | • Funding for scheduled items (FAQ says buildings only)  
• Up to 50% of total work  
• Grants between $15,000-$150,000 require landowner to enter a limited covenant  
• Grants over $150,000 require landowners to enter a full covenant  
• Funded works must be complete within 18 months  
• Does not appear to be a maximum amount per applicant                                                                                                                                 | 954                                          | $732                                                                                                                                 |
| Dunedin City Council              | $670,000                                         | • Jointly administered with HNZPT – preferred to be listed or in a precinct  
• Can be building, archaeological site, etc  
• Can offer grants or interest free loans  
• Grants are not paid until the work is complete                                                                                                                                                  | 1300                                         | (ca 800 scheduled and ca 500 character-contributing, which are also eligible) $515                                                                                                               |
| Hamilton City Council             | $100,000                                         | • Buildings and Group 1 archaeological sites  
• Can apply for up to $100,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 152                                          | (123 buildings  
29 Group 1 archaeological sites) $658                                                                                                                                                    |
| Horowhenua District Council       | $30,000 (plus an additional $20,000 earmarked for consent waivers) | • The Heritage Fund is for projects that conserve or restore the heritage value or character of a property that is recognised under the Horowhenua District Plan for its historical significance.                                                                 | 83                                           | $477 (relates to the $30,000 fund only)                                                                                                                                                  |
| Hurunui District Council          | $5,000                                           | • Hurunui Heritage Fund - The purpose of this fund is to encourage and assist with voluntary work that protects, enhances, explains or restores significant heritage values of the District  | 255                                          | $20                                                                                                                                                                                      |
**Increasing the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment A</th>
<th>Page 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Item 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment and Community Committee</th>
<th>10 July 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Council</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hutt City Council</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Built Heritage Incentive Fund (255 places - some places contain multiple individually scheduled items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Community grants fund (for which heritage projects are eligible to apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipara District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community grants scheme (for which heritage projects are eligible to apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiti Coast District Council</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Heritage Management Plans are required for any Heritage Fund application under the categories of Preservation, Management or Riparian Management Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough District Council</td>
<td>$39,450 was distributed in FY 17/18</td>
<td>Community grants fund (for which heritage projects are eligible to apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napier City Council</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Jointly administered with the Art Deco Trust under the name Robert McGregor Heritage Fund – public can donate to the fund to boost the funding pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson City Council</td>
<td>$107,798</td>
<td>Maintain, repair, restore, stabilise and provide advice and work for statutory seismic strengthening for buildings, objects and sites that are identified in the Nelson Resource Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Plymouth District Council</td>
<td>$50,000 per year – under-subscribed and extra money rolls over each FY, so the pool available is actually higher than $50,000</td>
<td>The Built, Cultural and Natural Heritage Protection Grant was established by the council to help private landowners manage, maintain and preserve the heritage values of their properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston North City Council</td>
<td>$40,000 (as at 2016)</td>
<td>Natural and cultural heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rikhi Memo Final**

**Page 7**
### Increasing the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Fund

**Region:**
- Queenstown Lakes District Council: $25,000 (under-subscribed - money does not roll over)
- Rangitikei District Council:
  - Community Initiatives Fund – heritage projects are eligible
  - Maximum grant is $2,500
- Rotorua Lakes District Council: $50,000
  - Rotorua Lakes Council Community Grants – heritage projects eligible
  - Vibrant city heart – Waahi pumaranawa. Our inviting and thriving inner city reflects our unique heritage and lakeside location
  - Maximum grant is $5,000
- Selwyn District Council: $36,500 was distributed to in 2017
  - Buildings, archaeological sites and protected trees
  - Grants are between $500 and $7500
- Southland District Council: $60,000
  - The purpose of this fund is to provide grants for projects and initiatives which preserve, communicate and promote Southland’s heritage and are significant within a regional context
  - Maximum grant is $10,000 (can be more in exceptional circumstances)
- Tauranga City Council: $20,000 (for small grants up to $1,000)
  - Community grants fund (for which heritage projects are eligible to apply)
  - Up to 50% of the project
- Tasman District Council:
  - Grants of up to $500 are available for specified restoration work on buildings identified as having heritage value and listed in the Tasman Resource Management Plan.
  - Grants of up to $1000 are available for large earthquake strengthening projects on listed heritage buildings.
- Thames-Coromandel District Council: See Notes
  - Community Grant Fund – heritage events are eligible for funding
  - Funding is allocated by ward:
    - Coronandel/Cowville Board Community Grants - $35,000
    - Mercury Bay Community Board Grants - $40,000, made up of $20,000 for Community Grants and $20,000 for Mercury Bay events.
    - Taipa/Pauanui Community Board Grants - $37,000
    - Whangamata Community Board Grants - $30,000

---

**Notes:**
- For commercial or community projects, the maximum grant is 50% of project costs up to $10,000.
- Maximum for “strengthening” is $50,000.
- Three types of grants: professional advice, consents, maintenance
- Buildings, archaeological sites and trees – must be scheduled
- Funded works must be completed within 18 months
- The same place can only receive funding up to once every three years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Timaru District Council | $60,000 | o Thames Community Board Grants - $60,000  
• Only relates to buildings, and only to external works  
• Maximum grant is $5,000 (unless exceptional circumstances exist) |
| Waikato District Council | $40,000 (Heritage Project Fund) | 171 |
| Waikato Regional Council | $240,000 (as at 2009) | $23  
• Environmental Initiatives Fund (Value to Māori Whenua – how the project involves Iwi Maori including their cultural values, interests and associations, the effect on Maori historic heritage and the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wahi tapu and other taonga including fauna and flora)  
• Maximum grant is $40,000 |
| Waimakariri District Council |  |  
• Contestable Fund to encourage and assist with voluntary work that benefits the natural and built environment associated with notable trees, heritage sites, and vegetation and habitat sites listed in chapters 26 and 29 of the District Plan |
| Waitakere District Council |  |  
• The Heritage Fund is open for projects that include archaeological and traditional sites, buildings and sites with Historic Place classifications, notable and heritage trees and other buildings or sites Council consider worthy of assistance.  
• Maximum grant $1,000 |
| Waipa District Council | $70,000 |  
• Heritage Fund to assist with the preservation, enhancement and showcasing of the unique environmental and cultural heritage, diversity and history of the District  
• fund be used to assist with physical works for heritage buildings, objects, natural vegetation, habitats, cultural or archaeological sites, whether the feature is in public or private ownership.  
• There is no minimum or maximum assistance amount  
230 |
| Waitomo District Council |  |  
• Jointly administered with HNZPT  
• Preference will be given to assisting projects that restore or strengthen the fabric of historic buildings or protect and conserve archaeological sites  
• Can be a grant or a low-interest loan (privately owned places can only receive a loan, not a grant) |
| Wellington City Council | $400,000 |  
• Funding only for protected buildings  
• 85% of the fund is specifically earmarked for seismic strengthening  
• 15% is for other heritage projects  
650 |
| Whanganui District Council | $100,000 | Only for buildings located in the town centre  
- EQ strengthening NOT covered  
- Works must be appreciable from the public realm  
- Projects under $15,000 are eligible for up to 80% of costs  
- Projects over $15,000 are eligible for up to 50% of costs  
- Cannot apply unless consents are already secured  
- Work must be completed within 12 months | 467 | $215 |
### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International local, regional or state/provincial authority</th>
<th>Total amount of Heritage funding available per year</th>
<th>Features of the program</th>
<th>Approximate number of places eligible for funding</th>
<th>Approximate $ allocated per place – note this is not the same as the amount available per place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New South Wales                                           | AU$6 million                                    | • Heritage Grants Program, providing grants to heritage owners and custodians, local government and the community to deliver a broad range of heritage outcomes.  
• Three funding streams: Aboriginal Cultural, Community Heritage, Caring for State Heritage.  
• There is also an emergency works grants for heritage places that have been damaged or destroyed in a natural catastrophe. | | |
| Victoria                                                  | AU$8.5 million                                   | • Living Heritage program – 4-year program (2016-2020) with AU$38.5 million targeted toward at-risk heritage places. AU$8.5 million is specifically for a contestable grants program.  
• Grants of between AU$20,000 and AU$200,000 are available per project, per application round.  
• For projects valued at AU$50,000 or more, an appropriately qualified project manager, with experience in heritage conservation, will be required and a percentage of the grant funds.  
• Places must be scheduled at the state level. | | |
| Queensland                                                | AU$12 million                                    | • Community Sustainability Action grants – for which heritage projects are eligible to apply (Current heritage funding round has AU$950,000).  
• Maximum grants is AU$40,000  
• Grants will be provided to conserve Queensland’s heritage-listed places. Grants will also be provided for the preparation/update of Conservation Management Plans by a qualified heritage architect for such places. | | |
| South Australia                                           | AU$500,000                                      | • The SA Heritage Grants Program has been set up to help conserve and activate heritage places and areas, and to support heritage trades. | | |
| Western Australia                                         | AU$1.2 million                                   | • Heritage Grants Program offers assistance to private owners of State Registered heritage places to undertake urgent conservation works, or develop conservation management plans or strategies.  
• Grants of up to $100,000 are available through a competitive process and owners are required to match funds to the projects.  
• A maximum grant of $20,000 applies to documentation projects | | |
| Tasmania                                                  | AU$10 million                                    | • Heritage Places Renewal Loan Scheme will provide for up to $10 million to be made available for low interest loans. over an initial two year period, for owners of Tasmanian Heritage listed properties.  
• Loans are available for refurbishing a property that facilitates tourism and business development opportunities, essential heritage conservation projects, developing a business or adapting a property to support a new business initiative that will grow the visitor economy.  
• Loans are not available for properties used as a private residences  
• Led by the Office of the Coordinator-General and Department of State Growth and administered by the Tasmanian Development Board, loans will be provided for a minimum of $100,000 to a maximum of $1.5 million. | | |
<p>| Northern Territories                                      | AU$250,000                                      | • Heritage Grants Program funds conservation work to privately owned heritage places. | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Fund Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Grant Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane City Council</td>
<td>AU$342,000</td>
<td><strong>Heritage Incentives Scheme</strong> fosters an appreciation of Brisbane’s heritage. It offers professional advice and financial assistance in the form of grants to owners of heritage-listed places.</td>
<td>AU$131 (approx NZ$140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• up to $3000 for small projects ($1000-$15,000 in conservation costs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• up to $10,000 for large projects (more than $15,000 in conservation costs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• up to $15,000 for not-for-profit organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Owners are ineligible if they have modified the subject heritage place in a detrimental manner after it was entered on the heritage register.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimum grant of $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Perth</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Heritage Adaptive Re-use Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Adelaide</td>
<td>AU$1.3 million</td>
<td><strong>Heritage Management grants</strong> Since 1988, the City of Adelaide has provided the most substantial local government heritage grant scheme in Australia, reimbursing owners with part funding for documentation and conservation work of heritage and unlisted historic character places which meet specific criteria.</td>
<td>AU$521 (approx. NZ$556)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Scheme is widely regarded and has attracted much attention from interstate and overseas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since 1988, the Scheme won the Planning Institute of Australia (PIA) SA award in the Best Planning Ideas - Large Project category. In May 2018, the Scheme was awarded a Commendation at the Planning Institute of Australia (PIA) National Awards for Planning Excellence, held in Perth, Western Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since its inception, this multi-award-winning Scheme:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• has provided over $20m in grants to property owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• provides a $1.68 return to the South Australian economy for every $1 invested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• contributes $3.95m to the Gross State Product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• supports 3,000 jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• contributes to the direct heritage tourism expenditure valued at $375 million annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>CA$5 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>CA$317,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage grant program – matching grants for conservation works to scheduled places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding must be allocated each financial year – does not roll-over into the next financial year if unspent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, breaks-even (not over or under-subscribed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This scheme is complemented by a Heritage Tax Rebate Program – most large-scale projects (over 500k) apply to this scheme, leaving the CA$317,000 for smaller projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA$21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Approx NZ$23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Ottawa</th>
<th>CA$300,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage grant program for building restoration - A heritage grant of up to $10,000 for small-scale residential buildings, and up to $25,000 for commercial, institutional and large-scale residential buildings is available on a matching basis to assist owners of heritage buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City &quot;matches&quot; up to 50% every dollar the property owner spends to a maximum of $10,000 for small-scale residential buildings, and $25,000 for commercial, institutional and large-scale residential buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum grant is $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipients must maintain personal liability insurance of at least $1,000,000 during the course of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All work must be completed by December 31 in the year that the funding is approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massively over-subscribed despite the fund being doubled recently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is any leftover money, it does not roll over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA$688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Approx. NZ$990)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waikumete Cemetery development options

File No.: CP2019/10292

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To inform the Environment and Community Committee of the findings of the Waikumete Cemetery Feasibility Study on the potential for additional burial capacity. To also seek approval to proceed to the master planning of Waikumete Cemetery development.

Whakarāpopototangata matua
Executive summary
2. Waikumete Cemetery currently has approximately three years of general lawn burial capacity available. There are no remaining areas within the cemetery that allow for easy development of additional lawn burial capacity.
3. Through the preparation of a Feasibility Study for Waikumete Cemetery, council has investigated possible areas that could be developed to create additional burial capacity.
4. Potential areas for expansion have been refined through an iterative process of technical assessment and engagement with iwi, local boards, key stakeholders and the public.
5. Different burial methodologies have also been considered through the cost and yield calculations.
6. Six areas within the cemetery have been identified as having potential for future expansion, which, if fully developed, could provide up to 15 years additional capacity for lawn burials.
7. Staff recommend that the six identified areas are included in the preparation of a Waikumete Cemetery Masterplan.
8. The preparation of the Waikumete Cemetery Masterplan will allow further testing and refinement of the expansion areas that will in turn inform future budget allocation and detailed design, consenting and development work.

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

a) approve the inclusion of potential expansion areas one to six (1-6) as described in the Waikumete Cemetery Feasibility Study for inclusion in the Waikumete Cemetery Masterplan.

Horopaki
Context
9. After 143 years of operation, Waikumete Cemetery is reaching capacity for lawn burials. The current supply of general lawn burial plots available for purchase will provide approximately three more years, based on current levels of demand. There are no longer any areas of the cemetery that can be readily developed for lawn burials.
10. The long term need for a new cemetery to service the needs of north and west Auckland are recognised, and work is currently underway to identify potential land suitable for a new cemetery. Any future cemetery will take time to acquire, to undertake the necessary regulatory planning processes to enable development, and to develop so that it is operational.
11. It is desirable to continue to provide for lawn burials at Waikumete for as long as possible, and at least until an alternative cemetery in the north west of Auckland is operational.

12. As a first stage in identifying how additional capacity might be provided at Waikumete, council commissioned a Feasibility Study. The Feasibility Study will inform the subsequent preparation of a Waikumete Cemetery Masterplan, that will describe in further detail how the cemetery will be developed.

13. In February 2019, the Environment and Community Committee considered an initial assessment of potential areas for expansion of burials. The committee resolved to explore two broadly defined zones, consisting of 20 discrete areas for potential expansion (ENV/2019/4). The committee also agreed not to explore potential expansion into other areas of the cemetery due to a range of site constraints in those areas.

14. Engagement with iwi, key stakeholders, local boards and the public was undertaken between 3 March to 2 April 2019. Feedback from this engagement informed the preparation of the Feasibility Study. A summary of feedback from the engagement is set out in this report.

15. Further technical assessment has been undertaken for the potential expansion areas, which has resulted in refinement of the extent and boundaries of those areas. Evaluation of the areas has included a multi criteria analysis and assessment of potential yield and costs of development. This assessment has informed the final Feasibility Study recommendations.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Engagement findings

Key Stakeholders

16. Key stakeholders were invited to a ‘world café’ workshop where they shared their views and wrote comments on different questions. The 24 attendees are involved in the funeral industry, representatives of the different cultural groups with specific burial areas within Waikumete Cemetery or interested in the environmental issues.

17. They generally agreed that it would be preferable for Council to purchase a new cemetery site rather than develop further areas of Waikumete Cemetery. Their major concerns were:

- the environmental impact on the significant ecological area
- the site constraints that would make burials costlier and more difficult
- the lead time required to identify, purchase, designate and develop a new cemetery
- impact of further development on the adjacent residential areas, traffic flow, and stormwater.

Public

18. Information and maps about potential expansion areas were provided on the Auckland Council Have Your Say website for feedback between 3 March and 2 April 2019. While there were a number of media stories and social media publicity, the response was low with 36 completed feedback forms.

19. Most submitters were residents in the adjacent local boards and four respondents identified with the following organisations:

- The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc Waitakere Branch
- Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
- Friends of Sunhill Scenic Reserve
- Auckland Botanical Society.
20. Key themes emerging from the public feedback were:

- need for protection of ecological, heritage and recreational values
- concern about operational and access constraints on steep, unstable and vegetated land
- need for a new cemetery and the required lead time for purchase and development
- values shifting toward greater acceptance of emerging eco-friendly burial methods with greater spatial efficiency
- cost and risk of pursuing statutory approval to develop within the Significant Ecological Area.

*Iwi*

21. Iwi with an interest in the area were engaged through a hui. Feedback received is summarised in the Maori impact statement of this report.

*Local Board*

22. A workshop was held for the Waitakere Ranges, Henderson Massey and Whau Local Boards. Local board feedback is provided within the local impact and local board views section of this report.

**Refinement of potential expansion areas**

23. Following the engagement process, further refinement of the potential expansion areas was undertaken. This refinement was informed by more detailed assessment of:

- ecological values
- topography
- construction and operational constraints.

24. Following this refinement process, seven areas have been identified as having potential for expansion. These seven areas generally consist of part, or a combination of parts of the 20 areas previously approved by the committee.

25. The seven areas are illustrated in detail in the Feasibility Study (Attachment A) and shown in Figure 1.
Multi criteria analysis of potential development areas

26. The seven areas for potential expansion have been assessed and ranked relative to one another through a weighted multi criteria analysis process.

27. A full description of the multi criteria analysis is contained in the Feasibility Study. A summary of the findings, in order of highest to lowest ranked (see Table 1).

28. The relative scores for each criterion are summarised in bar graphs, as illustrated below. The circles on the central line represent a neutral score; above the line, the score is positive and below the line, adverse.
### Table 1: Summary of the multi criteria analysis of seven potential development areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Multi Criteria Analysis</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enclosed gulley falling to the north, with views to the CBD and harbour, accessible from Narcissus Drive, Orchard Rise and Orchard Rise extension. Much of the area is currently fragmented, poor quality SEA. Proposed lawn burials along Orchard Rise extension and a new public mausolea at the head of the gully in a setting of high amenity.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Graph 1" /></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Current flat depot site and some surrounding bush slopes accessed from Amber Crescent. Avoids critically challenging vegetation and requires relocation of operations depot. Utilises a prime elevated site with high amenity and natural values contributing to the cultural and landscape values of the cemetery.</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Graph 2" /></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northern operational area accessed from Quartermasters Quadrant adjacent to established burial areas. Utilises land already cleared with extension into the vegetated fringe avoiding critically challenging scrub and stream margins and retaining natural land forms.</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Graph 3" /></td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North west slopes accessed from Waitakere View Road and Kemp Rise. Proposes earthworks of cleared land to make suitable for lawn burials with extension into the vegetated areas. Encroachment into some critically challenging vegetation but avoids fragmentation.</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Graph 4" /></td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southern slopes with access from Waitakere View Road and Agathis Rise. Vegetation lacks cohesion due to stands of exotic trees. Proposes development of vegetated areas adjacent to current burial sites to reduce ecological fragmentation, minimise edge effect and utilise less steep ground. Loss of some critically challenging vegetation is mitigated by retention of a larger contiguous tract of vegetation. Proposes location of a new operations depot south of the gas easement, close to the rail line.</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Graph 5" /></td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extension of established burial areas west of Lavender Road. Utilises adjacent vegetated areas, some critically challenging, but with minimal edge effect.</td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Graph 6" /></td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gentler slopes within the dominant vegetated western slopes. Falls completely within the SEA. High risk in interruption of vegetated backdrop. One access point creates safety, circulation and accessibility issues. Mitigation of stormwater issues may impact critically challenging vegetation.</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Graph 7" /></td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Burial methodologies

29. The primary demand for additional capacity at Waikumete Cemetery is for full body lawn burials.

30. There are a range of alternatives to full body burial currently available at Waikumete such as cremation and ash interment or ash scattering, private and public mausolea, and eco burials. There is however a key assumption underpinning the Feasibility Study that demand for full body burials will continue for the foreseeable future and that this is the type of burial capacity that is required.

31. A key limiting factor for lawn burials is the gradient of the land. The maximum slope suitable for a dug grave is a 1:5 gradient. Slopes steeper than 1:5 create a range of challenges, including health and safety risks while excavating graves, and access challenges for burials and for visitors.

32. Steeper slopes can be modified by constructing retaining walls and earthworks to create areas of more acceptable gradient.

33. Consideration was given to an in-ground vault system that would provide an opportunity to utilise areas of steeper slope for full body burials. Staff do not recommend pursuing the in-ground vault system option due to the high costs of development, the need for specialist equipment to enable burials, and the current lack of demand for this system where it is provided for in other cemeteries in the region.

34. Mausolea provide a further option for interment. Waikumete Cemetery currently offers areas for both private and public mausolea. There remains some capacity within the existing public mausolea, but consideration has been given to future public mausolea provision.

Yield and costs

35. Potential yield and associated costs of development of areas 1-6 are summarised in Table 2.

36. A distinction has been made between areas of land with a lower gradient than 1:5, as these areas are likely to cost less to develop than areas that are steeper than 1:5 gradient.

37. Based on this initial assessment, it is estimated that up to 7,110 plots could feasibly be developed. This could provide additional capacity of up to 16 years if fully developed, at an estimated cost of $24.5 million.

38. While 7,110 additional plots represent the maximum feasible additional capacity identified, the cost of development per plot varies across and within the six identified expansion areas. Staff recommend that further cost benefit assessment of development is considered through the masterplan process. It is possible that the most cost effective option is to develop fewer plots than the identified maximum.

39. If Waikumete Cemetery is not developed for lawn burial plots, customers would be able to access other cemeteries in north and south Auckland. It is estimated that Manukau Memorial Gardens has enough capacity for lawn burial sales until 2035, and North Shore Memorial Park until 2050.
### Table 2: Summary of recommended lawn burial development options with estimated yield and costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lawn Burial</th>
<th>MCA Rank</th>
<th>Potential expansion area</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Cost of development $million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of plots</td>
<td>Capacity in years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower gradient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average development cost per plot $3,000</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,280 plots</td>
<td>9.7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steeper gradient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average development cost per plot $4,000</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>6.2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7110 plots</td>
<td>15.9 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Option 3 also includes a public mausoleum with an additional 360 spaces for $2.44 million.

### Summary of recommendations

41. Staff recommend the following based on the findings of the Feasibility Study:

- that potential expansion areas 1-6 are included in the Waikumete Cemetery masterplan as areas for future expansion.
- that potential expansion area 7 is not considered as feasible for expansion due to adverse impacts on environmental effects and thus consenting risk, and safety and surveillance issues arising from its isolated position and poor access.
- that lawn burials and a public mausolea are considered, and that the in-ground vault system be discounted.
- that further cost benefit assessment is undertaken through the masterplan process to identify the optimum number of new plots that should be developed at Waikumete Cemetery.
42. In considering these recommendations, it is important to note the following caveats:

- cost and yield estimates are initial estimates only and will need to be tested and refined through a further design process
- there is no guarantee that the identified areas for expansion will be deliverable, particularly through the consenting process, and all expansion will be subject to securing necessary consents
- the identified time that the additional burial capacity will provide assumes the current demand of circa 400 plots per annum continues
- expansion area 2 is currently occupied by the cemetery operations depot, and development of this area for burials is dependent on the identification and development of a suitable alternative depot site
- there is currently no specific development budget for Waikumete Cemetery in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028, and the extent of any development will be subject to budget being made available.

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

Heritage
43. The council heritage team were concerned that the development plan would include unutilised graves within the heritage areas as suggested in previous technical studies for the cemetery. This proposal was further investigated and discounted early in the process as only eight possible plots could be identified which did not warrant the risk of disrupting heritage graves.

44. There is still concern that new development adjacent to the heritage area needs to be appropriate to that context.

Ecology
45. The council biodiversity team cautioned about encroachment into the Significant Ecological Area but acknowledged that the new ecological report informing the Feasibility Study is more comprehensive than previous assessments.

46. They advised, however, that a further, more detailed report of each specific development area will be required to ensure all ecological values have been identified and assessed, prior to a consent application.

Cemetery Services
47. Council Cemetery Services, as part of the project control group, have raised their concerns with regards to:

- relocation of the new depot from its current central position
- topographical constraints will hinder usual cultural practices at the grave side, and access for operations staff, stone masons and funeral directors
- development costs if transferred to the customer will increase the cost burden on the low income community with specific lawn burial requirements
- lack of public uptake and need for new equipment required by an in-ground vault system.
Waikumete Cemetery falls within the Waitakere Ranges Local Board, although as an active cemetery, governance rests with the Governing Body. Both Henderson-Massey and Whau Local Boards share boundaries with the cemetery. The local boards have been informed and were invited to a workshop as part of the engagement process.

There was general support to maximise the burial capacity of the existing cemetery as that is the designated purpose of the space.

Waitakere Ranges Local Board provided formal written feedback making the following points:

- Support development of Zone 1 and 2 as areas of lower ecological value
- Support cemetery expansion as envisaged by the 2015 Reserve Management Plan.
- Support the strong community connections with the cemetery and their wish to be interred there.
- Value the important heritage landscape as a record of the foundation and growth of Auckland.
- Support an operational cemetery as it will attract funding needed to ensure the reserve is well maintained and looked after. Concern that the funding level will be cut and maintenance standards will fall when the cemetery closes.
- Ensure the cemetery is a safe place for visitors and surrounding communities.
- Develop recreational opportunities within the reserve with walking trails and interpretive signage.

Te Kawerau a Maki advised in writing that the iwi “do not have any issues with the proposed plan for Waikumete Cemetery. We are happy with the information we have received and the supporting reports”. They would like to be involved in the process going forward.

Te Ākitai Waiohua, however advised that the iwi did not support development into the significant ecological areas of Waikumete Cemetery as they “are acutely cognisant of the sustained pressure on both the green spaces and reserves of Tāmaki Makaurau and its extant native ecologies alike and are correspondingly loathe to rubber stamp any development within a Significant Ecological Area lest we set an irresistible and irreversible precedent.” If the project proceeds, then ‘the matter of offset mitigation must come to the fore and remain front and centre as a matter of course.’

Some representatives not at the hui provided the following feedback:

- Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua support the development
- Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei and Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua defer to Te Kawerau a Maki and Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara.
- Ngāti Whātua o Orākei and the Urupa Komiti wish to be involved going forward.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

Members of the northwest mana whenua forum were invited to a hui which was also attended by the Waikumete Cemetery Urupa Komiti co-chair. Representatives from both Te Kawerau a Maki and Te Ākitai Waiohua attended and provided formal feedback to proposed development Zones 1 and 2.

Te Kawerau a Maki advised in writing that the iwi “do not have any issues with the proposed plan for Waikumete Cemetery. We are happy with the information we have received and the supporting reports”. They would like to be involved in the process going forward.

Te Ākitai Waiohua, however advised that the iwi did not support development into the significant ecological areas of Waikumete Cemetery as they “are acutely cognisant of the sustained pressure on both the green spaces and reserves of Tāmaki Makaurau and its extant native ecologies alike and are correspondingly loathe to rubber stamp any development within a Significant Ecological Area lest we set an irresistible and irreversible precedent.” If the project proceeds, then ‘the matter of offset mitigation must come to the fore and remain front and centre as a matter of course.’

Some representatives not at the hui provided the following feedback:

- Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua support the development
- Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei and Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua defer to Te Kawerau a Maki and Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara.
- Ngāti Whātua o Orākei and the Urupa Komiti wish to be involved going forward.
Ngā ritinga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

55. Cost of full development of the six recommended expansion areas is estimated to be approaching $25 million. There is currently no budget allocated for this level of development at Waikumete.

56. Prior to any possible construction the master plan needs to be completed and consents obtained. There is a risk that the publicly notified consent process may end up in the Environment Court, adding cost and time to the project. The budget for this current master plan project has contingency allowed for such a situation.

57. The development costs of Waikumete Cemetery need to be balanced with the inevitable purchase of a new cemetery site in west Auckland. While a new cemetery site has yet to be identified or acquired, it is anticipated that the cost per plot for development within a new cemetery would be less than the cost of additional plots within Waikumete Cemetery.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time required for publicly notified resource consent process is longer than the current supply of burial plots will last</td>
<td>• Consenting strategy will identify areas outside the SEA to fast track for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall cost of plot is too expensive for the customer</td>
<td>• Develop lawn burials plots and mausolea only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do not develop the in-ground vault system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Purchase more suitable land for new cemetery which is anticipated to have lower development costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

58. Develop a master plan incorporating the approved option areas, with more detailed consideration of development stages, consenting strategy, and access and circulation for cemetery functions and passive recreation.

59. It is anticipated that this master plan will be completed by the end of 2019, with a first resource consent application made early 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer - Operations Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To note progress on the forward work programme (Attachment A)
2. To provide a public record of memos, workshop or briefing papers that have been distributed for the Committee’s information since 11 June 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

3. This is regular information-only report which aims to provide public visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo or other means, where no decisions are required.
4. The following papers/memos were circulated to members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14/06/2019</td>
<td>Memorandum Social impacts initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2019</td>
<td>Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/06/2019</td>
<td>Update on Coastal Compartment Management Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/06/2019</td>
<td>Walking Access Act Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The following workshops/briefings have taken place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/06/2019</td>
<td>Environment Aotearoa 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.

7. This documents can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link:  
   http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/  
   • at the top of the page, select meeting “Environment and Community Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;  
   • under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled ‘Extra Attachments’.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the summary of the Environment and Community Committee information report – 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>Forward Work Programme</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Memorandum Social impacts initiative <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Memorandum Social impacts initiative attachment A <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Memorandum Social impacts initiative attachment B <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Workshop Environment Aotearoa 2019 <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Memorandum Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Key themes for submission summary Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Climate Change response Zero Carbon Amendment Bill Summary <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Update on Coastal Compartment Management Plans <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Walking Access Act Review <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Suad Allie - Governance Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer - Operations Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This committee deals with strategy and policy decision-making that relates to the environmental, social, economic and cultural activities of Auckland as well as matters that are not the responsibility of another committee or the Governing Body.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic approach to Climate Change</td>
<td>To demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop draft plan March – May 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Draft plan to committee for input and adoption June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public consultation of draft plan July-August 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic direction</td>
<td>will be provided in the coming months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report was considered on 20/2/18, resolution ENV/2018/11 Dec 18 – approval for consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb – Mar 19 - targeted public engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 19 – feedback presented to elected members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 19 – final strategy for adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 19 – Draft submission Climate Change Response Amendment Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress to date
- Report was considered December 2018 meeting, Res ENV/2018/170 Q4 (June)
- Workshop scheduled 23 May 2019
- Report on Auckland’s Climate Action Framework Consultation draft and approach was considered on 6/11/2018, resolution ENV/2019/71
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-Jun 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Sept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 22**

### Low carbon living

To deliver on Low Carbon Auckland Plan commitments by the design and implementation of awareness raising and incentives programmes to reduce household, community, business and schools carbon emissions by approximately 50% of current levels.

**Strategic direction and endorse** programmes as part of the Low Carbon Auckland Plan implementation.

**Progress to date:**

Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec 18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group (IAG) was approved. Chairs Planning and Env & Community Ctee & an IMSB member and the Mayor’s office to decide on the membership of the IAG.

### Low Carbon Auckland / Climate Change Mitigation

Four-yearly review of strategic action plan due in 2018; increased engagement with and commitments via C40 Cities membership; development of proactive policy agenda to central government emerging

**Climate Plan Workshop:**

- Risks and vulnerabilities (June)
- Communication strategy for broader public engagement
- Local Board workshops
- Mana whenua engagement (integrated throughout)
- Stakeholder workshops

Prioritisation criteria and identified actions (Jul/Aug)

- Cost benefit and total value analysis
- Agree prioritisation criteria
- Review all actions
- Draft plan
- Draft plan to committee (Dec 2018)
- Consultation (linking to other plans, approach tbc)
- Updates to action plan
- Adoption of updated plan by council (Proposed December 2018)
- Final Adoption of Climate Plan (Mar 09)

**Decision and endorsement** of strategic direction

**Progress to date:**

Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec 18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group was approved. Workshops scheduled: 4/7/18 and 26/09/18. An update was on 12/06/18 meeting agenda.

Report reapplication for C40 Cities membership was considered at 13/11/2018 meeting. Res ENV/2018/149 reapplication for membership was approved

### Urban Forest Strategy

Strategic approach to delivering on the wider social, economic and environmental benefits of a growing urban forest in the context of rapid population growth and intensification.

**Decision on strategic direction and endorsement of strategy.**

**Progress to date:**

A workshop was held on 14/06/17. Report was considered on 12/09/17 ENV/2017/116 a full draft of the strategy was considered 20/02/18, Res ENV/2018/12 with a report back on the results of the LIDAR and an implementation plan on costs and benefits in Aug 2018. An update was included in the 14 Aug agenda regarding several workstreams covered by the 18 high level implementation actions. A report on a full progress on implementing the strategy will be in August 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund</td>
<td>Decision making over medium and large funds from the Waste Minimisation and Innovation fund in line with the fund’s adopted policy. Funds to contribute towards council’s aspirational goal of zero waste to landfill by 2040. Full review of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund will be undertaken. Outcomes provided with the section 17a review report in March 2019.</td>
<td>Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year. Decision: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17 <strong>Progress to date:</strong> Report was considered on 4/12/18 to note allocations for the 2018/2019 small to med September funding round, res ENV/2018/176. Item C1 approval of medium to large grants September 2018 round April 2019 - email to committee re: small grants round opening 1 April to 30 April. A copy of the memo is attachment C of the Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information – updates, memos and briefings – 9 April 2019 report. – April agenda.</td>
<td>FY18/19 Jan-Mar 2019: 12 Feb 12 March Apr-Jun 2019: 9 April 14 May 11 June Jul-Sep 2019: 9 July 13 Aug 10 Sept FY19/20 Q3 (Mar) Q4 Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland’s water strategy</td>
<td>The health of Auckland’s waters is a critical issue. Both freshwater and marine environments in Auckland are under pressure from historic under-investment, climate change and rapid growth. The draft Auckland Plan 2050 identifies the need to proactively adapt to a changing water future and develop long-term solutions.</td>
<td>Decision and strategic direction and priorities as part of the Auckland Plan. Consider the development of an Auckland’s waters strategy to be adopted for consultation December 2018. <strong>Progress to date:</strong> A report was considered on 12/06/18 to approve the proposed scope, timeframe and budget for the development of the strategy, Res ENV/2018/78 Key milestones: • June 2018 – develop a strategic summary of water related outcomes, identify integrated water outcomes, • July- Oct 2018 – high level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes – consultation with mana whenua <strong>Progress to date:</strong> A Report was considered December 2018 - discussion document ahead of public consultation Res ENV/2018/168. Key timeframes: • Public consultation on discussion document 17 Feb – 17 March • Public engagement feedback to committee, April 2019 • Draft options for the finalisation of Auckland’s water strategy, and associated work programmes to be present to committee in June 2019</td>
<td>Q4 (June 19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Item 22

### Area of work
Regional Pest Management Plan review

### Reason for work
Statutory obligations under the Biosecurity Act to control weeds and animal pests. To ensure that the plan is consistent with the national policy direction and up to date.

### Decision or direction
- Workshop – April water discussion document, and to foreshadow and seek the councillors' input on the contents of the report that will be coming to them in June
- **Progress to date** adopt Our Water Future - Tō Tātou Wai Ahu Ake Nei discussion document report, resolution ENV/2019/75
- Decision and strategic direction on weed and plants that will be subject to statutory controls.
- Consider submissions received on the draft plan in mid-2018 and adopt the final plan by December 2018.
- Decision: Agreed to the inconsistencies in ACT at the 14 Feb 2017 ENV/2017/7 Item 12 Workshops held on 4/04/17, 3/05/17 and 27/09/17 Draft plan was approved for consultation in Nov 2017 Funding for implementation of the proposed RPMP through LTP, A memo was distributed and is attached to the July agenda. Key milestones:
  - workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018
  - workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018
  - engagement with mana whenua – September – October 2018
  - workshop with Environment and Community Committee – October – November 2018
  - formal feedback from local boards at business meetings – October – November 2018
  - approval of final plan by Environment and Community Committee – March 2019
- **Progress to date:**
  - 12 March 2019 report to consider the adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2019. Adoption was approved and the motion was put in parts: ENV/2019/22 – ENV/2019/32

### Expected timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter (month if known)</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019</td>
<td>12 Feb</td>
<td>9 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 March</td>
<td>14 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Jun 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan</td>
<td>To ensure the plan is consistent with Auckland Council’s: proposed Regional Pest Management Plan - current and future marine biosecurity programmes - response to SeaChange – Tai Timu Tai Pari Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan.</td>
<td>Decision on the development of the discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan for public consultation. A memo was distributed on 31/05/18 advising the committee on the Auckland Council’s participation in the development of a discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan, through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity partnership. <strong>Progress to date:</strong> 12 February 2019 report To approve the discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan, ahead of informal public consultation between March and May 2019. Res ENV/2019/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of the Regional Natural Heritage Grant</td>
<td>Decision-making over regional environment fund as per the grants funding policy and fund guidelines</td>
<td>Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year. Allocation of the Regional Environmental Natural Heritage Grant for the 2017-2018 financial year was made on 6 Dec 2016_ENV/2016/11 Item 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management</td>
<td>The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management is being implemented, with periodic reporting to council committee on progress, and responding to ongoing central government refinement of the framework for achieving water outcomes.</td>
<td>Progress to date: Council submission was approved on Central Govt. Clean Water Consultation 2017 process: Minutes of 4 April ENV/2017/54 Item 12. Follow up is required for resolution b) – a workshop held on 14 June. A supplementary submission on the Clean Water Consultation package was made on 25 May 2017, Item 14 13/06/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENV/2018/14 on engagement approach for consultation on the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management in Feb 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A report was considered on 26/6/18 : Res ENV/2018/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• June 2018: develop strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• July to Oct 2018 – High level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes in consultation with mana whenua, local boards and key stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dec 2018- Draft Auckland's waters strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for approval for release for public consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Feb to Apr 2019 - Targeted public engagement on the draft Auckland's waters strategy in February to March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Apr 2019 - Feedback analysed and presented to elected members in April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Jun 2019 - Final strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Policy Alliance</td>
<td>To consider food policy alliance</td>
<td>Decision on food policy alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Growing Greener</td>
<td>Statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act, Biosecurity Act and Local Government Act. Consideration of items to give effect to the adopted commitment of Auckland Council to grow greener.</td>
<td>Strategic direction and oversight into council’s role to improve the natural environment, and to endorse proposed incentives. This may include endorsing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• a framework to ensure planning and growth decisions are underpinned by relevant environmental data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• proposed incentives for green growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• recommendations arising from a current state statutory obligations review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hunua Aerial 1080 Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide information on outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation</td>
<td>To note outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation.</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019 Apr-Jun 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb 9 April 14 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 March 11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019 Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 July 13 Aug 10 Sept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parks, Sports and Recreation

#### Sport and Rec Strategic Partnership Grant to Aktive Auck Sports Rec

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auck &amp; Sport to deliver on agreed priority initiatives.</td>
<td>To approve the $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport &amp; Recreation for 2017/2018</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2019 reporting schedule:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019 Apr-Jun 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- January 2019 - Interim report from 1 July – 31 December 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb 9 April 14 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- June 2019 - confirm 2019/20 priorities, outcomes and measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 March 11 June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Te Motu a Hiaroa (Puketutu Island)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status update on the Te Motu a Hiaroa Governance Trust</td>
<td>To note further update on progress of the governance trust.</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019 Apr-Jun 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb 9 April 14 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 March 11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019 Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 July 13 Aug 10 Sept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status report on implementation plan</td>
<td>Direction on future options for sport and recreation.</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019 Apr-Jun 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb 9 April 14 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 March 11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019 Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 July 13 Aug 10 Sept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sports Investment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports</td>
<td>Draft Plan approval</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
<td>Finalise and adopt investment plan – approval of guidelines</td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019 Apr-Jun 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- public consultation February to March 2019</td>
<td>Evaluation of current sports facilities investments and proposed changes was adopted on 14 March, resolution ENV/2017/39 Item 15 with the final draft investment plan to be adopted prior to consultation.</td>
<td>12 Feb 9 April 14 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- final approval of plan will be sought June 2019</td>
<td>An outcome measurement tool to support the Sports Facilities Investment Plan was considered and agreed at the 4 April 2017 meeting. Resolution ENV/2017/50 Item 9 The findings of the pilot will be reported in mid-2019 seeking a decision on the roll-out model.</td>
<td>12 March 11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementation of the plan will occur in stages over the next three to five years, depending on council budgetary and planning processes.</td>
<td>Decision on issues papers Draft Plan approval Finalise and adopt investment plan – approval of guidelines Evaluation of current sports facilities investments and proposed changes was adopted on 14 March, resolution ENV/2017/39 Item 15 with the final draft investment plan to be adopted prior to consultation. An outcome measurement tool to support the Sports Facilities Investment Plan was considered and agreed at the 4 April 2017 meeting. Resolution ENV/2017/50 Item 9 The findings of the pilot will be reported in mid-2019 seeking a decision on the roll-out model.</td>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019 Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An outcome measurement tool to support the Sports Facilities Investment Plan was considered and agreed at the 4 April 2017 meeting. Resolution ENV/2017/50 Item 9 The findings of the pilot will be reported in mid-2019 seeking a decision on the roll-out model.</td>
<td>9 July 13 Aug 10 Sept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Progress to date:

**Report** was considered 5/12/17 Resolution ENV/2017/186 – report back against KPI every six months.

A report was considered on 10 July 2018 to approve the strategic partnership grant of $552,000 per annum for a three-year term (2018-2021) Res ENV/2018/90

A funding agreement will be prepared for Aktive that ensures clear accountability and KPIs for each of the four geographical areas (North, West, Central and Southern) for the investment. (TBA)

### Decision on issues papers

- **Draft Plan approval**
- **Finalise and adopt investment plan**
  - Evaluation of current sports facilities investments and proposed changes was adopted on 14 March, resolution ENV/2017/39 Item 15 with the final draft investment plan to be adopted prior to consultation.
  - An outcome measurement tool to support the Sports Facilities Investment Plan was considered and agreed at the 4 April 2017 meeting. Resolution ENV/2017/50 Item 9 The findings of the pilot will be reported in mid-2019 seeking a decision on the roll-out model. 

### Progress to date:


Adoption August 2019 committee meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indoor Courts</strong></td>
<td>Strategic business case for indoor courts investment</td>
<td>Decision on investment approach</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Springs Community School Partnership</strong></td>
<td>Improve Community Access to school facilities</td>
<td>Decision on Business and Investment in indoor court facility at Western Springs</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date: A workshop was held on 12 Sept and information is available on OurAuckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Programme</strong></td>
<td>Update on proposed growth funding allocation for 2018-2020</td>
<td>Decision on growth funding allocation</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Sport and Recreation grants programme 2018/2020</strong></td>
<td>Review of previous grants allocation and recommendation for next round</td>
<td>Decision on sport and recreation grants programme objectives and approach</td>
<td>Q3 (June) Q4 (Sep) Q1 (Sep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012: TOR</td>
<td>The review will assess the efficacy of the guidelines in for the council to deliver the best possible outcomes for Auckland through community leases</td>
<td>Decision on the terms of reference for the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012</td>
<td>FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The TOR was approved for the review to commence and will report back in July 2018 subject to TLP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An update memo was circulated in August 2017 in response to feedback from the July 2017 meeting. Joint workshop with local board chairs held 20/6/18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report was considered November 2018 and resolved ENV/2018/150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation Investment and Visitor Experience</td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcome, priorities and investment for active walking, cycling, waterways and visitor experience on open space, parks and regional parks</td>
<td>Decision on scope and phasing</td>
<td>FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takaro – Investing in Play discussion document</td>
<td>Development of a play investment plan</td>
<td>Decision on approval for public release</td>
<td>FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved on 16/05/17 for public release the discussion document and will report to E&amp;C for approval in late 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Takaro was reported to committee approved for release on 20 Feb 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A report back by August 2018 for approval to initiate public consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Management Plan 2010 – variation to incorporate land at Piha into the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td>To approve variation to incorporate land purchased at Piha to be known as Taitomo Special Management Zone as part of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td>Decision on approval to a variation</td>
<td>FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved on 20/2/2018 Res ENV/2018/19 report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager, Regional Parks, will prepare an integrated vegetation management and fire–risk reduction plan in consultation with the local community and report back on the resourcing needs for its effective implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Southern Initiative (TSI)</td>
<td>Provide an update on the TSI approach, priorities and achievements.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic direction</strong> of the TSI approach to social and community innovation in south Auckland</td>
<td>FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Engagement Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Provide an update and direction of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities. It has been three years since a new strategic direction was introduced, progress on this strategy will be presented.</td>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong> of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities</td>
<td>FY18'19 Jan-Mar 2019 Jan-Mar 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly global engagement updates are published on each agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18'19 Jan-Mar 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options to expand revenue streams for sport facilities investment</strong></td>
<td>Provide strategic direction to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft Sports Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td><strong>Strategic direction</strong> to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft Sports Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A report was considered in Aug. Res ENV/2017/121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social, Community, Cultural Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A progress report was considered on 14 March. Resolution ENV/2017/36 Item 11 to report back on an indicative business case for investment in the central-west area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan</strong></td>
<td>Develop and endorse the Sports Facilities Investment Plan to enable Auckland Council to take a more co-ordinated approach to its sports facilities investment.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on the Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan. <strong>Decision</strong> on sector’s investment priorities and investigate potential funding options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The plan was endorsed on 12 Sept ENV/2017/118. Staff to report back on priorities and potential funding options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 March 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 April 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 May 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 June 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 July 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Aug 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Sept 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Implementing Regional Policy and Strategy resolution to progress work around Council’s strategic position on addressing homelessness (note this work will be informed by discussions at the Community Development and Safety Committee)</td>
<td>Decision on scope of scope and direction addressing homelessness</td>
<td>Q3 (Aug) Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date: Approval the scope policy 14 Feb Item 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland council’s position and role was considered at the August meeting report item 12. Staff to report back with an implementation plan. Resolution ENV/2017/118 of preferred position and role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Partnerships Policy</td>
<td>Identify the range of current council approaches to facility partnerships, issues, opportunities and agree next steps Next steps: • January – March 2019 policy summary released • April – June 2019 implement initial operational guidance and systems • July 2019 detailed operational design and testing continues. Benefits realisation plan developed</td>
<td>Decision on facility partnership approach Decision to adopt Facility Partnership Framework in December 2017 Update was given at 14 February meeting on Phase 1 Approval was given on the proposed timelines for Phase 2: Minutes 14 February Item 14 preferred option A report seeking approval to engage on a draft facility partnerships policy on 12/06/18. Resolution ENV/2018/74</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Advice Bureaux Services</td>
<td>Review of the Citizens Advice Bureaux Services RSP decision in April 2016 [REG/2016/22]</td>
<td>Decision on review results Progress to date: Report was considered at 20 Feb meeting. Decision: lies on the table. A supplementary report was considered on 10 April 2018. Resolution ENV/2018/48 and with changes for an updated funding model to be agreed by 1 April 2019. Report was considered at 14 May meeting funding model decision Res ENV/2019/58</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb) Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Community Housing Strategy and initiatives</td>
<td>Strategic overview of social and community housing initiatives. Wider housing portfolio and spatial outcomes of council’s role in housing is led by the Planning Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Intervention</td>
<td>Understanding NZ and international interventions to address affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | **Te Kauroa – Library Strategy**                 | Libraries and Information is carrying out a change programme (Fit for the future) to accelerate the implementation of this 2013-2023 strategy (approved by the Governing Body) | Direction relating to priorities and to receive update on strategic direction and implementation progress  
**Approve** an expanded and improved regional mobile library service  
**Progress to date:**  
workshop held on 7 March with local board chairs. Workshop notes were attached to the 10 April agenda | FY18-19  
Jan-Mar: 12 Feb  
Mar: 19 Mar  
Apr-Jun: 14 May  
Jun: 11 July  
Jul-Sep: 10 Sept  
Oct-Dec:  
Q1 (Sep)  
Q2 |
|        | **Central library strategic review**             | A strategic review of the Central Library has been commissioned to understand how the current building can meet future need and demand for services, assess the Central Library’s current and potential future role in the region, and guide decision making about future investment and development opportunities | Decide direction and receive the strategic review                                      | Q3  
Q4  
Q1  
Q2 |
|        | **Libraries**                                     | Work around the integration with customer services                                                                                                                                                         | Decision on matters relating to regional aspects of the proposed integration (local boards will decide on local outcomes) | Q3  
Q4  
Q1  
Q2 |
|        | **Intercultural Cities Network**                 | Consideration of a proposal to join the Intercultural Cities Network to support implementation and monitoring of progress on ‘Inclusive Auckland’ actions.                                                   | Decide whether Auckland should be a member of the network                             | Q3  
Q4  
Q1  
Q2 |
|        | **Investing in Aucklanders (Age Friendly City)** | Identity issues and opportunities for an inclusive friendly city (Regional Policy and Strategy resolution REG/2016/32)                                                                                         | **Strategic direction** on the approach to a friendly, inclusive, diverse city.       | Q3  
Q4  
Q1 (Jul)  
Q2 |

**Progress to date:**
- Update reports were circulated on 18 April 2018 and 14 Dec 2017. Staff report findings and the proposed next phase in 2018.
- A report on the Findings was considered on 12/06/18 meeting. Resolution ENV/2018-75 approval for up to five inclusion pilots.
- A report back on the advantages and any obstacles to Auckland becoming an Age Friendly City as part of the World Health Organisation’s Global Network.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-Jun 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Enterprise approaches for youth and long term unemployed</td>
<td>Improved understanding of social enterprise reach, impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on council’s approach to social enterprise.</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1 (Jul), Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth volunteer programmes</td>
<td>Intervention assessment of youth volunteer programmes on long term education and employment – understanding impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on interventions approach</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1 (Jul), Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Policy</td>
<td>A review of what is working well and what isn’t</td>
<td>Decision on audit results</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1, Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Policy Monitoring</td>
<td>Audit of the application of the Grants Policy</td>
<td>Decision on audit results</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1, Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toi Whitiki Strategy</td>
<td>Targeted analysis of social return on investment on specific art and culture investment</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1, Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art Policy</td>
<td>Review of the Public Arts Policy: what’s working what’s not. Decisions relating to major public arts</td>
<td>Decision on the investigation findings</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1, Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Development Contribution revenue and expenditure – funding for open space purposes</td>
<td>Highlight the new parks and open spaces for Aucklanders’ use and enjoyment</td>
<td>Decision on the investigation findings</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1, Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation in North-west Community Provision</td>
<td>Investigation to identify any current gaps in services or facilities or in the future</td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1, Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Environmental Standards</td>
<td>Council response on the National Direction for aquaculture expected following scheduled release of consultation document in April 2017. The National Direction is likely to address matters relating to re-consenting, bay-wide management, innovation and research, and biosecurity.</td>
<td>Direction Committee agreement to a council submission on the National Direction for Aquaculture</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q1, Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGISLATION/CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

National Environmental Standards | Council response on the National Direction for aquaculture expected following scheduled release of consultation document in April 2017. The National Direction is likely to address matters relating to re-consenting, bay-wide management, innovation and research, and biosecurity. | Direction Committee agreement to a council submission on the National Direction for Aquaculture | Q3, Q4, Q1, Q2 |
### Area of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic acquisition issues and opportunities</td>
<td>Understanding current acquisition issues and options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition for stormwater purposes</td>
<td>Delegated responsibility of the committee. To acquire land for stormwater management and development purposes, to either support a structure plan or ad-hoc development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Plan</td>
<td>Informing the development of the 2018-2028 Auckland Council Long-term Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expected timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter (month if known)</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>12 Feb</td>
<td>9 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>12 March</td>
<td>9 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>14 May</td>
<td>13 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>11 June</td>
<td>10 Sept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND ACQUISITIONS**

- **Strategic acquisition issues and opportunities**: Decision to acquire land. Reports will come to committee as required. Next report will be in Feb 2018 seeking authority to carry out compulsory acquisition of land in the Henderson area for a flood prevention project.

**OTHER**

- **Long-term Plan**: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Environment and Community Committee

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

C1 Confidential report: Acquisition of land for open space - Helensville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities. s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In particular, the report identifies land the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes.

C2 Confidential report: Acquisition of destination park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities. s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In particular, the report identifies land the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes.
C3  Confidential report: Boundary adjustment by way of land exchange pursuant to S15 Reserves Act 1977: (Covering report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities. In particular, the report contains information that is currently the subject of commercial negotiations.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>