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1 Welcome

Chairperson T Mulholland opened the meeting and welcomed those present.

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of interest

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

Specifically members are asked to identify any new interests they have not previously disclosed, an interest that might be considered as a conflict of interest with a matter on the agenda.

The following are declared interests of the Whau Local Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Organisation / Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Mulholland</td>
<td>• New Lynn Business Association – Business Associate/Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Zhu</td>
<td>• Chinese Oral History Foundation – Committee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Chinese Garden Steering Committee of Auckland – Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Battersby</td>
<td>• New Lynn Tennis Club – Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• West Lynn Gardens – Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tag Out Trust – Deputy Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New Lynn Bowling Club - Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New Lynn RSA - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Farmer</td>
<td>• Avondale-Waterview Historical Society – Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Blockhouse Bay Historical Society – Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Portage Licensing Trust – Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Blockhouse Bay Bowls – Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forest and Bird organisation – Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Grey Power - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te’eva Matafai</td>
<td>• Pacific Events and Entertainment Trust - Co-Founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Miss Samoa NZ - Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Malu Measina Samoan Dance Group - Director/Founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pasifika Festival Village Coordinators Trust ATEED - Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aspire Events – Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whitley</td>
<td>• REINZ - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lopdell House - Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amalgamated Hardware Merchants (AHM) Apprenticeship Trust – Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rotary New Lynn – Head director of Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New Lynn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Confirmation of minutes

That the Whau Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes, including the confidential section of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 3 July 2019 26 June 2019, as true and correct.
5 Leave of Absence

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

6 Acknowledgements

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

7 Petitions

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

8.1 Deputation - rollout of 5G wireless, Janine Johnson

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To receive a deputation from Janine Johnson on the rollout of 5G Wireless.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Janine Johnson, on behalf of Concerned Citizens for 5G FREE West Auckland, will be in attendance to present on the proposed rollout in Auckland 2020 of 5G Wireless and concerns that the 5G electromagnetic frequencies pose a threat to health of the community and environment.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Whau Local Board:

a) receive the presentation on the rollout of 5G wireless and thank Janine Johnson, on behalf of Concerned Citizens for 5G Free West Auckland, for her attendance.

Attachments

A 5G Free Deputation ..........................................................................................119
B 5G Deputation Presentation ...........................................................................125

8 Public Forum

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

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

9 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.”
Whau Local Board Member vacancy

File No.: CP2019/13002

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. For the Whau Local Board to respond to the vacancy of a local board member.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. On 9 July 2019 Whau Local Board Member Duncan Macdonald provided the Chief Executive of Auckland Council with his resignation from the Whau Local Board which took immediate effect. As a result, a vacancy on the Whau Local Board now exists.

3. According to Section 117(3) of the Local Electoral Act 2001, on receiving notice under subsection (2) the local board must, at its next meeting (other than an extraordinary meeting) or, if that is not practicable, at its next subsequent meeting (other than an extraordinary meeting), determine by resolution that either (a) that the vacancy will be filled by the appointment by the local board of a person named in the resolution who is qualified to be elected as a member; or (b) that the vacancy is not to be filled.

4. The Whau Local Board must therefore decide at this business meeting to resolve to appoint someone to the position or determine to leave the position vacant.

5. A person is eligible to be nominated if they are over 18 years of age, a New Zealand citizen, and on the electoral roll. The board may take other criteria into consideration.

6. If, under section 117 (3) (b) the board resolves at this business meeting not to fill the vacancy, it must immediately give public notice of its decision.

7. If under section 117(3) the board resolves to appoint to the vacancy it must immediately give public notice of its decision and its selection process. The board confirms the appointment at its next business meeting on 28 August 2019 and the appointed member will make their statutory declaration.

8. The staff recommendation is that the Whau Local Board resolve not to fill the vacancy due to the proximity of the 2019 Local Government Elections in October 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Whau Local Board:

a) resolve to not fill the vacancy created on the Whau Local Board by Member Macdonald’s resignation from the board on 9 July 2019, pursuant to section 117 (3) of the Local Electoral Act.

OR

b) resolve to appoint <<person nominated>> to fill the vacancy until the next triennial election, which takes place on 12 October 2019, pursuant to section 117 (3) of the Local Electoral Act, and that <<person nominated>> be sworn in as a Member at the local board’s business meeting on 28 August 2019.

c) note that the board have selected <<person appointed>> because of <<criteria met>>.

d) resolve that the outcome of the appointment be publicly advertised after the report and resolutions have been restated.
Horopaki
Context
9. On 9 July 2019, Whau Local Board Member Duncan Macdonald provided the Chief Executive of Auckland Council with a letter of resignation from the Whau Local Board, which took immediate effect.

8. As the resignation has taken place within the 12-month period prior to the next local body election, which is on 12 October 2019, the local board has discretion about what it will do. The two options available to the board are:
   i) Not to fill the vacancy and run one member short until the next election in October 2019.
   ii) Appoint an eligible person to fill the vacancy. There is no requirement or convention that indicates the board must appoint the highest polling, or any candidate from a previous election.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
9. According to Section 117(3) of the Local Electoral Act 2001, on receiving notice under subsection (2) the local board must, at its next meeting (other than an extraordinary meeting) or, if that is not practicable, at its next subsequent meeting (other than an extraordinary meeting), determine by resolution (a) that the vacancy will be filled by the appointment by the local board of a person named in the resolution who is qualified to be elected as a member; or (b) that the vacancy is not to be filled.

10. Following the formal notification of the vacancy to the Chief Executive to the Whau Local Board on 9 July 2019, section 117 (3) of the Local Electoral Act applies. The Whau Local Board must at the next meeting (other than an extraordinary meeting), or next subsequent meeting, determines by resolution either:

   (a) that the vacancy is filled by an appointment by the local board of a person named in the resolution who is qualified to be elected, or

   (b) that the vacancy is not to be filled.

11. The process commences at the time the board decides on the preferred option.

12. It is recommended that the vacancy is not to be filled. This advice is based upon the consideration of timing of the vacancy in the electoral cycle. Within two days of the business meeting receiving this report (Friday 19 July) nominations will open for the 12 October 2019 triennium elections, furthermore there are only two more business meetings for the current electoral term, and no significant decisions are scheduled.

13. If it is agreed not to fill the vacancy the only action required is to pass a resolution to this effect.

14. If the Whau Local Board decides to appoint an eligible person, then criteria apply.

15. The criteria for eligibility for serving as an elected representative on a local board are provided in legislation and are:

   i) Applicants must be:

      a. Over eighteen years of age

      b. A New Zealand citizen

      c. On the electoral roll.
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ii) Additionally, no member of the governing body may also be a member of a local board. If a person is an un-discharged bankrupt they must disclose this fact to the Chief Executive (Auckland Council’s Code of Conduct).

16. The board may wish to consider other criteria, for example:

- Experience of community leadership within the Whau Local Board area
- An empathy with the cultural diversity of the Whau Local Board area
- Has operated in a governance role
- Experience or knowledge of local government
- Is an excellent communicator
- Has an ability to evaluate and interpret information.

17. Proposed timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 July 2019</td>
<td>Board meets at scheduled ordinary meeting to make a decision. Resolution made to appoint or leave vacant, under section 117(3) of Local Electoral Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 July 2019</td>
<td>If appointment is made, candidate(s) informed of the board’s decision by nominated elected representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July 2019</td>
<td>If no appointment is made, the resolution will also be publicised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If appointment made provide public notice via the next available publication of local newspapers and minutes, providing the resolution and the process and/or criteria by which the person named in the resolution was selected for appointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 August 2019</td>
<td>If appointment made confirm appointment at the next scheduled business meeting; new member to make their Statutory Declaration. Section 118 (2) of the Local Electoral Act provides that the person appointed is for all purposes to be treated as having been elected to fill the vacancy on the date at which the appointment is confirmed. Term of office does not start until there has been a resolution confirming the appointment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

18. The short-term change to one elected member’s position would not significantly impact on the status quo of the Whau Local Board.

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

19. The recommendations contained within this report fall within the local boards legislative responsibilities to respond to an elected member vacancy on the local board.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori  
Māori impact statement

20. As of Friday 19 July, nominations open for the 12 October 2019 triennium elections, which are open to all.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
21. There are no financial implications of this decision as it falls within existing operational and governance budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
22. The local board would be at risk of not meeting its legislative obligations if it fails to make a decision on this matter.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
23. Subsequent to the decision Local Board Services will operationalise and manage next steps.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mark Macfarlane - Democracy Advisor - Whau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To respond to requests on transport-related matters, provide an update on the current status of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF), provide a summary of consultation material sent to the board and provide transport related information on matters of specific application and interest to the Whau Local Board and its community.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. In particular, this report:
   • Provides updates on the Local Board Transport Fund projects in the Whau Local Board Area.
   • Notes consultation information sent to the Board for feedback and, details decisions of the Traffic Control Committee as they affect the Board area.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Whau Local Board:
   a) receive Auckland Transport’s update for July 2019.

Horopaki

Context
3. This report updates the board on Auckland Transport (AT) projects and operations in the local board area, it updates the board on their advocacy and consultations, and includes information on the status of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund.

4. Auckland Transport is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. We report on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in our Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within the governance of Auckland on behalf of their local communities.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice
5. The Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council and delivered by Auckland Transport. Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they believe are important but are not part of Auckland Transport’s work programme. Projects must also:
   • be safe
   • not impede network efficiency
   • be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks can be considered
6. The Whau Local Board has allocated all their funding available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whau Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds Available in current political term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount committed to date on projects approved for design and/or construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget left</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avondale Streetscape Project Update

7. An external project manager has recently been engaged to manage this project on behalf of Auckland Transport.

8. The current phase of work involves project familiarisation, meeting with the various project partners and developing a Project Plan (including timeframes) for discussion with the Local Board in August or beginning of September through a workshop.

Community Safety Fund Update

9. Auckland Transport has prepared a separate report for the Local Board to consider what project(s) they would like to allocate their funds to.

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

Parking Around Avondale Station

10. Next year (2020) Auckland Transport (AT) is scheduled to undertake a comprehensive parking study in Avondale town centre. AT will make a note of this request and proper consideration will be given to this area as part of town centre study.

11. AT is also aware of projects that Panuku is undertaking in Avondale. AT will endeavor to work closely with Panuku and where possible to review parking around these projects and recommend any appropriate changes as part of these projects.

Saltaire Street Request For Pedestrian Crossing/Traffic Lights

12. Auckland Transport is currently undertaking a number of projects on arterial roads such as Great North Road, which will look at ways to improve the movement of public transport as well as increasing safety for active modes of travel such as cycling and walking. These changes will also impact the intersections with these arterial roads, such as the Saltaire Street intersection.

13. It is anticipated that consultation with Local Boards, residents, and businesses will form part of the design process. This will enable these projects to deliver an improved road safety environment, which meets the needs of local residents and visitors. As these projects are currently in the early stages, AT have no detailed timescales on when consultation will be available, nor when any changes will occur.

14. Auckland Transport will keep the board updated on progress.

Consultation documents on proposed improvements

15. Consultation documents for the following proposals have been provided to the Whau Local Board for its feedback and are summarised here for information purposes only.

16. Following consultation, Auckland Transport considers the feedback received and determines whether to proceed further with the proposal as consulted on or amend the proposal if changes are considered necessary.
17. The Whau Local Board were in support of the above consultation.

**Auckland Transport’s Traffic Control Committee (TCC) report**

18. Decisions of the TCC during the month of April 2019 affecting the Whau Local Board area are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Street (Suburb)</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Nature of Restriction</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-April-19</td>
<td>Maui Pomare Street, Whitney Street, Blockhouse Bay</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times</td>
<td>CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-May-19</td>
<td>Blockhouse Bay Road, Donovan Street, White Swan Road, Gill Crescent, Gilfillan Street, Lewis Street, Marshall Laing Avenue, Haycock Avenue, Ellis Avenue, Pascoe Street, Rathlin Street, Mt Roskill</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</td>
<td>Lane Arrow Markings, No Stopping At All Times, Clearway, Bus Stop, Bus Shelter, Traffic Island, Pedestrian Crossing, School Crossing Point, School Patrol, Flush Median, Traffic Island, Stop Control, Give-Way Control, Traffic Signal Control, Edge Lines</td>
<td>CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Lynn to Avondale Shared Use Path Timeline Update**

19. Tendering and Award milestones

- 05 April 2019: Tender released for construction of all stages
- 15 May April 2019: Tender close
- June 2019: Tender awarded

20. Consents milestones

- 15 March 2019 lodged Resource Consents for Stage 3;
- 05 May 2019: Planned lodgement of Resource Consents for Stage 1
- TBC: Planned lodgement Resource Consents for Stages 2a and 2b;

**Wolverton Street Culvert Project Update**

21. The Wolverton Street culvert project is now expected to begin in 4-6 weeks. The project team is reviewing construction methodologies to ensure the least impact on the road network.

22. The current proposed construction plan is:
   - Culvert 1 - September 2019- March 2021
   - The new culvert is a top down bridge construction consisting of bored piles and
23. Culvert 2 - July 2019 - September 2020
   • A new triple barrel 3m diameter pipe culvert is to be constructed off line to the existing culvert. A tunnel boring machine will be used to bore and thrust the new pipe culverts beneath the road over a 12 month period, before moving to complete the stream works.

24. Traffic management plan:
   • The road will be widened at Culvert 1 to accommodate a 3 lane temporary tidal flow traffic setup
   • Tidal flow arrangement - starts mid-August 2019 for 12 months
   • The tidal flow system will see two lanes used for peak traffic flows and a single in the opposite direction. The tidal flow refers to the AM and PM changeover to always have 2 lanes of traffic flowing in the peak direction.

25. More information about the project and how the tidal flow traffic setup will work will be provided before the commencement of work.

 Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
 Māori impact statement

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

 Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
 Financial implications

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

 Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
 Risks and mitigations

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

 Ngā koringa ā-muri
 Next steps

29. The forward works programme in the Whau Local Board area could change from the advice provided here if circumstances change.

30. Auckland Transport has risk management strategies in place for the transport projects undertaken in the local board area.

 Ngā tāpirihanga
 Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

 Ngā kaihaina
 Signatories

| Author                        | Owena Schuster, Elected Member Relationship Manager |
## Authorisers

| Authorisers | Jonathan Anyon, Manager Elected Members Relationship Unit  
Glen Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau |
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. The purpose of the report is for the Board to consider how to allocate its share of the Auckland Transport Community Safety Fund to road safety projects in its area and to decide on a prioritised list of projects to fully utilise the Whau Local Board area’s allocation of the fund.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Board has put forward two projects after consideration in a briefing with the Chairperson and one other member. The projects put forward have been assessed, scoped and an estimated cost developed by Auckland Transport. The scope and costs were considered at a further briefing with the Chairperson prior to the meeting.

3. It is recommended that the Board prioritise both the projects even though funds allocated to the Whau Local Board will only be sufficient to upgrade the roundabout, given the current estimate, however, should the roundabout project were to be completed for less than the estimate, there would be a scoped project ready to be subsequently progressed.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Whau Local Board:

a) endorse the following projects in priority order to utilise the Auckland Transport Community Safety Fund allocated to the Whau Local Board area:
   i) Blockhouse Bay Roundabout Safety Upgrade
   ii) Veronica Street pedestrian crossing

b) allocate sufficient budget from it’s upcoming 2020-23 Local Board Transport Capital Fund to top up the Community Safety Fund and allow both the above projects to be completed.

Horopaki
Context
4. The 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan allocated $20 million for Financial Year 2019/2020 and Financial Year 2020/2021 for local initiatives in road safety. ($5 million in Financial Year 2019/2020 and $15 million in Financial Year 2020/2021). In order to promote safety at the local community level, the fund is apportioned to each local board area based on a formula that focuses on the numbers of Deaths and Serious Injuries (DSI) in that area.

5. The objective is to accelerate local community-initiated safety projects, around identified high-risk locations and local schools. Local Boards were invited to submit proposals for projects addressing safety issues their communities have identified and also worked with Auckland Transport’s Community Transport Team to identify projects using the new toolbox developed for the Safe School Streets pilot.

6. The Whau Local Board share of the Community Safety Fund is $800,168 over the two years.
7. Criteria for the fund includes physical measures raised by the local community to prevent, control or mitigate identified local road and street safety hazards which expose people using any form of road and street transport to demonstrable hazards which may result in death or serious harm. Individual project cost is to be no greater than $1 million. Projects must consist of best practice components, conform to AT standards and comply with New Zealand law.

8. The fund does not cover the following:
   - Projects that are funded by existing AT road safety or other capital works programmes including, but not limited to setting speed limits, seal extensions, maintenance, renewals and planned footpath upgrades (but can be used to augment these projects).
   - Projects not within the street, including parks, rail corridor, beaches and property not owned or controlled by AT.
   - Projects that have unacceptable effects on network efficiency or introduce unacceptable secondary hazards or effects.
   - Projects with an unacceptably high maintenance cost.
   - Projects that clash with other planned public projects.
   - Complex projects that may take greater than 2 years to deliver including but not limited to projects requiring significant engineered structures, complex resource consents and complex traffic modelling.
   - Projects containing unconventional or unproven components including new trials or pilot projects.
   - Projects or components of projects that have no demonstrable safety benefit unless they are integral with a safety project.

9. That list of projects has now been costed by AT. If this costing is more than the budget allocated to the particular local board under this funding, then it has the option of using any of it’s available Local Board Transport Capital Fund to top up the project budget.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

10. The list of projects put forward for assessment and costing by the Board is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Blockhouse Bay Roundabout Safety Upgrade | Lower speeds, less driver confusion, improved amenity, improved perceptions of safety and encouragement of active modes. | PASS | Best option to address the identified hazard: Consultation plan attached Includes:  
- Raising existing zebras  
- New raised zebra  
- Kerb buildouts  
- High friction surfacing | $800,000 | CSFW H1.1 |
### Community Safety Project Proposals – Whau Local Board July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Street pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>This is a very busy area for pedestrian traffic with shoppers walking to and from Lynn Mall and the train station. There is currently nowhere to safely cross leading to risk-taking behaviour by pedestrians and near misses.</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Best option to address the hazard is a pedestrian crossing with a raised table (raised zebra)</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>CSFW H1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

**Council group impacts and views**

11. The impact of information (or decisions) in this report is/are confined to AT and do/does not impact on other parts of the Council group.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

12. The projects allocated funding in this report will improve the road safety environment in the communities within the Whau Local Board area.

**Tauākī whakaaweave Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

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

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

14. The Whau Local Board area’s allocation of the Community Safety Fund is fully utilised.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

15. There are no risks associated with receiving this report.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

16. Design and construction of approved list of projects.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Owena Schuster, Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon, Manager Elected Members Relationship Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te Tohu o Te Auaunga (Oakley Creek) Implementation Strategy - Whau
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
1. The Te Auaunga (Oakley Creek) Vision and Restoration Strategy for the Upper Catchment was published by the Puketāpapa Local Board in 2016 and identified community recognition and engagement as key to the successful restoration of the awa.
2. This vision was also shared by the Albert-Eden and Whau local boards, with sister strategies adopted for the lower catchments of Te Auaunga.
3. To help raise community awareness and give the awa a sense of place, the Puketāpapa Local Board funded the development of a Tohu to represent the whole of Te Auaunga (Oakley Creek).
4. Following its adoption, the Whau, Puketāpapa, and Albert-Eden local boards funded the production of a design guide for the Tohu. This was subsequently adopted in October 2018.
5. A partnership between three local boards, nine mana whenua groups and other stakeholders (including Friends of Oakley Creek), contributed to the production of Implementation Strategies for each local board. The resulting documents set out the initial strategy for implementation of the Tohu.
6. Adoption of the Implementation Strategy by each of the three local boards will support an integrated approach for use of the Tohu across the entire catchment, and demonstrate commitment to raising the profile of this awa.
7. This report specifically seeks the adoption of the Te Tohu o Te Auaunga Implementation Strategy dated March 2019 for Whau (Attachment A, Appendix C).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Whau Local Board:

a) adopt the Te Tohu o Te Auaunga Implementation Strategy for Whau dated March 2019.

Horopaki
Context
8. Te Auaunga is the longest urban stream in Auckland, flowing over fifteen kilometers from its headwaters in Puketāpapa through the Whau and Albert-Eden local board areas with its mouth at the Waitemata Harbour.
9. Sections of the catchment have been extensively modified and are polluted. This negatively impacts the health of the awa and the harbour.
10. The Te Auaunga Vision and Restoration Strategy for the Upper Catchment, was published by the Puketapapa Local Board in 2016, and identified a number of high level objectives for restoration of the lower catchment.

11. This vision was also shared by the Albert-Eden and Whau local boards, with sister strategies adopted for the lower catchments of Te Auaunga.

12. The Tohu design was adopted in 2017, and Tohu design guide in 2018, by all three local boards.

13. Following this, the Te Tohu o Te Auaunga Implementation Strategy for Whau was developed collaboratively between council staff, three local boards, nine mana whenua groups and other stakeholders, including the Friends of Oakley Creek.

14. The Implementation Strategy outlines which elements from the design guide will be prioritised for delivery over the next 3-5 years.

15. It also indicates locations where the Tohu could be installed.

16. The plan embraces six key elements (Attachment A, Appendix C)
   - Mauri Stone
   - Interpretive Signage
   - Art Installation
   - Milestone Markers
   - Pou Whenua
   - Riparian Planting.

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

17. The Whau, Puketapapa and Albert-Eden local boards worked collaboratively with mana whenua and other stakeholders to provide input into the Implementation Strategy.

18. The strategy was workshopped with the board 22 November 2018 and the awa-wide strategy was the topic of a governance hui 26 February 2019. Feedback from these hui was incorporated into the final document.

19. Adoption of Te Tohu o Te Auaunga Implementation Strategy will result in increased community engagement and awareness of the importance of the awa.

20. Adoption of the Implementation Strategy responds to a key outcome identified in the Whau Local Board Plan 2014 around the development of great communities across the Whau.

21. In addition, the Whau Open Space Network Plan 2017 indicates that “provision of signage that names the Whau’s streams will raise awareness of the waterways and contribute to how they are valued”.

22. Adoption of this strategy also reflects the desire of Auckland Council to deliver the vision of the world’s most liveable city, including a Māori identity that is Auckland’s point of difference in the world.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

23. Mana whenua were engaged as a partner throughout the development of the Tohu and design guide. Representatives from Te Akitai Waiohua, Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Whātua Orākei, Te Kawerau a Maki, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki, and Ngāti Whanaunga helped to provide advice to guide development of the design guide at multiple hui and on a site walkover.

24. Possible future projects related to the tohu are the development of carvings or art installations along Te Auaunga. Should these projects be funded and initiated, Mana Whenua would be engaged further to provide input.
25. Te Auaunga is of cultural significance to Māori. Its waters weave together a cultural landscape of diverse cultural sites including mahinga kai, pā taua, papakāinga, wāhi nohoanga and wāhi tapu.

26. Design of the Tohu itself represents the cultural significance of the awa and symbolises the importance of mana whenua as kaitiaki (guardians) of the catchment.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

27. Additional funding will be sought in the future through the Community Facilities work programme to progress further implementation of the Tohu.

28. Future asset renewals within the catchment may also look to prioritise elements from the design guide.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

29. The exact locations for the Tohu are yet to be determined, and due to unforeseen circumstances or site constraints there is a risk not all elements will be able to be delivered. Any variations will be raised for discussion with all stakeholders and partners.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

30. Next steps are detailed investigation and design, as funding becomes available.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Te Tohu o Te Auaunga Implementation Strategy dated March 2019</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Netty Richards - Parks &amp; Places Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers | Mace Ward - General Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation  
Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau |
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Te Tohu o Te Auaunga

CONTEXT
1.1 INTRODUCTION

Te Tohu o Te Auaunga is a project supported by all three local boards through which Te Auaunga flows (Puketapapa, Albert-Eden, Whau). The purpose of the Tohu is to increase public awareness and engagement with the awa. The tohu is a symbol that was developed to represent the awa and the relationship of mana whenua with the awa. It was developed collaboratively among mana whenua and Whaotapu who are a collective of Tohunga Toi Ake and work across Tamaki Makaurau and the motu.

Mana whenua have been involved as partners in this project. Thirteen Mana whenua groups with interests in this area were invited to engage with the project. Mana whenua groups involved to date include: Te Akītai Waiohua, Ngāti Whātua ō Ōrākei, Ngāi Tai ki Tamaki, Te Kawerau Ā Maki, Te Ara Rangatahi o Te Iwi o Ngāti Te Aha Waiohua, Ngāti Tamacho, Ngāti Whānauanga and Ngāti Te Aha Waiohua. Friends of Oakley Creek have also been engaged as a key stakeholder.

This document is a design guide for applications of the tohu across the length of the awa. This will ensure an integrated approach for use of the tohu across the entire catchment. Local board specific strategies will be developed to guide local implementation stages of the tohu. Underlying this project is the vision, mission and strategy developed for Te Auaunga:

“We aim to integrate mātauranga Māori and environmentally sustainable practices to restore the mauri of Te Auaunga so it becomes a thriving, flowing creek in a green corridor that is treasured and respected for generations to come.”

Additionally, this guide is underpinned by the two themes from the strategy - Restoration of Mauri and Empowerment.
1.2
TE AUAUNGA CATCHMENT

KEY
- Local board boundaries
- Te Auaunga
- Te Auaunga feeders
- Motorway
- Main arterial road
- Te Auaunga catchment
- Open space
- Te Auaunga receiving harbour
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1.3 TE AUAUNGA EXISTING + PLANNED PROJECTS

KEY

1. Planned projects
2. Existing / complete projects
3. Combination of planned and existing / complete projects
4. Keith Hay Park – potential future naturalisation works
5. Along SH10 – potential habitat enhancement and bank stability works
6. Mount Roskill Intermediate – some riparian planting completed to date; Healthy Waters planning for comprehensive plan for the schools 2020 budget
7. Winstone to May Roads – potential future naturalisation works
8. Freeland Reserve – potential future naturalisation works
9. Along SH120 – potential habitat enhancement and bank stability works
10. Mt Roskill War Memorial Park naturalisation / mitigation Healthy Waters project and park concept plan
11. Wallissey / Underwood naturalisation works (underway)
12. Alan Wood and Kikowai Park naturalisation works (complete)
13. Open spaces from New North Rd to SH16/S120 interchange – range of existing & potential habitat enhancement and bank stability projects
14. Unitec (Waraka stream) restoration as part of housing development
15. Healthy Waters Erosion Control Works

1:25,000 @ A3
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1.4 SITES OF SIGNIFICANCE

KEY
- Te Auaunga Catchment Borders
- Molly Green Reserve – Place where Te Auaunga first emerges
- Puketāpapa / Pukerua / Mount Roskill
- Te Whitinga Bridge – Views of local Maunga
- Convergence of two streams
- Stream mouth to Waitematā Harbour
- Maunganuiwhau / Mount Eden
- Te Tatusa a Rikiraka / Three Kings
- Dwariraka / Te Ahi ka roa a Raka / Mount Albert
- Oakley Creek Waterfall
- Views to Maunga
- Local board boundaries

1:25,000 @ A3  0  0.5  1km
1.5 CHARACTER AREAS

There are 11 ‘character areas’ along Te Auaunga with distinctive uses, spatial characteristics, environmental patterns and aesthetic experiences. Defining character areas helps to frame and organise the site into areas with similar opportunities and constraints which require similar management and maintenance.

KEY

A  Character Area A - River Mouth / Estuarine
B  Character Area B - Mixed Riparian Bush
C  Character Area C - Institutional Infrastructure & Open Space [Future Residential]
D  Character Area D - Parkland & Native Riparian Bush
E  Character Area E - Residential with Pocket Parks
F  Character Area F - Wellesley / Underwood Parks - Informal Recreation Zone
G  Character Area G - War Memorial Park - Sport and Active Recreation Zone
H  Character Area H - Residential / Suburban Open Channel
I  Character Area I - Mt Roskill Schools - Institutional Infrastructure & Open Space
J  Character Area J - Industrial & Motorway
K  Character Area K - Keith Hay Park & Akarana Golf Course - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Local board boundaries

STREAM CONDITION

- Concrete dish drain
- Basalt channel
- Natural channel (Mature vegetation)
- Naturalised channel (Young regeneration)
- Naturalised channel (Open/Early Succession)
- Pipe/Culvert
- Piped over significant distance

1:25,000 @ A3
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Te Tohu o Te Auaunga

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY
2.1 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY_APPLICATIONS

**MAURI STONE**
The tohu is carved into locally sourced basalt either by itself or together with the name and/or story. The mauri stone can play a role in custom elements such as mahi toi, commissioned art, toka Māori and/or water features that might be incorporated along the awa.

**INTERPRETIVE SIGNAGE**
The tohu is included in new interpretive media, including the story of its development, purpose and significance to mana whenua. This will help raise the understanding of local communities of the tohu symbol and its story. All other interpretive signage should seek to incorporate the tohu as a wayfinding tool.

**PAINTED SURFACES**
Paint and stencilling may also be used in custom elements such as commissioned murals or on horizontal surfaces such as footpaths to indicate the presence of Te Auaunga.

**ART INSTALLATION**
The tohu and other elements can be integrated into stand alone contemporary mahi toi and commissioned art pieces. In the long term, large art installations could be considered at key sites along the awa. In the short term, local artists can be commissioned to produce smaller scale public artwork, or through rangatira Māori mana whenua can create and install contemporary mahi toi applications.

**MILESTONE MARKERS**
The tohu is incorporated into milestone markers throughout the catchment, either onto existing markers and/or into new markers.

**BOLLARD MARKINGS**
The tohu is marked onto a bollard through several possible applications, as referred to in the Design Guide. Options include carving, routing, branding, etching or metal cut-outs.

**POU WHENUA**
Pou whenua are carved wooden posts used to mark territorial boundaries or places of significance and can be used as an application method in prominent, distinct places along the awa to mark specific sites. Carvings on the pou may or may not incorporate the tohu. Mana whenua will identify the carver[s] to engage.

**RIPARIAN PLANTING**
Planting along the awa can support and enhance other tohu applications and help restore the mauri of the awa. Many sections of the awa have steep banks and/or limited riparian canopy cover and the application of riparian planting as a tohu application would complement other applications by reinforcing cues to care.

**HORIZONTAL SURFACES**
Horizontal surfaces such as footpaths, roads and kerbs can be used to communicate supporting information about the tohu such as the name, story and/or map. The horizontal surfaces will utilise the tohu colour palette and font. Applications could include, but should not be limited to; bronze casting, stickers, sand-etching and projections etc. No part of the tohu itself shall be incorporated into the horizontal surface application.
2.2 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY CATCHMENT

KEY
1 MAURI STONE
2 INTERPRETIVE SIGNAGE
3 PAINTING SURFACES
4 ART INSTALLATION
5 MILESTONE MARKERS
6 BOLLARD MARKINGS
7 POU WHENUA
8 RIPARIAN PLANTING
9 HORIZONTAL SURFACES
Appendix A

Te Tohu o Te Auaunga Implementation Strategy

ALBERT EDEN LOCAL BOARD

REV_4 | March 2019
ALBERT EDEN IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY MAP

KEY

1 MAURI STONE
   1a. Beginning walkway Waterview Reserve
   1b. Along walkway between mana whenua Sanctuary and awa
   1c. Te Auaunga Waterfall
   1d. Puhinui Reserve
   1e. Hartcott Reserve

2 INTERPRETIVE SIGNAGE
   2a. Mouth of awa
   2b. Site bridge awa where the sound of running water is audible
   2c. Te Auaunga Waterfall (bundled)

3 PAINTING SURFACES
   3a. Vertical concrete pillars of South-West Motorway

4 ART INSTALLATION
   Open space Waterview Reserve between South-West Motorway and Great North Road

5 MILESTONE MARKERS
   Located at defined positions along the walkway and awa (Locations TBC)

6 BOLLARD MARKINGS
   Installed on existing way-finding bollards (Locations TBC)

7 HORIZONTAL SURFACES
   Horizontal surface painted to indicate path of Te Auaunga which runs underwater.
Appendix B

Te Tohu o Te Auaunga Implementation Strategy

PUKETĀPAPA LOCAL BOARD

REV_4 | March 2019
PUKETĀPAPA IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY_ MAP

KEY

1. MAURI STONE
   1a. Molley Green Reserve - Site where Te Auaunga first emerges
   1b. Keith Hoy Park
   1c. May Road
   1d. War Memorial Park
   1e. Warmsley Reserve
   1f. Underwood Park

2. INTERPRETIVE SIGNAGE
   2a. Molley Green Reserve
   2b. Keith Hoy Park
   2c. Freeland Reserve
   2d. War Memorial Park
   2e. Warmsley / Underwood

3. PAINTED VERTICAL SURFACES (BRIDGES)
   3a. Richardson Road - Walkway Underwood
   3b. Beagle Road
   3c. May Road
   3d. Memorial Road
   3e. Mount Roskill Road*
   3f. Dominion Road*
   3g. Winstone Road

4. ART INSTALLATION
   Molley Green

5. MILESTONE MARKERS
   Located at defined positions along the walkway and awa (Locations TBC)

*Surface potentially unstable

1:25,000 @ A3
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Te Tohu o Te Auaunga Implementation Strategy

WHAU LOCAL BOARD

REV.4 | March 2019
WHAU
IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY_ MAP

KEY

1 MAURI STONE
Channelled Te Auaunga at Ballard Avenue

2 INTERPRETIVE SIGNAGE
2a. Lookout at entrance to Te Auaunga Walkway at Methuen Road
2b. Valoria Reserve

3 ART INSTALLATION
4a. Terraced walkway in Alan Wood Reserve south of Mokomoko Bridge
4b. Wetland in Kokowai Park

5 MILESTONE MARKERS
Located at defined positions along the walkway and awa (locations TBC)

7 POU WHENUA
Entrance to walkway from Methuen Road

8 RIPARIAN PLANTING
8a. Channelled Te Auaunga at Ballard Avenue
8b. Banks along Avondale Motor Camp

1:25,000 A3
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Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

File No.: CP2019/12255

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek local board feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery has been developed to ensure Auckland is better prepared to recover from a disaster.

3. The planning framework set out in the document:
   - Identifies community values and priorities
   - Sets a vision for recovery
   - Focuses on the consequences to be addressed in recovery
   - Focuses on building capacity and capability and addressing barriers
   - Identifies actions to build momentum.

4. It has been developed with local board engagement over 2018 and local board feedback is now sought particularly on:
   - community values
   - community priorities
   - the vision
   - the way we will work in recovery
   - the work to be done to be better prepared for recovery.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Whau Local Board:

a) endorse and provide any further feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery document.

Horopaki

Context

5. Following the Christchurch and Kaikoura earthquakes the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 was amended, and new guidelines were issued requiring better preparation for, and implementation of, recovery from a disaster.

6. Auckland Emergency Management began development of the Resilient Recovery Strategy to ensure Auckland is better prepared. This included:
   - workshops on recovery with local boards between 24 May and 12 July 2018
   - reporting back on the workshops in September 2018
• presentations to Local Board Cluster Meetings in March and November 2018
• updating local boards on the development of the Resilient Recovery Strategy in November 2018 and advising that a draft would go the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee in February 2019.

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

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice


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

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

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

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

   Being well placed means being well-prepared.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
12. Many parts of the Auckland Council group potentially become involved in responding to a disaster and subsequent recovery. The planning framework in the Pathway’s document seeks to provide clarity about what will be required to support effective collaboration across the Council group in recovery.
13. Views from across the Council group are being sought during targeted engagement through June and July 2019.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
14. Auckland’s hazards and risks may give rise to events with local, sub-regional or region-wide impacts. Their consequences will be influenced by the circumstances of the time and place in which the event took place.
15. Local board views on their community’s values and priorities are important in determining the way we will work together collaboratively in recovering from a disaster.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
16. Recovery addresses the consequences of an emergency and their impacts across the natural, social, built and economic environments. The goals, objectives and execution of recovery holds implications for iwi, environmental guardianship, Māori communities (iwi, hapu and mataawaka), marae, assets and the Māori economy.
17. Building relationships amongst Auckland’s Māori communities to develop a deeper understanding of our potential collaboration across reduction, readiness, response, resilience and recovery is a goal of Auckland Emergency Management. It is also part of the workplan arising from the planning framework set out in the Pathways document.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
18. There are no financial implications arising out of this report.
Risks and mitigations

19. Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery and the work programme it will establish are intended to address the risk of Auckland being unprepared to recover from a disaster.

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

Next steps

21. Local board feedback will be collated and considered for reporting to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee and incorporation into the final iteration of the Pathways document.
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Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

**Introduction**

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

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

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

---

**The process we followed**

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

We followed this process to:

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

---

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

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

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

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

Identifying community values and priorities

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recovery

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

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

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

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

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

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

What does Well-placed mean?

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

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

- the early commencement of organised recovery activities

---

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

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

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

Reinstatement, regeneration or enhancement?

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

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

"Over the years there has been an appreciation that reconstruction is an opportunity to build back better. Today recovery is defined as the restoration and improvement of facilities, livelihoods and living conditions of disaster-affected communities, including efforts to reduce disaster risk factors,"[4] and is reflected in the definitions for recovery and recovery in the Civil Defence Emergency Act 2002.

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

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

---

Understanding consequences and opportunities

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

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

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

![Diagram of Hazards, Event, Impact, Circumstances, Recovery]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The way we work – a partnership approach

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

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

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

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

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

Building upon existing partnerships the approach will also work across wider groups to embrace new formal and informal partnerships.
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The way we work – collaborating across formal and informal partnerships

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


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

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

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

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

The work we do – addressing barriers to recovery

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

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

- capacity and capability is available
- collaboration is supported
- recovery is communicated
- recovery is understood
- monitoring and evaluation.
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It is recognised that effective recovery requires supporting work programmes in addition to implementation of the Framework, such as:

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Building a better understanding of Recovery**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understandably, recovery is not well understood.</td>
<td>Develop a ‘Recovery story’ supported by key messages and education materials (translated in different languages).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has a limited profile beyond the CDEM sector and people with personal knowledge.</td>
<td>Leverage opportunities to raise the profile and discuss recovery with new audiences through the CDEM Group, Auckland Council group, partners and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current level of understanding is a barrier to people’s ability to anticipate and prepare in advance of an emergency event.</td>
<td>Support Auckland Emergency Management’s education and outreach programme across the five R’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland hosts a rich and diverse population by age, gender, religion, sexuality, nationality and culture. This is a strength of Auckland while also meaning specific needs might present themselves in a recovery.</td>
<td>Cultivate improved cultural awareness to be able to understand specific concerns, to enable them to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving effective recovery will require the flexibility to ensure recovery works for all Aucklanders and their communities.</td>
<td>Access and tap into resources across the Auckland Council group and externally to better communicate and engage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, understanding recovery, and being able to engage and participate may be challenging in some communities.</td>
<td>Leverage the potential of Auckland Council’s demographic Advisory Panels – Seniors, Ethnic Peoples, Pacific Peoples, Disability, Youth and Rainbow Communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The disruption to daily life and routines can be sudden and significant. Previously routine tasks become complicated and can be subject to repeated change.</td>
<td>Clear and consistent communication is critical to maintaining trust in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of upset can be exacerbated by ongoing change due to recovery activities or weather changes. Previous plans go on hold.</td>
<td>Strike a balance between ambition and achievability in planning and preparations for recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of this magnitude can be disempowering and a source of frustration and distress for many.</td>
<td>Leverage creativity, community spirit and participation in a recovery to promote solutions and assist in the recovery effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is eager to return to something that resembles what was normal before the event, as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nature of the event, its impacts and the scale of the recovery effort required inform the type and extent of recovery efforts required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capacity and capability is available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy / Local Economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption can bring business, trade and commerce to a standstill. Orders and commitments may not be met, and employees may have not work. Everybody suffers hardships without cash flow or access to money to access necessities. Disrupted supply lines may need to be restored. Distinctions between rural and urban local economies are also important. For example, seasonal activities may have needs or requirements with potential consequences for production over an extended period.</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities and mechanisms for local sourcing/procurement of goods and services during a recovery. Work with Business Associations to encourage uptake of Business Continuity Planning and practices amongst their member businesses. Leverage a better understanding of the Auckland’s and local economies through engagement with potential Task Group members for the economic environment. Leverage opportunities for youth employment. Understand the implications of seasonal cycles and underlying activities to identify factors which are critical to Auckland’s rural economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| <strong>Māori communities</strong> | |
| Recent experience of response and recovery from disasters has benefited from the participation, support and leadership of mana whenua and local iwi at all levels – from delivering services to decision making. | Develop a shared understanding of recovery within Auckland Emergency Management’s wider engagement with mana whenua and mātaawhia. Build on the opportunities for collaboration to cultivate leadership, participation and outcomes for Māori. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-existing issues</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any existing issues at the time of an event will be magnified in their effect and</td>
<td>Environmental scanning to maintain general awareness of issues and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequence.</td>
<td>challenges facing Auckland across the four recovery environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing is under pressure in Auckland, with elevated house prices and rental costs.</td>
<td>Maintain engagement with partners and stakeholders and leverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homelessness and high demand for social housing and refuge. Emergency accommodation</td>
<td>opportunities to gather information and intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be a challenge in these circumstances.</td>
<td>• in recovery planning and preparations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples health conditions, disabilities, or personal circumstances may make them</td>
<td>• through the duration of recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>especially vulnerable to sudden change and disruption to their environment.</td>
<td>Access expertise, knowledge available, information and advice through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport bottlenecks or previously known weaknesses in a network may have a</td>
<td>the membership of the task groups established to support recovery after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronounced effect in a particular event.</td>
<td>an event (see below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychosocial recovery</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International and more recent experiences in New Zealand has raised awareness of</td>
<td>Ensuring people involved in recovery maintain an awareness of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the way that emergency events can have very different impacts on people.</td>
<td>complexities of psychosocial recovery that individuals may be going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some may be unscathed, and others impacted to varying degrees. Impacts may only</td>
<td>through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become apparent after the passage of time.</td>
<td>Sharing best practice amongst experienced practitioners with and amongst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person individual circumstances can make it more difficult to cope with ongoing</td>
<td>front-line staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disruption and change, to make decisions and to support others.</td>
<td>Apply case management and debriefing principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally, individual recovery from such impacts takes time and is non-linear or</td>
<td>Psychosocial first aid training or other for all people in contact roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous, with many ‘ups’ and ‘downs’ possible.</td>
<td>Awareness raising of the psychosocial impacts on responding agencies and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff and the putting in place of support mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Task Groups

Task Groups are established to provide advice and assistance for each of the natural, social, built and economic environments.

Each Task Group has a Terms of Reference, setting out its functions, roles and responsibilities. Task Groups may also comprise sub-task groups.

Potential members are practitioners, experts or leaders in their field whose knowledge would benefit a recovery. They are generally busy people, which can be a barrier to maintaining Task Groups, keeping informed and abreast of best practice in recovery.

Further, the membership of Task Groups needs to reflect the nature and scale of the task for each event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The intensity and pressure of a response is very demanding. People in lead roles in response can be expected to be exhausted. Although the same agencies may have lead roles/key roles, they will need to identify specific staffing to support the recovery effort.</td>
<td>Establishing a pool of potential Task Group members to ensure readiness and the ability to scale a recovery proportionate to the nature of the disaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the current capacity and capability for recovery within participating agencies.</td>
<td>The pool for each recovery environment may be comprised of both:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore potential arrangements they may operate in a recovery and their staffing.</td>
<td>- a core membership comprised of people within the wider Auckland Council group / emergency sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure key staff in the recovery are different from key staff in response.</td>
<td>- a wider membership of people who might only be called upon if the event demands it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train staff for recovery as required. (potentially based on common arrangements).</td>
<td>Core members would be more involved with up to 4 meetings/exercises a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider group members would be less involved, though steps taken to ensure relationships and awareness are maintained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective recovery requires high levels of coordination and collaboration, with everyone actively participating. Achieving this level of collaboration is supported by:</td>
<td>Develop guidelines setting out the process; considerations, information/intelligence required and potential sources to asset in considering whether a recovery process needs to be activated - incorporate key elements into Standard Operating Procedures, with thresholds.</td>
<td>Share Standard Operating Procedures, plans and recovery documentation (and subsequent updates) with partners as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• strong institutional and personal relationships</td>
<td>Build and maintain institutional and personal relationships amongst key agencies.</td>
<td>Clarifying agreed roles and responsibilities amongst leading partners and key agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clear roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formalise arrangements, roles, responsibilities in key areas through developing protocols, memorandum of understanding or similar. (Key areas = support delivery of a critical service or critical resources or arrangements important in every recovery)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monitoring and evaluation

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

File No.: CP2019/13166

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity for local boards to formally provide feedback on the Productivity Commission’s (the commission) inquiry into local government funding and financing.

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

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

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

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

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

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Whau Local Board:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
19. Staff will also seek input from the Independent Māori Statutory Board.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

20. There are no financial implications in deciding to make a submission. However, there may be positive or negative financial implications if the government decides to implement any of the recommendations made by the Productivity Commission.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

21. If the local board does not contribute to the submission, then there is a risk that the Auckland Council family’s position on this inquiry will not reflect issues that are important to the local community.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

22. The council will make a submission on the draft report. Staff will prepare a submission for the Finance and Performance Committee’s consideration at its meeting on 20 August 2019.

23. A workshop to discuss the draft council submission with the Finance and Performance Committee has been scheduled for 15 August 2019.
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Auckland Council submission

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

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

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

2. This submission has been approved by the council’s Finance and Performance Committee. The address for service is Auckland Council, Private Bag 92360, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142.

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

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

Executive summary

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

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

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

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

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

7. The council also considers there is scope for the government to make changes to enhance the flexibility of existing funding tools reflecting the developing trust between government and the council. These tools include rates, fuel taxes, development contributions and New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) subsidies. Useful changes could include:
   - allowing the regional fuel tax and development contributions to be set based on broad future funding intentions rather than specific identified projects that limit the council’s ability to respond to the development market and changing transport priorities.
Item 16

- amending NZTA subsidy level rules to reflect the agreement on the share of local and central government funding in the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP)
- provide the council with greater information gathering powers to establish how properties are being used so rates can be set fairly. At present ratepayers aren't required to advise the council on how they are using their land.
Financing and funding challenges

Infrastructure and investment demand

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Financing**

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

**Funding**

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

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

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

**Solutions**

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

**New sources of financing**

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

---

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

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

Regional fuel tax and NZTA transport funding

25. To manage the demands for greater investment noted above within these revenue constraints the council replaced the Interim Transport Levy, a targeted rate set per separately used or inhabited part of the rating unit,2 with a regional fuel tax developed in conjunction with central government. The regional fuel tax provides a stronger connection between those paying and road users. Raising the cost of driving also serves to provide incentives to reduce pollution and congestion. However, there are concerns that the higher cost of fuel most impacts on those on lower incomes for whom fuel makes up a greater proportion of expenditure and who are likely to live in areas further from main centres and in areas with less transport options.

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

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

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

Funding economic growth

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

---

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

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

Amendments to development contributions legislation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other funding commentary

Taxation relationship with government

38. The Local Government Act 2002 and SOLGM submissions raise the issue of the application of GST to rates and the Crown’s exemption from rates and development contributions. The council has also previously noted these issues.

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

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

Rates and funding fairness and affordability

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rates rebates

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

Expansion of local government responsibilities

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

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

Local income and sales taxes

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

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

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

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

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

Tax increment financing

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

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

Local property tax

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

7.2 Financing growth infrastructure

Purpose

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

Summary

2. The Auckland Unitary Plan has provided sufficient zoning capacity to support substantial amounts of new housing development. However, the capacity of infrastructure needed to support these new houses is a constraint.

3. The infrastructure required to support growth includes arterial roads, public transport works, stormwater drains, sewer mains, pump stations, reservoirs, water mains, parks and community facilities.

4. Auckland Council’s current financial strategy is to primarily finance this kind of housing-related infrastructure through borrowings which are repaid over time from development contributions or Watercare’s infrastructure growth charges which are paid by developers as and when they develop their land.

5. While this general approach will continue, there are several reasons why we need to consider making some adjustments:
   a) the infrastructure costs per dwelling in some areas are considerably higher than our current charges and so some pricing increases will be necessary
   b) the council faces borrowing constraints
   c) many growth infrastructure projects also provide benefits to existing dwellings, and it is not appropriate to recover all of the infrastructure costs through development contributions which are charged on new developments. These infrastructure projects can only proceed if another funding source is available to cover the gap in funding.
   d) charging large one-off payments when developers choose to develop their land may incentivise land banking rather than early release of land supply to market.

6. To complement and enhance our existing approach, we are proposing to:
   a) review development contribution pricing in key growth areas
   b) be ready to introduce new growth infrastructure targeted rates in key growth areas
   c) work with central government on the establishment of new legal entities to take a lead role in financing this infrastructure in a way that doesn’t rely on significant increases in council debt.

Background

The growth challenge

7. Auckland faces significant challenges in funding its critical infrastructure, including its transport and wastewater network. Auckland’s population has grown by over 45,000 per year for the past two years, and is some four to five years ahead of official population growth projections.

8. Given these pressures, Auckland Council is firmly committed to increasing the supply of land for housing, as evidenced by the significant lift in zoning capacity enabled by the Auckland Unitary Plan. However, the council’s lack of debt headroom is constraining our ability to provide the necessary infrastructure to service this land.
Current financial strategy and funding policy

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

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

Development contributions

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

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

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

Infrastructure growth charges

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

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

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

Growth infrastructure targeted rates:

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

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

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

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

**Infrastructure demand in key growth areas**

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

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

- Kumau, Whenuapai and Redhills in the Northwest
- Silverdale, Dairy Flat, Wainui and Warkworth in the North
- Pupeke, Drury, Paeraata and Takapuna in the South.

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

24. Auckland Council has also been working closely with central government on finding a way to enable investment in $600 million of growth infrastructure to support 5,500 additional houses in Wainui in Auckland’s North and 17,300 houses in the South.

**Investment partnership model**

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

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

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

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

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

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

31. The main options are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attachments

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Impact on developers/land owners</th>
<th>Wider policy implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option One:</strong></td>
<td>Do nothing – growth infrastructure investment is not built at the pace needed to keep up with demand.</td>
<td>• Does not impose any additional council charges on anyone • Leaves it to private landowners to work together to build and finance critical infrastructure to support their developments</td>
<td>• No additional charges, would only pay current development contributions and infrastructure growth charges if they are able to develop • Many land owners will be unable to develop due to lack of infrastructure capacity</td>
<td>• Auckland’s housing issues highly likely to be further exacerbated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Option Two:** | Adopt a strategy of using higher development contributions (DC) and infrastructure growth charges (IGC) in the key growth areas to help pay for any additional infrastructure | • Developers should make a fair contribution to the cost of the infrastructure that enables their development • Consistent with well-established approach to paying for growth infrastructure | • Developers would pay higher combined (DC plus IGC) charges as follows:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>$30k</td>
<td>$40-50k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>$25k</td>
<td>$40-65k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>$21k</td>
<td>$40-55k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNZ areas</td>
<td>$30k</td>
<td>$35-45k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land owners would be able to develop, but would not have to contribute anything towards the cost of the infrastructure until they choose to develop</td>
<td>• May enable faster housing development • The use of this strategy may be limited by the availability of council debt headroom • Potentially creates a greater incentive to land bank rather than release land early for development • This policy tool does not provide a mechanism to recover any proportion of infrastructure costs that primarily benefit existing housing units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*The cost per house for the infrastructure to support the development of all the land provided for in the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (FULLS) is in the range of $30k to $110k. The cost per house noted in the table above has been assessed on a marginal approach based on the infrastructure to support the developments in these areas even though they may benefit from some of the wider investments in the FULLS.*
### Option Three

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

- Land owners should make a fair contribution to the cost of the infrastructure that enables their land to be developed.

### Impact on developers/land owners

- Land owners would pay new targeted rates in addition to current DCs and IGCs as follows:
  - **Area**
  - **Proposed new rate**
    - North West: $900-$1,800
    - North: $1,300-$3,500
    - South: $1,100-$2,400
    - HNZ areas: $500-$1,100

- Rates would apply for a 20 year period from when land is development ready.
- Land owners would be able to develop and would be required to pay regardless of whether they choose to develop now or wait.
- Where land is held in large blocks, the annual targeted rate will also be charged in e.g. a block large enough for 100 houses with a $2,000 targeted rate would pay $200,000 per annum.

### Wider policy implications

- Likely to enable and incentivise faster housing development.
- The use of this strategy may be limited by the availability of council debt headroom.
- Targeted rate may unintentionally impact on some smaller landowners in the area that will never develop their land.
- However, there are a range of rates policy tools available to the council to address those issues.
- Able to also charge a fair share of costs to existing housing units that also benefit from the infrastructure.

### Option Four

In conjunction with options (i) and/or (iii) implement an investment partnership model to finance growth infrastructure.

- Enables faster housing development in a way that is not limited by the availability of council debt headroom.
- Provides an opportunity for a commercially focused entity with relevant skills and
- Landowners will be able to negotiate with a commercially focused entity to access infrastructure financing.
- Developers/land owners will ultimately need to pay higher charges in some form to cover the cost of the growth infrastructure. This could take the form of higher DCs and/or IGCs, new targeted rates, higher user charges or voluntary payments under a negotiated contract.

### Wider policy implications

- Likely to enable faster and larger-scale housing development that is not limited by council debt headroom.
- A third party (not the council) would take substantial risk such as the risk that development is

*As note 1 above.*
## Section 7: Additional supporting information

### 7.2 Financing growth infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Impact on developers/land owners</th>
<th>Wider policy implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Item 16 | Expertise to take a lead role in negotiating infrastructure financing arrangements with developers | • Where private contracts are involved, land owners may need to accept a charge on the land title recognising the obligation  
• Changes may be slightly higher under an investment partnership model as investors (whether public or private sector) will require a rate of return on their investment that fairly reflects the risks they are taking around the timing of when they will be repaid | taken up over longer time frames than anticipated  
The Auckland Council group will still lead the construction of the infrastructure and will be the long-term asset owner and operator  
Implementation of the investment partnership model could involve the establishment of a new council controlled organisation |
Attachment B: Issues for consideration – targeted rates for growth infrastructure

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

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

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

1. Timing

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

Commencement

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

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

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

Lifespan

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

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

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

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

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

Capital value

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

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

Land value

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

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

Land area

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

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

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

**Conclusion**

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

**3. Managing the impact on different land owners**

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

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

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

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

The options are:

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

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

4. Informed buyers

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

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

Further assurance could be provided that buyers, and their advisers, are familiar with the obligations by allowing the obligation to be recorded on a property’s title. To provide for this legislative change will be required to allow the council to record this charge on land title.
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15 February 2019

To: Chair, Finance and Performance Committee
    Desley Simpson, Deputy Chair, Finance and Performance Committee

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

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

From: Waitematā Local Board

Purpose

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

Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Issues and Options Paper Key Topics

Local government in New Zealand

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

How funding and financing currently works

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Future Funding and Financing**

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

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

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

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

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

3. However, in practice the shared decision-making model is inherently unequal because the decision as to how local boards are funded is made by the governing body. Auckland Council’s 2015 Governance Framework Review found that “The funding policy is highly paternalistic, the governing body sets the budgets for each local board and directs where the majority of funding can be spent”. Additionally, it noted that “local boards lack clear accountability to their voters for their decisions. …ultimately any decision-making role is undermined where the decision-maker does not have the responsibility for funding those decisions.”

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

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

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


Angela Dalton
Chairperson, Manurewa Local Board
At a glance

Local government funding and financing
Draft report – July 2019

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

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

High-performing local government is vital for community wellbeing

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

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

The current funding and financing framework is broadly sound

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

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

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

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

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

The best way to use the current funding tools

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

Improving equity

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

New funding tools are needed to address key pressures

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

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

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

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

Value capture and user charging would help growth "pay for itself"

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

Special Purpose Vehicles could help councils nearing their debt limits

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

Considering two additional options

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

Adapting to climate change is a significant challenge

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

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

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

**Funding support for tourism hotspots**

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

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

**Need to reset the relationship with central government**

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

**A new regulatory regime for the three waters**

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

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

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

New Zealand Productivity Commission
www.productivity.govt.nz
Local government funding & financing at a glance

Rates have grown in line with population and incomes

- Rates to GNI
- Rates per person to household disposable income

Local government spending growth has been focused on essential infrastructure

- Road and water accounts for 56% of opex over the last decade
- Capex has had flow-on effects to opex (depreciation and interest)
- The prices faced by local government grew faster than those for general consumers
- Real local government expenditure growth per person has been modest (1.2% a year)
- Debt has risen significantly, but for most councils and the sector as a whole, is not a concern

The current funding and financing framework is broadly sound

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

The best way of using the current funding tools

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

Better use of existing tools

- General rates
- Targeted rates (incl. uniform charges)
- Fees and user charges
- Development contributions
- Central government funding
- Debt

Funding pressures

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

Case study: 3 waters performance

Funding gaps

Reforms and new tools

- Special Purpose Vehicles
- Volumetric charging for wastewater
- Road congestion pricing
- Value capture
- Payment based on new building work
- “Partners in Regulation” protocol
- Extended NZTA model
- Local Government Resilience Fund and Agency
- Nationally-led science and legal framework
- New regulatory regime and regulator

Equity and affordability

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

Improved decision making and performance

- Capability building
- Streamlined Long-Term Plans
- Fundamental review of performance reporting regime
- Encourage uptake of existing performance improvement and benchmarking programmes
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the record of the workshop held in June 2019 by the Whau Local Board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Briefings provided at the workshop held are as follows:
   a) 19 June 2019
      ii) Parks Sports and Recreation - Play Provision Assessment
      iii) Local Board Services - Elected Member Survey

3.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Whau Local Board:
a) confirm the record of the workshop held on 19 June 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Workshop Record for 19 June 2019</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mark Macfarlane - Democracy Advisor - Wahu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whau Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Whau Local Board held at the Whau Local Board boardroom, 31 Totara Avenue, New Lynn, Auckland on Wednesday 19 June 2019, commencing at 9:15 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Tracy Mulholland
Members: Catherine Farmer; David Whitley, Derek Battersby, QSM, JP, Susan Zhu arrived 9.31am
Apologies: Duncan Macdonald, Te’vea Matafa'i
Also present: Glenn Boyd, Antonina Georgetti, Michelle Hutchinson
Notes: Meeting opened by Chair at 9:00 am.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Item 1: Administration/ Operations**  
Presenters: LB Staff and Chair  
Time: 9:15 – 9:25 am | Keeping informed | Chair advised board members against interfering in the regional process surrounding the Avondale Jockey Club issue.  
RM reminded members of protocols around Code of Conduct.  
The board was advised that removal of trees in Gittos Domain is being progressed in the coming school holidays.  
The board asked RM to push progress on Transit Lane way renewal.  
The board discussed the possibility of opening up workshops to the public in the new term. |
| **Item 2: Whau Quick Response Round Three 2018/2019**  
Presenters: Erin Shin  
Time: 9:25 – 9:42 | Engagement | Grants Advisor presented applications for Round Three. Members noted Walking Samoans great work with Pacific Wardens; monitoring of Stronger and Safer Community for Families programme; reminder to Nandran (An Indian Bengali Association) to provide accountability report. All grants agreed will be presented in July report. |
<p>| <strong>Item 3: Play Provision Assessment</strong> | Engagement | The Whau Play report presented to members. Board asked for follow up meeting with all board members and officers including Work Programme Lead Officer with summarised version. Purpose |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Presenters:                       |                   | **Presenters:** Netty Richards  
Leigh Wilson (from Bespoke)                                              | is to review and define board position and feedback into future work programme, prior to workshop and July board meeting.  
Chair thanked Bespoke for work done to date. It was noted that this report supports the board’s recommendation to retain 10 Crown Lynn Place for an enhanced open space in a high density housing area. |
| Time:                             |                   | **Time:** 9:42am – 10.23am                                                                                                                                  |
| Item 4: Elected Member Survey    | Keeping Informed  | **Presenters:** Glenn Boyd  
**Time:** 10.25 – 10.37am                                                                                       | RM presented summary of results. Continue focus on quality advice, culture of staff impartiality and respect; require departments to identify actions to respond to the survey findings and report to ELT and elected members after 3 months. Overall increasing trend, key driver is quality advice to members. |

The workshop concluded at 10.40am.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
[link to Auckland Council's quality advice programme]
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Whau Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.
3. The governance forward work calendars are part of Auckland Council’s quality advice programme and aim to support local boards’ governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is expected and when
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar also aims to provide guidance for staff supporting local boards and greater transparency for the public.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Whau Local Board:
a) receive the governance forward work calendar for 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>Governance Forward Work Calendar - July 2019</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mark Macfarlane - Democracy Advisor - Whau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 8.1</th>
<th>Attachment A</th>
<th>5G Free Deputation</th>
<th>Page 119</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 8.1</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
<td>5G Deputation Presentation</td>
<td>Page 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5G SAFE WEST AUCKLAND

24 July 2019 at 6pm
31 Totara Ave, New Lynn

5G FREE DEPUTATION
WHAU LOCAL BOARD

Topic:
Dangers of 5G Electromagnetic radio-frequency radiation, used by the Telecommunications industry, which is harmful to Health and Environment.

Purpose:
Prevent 5G wireless roll-out by Telcos until independent scientific research is done on cumulative biological effects on human health.

Proposal:
Whau Local Board recommends that Auckland Council invoke the Precautionary Principle to Protect the Health, Safety and well-being of the community and the environment.

Presenters: Janine Johnson, Laurie Ross & Katherine Smith
Concerned Citizens for 5G FREE West Auckland and New Zealand
INTRODUCTION - Janine Johnson
We have a family business at 6A Honan Place in Avondale. I have become increasingly concerned with the amount of cell towers that are being installed so close to work places and child care centers. We currently have a Spark cell tower 45m away from our front door of our business. After 2 years operating at this premises I have noticed a decline in my health which raised concerns about the impact that the cell tower might be having on me. Especially as I am a health warrior and have not seen a doctor in 20 years. After getting an expert in to do EMF testing, we were horrified to find that the radiation levels are 1000 times higher than is biologically safe. This same tower is 250m from a child care centre that my granddaughter attends and that raises huge warning flags for long term health and safety for our children who are 10 times more susceptible to the effects of EMF.

The problem is the general public are totally unaware of the dangerously high levels of radiation they are being exposed to and until you actually get a specialist in to test the EMF levels in your home or surrounding environment you will continue in ignorant bliss, never taken precautions or action steps to protect yourself and your family.

4G cell towers are increasing in numbers and we are seeing them popping up everywhere without consultation to local residence or in consideration to childcare centers or schools. Now a whole new level of 5G radiation is going to be added on top of the existing blanket network coverage.

There is enough scientific evidence exposing the irresponsible danger of allowing 5G to be rolled out and I ask the members of the Whau Local Board to take on board the information now being presented to you by Katherine Smith/ Laurie Ross with the same serious consideration as has been shown when considering the risk and dangers of nuclear and GMO coming to our shores.
DANGERS OF ELECTROMAGNETIC FREQUENCIES & 5G

5G EMF wireless radio Frequency radiation is planned to roll out in Auckland communities in 2020

WITHOUT PUBLIC CONSULTATION OR CONSENT CONTRARY TO DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES

Telcom Industry Argument

The NZ telecommunications companies (Vodafone, Spark and 2 Degrees) are selling the need for 5G to provide faster internet speeds and downloads and putting everything under the electronic control of ‘Smart’ devices – which they sell, e.g. cell phones, meters, cars, toasters, fridges, office equipment, etc

Hence it is profit driven marketing of 5G ‘smart’ products and wireless technology that makes it appear necessary, desirable and indispensable.

Millions of dollars for promotion of ‘driverless cars’ and 5G ‘smart’ gadgets

Telcos denial of dangers is based on outdated 1998 industry standards of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP)

Conflicts of Interest may arise in Official Reports on Radiofrequency radiation (see Sue Pocket PhD article May 2019 www.mdpi.com/journal/magnetochemistry

How 5G Works

4G uses microwave bands between 700 MHz and 3 GHz.

5G will use non-ionizing millimeter waves between 30-300 GHz which has been used by the military since the end of the World War as a military weapon.

This is 300 times more powerful than 4G and 200 times faster

These higher frequencies have short wavelengths and are categorically more dangerous

5G EMF waves can only travel short distances and will require antennas every 100-500 meters
Impact of 5G on Health & Environment

*5G non-ionising (non-thermal) pulsating radiation is 100s of times greater than 4G.

Long term exposure increases the risks to health, especially of children whose brains and bodies are still forming, pregnant women and elderly.

**Problems Include**: Cancer, diabetes, brain and heart diseases, skin and eye problems, Endocrine disruption, DNA damage, Neurological, Reproductive and Immune system disorders, etc.

There is substantial scientific medical research e.g. Physicians for Safe Technology (www.MDSafeTech.org) to back up these claims

The 5G frequency penetrates leaves which die and necessitates massive tree removal as they obstruct transmission.

Environmental loss of trees and pollinating insects, will worsen the Climate crisis, increase carbon emissions and dramatically lower agricultural productivity etc.

**More Dangers**

*Govt and industry in the past have made costly mistakes in standards, regulations and monitoring of products and technologies eg. leaded petrol, asbestos, DDT, tobacco, etc so it is reasonable for the public to ask for safeguards

*5G is a military technology called 'active denial systems' which is used in 'crowd control' and 'non-lethal weapons' for cyber warfare

*Smart devices' are a vehicle for general invasion of privacy and public surveillance in the home and office and the data gathered could be used for other purposes.

*Rockets will launch 20,000 satellites over the next decade that will beam 24/7 blanketing the Earth and space with inescapable microwave radiation. 'Electrosmog' pollution of the atmosphere presents problems for navigation and weather prediction.

**Question**: Should everyone be forced to accept increased radiation in the atmosphere that will adversely affect our bodies, minds and the environment -just because some people want it?
Global Public Concern & Resistance

The ‘International Appeal for a 5G Moratorium on Earth and in Space’ to the UN and WHO need to heed the warning from 230 scientists and doctors [https://www.5gspaceappeal.org/the-appeal](https://www.5gspaceappeal.org/the-appeal) who have signed an appeal to the UN & World Health Organisation.

The Premier of Brussels has refused 5G installations stating that “The people of Brussels are not guinea pigs whose health I can sell at a profit.”

There is a growing number of civic groups and cities who are refusing 5G until proven safe. These include Geneva and several Swiss Cantons, municipalities in California and the list is growing.

PUBLIC RIGHTS

*The public must be informed about health risks in advance of 5G roll-out and have the legal right to reject 5G Electromagnetic radiation in their neighborhood.

*People should have the choice to live in 5G FREE areas to protect their children, animal and plant life from dangers of 5G tech.

Be Reassured: Our cellphones and computers run fine on 4G. We have landlines, fibre optics and safe tech alternatives. We do not need 5G

RECOMMENDATIONS

We request Whau Local Board and Auckland City Council to:

1. Invoke the Precautionary Principle to halt Roll-out of 5G EMF Wireless Technology in Auckland until independent scientific research is done on the cumulative biological effects of 5G Tech on health and safety of citizens and the environment.


3. Call for the NZ government to declare a 5G Moratorium until independent scientific research is done to update 1998 Regulations which are inadequate for judging harmful effects of the 5G technology.

4. Support the 5G International Appeal to the UN and World Health Organisation from scientists and medical doctors calling for a 5G Moratorium on Earth and in Space.
5G FREE IN AOTEAROA - NZ

Request to Whau Council Members to Invoke the Precautionary Principle and halt the roll out of 5G until it is proven safe for humans, animals and plants

Wednesday, 17 July 19
ROLL OUT OF 5G Electromagnetic Wireless Tech

5G EMF wireless radio Frequency radiation is planned to roll out in Auckland communities in 2020

WITHOUT PUBLIC CONSULTATION OR CONSENT CONTRARY TO DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES

Wednesday, 17 July 19
TELCOM INDUSTRY ARGUMENT

THEIR Justification for 5G tech:

~ is faster internet and more Smart Devices

~ To increase future profits of Technology Production and dominate our lives

~ Telecommunications Industry claims the technology is safe based on outdated 1998 Industry Standards
WHAT IS 5G

~ 4G uses microwave bands between 700 MHz and 3 GHz.

~ 5G will use non-ionizing millimeter waves between 30-300 GHz which has been used as a military weapon

~ This is 300 times more powerful than 4G and 200 times faster

~ These higher frequencies have short wavelengths and are categorically more dangerous

~ 5G EMF waves can only travel short distances and will require antennas every 100-500 meters
IMPACT OF 5G ON HEALTH & ENVIRONMENT

~ Non-ionising radiation poses serious health dangers

~ Neurological, endocrine, reproductive and DNA damage, diabetes, cardiac and immune system disruption

~ Environmental threats to trees, bees and pollinating insects
MORE 5G DANGERS

~ Poor Government and Industry Standards

~ 5G is a military technology called active denial systems

~ Smart devices are a vehicle for general invasion of privacy, public surveillance & data gathering

~ This requires 20,000 satellites radiating 5G threatening life on earth
GLOBAL PUBLIC CONCERN & RESISTANCE

~ 230 Scientists have signed a public document protesting against the roll out without safety studies.

~ The Environmental Minister of Brussels has refused 5G installations stating that “they will not have their citizens used as guinea pigs”

Cities that refuse 5G because of proven biological hazard to human health:
Brussels
Geneva
Municipalities in California
PUBLIC RIGHTS

~ INFORM PUBLIC OF THE HEALTH RISKS AND DANGERS OF 5G

~ FREEDOM OF CHOICE to live in 5G FREE areas to protect trees, birds, bees and children

~ *Be Reassured that 5G will not be pushed on the public without their consent.

~ New Zealand City councils and Local Boards can refuse to allow roll-out of 5G wireless technology by telcos, like many other cities have done
POLITICIANS TO ACT NOW

Politicians must ACT Now by:

~Invoking the Precautionary Principle and Call for a Moratorium on 5G roll-out until independent Scientific evidence can prove long term safety to citizens

~Revise policies to protect public health from 5G EMFs