

Attachment D: Local Board views

Not all local boards provided responses to all of the key areas of change. A summary of local board views is set out below.

Response	No.	Boards
Support the intent of the draft Contributions Policy to increase infrastructure investment by increasing development contributions		
Support	18	Albert-Eden, Devonport-Takapuna, Great Barrier, Hibiscus and Bays, Howick, Kaipātiki, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrākei, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Rodney, Upper Harbour, Waitākere Ranges, Waitematā and Whau
Do not support	1	Franklin - prefers greater use of targeted rates
Changes to transport demand factors		
Support	8	Albert-Eden, Howick, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrākei, Puketāpapa and Waitematā, Whau,
Partially Support	3	Devonport-Takapuna, Manurewa, Papakura – do not support reduced DC prices for residential
Other	2	Devonport-Takapuna, Kaipātiki – concerned about impact on retail and want further work
Extending payment timing for residential developments of 5 or more units		
Supports	11	Franklin, Howick, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa (wants extension until sale), Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrākei, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Waitematā, Whau
Other	3	Devonport-Takapuna - concerned about defaults and wants costs of extension paid by developer. Kaipātiki, Upper Harbour – concerned about defaults
Do not support	2	Hibiscus and Bays, Rodney – concerned delayed collections will delay reserve acquisition.
Changes to Development Types		
Support	10	Howick, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa, Ōrākei, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Waitematā, Whau
Other	2	Great Barrier, Waiheke – support inclusion of Community Housing Providers in Emergency Housing development type Māngere-Ōtāhuhu – support Māori development types
Changes to Funding Areas		
Support	9	Albert-Eden, Howick, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrākei, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Puketāpapa, Waitematā, Whau
Want further refinement	5	Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki, Rodney, Upper Harbour,

Local boards also provided their views on a range of other issues and the key themes were:

- a) Deferral agreements (5 local boards)
 - Vested assets should be of a suitable standard and requirements.

- b) Maori Development (6 local boards)
- endorse the utilisation of the grants process for Māori development and recommend that the Māori Cultural Initiatives Fund is resourced to support the needs of Māori development. (Franklin, Howick and Ōtara-Papatoetoe)
 - Support further exploration of how Māori developments such as marae and papakāinga housing could have reduced development contribution costs. (Manurewa and Papakura)
 - Suggested an additional development type for marae and papakāinga to differentiate between these kinds of development and commercial projects undertaken by iwi organisations (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa and Papakura).
- c) Reserves (4 local boards)
- request that the policy be amended to allow council to take the maximum amount for reserve contributions that is permissible by law. (Kaipātiki and Rodney)
 - express concern that council's prioritization of reserve acquisition to very high growth and high growth areas, means that only 10% of acquisitions are likely to be allocated to filling the gaps in the existing parks and openspace network. (Kaipātiki)
- d) Aotea Great Barrier
- Fully support the position that Aotea, Great Barrier Island be assessed on a case by case basis and not as part of the Rural Islands funding area.
 - The proposed Development Contributions are prohibitive, out of scale for the island and will inhibit our growth. The island has no council owned community infrastructure. Our community lives off the grid.

The full local board resolutions are set out below.

Local Board Resolutions
Albert-Eden
<p>Resolution number AE/2018/332 MOVED by Chairperson P Haynes, seconded by Deputy Chairperson G Fryer: That the Albert-Eden Local Board:</p> <p>a) support the increase in the average urban development contribution price to around \$26,000 to enable greater investment in infrastructure.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>CARRIED</u></p> <p>Note: <i>Member Lee and Member Corrick voted against resolution a) and requested that their dissenting votes be recorded.</i></p> <p>Resolution number AE/2018/333 MOVED by Chairperson P Haynes, seconded by Deputy Chairperson G Fryer: That the Albert-Eden Local Board:</p> <p>b) support extending the timeframe for payment to help developers to pay development contributions as close as possible to the potential realisation of their investment.</p> <p>c) oppose the proposal for a new development type for student accommodation, as it does not reflect the demands students place on infrastructure.</p> <p>d) support the changes in demand factors to ensure the sharing of costs between development types is equitable.</p> <p>e) support the proposal to change the 'size' definition of small ancillary dwelling units and amend the definition of a 'Retirement Village' to align with the Unitary Plan.</p>

- f) support the proposal to create new funding areas for transport and stormwater and change funding areas for reserves.
- g) request that the Motu Manawa Marine Reserve Boardwalk be reinstated within the Growth Funding Programme, as it is a current project and appears to have been omitted from the report in error.

CARRIED

Devonport-Takapuna

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

a) provide the following feedback on the draft Contributions Policy 2019:

i. Cost of development contributions:

- A. support the intent of the proposed draft Contributions Policy, as it places the burden of funding development onto those actors whose developments will impact the most on creating future demand on the infrastructure network ('exacerbator pays' principle).
- B. support the proposed increase in the average urban Development Contribution price from \$21,000 to \$26,000 excluding GST
- C. note concern that the level of development contribution paid by developers may not be high enough to recover the actual cost of growth infrastructure projects.
- D. consider that more accurate scoping of growth projects would show a higher cost, and that the rate of development contributions should probably be higher in order to recover those costs.

ii. Unit of demand factors:

- A. support the principle that the cost of growth needs to lie where it is triggered.
- B. support development types that place higher demand on infrastructure paying higher development contributions.
- C. note concern that the demand placed on infrastructure by residential development has been undervalued, and do not support development contribution prices for these development types decreasing.
- D. support the reduction of the transport component for residential dwellings

iii. Extending the timeframe for payment:

- A. note concern that the deferred payment schedule proposed for residential use and single residential consents that contain five or more dwelling units, creates potential for default that is not present under the current Contributions Policy.
- B. note that the developer is responsible for payment of development contributions before the Code of Compliance Certificate is issued.
- C. request that consideration be given to the cost of the new proposed extended credit on the Development Contributions be paid by the developer

iv. Other considerations:

- A. support further definition of catchments to ensure that growth funded infrastructure is reinvested to where contributions are being collected, which relates to the new and changed funding areas noted in the draft Contributions Policy.
- B. note concern about the impact on potential future retail developments, and support further work on the unit of demand factors so the impacts on developments are more accurately understood.

Franklin

That the Franklin Local Board:

a) resolves feedback on the Contributions Policy 2019 as follows:

- i) extending the timeframe for the payment of contributions on residential development is supported, as it will better align with the lead in time between consent and sale of housing.
- ii) targeted rates should be considered rather than further increasing developer contributions for residential sites, because it is considered that frontloading the contributions will simply push up the cost of the housing and make it less affordable.
- iii) any reserve land vested as part of a development agreement needs to be of a size and form that is suitable for community use.
- iv) a consistent approach needs to be agreed with Waikato District Council, to acknowledge the use of community infrastructure in Franklin by the residents of growing communities in north Waikato.
- v) utilisation of the grants process for Maori development is favoured over remissions, based on merit, and on a case-by-case basis.

Great Barrier

Aotea Great Barrier Local Board provides the following feedback to the Development Contributions Policy:

- We acknowledge and support the overall principle of the policy to pay for urban Auckland's growing infrastructure needs in an equitable manner.
- Thank you for acknowledging our previous submission and we fully support the position of the policy that Aotea Great Barrier Island be assessed on a case by case basis and not as part of the Rural Islands funding area.
- We are a unique place with a unique situation and few of the charges within the Development Contributions Policy relate to Great Barrier, such as:
 - Aotea Great Barrier Island has no reticulated power, nor water. We have no stormwater system and no public transport. Our community lives entirely off the grid.
 - The island also has no council owned community halls, community centres or aquatic centres. All community meeting and sports facilities/parks are privately owned with the exception of the golf course which is council owned and leased by a local group.
- We have a number of properties in multiple ownership eg: Windy Hill; Wairahi; Arohanui; Little Goat; Waterfall Bay which seem unfairly affected with development contributions especially due to the fact most multi-dwelling properties on Great Barrier put in all their own roads, driveways and infrastructure (WWS and power).
- Building on island has extra demands not associated with urban developments such as extra
- barge freight costs for building materials; Geotech reports for waste; off the grid power systems; lizard reports; travel costs for planners (flights, parking, and time). It is a high cost for building with little infrastructure provided.
- There is no social nor pensioner housing on the island. Affordable housing is difficult to find on the island and rental accommodation is near impossible. The expensive consenting process, build and development contributions are making new builds prohibitive.

- Our island relies on a robust resident population as well as tourism – the proposed Development Contributions are prohibitive, out of scale for the island, and will inhibit our growth.
- We support Development Contributions being used to incentivize social and affordable social housings initiatives, such as Auckland Community Housing Provider’s Network’s submission initiative to establish a Community Housing Provider HUE.

Henderson-Massey

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

- a) Support the draft Contributions Policy progressing to public consultation.

Hibiscus and Bays

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

- a) provide the following feedback on the draft Contributions Policy 2019 (the policy)
- i) generally supports the policy but notes that it has not had the opportunity to see or assess the public feedback on the policy to inform the local board feedback, and will not have that opportunity prior to the Governing Body making a decision to adopt the policy in December 2018.
 - ii) note that, since development contributions can only account for the growth component of new infrastructure, there will never be enough contributions collected to fully fund the infrastructure our communities require
 - iii) express concern that development contributions can be collected to fund swimming pools and other community infrastructure as it will spread the amount of funding that is collected over more community infrastructure, making necessary infrastructure harder to deliver within available budgets
 - iv) note that council is still paying for infrastructure that is already built (such as major transport upgrades) which means development contributions that are collected now do not necessarily translate into new infrastructure; this issue is not well known or understood by the public
 - v) request that council improve their communications with the public to better inform them what their development contributions are paying for in their local area (such as paying for infrastructure that is already built)
 - vi) request that the policy be accompanied by greater transparency about where and what development contributions are paying for across the region
 - vii) request that the policy be amended to allow council to take the maximum amount for reserve contributions that is permissible by law (7.5%) given the importance of open space and reserves and the high cost of these.
 - viii) do not support the change of the timing for collection of development contributions to when code of compliance is issued as it will delay the collection of funding and have a flow on impact on the acquisition of open space which usually happens in the early stages of a development
 - ix) reiterate previous feedback provided that Funding Areas need to be smaller to more accurately reflect the needs of growing communities.

Howick

That the Howick Local Board:

- a) provide the following feedback on the Contributions Policy 2019:
- i) endorse the increase of development contributions to enable growth related infrastructure.

- ii) endorse the changes in demand factors to reflect the expected demand the development will have on public infrastructure, ensuring the sharing of costs between development types is equitable.
- iii) endorse extending the timeframe for the payment of development contributions on residential construction, to better align the payment of development contributions to the sale of development properties.
- iv) endorse the proposal to create new funding areas for transport and storm water and change funding areas for reserves.
- v) endorse the proposal to:
 - A) create a new 'student accommodation units' category for student accommodation administered by schools and universities, due to lower demand on transport and open space infrastructure.
 - B) change the 'size' definition of small ancillary dwelling units to align with the Unitary Plan and avoid customer confusion.
 - C) amend the definition of a 'Retirement Village' to align with the Unitary Plan and avoid customer confusion.
 - D) amend the definition of a 'Accommodation Units' to clarify that they include properties used for short-term rental.
- vi) endorse the utilisation of the grants process for Māori development and recommend that the Māori Cultural Initiatives Fund is resourced to support the needs of Māori development.

Kaipātiki

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

- a) support the intent of the proposed draft Contributions Policy, as it places the burden of funding development onto those actors whose developments will impact the most on creating future demand on the infrastructure network ('exacerbator pays' principle).
- b) support further refinement of catchments to ensure that infrastructure is prioritised to where contributions are being collected, which relates to the new and changed funding areas noted in the draft Contributions Policy.
- c) note concern about the impact on potential future retail developments, and support further work on the unit of demand factors so the impacts on developments are more accurately understood.
- d) note concern that the deferred payment schedule proposed for residential use and single residential consents that contain five or more dwelling units, creates potential for default that is not present under the current Contributions Policy.
 - e) express concern that council's prioritization of reserve acquisition to very high growth and high growth areas, means that only 10% of acquisitions are likely to be allocated to filling the gaps in the existing parks and openspace network.

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) support increasing the cost of development contributions to enable growth related infrastructure.
- b) endorse the changes in demand factors to reflect the expected demand the development will have on public infrastructure, ensuring the sharing of costs between development types is equitable.

- c) support extending the timeframe for payment of development contributions, since the developer does not receive profit when the consent is issued and should be paid through a phasing system in alignment with the development.
- d) agrees that Auckland Council needs to account for any shortfall that may be incurred by extending the timeframe for payment and implement mechanisms to address non-payment contributions as this is a risk to Auckland Council and local rate payers.
- e) endorse the proposal to create new funding areas for transport and stormwater and change funding areas for reserves.
- f) support creating a new student accommodation unit category for student accommodation administered by schools and universities and reducing the demand factors in recognition of the fact that these types of development that are located near or at the schools and universities have a lower demand on transport and open space infrastructure.
- g) support definition changes to align with the Auckland Unitary Plan and avoid customer confusion.
- h) support reduced development contribution costs on Māori developments such as marae and papakāinga housing and:

a new development type definition for these kinds of development could be developed to facilitate this outcome. This needs to differentiate between these kinds of development and commercial projects undertaken by iwi organisations.
- i) support the Māori Cultural Initiatives Fund is resourced to support the needs of Māori development.
- j) asks that with significant growth taking place in the local area, 10% of the development contributions from the area be invested back locally.

Manurewa

That the Manurewa Local Board:

- a) endorse its feedback on the draft Contributions Policy 2019 as follows:

Aspect of Draft Contributions Policy	Manurewa Local Board Feedback
Cost of development contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support increasing the cost of development contributions. • The level of development contribution paid by developers is not high enough to recover the actual cost of growth infrastructure projects. • Feel that more accurate scoping of growth projects would show a higher cost, and that the rate of development contributions should probably be higher in order to recover those costs.
Unit of demand factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the principle that the cost of growth needs to lie where it is triggered. • Support development types that place higher demand on infrastructure paying higher development contributions. • Are concerned that the demand placed on infrastructure by residential development has been undervalued, and do not support development contribution prices for these development types decreasing.
Extending the timeframe for payment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support extending the timeframe for payment of development contributions, since the developer does not receive profit at time the consent is issued.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development contributions should be able to be paid when the developer capitalises their investment, which is after the Code Compliance Certificate has been issued. • Auckland Council needs to account for any shortfall that may be incurred by extending the timeframe for payment.
Development type definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support these proposed changes.
Remission of DCs for Māori development and social housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support further exploration of how Māori developments such as marae and papakāinga housing could have reduced development contribution costs. • Believe this would be equitable since these developments do not place significant demands on infrastructure. • A new development type definition for these kinds of development could be developed to facilitate this. • Such a definition would need to differentiate between these kinds of development and commercial projects undertaken by iwi organisations.
Other considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board would like to highlight concerns around developers seeking development agreements instead of paying development contributions. • Development agreements should only be considered if the private infrastructure being offered meets or exceeds council standards. • If developers seek development agreements, the assets vested with council should be of a high standard. They need to at least meet the same standard for council created infrastructure. • Any reserve land vested as part of a development agreement needs to be of an appropriate and useful size and form. • Council should develop playgrounds rather than taking vested playgrounds in order to ensure these are of a suitable standard as the cost of upgrading and maintaining the vested playground will fall to council after it is vested.

b) request that a copy of this feedback be forwarded to all local boards for their information.

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Resolution number MT/2018/190

MOVED by Chairperson C Makoare, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Burrows:

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

- endorse the increase of development contributions to enable growth related infrastructure;
- endorse the changes in demand factors to reflect the expected demand the development will have on public infrastructure, ensuring the sharing of costs between development types is equitable;
- endorse extending the timeframe for the payment of development contributions on residential construction, to better align the payment of development contributions to the sale of development properties;
- endorse the proposal to create new funding areas for transport and stormwater and change funding areas for reserves;
- endorse the proposal to:

- i) change the 'size' definition of small ancillary dwelling units to align with the Unitary Plan and avoid customer confusion;
- ii) amend the definition of a 'Retirement Village' to align with the Unitary Plan and avoid customer confusion;
- iii) amend the definition of a 'Accommodation Units' to clarify that they include properties used for short-term rental;
- f) oppose the creation of a new 'student accommodation units' category for student accommodation administered by schools and universities;
- g) endorse the utilisation of the grants process for Māori development and recommend that the Māori Cultural Initiatives Fund is resourced to support the needs of Māori development.

CARRIED

Ōrākei

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

- a) support the intent of the draft Contributions Policy 2019.
- b) note its comments on the key areas of the draft Contributions Policy 2019 as summarised in the table below:

Change	Ōrākei Local Board feedback
Cost	Support
Unit of demand factors	Support
Extending the timeframe for payment	Support
New development type - student accommodation	Support
Development type definitions - small ancillary dwelling units and retirement villages	Support
New and changed funding areas - transport, parks and community facilities and stormwater	Support

Ōtara-Papatoetoe

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

- a) support increasing the cost of development contributions to enable growth related infrastructure.
- b) support the different funding areas but wish to emphasise the importance of local geographic funding areas and considers it fair and equitable that local development contributions are spent on local infrastructure and other local growth needs.
- c) endorse extending the timeframe for the payment of development contributions on residential construction, to better align the payment of development contributions to the sale of development properties.
- d) endorse the proposal to create new funding areas for transport and stormwater and change funding areas for reserves.
- e) strongly support creating a new student accommodation unit category for student accommodation administered by schools and universities and reducing the demand factors

<p>in recognition of the fact that these types of development that are located near or at the schools and universities have a lower demand on transport and open space infrastructure.</p> <p>f) support definition changes to align with the Unitary Plan and avoid customer confusion.</p> <p>g) support the utilisation of the grants process for Māori development and recommend that the Māori Cultural Initiatives Fund is resourced to support the needs of Māori development including marae upgrades.</p>	
<p>Papakura</p>	
<p>That the Papakura Local Board:</p> <p>a) provide the following feedback on the draft Auckland Council Development Contributions Policy 2019:</p>	
Aspect of Draft Contributions Policy	Papakura Local Board Feedback
Cost of development contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support increasing the cost of development contributions. • The level of development contribution paid by developers is not high enough to recover the actual cost of growth infrastructure projects.
Unit of demand factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the principle that the cost of growth needs to lie where it is triggered. • Supports development types that place higher demand on infrastructure paying higher development contributions. • Is concerned that the demand placed on infrastructure by residential development has been undervalued, and does not support development contribution prices for these development types decreasing.
Extending the timeframe for payment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support extending the timeframe for payment of development contributions, since the developer does not receive profit at time the consent is issued. • Development contributions should be able to be paid when the developer capitalises their investment, which is after the Code Compliance Certificate has been issued. • Council needs to account for any shortfall that may be incurred as a consequence of extending the timeframe for payment.
Development type definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the proposed changes to the development type definitions.
Remission of DCs for Māori development and social housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support further exploration of how Māori developments such as marae and papakāinga housing could have reduced development contribution costs. • The board believes this would be equitable since these developments do not place significant demands on infrastructure. • A new development type definition for these kinds of development could be developed to facilitate this. • Such a definition would need to differentiate between these kinds of development and commercial projects undertaken by iwi organisations.
Other considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board would like to highlight concerns around developers seeking development agreements instead of paying development contributions. • Development agreements should only be considered if the private infrastructure being offered meets or exceeds council standards. • If developers seek development agreements, the assets vested with council should be of a high standard. They need to at least meet the same standard for council created infrastructure. • Any reserve land vested as part of a development agreement needs to be of an appropriate and useful size and form. • Council should develop playgrounds rather than taking vested playgrounds in order to ensure these are of a suitable standard as the

	cost of upgrading and maintaining the vested playground will fall to council after it is vested.
<p>b) support for any development contribution policy, contingent on that policy being informed by the evidence of the relative use of new assets as well as existing assets to reflect the apportionment of growth funding, and that this necessitates the completion of the review of existing parks and facilities</p>	
<p>Puketāpapa</p>	
<p>That the Puketāpapa Local Board:</p> <p>a) provide the following feedback on the Contributions Policy 2019:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) support the increase in the average urban development contribution price to around \$26,000 to enable greater investment in the infrastructure required by the development. ii) support extending the timeframe for payment to help developers to pay development contributions as close as possible to the potential realisation of their investment. iii) oppose the proposal for a new development type for student accommodation, as it does not reflect the demands students place on infrastructure. iv) support the changes in demand factors for infrastructure (storm water and transport) to ensure the sharing of costs between development types is equitable. v) support the proposal to change the 'size' definition of small ancillary dwelling units and amend the definition of a 'Retirement Village' to align with the Unitary Plan vi) support the proposal to create new funding areas for transport and storm water and change funding areas for reserves so that they more closely match the development areas. vii) recommend that officers investigate the unit of demand factors used to determine contributions for stormwater and reserves acquisition by residential properties because of the significant differences between stormwater runoff and use of reserves between 100 and 249 square metre dwelling and changing the sliding scale of development contribution vs dwelling size so that building of smaller dwellings is not disincentivised viii) investigate moving towards measuring impervious surfaces for determining development contributions for stormwater. 	
<p>Rodney</p>	
<p>That the Rodney Local Board:</p> <p>a) that the Rodney Local Board provide the following feedback on the draft Contributions Policy 2019 (the policy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) generally supports the policy but notes that it has not had the opportunity to see or assess the public feedback on the policy to inform the local board feedback, and will not have that opportunity prior to the Governing Body making a decision to adopt the policy in December 2018. ii) express concern that there was no public consultation event held in Rodney in the development of this policy and that no officers were present to answer questions at this business meeting 	

- iii) note that, since development contributions can only account for the growth component of new infrastructure, there will never be enough contributions collected to fully fund the infrastructure our communities require
- iv) express concern that development contributions are proposed to be collected to fund swimming pools and libraries as it will spread the amount of funding that is collected over more community infrastructure, making necessary infrastructure harder to deliver within available budgets
- v) note that council is still paying for infrastructure that is already built (such as major transport upgrades) which means development contributions that are collected now do not necessarily translate into new infrastructure; this issue is not well known or understood by the public
- vi) request that council improve their communications with the public to better inform them what development contributions are paying for in their local area (such as paying for infrastructure that is already built)
- vii) request that the policy be accompanied by greater transparency about where and what development contributions are paying for across the region
- viii) request that the policy be amended to allow council to take the maximum amount for reserve contributions that is permissible by law (7.5%) given the importance of open space and reserves and the high cost of these
- ix) do not support the change to the timing of the collection of development contributions to when code of compliance is issued as it will delay the collection of funding and have a flow on impact on the acquisition of open space which usually happens in the early stages of a development
- x) reiterate the previous feedback provided (RD/2018/54) that Funding Areas need to be smaller to more accurately reflect the needs of growing communities, for example, contributions collected from a development in Warkworth can fund transport improvements in Takapuna, even though residents in Warkworth will not receive any benefit.
- xi) request that a Funding Area for both transport and reserves be considered for the Warkworth area as this has been identified as a satellite town in the Auckland Unitary Plan and the Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy, and request the implications of this be reported back to the board.

Upper Harbour

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

- a) support the intent of the proposed draft Contributions Policy, as it places the burden of funding development onto those actors whose developments will impact the most on creating future demand on the infrastructure network ('exacerbator pays' principle).
- b) support further refinement of catchments to ensure that infrastructure is prioritised to where contributions are being collected, which relates to the new and changed funding areas noted in the draft Contributions Policy.
- c) note concern for the impact on potential future retail developments and support further work on the unit of demand factors so the impacts on developments are more accurately understood.

- d) note concern that the deferred payment schedule proposed for residential use and single residential consents that contain five or more dwelling units, creates potential for default that is not present under the current Contributions Policy.

Waiheke

That the Waiheke Local Board:

- a) note the Draft Contributions Policy 2019.
- b) endorse the submission of the Auckland Community Housing Providers' Network to Auckland Council Draft Contributions Policy 2019 as tabled under Item 24 – Chairperson's Report.

Waitākere Ranges

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

- a) support the proposal to increase developer contributions to provide resources required to address the effects of growth.
- b) note that Glen Eden and Swanson are facing the affects of significant growth and should also receive growth related infrastructure.
- c) staff are requested to ensure that supporting planning is done to inform the next Long-term Plan to enable listing of specific growth projects for development contributions particularly community infrastructure and open space needs.
- d) seek an adjustment to the policy so that developer contributions can be in the form of the provision of suitable and agreed land for open space purposes.
- e) request that a Have Your Say Event occurs in the West.

Waitematā

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) support the proposed increase in the urban development contributions to an average of \$26,000 to enable greater investment in the infrastructure required by the development so that developers are less effectively subsidised by the Council and make a fairer and more realistic contribution to the cost of infrastructure they generate
- b) support the principle that development types that place higher demand on infrastructure pay higher development contributions
- c) support extending the timeframe for payment of development contributions on residential construction to align better with realisation of the investment
- d) support the proposal to create new funding areas for transport and storm water and change funding areas for reserves so that they more closely match the development areas
- e) support the changes in demand factors for infrastructure (storm water and transport) to ensure the sharing of costs between development types is equitable
- f) support the proposal to change the 'size' definition of small ancillary dwelling units, amend the definition of Accommodation Units to include properties used for short term rental and amend the definition of a 'Retirement Village' to align with the Unitary Plan

- g) support introducing the changes once rather than in stages, partly to reduce the duration of the current effective subsidy, partly to create more clarity and certainty; partly to reduce administration costs and partly to reduce revenue risks and perverse incentives
- h) strongly urge that there be an appreciably lower Housing Unit Equivalent (HUE) for smaller residential dwellings, balanced by an increased HUE for larger ones.
- i) recommend the HUE per unit for detached dwelling units 99 square metres and below be reduced from 0.8 to 0.7, for attached low rise units from 0.7 down to 0.6 and for medium to high rise from 0.6 to 0.5. The HUEs for these 3 categories of units 250 square metres and over should be increased to 1.3, 1.2 and 1.1 HUE per unit respectively. This is for four reasons – financially to encourage the building of smaller units to enable intensification, recognition that smaller units have fewer residents on average, recognition those in smaller dwellings have less wealth and impose less costs on infrastructure, and partly respond to the requests of the community housing sector and Māori providers without introducing complex charging systems.
- j) note that the local board's five key points of advocacy to Council on the long-term plan and budget included ensuring Auckland Council actively builds or enables others to provide affordable housing through appropriate mechanisms and tools
- k) urge that Council actively seek and develop mechanisms to facilitate, partner in, provide informed advice or make grants to assist with the provision of affordable housing by Māori, community housing providers, private developers and the government. The grant to cover the development contributions and resource consents for the HomeGround project was a start but a bigger grant should be made for HomeGround and for similar projects by other providers
- l) urge that the reduced development contribution required of Housing New Zealand for building emergency housing be extended to registered community housing providers where they provide emergency housing
- m) urge that the proposed drastic reduction in the development contribution required from Production and Distribution buildings from 0.29 HUE to 0.10 HUE not be proceeded with. This contribution ought to be at least 0.29 HUE
- n) urge that work be done now on the level and nature of the increased development contribution levels that it would be appropriate to apply once the Local Government (Community Wellbeing) Amendment Act is enacted. This will enable development contributions to be charged for libraries, swimming pools and other additional community infrastructure and should be ready for implementation by the Council as soon as practicable.

Whau

That the Whau Local Board:

- a) support the draft Contributions Policy 2019.