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B. Attachment B Operating Performance Summary Puketāpapa
1. Welcome

2. Apologies

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

3. Declaration of Interest

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

4. Confirmation of Minutes

   That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
   a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 18 July 2019, as a 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. Deputations

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

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

9. Public Forum

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

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

10. Extraordinary Business

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

    “An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-
(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

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

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

   (ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

11 Notices of Motion

Under Standing Order 2.5.1 (LBS 3.11.1) or Standing Order 1.9.1 (LBS 3.10.17) (revoke or alter a previous resolution) a Notice of Motion has been received from Chair Doig for consideration under item 12.
Notice of Motion - Chair Harry Doig - Future site of the Cross/Star previously on the tihi of Puketāpapa/Pukewīwī/Mt Roskill

File No.: CP2019/14538

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

https://acintranet.aklc.govt.nz/EN/workingatcouncil/techandtools/infocouncil/Pages/ExecutiveSummary.aspx

1. In accordance with Standing Order 3.11.1, Chair Harry Doig has given notice of a motion that he wishes to propose.

2. The notice, signed by Deputy Chair Harry Doig and Deputy Chair Julie Fairey as seconder, is appended as Attachment A of the agenda report.

3. Supporting information is appended as Attachment A of the agenda report.

Motion

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) acknowledge the mana and decision-making role of Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority (TMA) in relation to maunga, and in particular their policy to remove all but strictly necessary infrastructure from the tihi (summit) of maunga across the region, including Puketāpapa / Pukewīwī / Mt Roskill.

b) note the long history of the presence of the cross/star structure on the tihi of Puketāpapa / Pukewīwī / Mt Roskill, and the wish of many community members for this heritage to be acknowledged

c) confirm that it will undertake a public consultation process, in the 2019 electoral term, to gather community views around:
   i) opportunities for new locations for the cross/star structure
   ii) preferred options for location, alongside details about cost, ownership, and tenure (eg temporary or permanent, for a set number of years or not)

d) recommend to the incoming Local Board, after the 2019 election, that they consider how best to undertake this process in a respectful and inclusive manner, with an intention to ultimately re-locate the cross/star appropriately

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Notice of Motion  (Future site of the Cross/Star previously on the tihi of Puketāpapa / Pukewīwi / Mt Roskill)

In accordance with Standing Orders, please place the following Notice of Motion on the agenda for the Puketāpapa Local Board meeting being held on 15th August 2019.

Recommendation/s  
That the Puketāpapa Local Board

a) acknowledge the mana and decision-making role of Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority (TMA) in relation to maunga, and in particular their policy to remove all but strictly necessary infrastructure from the tihi (summit) of maunga across the region, including Puketāpapa / Pukewīwi / Mt Roskill,

b) note the long history of the presence of the cross/star structure on the tihi of Puketāpapa / Pukewīwi / Mt Roskill, and the wish of many community members for this heritage to be acknowledged

c) confirm that it will undertake a public consultation process, in the 2019 electoral term, to gather community views around:
   a) opportunities for new locations for the cross/star structure
   b) preferred options for location, alongside details about cost, ownership, and tenure (eg temporary or permanent, for a set number of years or not)

d) recommend to the incoming Local Board, after the 2019 election, that they consider how best to undertake this process in a respectful and inclusive manner, with an intention to ultimately re-locate the cross/star appropriately

Background

Board members will be well familiar with this issue, which has been resolved on in the past including:

May 2015 Urgent resolution:

31.1 Extraordinary Item - Maunga Authority

Resolution number PKTPP/2015/105

MOVED by Member MP Wood, seconded by Chairperson JM Fairey.

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

   a) affirm the following in relation to ongoing discussions about the future of the cross/star structure of Puketāpapa/Pukewīwi/Mt Roskill:


Report Name  

Page 1
b) acknowledge the mana and decision making role of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority in relation to the maunga.

c) is aware of strong and genuinely held local views in relation to retention of the cross/star structure in some form.

d) supports an outcome whereby the parties with an interest in the matter including the Authority, local community and the Board engage in respectful dialogue to understand the matters at hand, and attempt to find a consensus outcome that respects the positions of all parties.

e) that in light of the above, the Board affirms discussions that have occurred to date involving Authority Officers, representatives of the Board, and the Mt Roskill Ministers’ Association to try and reach a mutually acceptable outcome.

f) believes that the option, broached in these discussions, of the Ministers’ Association taking ownership of the cross and receiving permission from the Authority to display the structure for an agreed fixed period each year, may be good option to meet the legitimate concerns of all parties, and asks that the Authority seriously consider this option.

g) would welcome the opportunity to engage in further dialogue in support of an outcome that meets the legitimate concerns of the Authority and local community.

h) forward these resolutions to members of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority.

And

November 2017:

Resolution number PKTPP/2017/191

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson J Fairey, seconded by Member S Kaushal:

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) acknowledges the mana and decision-making role of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority in relation to the maunga Puketāpapa / Pukewiwi / Mt Roskill, in particular in regard to the erection of any temporary structures

b) notes our resolution PKTPP/2015/105 requesting respectful dialogue and a mutually agreed outcome to the issue of the Star/Cross on the tihi in May 2015, and further notes that both respectful dialogue and a mutually agreed outcome were achieved in that process.
c) supports the 2017 application by the local Ministers’ Association to the Tūpuna Maunga Authority to continue arrangements in place since October 2015 to erect a temporary structure on Puketāpapa / Pukewīwī / Mt Roskill as a lit star around Xmas time and as a lit cross around Easter time, noting:

i) permission is at the discretion of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority, and

ii) the structure, and responsibility for its erection and dismantling, including transport and storage, are the responsibility of the local Ministers’ Association

iii) the strongly held views of some members of our community that the lit star/cross on the maunga is a symbol of local identity and heritage

d) forward this Notice of Motion and subsequent resolutions to the Tūpuna Maunga Authority for their attention.

Since these resolutions the TMA have continued with their programme to remove all but strictly necessary infrastructure from the tihi of maunga across the region. In particular they have removed the pole to which the cross/star was affixed, meaning that it can no longer be erected on the tihi of Puketāpapa / Pukewīwī / Mt Roskill. It is important to note that this is entirely within their remit, and has been done consistently with how they have treated other similar infrastructure across the network of maunga. The cross/star has thus not been erected on the summit of Puketāpapa / Pukewīwī / Mt Roskill since the Christmas season of 2018.

The Chair of the Puketāpapa Local Board, Harry Doig, held a series of meetings with the local Ministers’ Association in 2018 and early 2019 in order to assist them in their dealings with on this matter, and to discuss the possibility of finding a new location for the cross/star.

In late February 2019 a petition was started to gather support to have the cross/star reinstated on the tihi. This petition was presented to the TMA at their May meeting, and a response to the petitioners was given both at the meeting and in writing afterwards, addressing issues raised.

In July 2019 Local Board Chair, Harry Doig, convened a meeting at the local board office to facilitate discuss between the Chair of the TMA and several of its staff, representatives of the local Ministers’ Association, and several of the petitioners. At this meeting it was agreed that the Local Board Chair would put forward to the local board members the proposal that the Local Board take ownership of this issue, and undertake a public consultation process to gather input to assist with finding a new location for the cross/star.

It was recognised that there were a lot of complexities to finding a new site, for example will it be erected on an event-based basis (ie twice a year as previously) or permanently, what technology would be used and who would bear the cost of operations, and the required permission from land owners. As a result there would need to be both a call for options from the community, and a process presenting back those options, in a way that reflected the details of each option accurately, for community prioritising.
Due to the difficulties of the Local Board consulting in the pre-election period, the proximity of the local body election in October (which will see a new local board operating from November) and the complexity of the issue, it was recognised that much of the public consultation process will need to wait until the new term.

This Notice of Motion presents the proposal the Chair of the Local Board committed to put to the local board members for their approval, in order to find a way forward that recognises both the important heritage status of the cross/star to our community, and the mana and decision-making role of the TMA in relation to Puketāpapa / Pukewīwī / Mt Roskill.

<table>
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Purpose of the report

1. To endorse Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Strategic Framework (the framework) (Attachment A).
2. To receive the Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Action Plan (the action plan) (Attachment B).

Executive summary

3. The Puketāpapa Local Board Plan 2017 identified the development of a Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan, including strategies to promote wellbeing through access to drinking water, healthy food, physical activity, healthy housing and less use of harmful substances.
4. A Project Manager was recruited in March 2019 to develop the Healthy Puketāpapa framework and action plan, in collaboration with a co-creation group comprising of community and topic experts.
5. The framework outlines a vision for Puketāpapa communities to have a sense of wellbeing and feel happy, healthy, connected and safe, with focus on the social determinants of health that shape our sense of belonging, participation, cultural identity and the environment where we live, learn, work, travel and play.
6. The action plan focuses on environmental and system changes to support an improvement in the health and wellbeing of local residents and delivers a range of cross sector and other focussed initiatives that target those most impacted by harm or poor health outcomes.
7. Implementation of the action plan will be overseen by a coalition of community, providers, agencies and topic experts, who will finalise the actions and determine the priorities for 2019/2020.

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) endorse the Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Strategic Framework (Attachment A to the agenda report).

b) receive the Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Action Plan (Attachment B to the agenda report).

Context

8. The Puketāpapa Local Board Plan 2017 identified the development of a Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan, including strategies to promote wellbeing through access to water, healthy food, physical activity, healthy housing and less use of harmful substances.
10. A Project Manager was recruited in March 2019 to develop the framework and action plan.

11. A consultation process was run in April and May 2019, which included two community hui, a local board workshop, online surveys with the local board and peoples panel, one-to-one interviews with Puketāpapa community organisations, service providers, topic experts and academia, a review of the Puketāpapa Children’s Panel findings on health and incorporation of results from an Age Friendly City hui.

12. The results from the consultation were presented to a co-creation group comprising of community and topic experts. The group participated in three workshops in May and June 2019 and used the findings of the consultation and consideration of existing regional, national and global strategies, to theme and create the framework and associated action plan.

13. The action plan, which supports the strategic objectives in the framework was put through an equity review to identify and address the needs of those most impacted by poor health and wellbeing outcomes. The action plan was then amended to address the findings of the equity review.

14. The co-creation group and one-to-one interviewees from the consultation phase provided feedback on the framework and action plan. A final draft was circulated to specialist advisors in council’s Te Waka Anga Mua and was displayed for residents at the Roskill South Housing NZ subsidiary, Homes, Land, Community open day on 22 June 2019 for comment.

15. The local board were updated on the progress of the framework and action plan development at workshops on 7 March, 4 April, 23 May and 11 July 2019. The local board provided feedback on the framework at a workshop on 25 July 2019.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

16. The framework outlines a vision for Puketāpapa communities to have a sense of wellbeing and feel happy, healthy, connected and safe, with focus on the social determinants of health that shape our sense of belonging, participation, cultural identity and the environment where we live, learn, work, travel and play.

17. The framework provides an opportunity to influence these determinants through collaborative working, to positively impact the health and wellbeing of all Puketāpapa residents and address the issues and challenges faced by those most impacted by differing health outcomes.

18. The framework and associated action plan aim to increase:
   - understanding of ‘gaps’ in health responses within Puketāpapa and the communities’ ability to respond to these
   - targeted delivery on health and wellbeing initiatives
   - community involvement in the design, development and delivery of local initiatives and activities
   - council, agency and community collaboration
   - community partnerships
   - social connectedness and sense of belonging.

19. To provide direction and help make decisions during planning and review cycles, three signposts have been developed as part of the framework. These will also help guide and prioritise how and where to put effort during implementation. These signposts have been developed based on themes from the consultation process, and build on community strengths and priorities. The signposts are;
   - Mana Rangatiratanga / Our Community, Our Responsibility
• Business and Community Protecting Mauri Ora (Wellbeing)
• Wāhi Tākaro, Wāhi Ora / Connecting People through welcoming spaces.

20. The framework includes the following five priorities:
• Wai (water) is the first and easiest choice of drink
• Access to healthy kai (food) for all
• Encourage movement
• Access to healthy housing
• Less use of harmful substances.

21. Each priority area has two or three objectives to drive action at the neighbourhood, environment and system level, and create links across other programmes currently being delivered in Puketāpapa.

22. The framework includes a summary of contextual findings and data for the local board area for each priority area. The findings indicate that Puketāpapa residents from Māori, Pacific and South Asian communities have a greater burden of ill-health than residents from other ethnicities. These outcomes are also unequally impacted by socio-economic circumstances.

23. The framework also has an enabler objective, which reflects the work that needs to be done across the five priorities including processes for review, evaluation and sharing successes and lessons learnt.

24. The framework provides a strategy that can be used for the next five to ten years to:
• direct how the action plan will be delivered
• influence the decision making and plans of community organisations
• shape projects that reflect community needs, align with ongoing work and respond to the changing demographics of this diverse community
• guide future action plan iterations.

25. The action plan focuses on environmental and system changes to support an improvement in the health and wellbeing of local residents and delivers a range of cross sector and focussed initiatives that target those most impacted by harm or poor health outcomes.

26. The action plan will be delivered through a coalition of community, provider, agencies and topic expertise and in alignment of other council, community and agency programmes.

27. The framework gives emphasis to a commitment of building processes, structures and relationships with the Puketāpapa community to ensure Ngā Manukura (community leadership) and Te Mana Whakahaere (autonomy) are at the heart of the action plan delivery and to ensure it is responsive to local needs and priorities.

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

28. The framework aligns with Outcome 1 of the Auckland Plan 2050, Belonging and Participation and related directions, and the outcomes key objectives to:
• foster an inclusive Auckland where everyone belongs
• improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities.

29. Healthy Puketāpapa has been designed as an integrated project that deliberately seeks cross council cooperation. The framework and action plan can be used by departments across council to inform their work in Puketāpapa.
30. Council departments involved in the consultation and feedback processes include: Chief Sustainability Office, Environmental Services – Infrastructure and Environment, Parks, Sport and Recreation, Community Empowerment Unit, Auckland Transport, Community Facilities, Libraries and Information and Te Waka Anga Mua ki Uta.

31. Council teams involved in the co-creation group include: Environmental Services – Infrastructure and Environment and Community Empowerment Unit.

32. The cross-council relationships that were established during the development process will continue through implementation. Staff from across the organisation will be part of the ongoing implementation focussed Healthy Puketāpapa coalition.

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

33. The framework delivers on the following Puketāpapa Local Board Plan 2017 outcome:
   • **Outcome**: Improved wellbeing and safety
   • **Objective**: Provision and promotion of opportunities and services supporting healthy and active lifestyles.

34. The framework supports the local board to achieve the following outcomes from the Puketāpapa Local Board Plan 2017:
   • Transport choices meet our varied travel needs
   • Urban development meets community needs
   • Vibrant and popular parks and facilities.

35. The framework aligns with the following Puketāpapa Local board plans and strategies:
   • Puketāpapa Open Space Network Plan/Out and About Programme
   • Puketāpapa Greenways Plan
   • Puketāpapa Low Carbon Action plan.

36. The local board were updated on the progress of the framework and action plan development at workshops on 7 March, 4 April, 23 May and 11 July 2019.

37. The local board participated in a consultation exercise in May 2019 and their input was incorporated into the findings provided to the co-creation group.

38. The framework and associated action plan were presented to the local board at a workshop on 11 July and 25 July 2019. Feedback received from the local board was incorporated into the framework and action plan.

39. The local board is not responsible for the implementation of Healthy Puketāpapa. This role will be held by a coalition of community, providers, agencies and topic experts.

40. The local board can use the framework and action plan to inform decisions that impact on the health and wellbeing of Puketāpapa residents.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

41. Te Pae Mahutonga, a Māori holistic model of health and wellbeing, has informed Healthy Puketāpapa development, consultations and equity analysis and will continue to be the health and wellbeing model that informs delivery and review of the framework and associated action plan.

42. The Specialist Advisor Māori Responsiveness – Community Empowerment Unit (CEU) and Te Waka Anga Mua team within council have provided support and feedback into the process and outcomes of the framework’s development.
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43. Te Ha Oranga (Ngāti Whatua) reviewed and provided feedback on the development process, direction of the action plan and the finalised framework and action plan.

44. Hapai Te Hauora contributed to the consultation process.

45. The coalition approach to implementation and the continued use of te Pae Mahutonga which includes Ngā Manukura (community leadership) and Te Mana Whakahaere (autonomy) are at the heart of the plan.

46. Māori are over-represented and impacted by poor health outcomes. The framework and action plan’s focus on addressing equity is intended to create opportunities for Māori to engage and support cross cultural experiences that build community capacity and leadership across Puketāpapa.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

47. The 2018/2019 work programme included $35,000 for the development of a Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan.

48. The 2019/2020 work programme includes $42,000 for the ongoing project management of Healthy Puketāpapa.

49. The coalition that is forming to implement the action plan are considering cost effective and/or cost neutral options for the implementation of actions relating to the 2019/2020 Healthy Puketāpapa workplans. Funding from alternative sources is likely, given the innovative and impactful nature of this work.

50. Staff recommend integrating the objectives and outcomes of the framework and action plan into existing work programmes to maximise opportunities for impact, without requiring additional investment from the local board.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

51. Table 1 details the risks and mitigations associated with the framework and action plan.

Table 1: Risks and mitigations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding to implement actions.</td>
<td>Prioritise actions for implementation based on community voice. Coalition builds capabilities in funding applications. Seek funding from academic, philanthropic and innovation sources. Coalition partners contribute FTE to progress actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders involved in subject areas continue to work in isolation.</td>
<td>Create structured opportunities for networking and co-operative working while relationships develop. Maintain and develop both individual and organisational relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community ownership is not enabled due to not having capacity or capability.</td>
<td>Work with community on what is practical to achieve while building community capacity and capability as part of the Empowered Communities Approach outcomes and the Community Empowerment Unit’s role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā korera ā-muri

Next steps

52. The framework and associated action plan will be distributed to coalition members to begin the process of implementation.
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Healthy Puketāpapa
A Strategic Health and Wellbeing Framework
Puketapapa Local Board

It is an objective of the Puketāpapa Local Board that communities will have a sense of wellbeing and feel happy, healthy, connected and safe. We can’t do this alone.

The local board contributes to this outcome by funding projects to improve wellbeing and safety. We also work with the many agencies and communities trying to improve health and wellbeing and building connections between people.

Achieving wellbeing does not have to cost anything and can be as simple as getting out for a walk in the fresh air. Healthy Puketāpapa brings together agencies and the community to develop actions that will make a difference to the lives of people living in Puketāpapa.

Healthy Puketāpapa will identify ways to promote access to water, healthy food and active transport like walking and cycling. Eating well and getting exercise contribute to a better quality of life and helps prevent lifestyle-related diseases, such as type 2 diabetes.

Together communities and agencies will work to improve housing quality in the board area and design and develop actions that reduce the harm of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs.

Healthy Puketāpapa is about striving for health and wellbeing opportunities for everyone, we will achieve this together.

Harry Doig
Chair
Puketāpapa Local Board

Auckland Regional Public Health Service

Key themes (draft letter in development and to be approved by ARPHS)

- Alignment with ARPHS Strategic Plans
- Population Health key issues
- System and environment approach to creating health and wellbeing.

Jane McEntee
General Manager
Auckland Regional Public Health Service (ARPHS)
1. Introduction

Why a focus on health and wellbeing in Puketāpapa?

Key messages

- To create a built and lived environment that supports and encourages healthy behaviours
- To address the drivers of social disadvantage, so everyone has a fair opportunity to reach their full health potential
- This is a long-term commitment.

Being healthy and well is more than being free from disease. It is often thought that factors such as genetics and access to and use of health care services determine a person’s health. While these are important factors, the greatest impact on a person’s health and wellbeing encompasses all aspects of a person’s life and the environmental or living conditions in which a person is born, grows, lives, works, plays and ages.

For individuals and whānau health and wellbeing can be described as

- Toiora / Healthy Lifestyles. A balance of physical health, spiritual health, family health and mental health.
- Te Oranga / Participation in society. The inclusion of people to contribute in society, access to good health services or job opportunities or recreation. To build the connections that helps us to belong.
- Waioa / Physical environment. The positive and negative impacts on people’s health and wellbeing as shaped by where we live, learn, work and play.
- Mauriora / Cultural Identity. The security and knowledge that our identities are valued is a critical foundation for good health and wellbeing.

To enable this holistic view of health and wellbeing Ngā Manukura (community leadership) and Te Mana Whakahaere (autonomy) must be in place so that communities, whanau and individuals can take control of their health and wellbeing.

Local authorities, communities and local organisations can create a built and lived environment that supports and encourages healthy behaviours eg use of public transport or enjoyment of the green open spaces for recreation. Action at the local level increases interactions between people in the community enhancing our wellbeing.

We know that people’s living conditions are not always equal and can lead to poorer health and wellbeing outcomes for some. These inequities are often social and economic disparities, to improve the health and wellbeing of the community, we need to address the drivers of social disadvantage, so everyone has a fair opportunity to reach their full potential.

Changing demographics, economic shifts, environmental impacts, shifting community and social expectations and growth in technology will affect us all. Understanding these changes and improving the health and wellbeing of our community is everyone’s business. We all have a crucial role in creating environments that support everyone’s health and wellbeing.

Initiated by the Puketāpapa Local Board, Healthy Puketāpapa has been developed to enable Puketāpapa communities and organisations to create a community with a sense of wellbeing, that feels happy, healthy, connected and safe. Healthy Puketāpapa: A Strategic Health and Wellbeing Framework outlines the delivery of five health and wellbeing priorities. Developed as a collaboration, the ownership and delivery of Healthy Puketāpapa will be through a coalition of community and providers. Healthy Puketāpapa is intended to be a tool that challenges our community, organisations, services and businesses to improve health and wellbeing at the local level.
2. The Bigger Picture

2.1 Global Health and Wellbeing

In 2015 the United Nations General Assembly set 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to be achieved by 2030. These were an urgent call for action by all countries to end poverty and other deprivations through strategies that improve health and education, reduce inequality, and spur economic growth— all while tackling climate change and working to preserve our oceans and forests. Healthy Puketāpapa has direct alignment with SDG Goal 3 Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages.

The Healthy Puketāpapa will work in unison with other Puketāpapa plans including the Puketāpapa Low Carbon Action Plan, increasing action on health and wellbeing and action on climate change interact, especially in areas of transport, food and housing.

2.2 Wellbeing in Aotearoa / New Zealand

The Treasury has introduced the Living Standards Framework (LSF) as a way of measuring and understanding the impact government has on the intergenerational wellbeing of New Zealanders. Consisting of four capitals, it has informed the 2019 Budget and encourages cross-government plans and strategies. The four capitals are:

- **Human capital** - People’s knowledge, physical and mental health that enables them to fully participate in work, study, recreation and society.
- **Natural capital** - All aspects of the natural environment needed to support life and human activity.
- **Financial and physical capital** - The country’s physical, intangible and financial assets, which have a direct role in supporting incomes and material living conditions.
- **Social capital** - The social connections, attitudes, norms, and formal rules or institutions that contribute to societal wellbeing.

Two major inquiries relating to health are part of this government’s current term of office.

- He Ara Oranga – the Mental Health and Addictions Inquiry reported in Nov 2018 followed by Oranga Tāngata, Oranga Whānau, the analysis of Māori submissions, in January 2019.
- The Health and Disability System Review is exploring the future of health and disability services with an aim to improve inequities in health outcomes and is due to report March 2020.

Both inquiries have potential to significantly impact on how health and wellbeing is supported in Aotearoa / New Zealand.

Additionally, the Child Poverty Reduction legislation 2018, encourages a Government focus on child poverty reduction specifically, and child wellbeing more generally. A key requirement of the legislation is the creation of New Zealand’s first Child and Youth Wellbeing Strategy. The strategy which is due for release by the end of 2019 has five domains and 16 focus areas these include outcomes for tamariki and young people to be happy and healthy.

Finally, the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill, will restore the purpose of local government “to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities”.
2.3 Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi

Giving life to Te Tiriti o Waitangi contributes to a more equitable future for Aucklanders and generations to come.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi is Aotearoa/New Zealand’s founding document. Honouring Te Tiriti/the Treaty is recognising the unique and special place of Māori as tāngata whenua and in practice working to Treaty principles and enabling Māori participation and autonomy in decision-making.

Māori are unfairly over-represented and impacted by poor health outcomes. These have been identified as the result of colonisation and ongoing system and environmental failures as laid out in Wai 2575 - the Health Services and Outcomes Inquiry at the Waitangi Tribunal. Stage one reported 2 July that the primary care system has failed Māori and that Māori health inequities are persistent and unacceptable10. Māori have their own understanding of intergenerational wellbeing that draws on cultural values, beliefs, social norms and indigenous knowledge. Healthy Puketāpapa acknowledges its commitments to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Te Ao Māori and a whānau-centred approach to drive Māori wellbeing in Puketāpapa. We aim to develop with Māori, decision making processes that involve mana whenua and mātāwhakanga.

See Section 3 for details on Māori engagement and processes in Healthy Puketāpapa to date.

2.4 Health and Wellbeing in Tāmaki Makaurau/Auckland

Activities undertaken by local government impact on people’s health and wellbeing, local government therefore can positively transform the wellbeing of its citizens now and in the future.

The Auckland Plan 205011 is a long term spatial plan to address high population growth, shared prosperity and environmental degradation. The plan features six outcomes:

- Belonging and participation;
- Māori identity and wellbeing;
- Homes and places;
- Transport and access;
- Environment and cultural heritage;
- Opportunity and prosperity.

Healthy Puketāpapa aligns strongly to Outcome 1 Belonging and Participation and its directions and has links to all the other outcomes.

- Foster an inclusive Auckland where everyone belongs
- Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities

However, health and wellbeing is directly impacted by our sense of belonging and participation, the support and value of a strong cultural identity and the environment where we live, learn, work, travel and play shapes our opportunities and choices in life. These are called the social determinants of health.

By working at the local board level through activities that influence these determinants we have an opportunity by working together to positively impact the health and wellbeing of all Puketāpapa residents and address the issues and challenges faced by those most impacted by the differing health outcomes.
2.5 Puketāpapa – A Snapshot

Puketāpapa is Hillsborough, Lynfield, Mt Roskill, Roskill South, Three Kings, Waikowhai and Wesley. Below are some quick stats about the area.8

People

- Approximately 60,000 people
- 18% less than 15 years old
- 12% over 65 years old

Puketāpapa is one of the most ethnically diverse in Auckland with half born overseas, and nearly 70% of residents from non-European heritage.

Figure 1 Puketāpapa population by ethnicity

* MELAA - Middle Eastern, Latin American and African peoples

13 mana whenua have interest in Puketāpapa

Economic

- Median Household Income
  - Puketāpapa $72,700
  - Auckland $76,500

Environmental

- 36% of tamariki aged 0-14yrs live in poverty in Puketāpapa. Auckland is 32%
- 92% of tamariki can walk to school in 15 mins
- 62% of residents can walk to a large park in 10 mins,
- 52% to a small park in 5 mins
- Over 100 parks
- 2 recreation centres
- 1 swimming pool
- 1 library
- Te Auaunga/Oakley Creek is our awa and connects Puketāpapa to our neighbouring boards of Whau and Albert-Eden.

23 schools from Decile 1 to 8

---

8 Note Statistics are based on the 2013 NZ Census. Census 2018 data is due for release from September 2019. A base indicator report will be produced when data becomes available.

* Poverty is defined as an income less than or equal to 60% of median household income.
Tāmaki Makaurau/Auckland is one of the most diverse cities in the world and Puketāpapa, which has welcomed over decades migrates from across the globe, is one of Auckland’s most ethnically diverse communities. This diversity is a strength for the area.

Embracing our diversity starts with acknowledging the original culture of Māori as mana whenua. Their ancestry lies within Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland and the recognition of their role as kaitiaki (guardian) and manākitanga provided to matawāka and tau iwi of Puketāpapa. Generations of families have grown in Puketāpapa and there is a sense of pride of coming from this part of Tāmaki Makaurau. Supporting everyone to create roots and a sense of belonging creates wellbeing and resilience in our communities.

Puketāpapa is changing, with many neighbourhoods experiencing intensification. Around 10,000 new homes will be built over the next 10-15 years, bringing much needed warm, dry homes; however, living with change puts extra strain on individuals, whānau and communities. Our wellbeing is vulnerable during times of change and supporting those communities going through transition to maintain their wellbeing and to build strong, proud new communities that value established families and welcomes new people to the area is a theme of this plan.

Across Puketāpapa we have significant differences in socio-economic status and we see this in the health and wellbeing of our residents. The Healthy Puketāpapa will therefore deliver on a mix of actions where everyone across the board will benefit and targeted activities that work with those most impacted by health and wellbeing challenges.

Working across generations means giving thought to addressing our aging population and providing the best start for children as we know that early investment in a person’s life leads to greater the returns to society and how we create actions that benefit across the generations. One approach is to be child-centred as this often creates benefits across society eg addressing road safety, accessible and welcoming rest areas, initiatives that can benefit everyone.

To address the needs of our population we will use equity review to consider how our actions will impact on different community groups with specific focus on those most impacted by specific poor health and wellbeing outcomes.

Puketāpapa residents and organisations have been active in promoting health and wellbeing for several years. Some of the initiatives, strategies and plans that are contributing to Puketāpapa’s health and wellbeing include:
- Puketāpapa Open Space Network Plan/Out and About Programme
- Puketāpapa Greenways Plan
- Puketāpapa Low Carbon Action Plan
- Puketāpapa Children’s Panel

...as well as initiatives from ADHB, Enviro-schools, Health Promoting Schools, ProCare, Roskill Together, Sport Auckland, TANI and other Healthy Puketāpapa organisations and communities.
3. Health and wellbeing in Puketāpapa: An overview

In Puketāpapa 88% of people are enrolled with a GP or family doctor. The figure below demonstrates that people will travel to be with their doctor of choice.13/14

Figure 2 Puketāpapa resident’s GP location

The board area has the following community health services. Access can vary depending on transport options within the area.

Figure 3 Puketāpapa Community Health Services

75% of Puketāpapa residents rate their quality of life as good, very or extremely good. Auckland region was 82%15/11

Puketāpapa Life Expectancy at Birth

Women 84 years
Men 80 years

19% of Puketāpapa residents live with disability16
10% of Puketāpapa residents are living with diabetes17
14% of Puketāpapa residents are smokers

427 admissions in 2018 to emergency departments involved alcohol (Puketāpapa residents)

20% of Puketāpapa homes are over-crowded6

85% of residents are in walking distance to 3 or more shops but Puketāpapa is only scores 37/100 for walkability19

On average Puketāpapa schools have 7 fast food outlets with a 10min walk.16

6 The Canadian National Occupancy Standard uses five criteria to determine overcrowding based on the ratio of number of bedrooms per number and age of household residents.
Healthy Puketāpapa: Planning and implementation lifecycle

The Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan has a three-year lifecycle. Review and recommendations for the next stages of the plan will be part of the 2020/21 financial year.

2018/19  Planning, consultation, development of the Strategic Framework and Action Plan

2019/20  Implementation of priority projects, consolidation of the coalition and Health Puketāpapa structures

2020/21  Continued implementation of projects. Evaluation, review and recommendations for the development of Healthy Puketāpapa

Developing the plan

- **Consultation**
  
  Community and topic expert consultations were held April-May 2019. This process included:

  - 2 community hui
  - Puketāpapa Local Board representatives workshop
  - One-to-one interviews with topic and community organisations
  - Online Local Board and People Panel’s surveys
  - Review of Puketāpapa Children’s Panel findings on health
  - Seniors age friendly city hui results

  The results from the consultation were presented to a co-creation group comprising of community and topic expertise. The group workshoped the findings of the consultation to themes and created the Healthy Puketāpapa framework and action plan elements.

- **Equity Review**
  
  The plan’s proposed actions were put through an equity review to determine where and how to target activities to address the needs of those most impacted by poor health and wellbeing outcomes. The equity review also identified any unforeseen consequences that may be beneficial or harmful. The action plan was amended to address the findings of the equity review.

- **Feedback/consultation on draft plan**
  
  Feedback on the draft framework and action plan was invited from:

  - The co-creation group members
  - One-to-one interviewees
  - The final draft was circulated to specialist advisors including public health and Auckland Council’s Te Waka Anga Mua

  Puketāpapa Local Board representatives were updated on the progress of the plan through a series of workshops.

  The draft plan was displayed for residents at the Roskill South HLC open day.

---

*Puketāpapa Children’s Panel involved 119 tamariki participated from 8 Puketāpapa primary and intermediate schools*
Māori engagement and perspectives

We’d like to acknowledge the support and challenges provided by the Specialist Advisor Māori Responsiveness (CEU) and Te Waka Anga Mua within Auckland Council.

Ngā mihi ki Te Ha Oranga for their review and feedback on the development process and direction of the action plan, and Hapai te Hauora for their participation in the consultation process. We look forward to developing our relationship during the implementation of Healthy Puketāpapa.

Finally, nga mihi nui to the community members who have contributed their te ao māori voice to the consultation process.

Te Pae Mahutonga (Appendix 5) has informed Healthy Puketāpapa development, consultations and equity analysis and will continue to be the health and wellbeing model that will inform delivery and review of the plan.

As we move into implementation Healthy Puketāpapa is committed to building processes, structures and relationships with mana whenua and mata waka to ensure Ngā Manukura (community leadership) and Te Mana Whakahaere (autonomy) are at the heart of the plan. See Appendix 2 for the Healthy Puketāpapa implementation framework. We acknowledge that we are at the start of this journey and that trusting relationships take time and effort.

Community leadership and empowerment

Healthy Puketāpapa will be implemented through a coalition of community and agencies. The coalition Healthy Puketāpapa Together will build on existing community networks ensuring that consideration to community and NGO capacity is addressed.

It is proposed that Healthy Puketāpapa Together will have the ability to:

- Set priorities for delivery
- Allocate small grants (when available) to kick start neighbourhood projects
- Come together to discuss and workshops ideas and issues
- Co-design and develop projects and actions
- Create opportunities to network and share information and ideas

We believe that the best results for communities are achieved when all stakeholders are enabled and empowered to work together. For this to be a reality we are also committed to identify ways to grow the capability within communities, so they have the skills and resources to achieve the things that are important to them.

An empowered community is one where individuals, whanau and communities have the power and ability to influence decisions, take action and make change happen in their lives and communities. This includes communities of place, interest and identity. This is the aspiration for the Healthy Puketāpapa Together coalition.
4. Priorities for health and wellbeing in Puketāpapa

4.1. Wai (water) is the first and easiest choice of drink

Water is precious, essential to life and our wellbeing. Water is natural. Water links us to the whenua and the environment around us and how we care for it. By making water the first drink of choice where we live, learn, work and play and promoting water as the best option for our tamariki (children) and communities, we are taking action on obesity, poor oral health and their impact on our health and wellbeing.

- Sugary drinks are high in calories with little nutritional benefits
- New Zealanders are among the largest consumers of sugar in the world
- Our tamariki’s teeth are rotting, with Pacific and Māori tamariki the worst

Sugary drinks are high in calories with little nutritional benefit, they include fizzy drinks, energy drinks, flavoured waters, fruit drinks and juices, cordials and sports drinks. Drinking too much of them can damage teeth and have strong links with obesity, type-2 diabetes, rotten teeth, gout and other risk factors for heart disease and premature death.

New Zealanders are among the largest consumers of sugar in the world, on average drink about 84.2 Litres per person per year.21 Sugary drinks contribute more sugar to diet than any other single type of food or drink.

Our tamariki are exposed to junk food marketing on average 27 times per day and sugary drinks account for nine of these, they are the most frequently seen junk food marketing.22

Our tamariki’s teeth are rotting, being removed or filled because of sugar in our diet and drink. Sugar impacts our tamariki living in the poorest areas and Pacific and Māori tamariki the most. We know if we reduce sugar in our diets it reduces damage to teeth in tamariki.16

In 2016, tamariki living in the poorest areas of Tāmaki Makaurau/ Auckland were 22% less likely than those in the wealthiest areas to have healthy teeth and gums.16 By changing the environment around whānau and tamariki, whether this is the home, school, community or neighbourhood by promoting easy access to tap water, we are aiming to replace sugary drinks with wai as the first and easiest choice.

Figure 4: 5-year-olds: decayed, missing or filled (dmf) teeth in Auckland (2016)23
4.2. Access to healthy kai (food) for all

What is a vision for a healthy food environment where we live, learn, work and play? A Puketāpapa that promotes and attracts healthy food retailers; an environment that supports local producers, builds local healthy food enterprises that offer employment opportunities. An environment where community gardens and edible urban forests are easy to access, where healthy food is front and centre at our celebrations. Our food waste is donated, recycled and sustainably managed. Imagine our communities, and neighbourhoods built on a culture that ensures everyone has access to safe, affordable food. Imagine healthy eating being the easy choice.

- When we don’t have access to healthy food the health risks are serious
- Healthy choices are not always easily accessible
- Unhealthy food is now prolific in our environment
- Almost half of Māori and two thirds of Pacific adults are obese
- Indian men are at serious risk of heart disease and diabetes

When we don’t have access to healthy food the health risks are serious. There is increased risk of chronic diseases such as type-2 diabetes, stroke, and heart disease.

However, healthy choices are not always easily accessible. Healthier foods are often more expensive or take longer to prepare. In contrast, less nutritious heavily processed foods are carefully formulated to appeal to our tastes and are cheap and convenient. People with limited resources often select food high in energy but low in nutrients to satisfy their hunger.13

Māori, Pacific and lower socio-economic communities face significant challenges. Almost half of Māori, and two thirds of Pacific adults are obese, and Indian men at increased risk of having heart disease and diabetes. For children, one in four Pacific and one in five Māori tamariki are obese.16

Figure 4 demonstrates how fruit and vegetable consumption reduces as populations become less wealthy. Healthy Auckland Together a Tamaki Makaurau obesity prevention programme has reported that the proportion of fast-food outlets compared to grocery stores increases in more deprived neighbourhoods.19

Figure 4 Percentage of Auckland Adults Meeting Fruit & Veg Guidelines by Income Group (2014-17)

Our local food environments have changed. Unhealthy food is now prolific. The density and proximity of stores selling unhealthy food is highest around secondary schools, low decile schools and those in densely populated and commercial areas.25 Tamariki are constantly exposed to marketing seeing approximately 27 junk food ads or branding (including sports sponsorship) per day compared to 12 for healthy foods18.

---

1 Each group is 20% of the population. Graph 4 splits the population by income, Group 1 being the wealthiest and Quintile 5 the poorest.

---
Across different ethnicities living in the Auckland District Health Board (ADHB), the DHB that serves Puketāpapa, the top reason of preventable deaths (conditions that can be a result of lifestyle or environment factors) are - coronary heart, cardiovascular and cerebral vascular disease, all of these are associated with diet.

**Table 1: Preventable Adult Mortality (ADHB)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>European</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Pacific peoples</th>
<th>Middle Eastern</th>
<th>Latin American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral</td>
<td>Coronary</td>
<td>Coronary</td>
<td>Coronary</td>
<td>Coronary</td>
<td>Coronary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Cardio</td>
<td>Cardio</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardio</td>
<td>Cardio</td>
<td>Vascular</td>
<td>Vascular</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we look in detail at Cardio Vascular (CVD) rates (Figure 5) we can see that the disease impacts across ethnicities differently, with South Asian men show the highest rate of CVD. This is especially important in Puketāpapa where our adult population comprises of South Asian (26%), Pacific (15%) and Māori (6%).

**Figure 5: CVD Prevalence rates (per 100,000) by ethnicity and male gender**

Overall in Puketāpapa 10% of people are living with type-2 diabetes. However Pacific Peoples and Indian communities have a greater prevalence of type-2 diabetes compared to their community size.

![Figure 6: Diabetes in Puketāpapa](image)

Source: National Diabetes Registration Database as at 23 May 2019
4.3. Encourage movement

Everyone has a part to play in making physical activity a daily norm and in creating environments that make it easy. We want neighbourhoods that invite residents to walk, enjoy the parks and stroll to town centres and shops. A Puketāpapa where family time, for all the generations, means moving together and playing together because it is fun, accessible and affordable. More use of public or active transport like walking or cycling to work means less cars and improved air quality as well as safer roads for all.

Being physically active helps tamariki to develop and grow well and for adults and older people, physical activity reduces the risk of heart disease, diabetes, obesity, stroke, depression, some cancers, and falls.

- Open spaces support physical and mental wellbeing and a connection to our environment
- Māori and Pacific men are the most physically active in our communities
- Puketāpapa gets a low score of 37/100 for walkability
- At the last census 79% of residents drove to work
- Daily use of the Southern-western cycle path increased by nearly 25% in a year 16-17; good infrastructure gets used

Open spaces provide something for everyone in Puketāpapa. Not just lovely to look at, they support physical and mental wellbeing and a connection to our environment, whether busy Saturday morning sports or quiet contemplation spots for relaxing or a chance to connect with family and friends.

Puketāpapa has over 100 parks ranging from end of street domains to large parks like Keith Hay Park that host many facilities. These bigger parks form a significant part of our greenways- pedestrian and bike routes that encourage residents to ditch the car and move easily around the area. 62% of residents are within 15 mins walk of a large park.

In Tāmaki Makaurau, Māori (57%) and Pacific (50%) men are the most active. Asian men are significantly less active (42%). However, women are less likely than men across all the different ethnic groups to meet physical activity guidelines.

The Walkable Access to Destination Index (WADE index) measures how close Auckland’s population is to a range of services and destinations from their home. The more destinations in walking range, the higher the walkability scores. Conversely, an area with fewer destinations, hilly terrain and poor road/footpath connectivity (e.g. dead-end streets) the lower the walkability scores. The final score is made up of all the indicators in the index and has a range of 0-100. A score of 80/100 is moderately walkable. Puketāpapa has a low score of 37/100.

---

**Figure 7 Walkability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Walkability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Eden</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 Adults activity guidelines recommend at least 2.5 hours of moderate or 1.5 hours of vigorous physical activity over the week.
Of the central urban boards, outside the CBD, the most walkable is Albert Eden (70%) and the least Manurewa (17%), Puketāpapa’s poor score is likely to be a combination of lower access to local services in parts of the board area and our hills and how streets interconnect. This impacts on ability for Puketāpapa residents to use cycling and walking as options for transport.

Figure 8 Puketāpapa adult daily commute mode %\(^1\)

![Diagram showing commute mode percentage for Puketāpapa and Auckland]

In Auckland-wide 45% of tamariki (under 18) used active transport (walking, cycling etc) to get to school, with girls across different ethnicities are less likely than boys to use active transport and Asian tamariki are the least likely to walk or cycle to school. In Puketāpapa 92% of schools are within a 15-minute walk, a significant number of our schools are Travelwise schools this provides a good infrastructure to build a culture of active transport with Puketāpapa students.

Since the 2013 Census there has been significant work in Puketāpapa with Auckland Transport to grow the use of public and active transport. The Puketāpapa Health and Wellbeing Baseline monitoring report will include 2018 Census data on how Puketāpapa residents commute to work and school.

Figure 9 South Western shared path Mt Roskill daily riders\(^{16}\)

![Bar chart showing daily riders at Mt Roskill]

Daily cyclist numbers on the Southern-western shared path in Mt Roskill has increased by nearly 25% from 2016 to 2017 and as the safe cycle routes grow and connect, daily use should continue to rise around the area. This demonstrates making changes to the environment through infrastructure encourages active and public transport use.
4.4 Improving access to healthy housing

A home is much more than a roof over someone’s head. A warm, dry home can be the foundation of a family. It builds stability and stronger families this means healthier tamariki and seniors.

Research shows strong links between housing, physical and mental health, educational achievements and lower crime rates. A warm dry home also contributes to society through less days off school and work and reduced hospital admissions.

- A warm, dry home is the foundation of a family
- There are strong links between unhealthy homes and increased risk of serious and avoidable illnesses or impacted by poor mental health
- 41% of Puketāpapa neighbourhoods experience housing deprivation
- 59% of residents rent in Puketāpapa and this is rising
- Rental properties are in poorer condition than owner-occupied
- Pacific, African, Māori and Indian populations are disproportionately living in overcrowded conditions

People who live in unhealthy homes have increased risk of contracting a range of serious and avoidable illnesses such as meningitis, rheumatic fever and pneumonia, and exacerbate conditions like eczema and asthma. Unhealthy homes also heighten the risk of physical injury and can lead to depression and other forms of mental illness.

Those who are affected, are often hospitalised and treated but they return home to the same conditions that caused the illness. The most vulnerable people, particularly tamariki and older people, are among those who experience the worst effects of inadequate housing.

At the 2013 census nearly 60% of residents rented in Puketāpapa, this data, in the 2018 census, is expected to show growth in renting.11

Figure 10 Puketāpapa Housing Tenure (2013 Census)

A housing quality report from BRANZ24 demonstrates that rental properties are in poorer condition than owner-occupied. As of 1 July 2019, there is a minimum standard for insulation in rental properties.

The University of Auckland’s Multi Index of Deprivation27 determines housing deprivation as number of people in a rented household combined with number of people in overcrowded households.

In Puketāpapa of the neighbourhoods reviewed using the index 41% were classed as most deprived in the country. These neighbourhoods included Waikowhai, Waalsms, Wesley and Roskill South with a part of Waikowhai ranking 30th worst in New Zealand7.

---

7 The Multi index of deprivation splits New Zealand into 5958 neighbourhoods
These areas of Puketāpapa are experiencing significant change as intensification shapes the housing stock over the next 10 years. This change means families experiencing deprivation are living with instability and the wellbeing challenges this brings.

Poverty plays a large role in being able to maintain a warm, dry home. The health risks, discussed above, are often exacerbated by the fact that people who live in unhealthy homes are more likely to have to make trade-offs between housing costs and decent food, heating, and other necessities of life.

Overcrowding in homes is also associated with poverty. Overcrowding like housing quality can have impact on health and wellbeing, impacting on physical, emotional, mental health and family relationships.

Figure 11 demonstrates the populations most impacted by overcrowding in Auckland. Puketāpapa at the last census was the 5th most overcrowded local board with approximately 20% of homes over or severely overcrowded; this is not distributed evenly across different ethnicities.

Puketāpapa has significant Pacific, African, Māori and Indian populations who will be living in overcrowded conditions. Lack of fit for purpose housing is one of the reasons for intensification in Puketāpapa.

Figure 12 demonstrates that there is a link between household income and use of fuel to warm a home. The Census Area Units (CAU) or neighbourhoods across Puketāpapa are ranked from poorest to wealthiest.

We know that a partnership between landlords and tenants is required to ensure that everyone has access to warm dry homes, and this is included in the Healthy Puketāpapa Health and Wellbeing Action Plan in the healthy homes priority area.
4.5. Less use of harmful substances

Alcohol, tobacco and other drug related harms are major contributors to the differences in health and wellbeing experienced by our communities. The poor health inflicted by harmful substances impacts on individuals, whānau, communities and neighbourhoods.

By working together, we can influence and change how these harmful substances impact on our society and environment. Our connection to where we live and those around us build resilience, and actions that strengthen the feeling that everyone is valued and belongs builds our mental wellbeing which has a strong association with reducing the use of harmful substances.

- Alcohol is our most accessible harmful substance, it is a causal factor in over 200 diseases including 7 cancers
- Puketāpapa residents account for approximately 10% of ED admissions involving alcohol
- 31% of Māori adults and 20% of Pacific Peoples smoke
- 44 percent of New Zealanders will try an illicit drug in their lifetime

The National Drug Policy 2015 – 2020 aims to minimise alcohol and other drug (AoD) related harm and promote and protect health and wellbeing for all New Zealanders. The Policy has three broad strategies:

- Reduce harm that is already occurring to those who use AoD or those affected by someone else’s AoD use.
- Reduce the desire to use AoD. It includes activities that delay or prevent uptake.
- Prevent or reduce the availability of AoD.

- Alcohol

Alcohol is our most accessible harmful substance; it causes cancer and is a causal factor in more than 200 diseases and injury conditions. In New Zealand there are between 600 - 1000 deaths each year due to alcohol harm.

A recent Australian study ranked substances according to harm, alcohol was ranked the most harmful substance overall, followed by cigarettes, crystal methamphetamine, cannabis, heroin and pharmaceutical opioids.

In 2018, 427 Puketāpapa residents were admitted to Auckland’s emergency departments for conditions involving alcohol, that is just under 10% of all Emergency Department (ED) admissions for the region (Puketāpapa makes up 4% of the region’s population).

Figure 14 Alcohol involved admissions to ED by ethnicity 2018 (Puketāpapa residents)

The majority of admissions came from neighbourhoods; Akarana, Three Kings and Wesley. European, Māori and MELAA communities were over-represented and 26% of admissions were under 25 years. As Puketāpapa has a very diverse population, breaking down MELAA and other ethnicity data will be important to determine specific community need.
Premises with licences to sell alcohol were most common in Walsmsley, one of Puketapapa’s most deprived neighbourhoods (the darkest green shaded area in figure 15).

Walsmsley and Three Kings have the most off licences per 1000 adults in the board area35.

Figure 15 Density of all alcohol licences in Puketapapa (2016)

- **Tobacco**
  In 2011 the New Zealand Government determined to reduce the horrendous burden of death and disease caused by smoking. They set an ambitious target of being Smokefree by 2025. Three priorities were set that meant services, communities and parliament combined forces to
  - protect tamariki from exposure to tobacco marketing and promotion
  - reduce the supply of, and demand for tobacco
  - provide the best possible support for quitting.

Smoking prevalence rates have dropped to 13% from 25% in 2006/7. An increase in Smokefree public spaces, taxes and a focus on support to quit. However smoking prevalence is not spread equally through our communities with 31% of Māori adults and 20% of Pacific Peoples smoking, worryingly Māori women have the highest smoking rate of 37%. In Puketapapa our smoking rates reflect the national picture. (figure 16). However, it will be important with Puketapapa’s significant Asian population to breakdown data to the different ethnicities and gender.

New products such as vaping have been introduced as cessation tools, however there is increasing concern of young people initiating use and becoming addicted to nicotine. Further discussion and research is required to determine if this is an issue for Puketapapa communities.

Figure 16 Puketapapa Smoking prevalence rates (by ethnicity)
Drugs

The New Zealand Drug Harm Index 2016 estimates the social cost of drug-related harms and intervention costs in 2014/15 as NZ$1.8 billion. The total cost of illicit drug use includes:

- personal harm, including harm on physical health, psychological wellbeing and personal wealth;
- community harm, including the crime attributable to drug use, injury to others, harms to friends and whānau;
- the cost of interventions by agencies attempting to address harms associated with drug misuse and include health, education and law enforcement.

Over their lifetime 44 percent of New Zealanders will try an illicit drug, and by 15 years of age, 16% of New Zealanders will have tried an illicit drug.77

In New Zealand around 12% of the population are estimated to experience a substance use (including alcohol) disorder in their lifetime.33 For people who develop substance abuse or dependence, around 75% will do so by the age of 25.77

Of the 80% of New Zealanders who try cannabis by aged 21, 10% will go on to have a pattern of heavy use.

The recommended approach to minimising harm from alcohol and other drug misuse recognises that alcohol and other drug problems are first and foremost health issues. Harm minimisation encompasses the prevention and reduction of health, social and economic harms experienced by individuals, their families and friends, communities and society from AoD use.

- 1 in 13 New Zealanders over 15 years smoke cannabis at least once a month
- 1 in 37 New Zealanders have used ecstasy in the last year
- 1 in 100 New Zealanders have used amphetamine in the last year
4.6. Future Potential Priorities

During the consultation a number of priorities outside the five priorities came through during analysis. These included -

- Mental health and wellbeing
- Family violence prevention
- Environmental and climate change.

All three of these were very strong themes from the children’s panel.

Healthy Puketāpapa, through the use of Te Pae Mahutonga, has woven mental wellbeing through the five priorities and by taking a holistic approach to health and wellbeing, impact on mental health will be part of the plan’s implementation.

Increasingly the impact of climate change on the environment and its association with our wellbeing is acknowledged, with particular impacts on our food, transport and water. Healthy Puketāpapa is teaming up with Puketāpapa Low Carbon Action Plan team to deliver a joined-up approach in these areas.

Family violence is a serious issue in Aotearoa/New Zealand, we are 1st for intimate partner violence and 5th for child abuse out of the 31 OECD countries. We will continue to review this topic and the communities’ perspective during the implementation of the Action Plan and connect to family violence prevention providers when appropriate.

These potential priorities will be explored again as part of the review of the plan in 2020/21.

4.7. How to read the Healthy Puketāpapa documents

Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Strategic Framework

Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Strategic Framework is headed by the vision of a healthy and well Puketāpapa this destination is signposted to enable implementation to stay on track.

Three signposts have been developed to guide how and where to put our efforts and to help us make decisions during planning and review. These signpost have been developed based on themes from our consultation and build on community strengths and wishes. See Appendix 4 for more information on the individual signposts.

The five priorities are supported by an enabler objective. This enabler objective reflects the work that needs to be done across the five priorities to achieve the Healthy Puketāpapa vision. It builds structure and processes into the framework and action plan, committing to a process of review, evaluation and sharing successes and lessons learnt.

Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Action Plan (Appendix 1)

The five Priorities are detailed with their high-level objectives – what we want to achieve in each of the priority areas and the relevant actions that contribute to that objective with proposed leads.

Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Action Plan also details a proposed implementation framework. Highlighting the role of a community and agency coalition in deciding priorities and implementing the actions within the Action Plan.
5. Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Strategic Framework

AKITU / VISION
Puketāpapa communities have a sense of wellbeing and feel happy, healthy, connected and safe.

URUNGI SIGNPOSTS
Mana Rangatiratanga
Our Community, Our Responsibility

Business and Community
Protecting Mauri Ora (Wellbeing)

Wāhi Takāro, Wāhi Ora
Connecting People Through Welcoming Spaces

WHAKAROTAU / PRIORITIES

- Wai (water) is the first and easiest choice
  - Puketāpapa has increased access to free drinking water
  - Puketāpapa is reducing the appeal of sugary drinks
  - Sustainability up, plastic down

- Healthy Kai (food) for all
  - Environments where people live, learn, work and play have a focus on improving nutrition and supporting food sustainability
  - Healthy Puketāpapa partners are leading by example by improving structures that promote healthy, fresh, local and sustainable food

- Encourage Movement
  - Walking and cycling are the first or easiest choice
  - Public spaces are valued and encourage activity for everyone
  - Residents can connect locally and easily with movement opportunities

- Healthy Homes
  - Tenants and landlords are supported to create healthy rental homes in Puketāpapa
  - Intensifying Puketāpapa neighbourhoods build sustainable healthy homes with current and future communities
  - Residents’ voice shapes healthy home support in Puketāpapa

- Less use of Harmful Substances
  - Healthy Puketāpapa partners are working together to reduce the harm of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs
  - The community is leading on the issues and solutions for alcohol and other drugs harm reduction in Puketāpapa
  - Puketāpapa is focused on prevention by building inclusion and valuing identity

ENABLER OBJECTIVE

Leadership Engagement & Learning

- Knowledge empowers communities and decision making, and builds new opportunities
- Communications and engagement drives action
- Health and wellbeing is embedded in our decision-making, practices and policies
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Introduction

Why a focus on health and wellbeing in Puketāpapa?

Being healthy and well is more than being free from disease. It is often thought that factors such as genetics and access to and use of health care services determine a person’s health. While these are important factors, the greatest impact on a person’s health and wellbeing encompasses all aspects of a person’s life and the environmental or living conditions in which a person is born, grows, lives, works, plays and ages.¹

For individuals and whānau health and wellbeing can be described as¹

- Tōiora / Healthy Lifestyles. A balance of physical health, spiritual health, family health and mental health.
- Te Oranga / Participation in society. The inclusion of people to participate in society, access to good health services or job opportunities or recreation. To build the connections that helps us to belong.
- Wāiora / Physical environment. The positive and negative impacts on people’s health and wellbeing as shaped by where we live, learn, work and play.
- Mauriora/ Cultural Identity. The security and knowledge that our identities are valued is a critical foundation for good health and wellbeing.

To enable this holistic view of health and wellbeing Ngā Manukura (community leadership) and Te Mana Whakahaere (autonomy) must be in place so that communities, whanau and individuals can take control of their health and wellbeing.

Action at the local level increases interactions between people in the community enhancing our wellbeing, with local authorities, communities and local organisations able to create a built and lived environment that supports and encourages healthy behaviours.

We know that people’s living conditions are not always equal and can lead to poorer health and wellbeing outcomes for some. These inequities are often socially produced, to improve the health and wellbeing of the community, we need to address the drivers of social disadvantage, so everyone has a fair opportunity to reach their full potential.

Healthy Puketāpapa

Healthy Puketāpapa will focus on environmental and system changes that support an improvement in health and wellbeing. It will deliver a mix of whole of board initiatives and focussed initiatives that target those most impacted by harm or poor health outcomes through a coalition of community, provider, agencies and topic expertise and in alignment of other council, community and agency programmes. Healthy Puketāpapa provides the opportunity for organisations who can influence the environments where Puketāpapa residents live learn work and play to align decision making and plans that contribute to the Healthy Puketāpapa vision.

¹See Appendix 3 Te Pae Mahutonga for further description of the domains of holistic health
1.1. How to read the Healthy Puketāpapa Documents

Healthy Puketāpapa has been developed to enable Puketāpapa communities and organisations to create a community with a sense of wellbeing, that feels happy, healthy, connected and safe. Healthy Puketāpapa: A Strategic Health and Wellbeing Framework outlines the delivery of five health and wellbeing priorities. Developed as a collaboration, the ownership and delivery of Healthy Puketāpapa will be through a coalition of community and providers. Healthy Puketāpapa is intended to be a tool that challenges our community, organisations, services and businesses to improve health and wellbeing at the local level.

There are two foundations documents for Healthy Puketāpapa

Document 1: Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Strategic Framework - The 5-10 year strategy for the development and delivery of Healthy Puketāpapa


Designed to guide the work of Healthy Puketāpapa over the next 5-10 years the Strategic Framework provides a strategic vision and roadmap for implementation of Healthy Puketāpapa. More details of the framework and the context of health and wellbeing in Puketāpapa can be found in this document (LINK)

The Framework outlines the following

- A vision for Healthy Puketāpapa - Puketāpapa communities have a sense of wellbeing and feel happy, healthy, connected and safe.
- Signpost - Three signposts have been developed to guide how and where to put our efforts and to help us make decisions during planning and review. These signpost have been developed based on themes from the consultation and build on community strengths and priorities.
- The five priorities for Healthy Puketāpapa are
  - Wai (water) is the first and easiest choice of drink
  - Access to healthy kai (food) for all
  - Encourage movement
  - Access to healthy housing
  - Less use of harmful substances

Each of the Framework’s priority area has 2-3 objectives that will drive action at the neighbourhood, environment and system level, and create links across other programmes currently being delivered in Puketāpapa. An additional enabler objective has been developed. This objective captures the work required across the five priorities to achieve the Healthy Puketāpapa vision. It builds structure and processes into the Framework and Action Plan, committing to a process of review, evaluation and sharing successes and lessons learnt.
1.2. Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Strategic Framework

**AKITU / VISION**

Puketāpapa communities have a sense of wellbeing and feel happy, healthy, connected and safe.

**URUNGI SIGNPOSTS**

**Mana Rangatiratanga**
*Our Community, Our Responsibility*

**Business and Community**
*Protecting Mauri Ora (Wellbeing)*

**Wāhi Takāro, Wāhi Ora**
*Connecting People Through Welcoming Spaces*

**WHAKAROTAU / PRIORITIES**

- **Wai (water)**
  *is the first and easiest choice*
  - Puketāpapa has increased access to free drinking water
  - Puketāpapa is reducing the appeal of sugary drinks
  - Sustainability up, plastic down

- **Healthy Kai (food) for all**
  - Environments where people live, learn, work and play have a focus on improving nutrition and supporting food sustainability
  - Healthy Puketāpapa partners are leading by example by improving structures that promote healthy, fresh, local and sustainable food

- **Encourage Movement**
  - Walking and cycling are the first or easiest choice
  - Public spaces are valued and encourage activity for everyone
  - Residents can connect locally and easily with movement opportunities

- **Healthy Homes**
  - Tenants and landlords are supported to create healthy rental homes in Puketāpapa
  - Intensifying Puketāpapa
  - Neighbourhoods build sustainable healthy homes with current and future communities
  - Residents’ voice shapes healthy home support in Puketāpapa

- **Less use of Harmful Substances**
  - Healthy Puketāpapa partners are working together to reduce the harm of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs
  - The community is leading on the issues and solutions for alcohol and other drugs harm reduction in Puketāpapa
  - Puketāpapa is focused on prevention by building inclusion and valuing identity

**ENABLER OBJECTIVE**

- **Leadership Engagement & Learning**
  - Knowledge empowers communities and decision making, and builds new opportunities
  - Communications and engagement drives action
  - Health and wellbeing is embedded in our decision-making, practices and policies
Appendix 1 Healthy Puketāpapa: A Health and Wellbeing Action Plan


This is the delivery arm of Healthy Puketapapa. Our Healthy Puketāpapa Health and Wellbeing Action Plan 2019-21 focuses on 5 priority areas plus one Enabler Objective that will support the actions in the priority areas. Each of the priority areas in the Action Plan includes:

What

- We have been told by the community
- Work already underway in Puketāpapa

How

- will we know we are making progress? The targets we are setting to demonstrate actions are making the change we want to see

Who

- The partners that will help drive the actions for this Healthy Puketāpapa priority
  Note These partner lists will continue to grow so in this document show who is involved and interest as we start the work

The tables

- Show the objective and the actions expected to achieve this
- How we will measure our progress on that action
- The proposed Healthy Puketāpapa lead agency
  Note We will build capacity and enable communities to take on leadership roles as a key principle of delivery
- Note When the table indicates Healthy Puketāpapa is the Lead Agency, this work will be managed by the CEU Project Manager on behalf of the Healthy Puketāpapa collective
Appendix 1.1 Wai (water) is the first and easiest choice of beverage

What you said

- More accessible, clean and clearly identified water fountains around Puketāpapa in parks, town centres, schools and on bike routes.
- Promote tap water and the harms of sugary drinks, work with retailers to improve desire for water over sugary drinks
- Make water easy to access at events
- No more advertising sugary drinks to our tamariki
- The environmental is important – this was a strong message from Puketāpapa tamariki – reduce and reuse plastic.
- Connect drinking water to our environment and our cultural stories of wai, awa and moana to build belonging in Puketāpapa.

What is happening

Number of water fountains in Puketāpapa 2019

![Water fountains icon](image)

- The east and south of the local board is not served well with water fountains.
- There are long term plans to double the number of water fountains across Puketāpapa.
- Partnership with Waik Auckland and Refill NZ to make it easier to reuse and refill water bottles for free anywhere

How

- 100% of Puketāpapa schools and early childhood centres are water only
- That people can consume and refill water easily and freely wherever they are in Puketāpapa
- Work to reduce sugary drink advertising around school

Who

Puketāpapa communities, Waik Auckland, Health Promoting Schools, Healthy Auckland Together (HAT), Watercare, Auckland Transport, Puketāpapa Local Board, Auckland Council Parks, Recreation and Sport (PRS), Puketāpapa Children’s Panel, Schools, University of Auckland, Hapai te Hauora, RefillNZ and more...
### Attachment B

#### Item 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Action Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Puketāpapa has increased access to free drinking water</td>
<td>1.1.1 Recommended new public drinking fountains are installed in Puketāpapa to improve availability, appeal and accessibility of tap water, particularly for tamariki and young people</td>
<td>% of proposed water fountains in high/med priority Parks list are in place by June 2021</td>
<td>Wai Auckland, AC PRS Health Promoting Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of water only Puketāpapa Schools and ECEs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 There is an equitable spread of RefillNZ sites across Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Audit of RefillNZ refill sites (heat map)</td>
<td>Wai Auckland/Refill NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Puketāpapa is reducing the appeal of sugary drinks</td>
<td>1.2.1 Healthy Puketāpapa partners have implemented the healthy environment guidelines for wai through activities, events and/or grants</td>
<td>Partners report implementation of guidelines at all event (% compliance)</td>
<td>Healthy Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partners grant reports indicate HEG used in awarding grant decisions (% compliance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2 Displace sugary drink marketing in public places where tamariki and whānau meet</td>
<td>Out of home marketing audit complete</td>
<td>Auckland University HAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.3 Connect and promote the cultural value of water as drink of choice</td>
<td>Evaluation shows greater acceptance of tap water</td>
<td>Community/TANI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.4 Promote quality of tap water to address barriers to use</td>
<td>Number of communications to promote quality of tap water</td>
<td>Wai Auckland Watercare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Sustainability up, plastic down</td>
<td>1.3.1 Support actions on drinking water in the Puketāpapa Low Carbon Action Plan (LCAP)</td>
<td>As per LCAP measures</td>
<td>Live Lightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore opportunities to cross promote Healthy Puketāpapa Wai and Active/Public transport initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.2 Plastic straw reduction community project</td>
<td>Plastic straw reduction measures in place Y/N and # of establishments</td>
<td>Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation agreed by disability sector Y/N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1.2 Access to healthy kai (food) for all

What you said

- Work with schools, businesses and faith-based organisations on policies to create a healthy kai environment and reduce plastic waste
- Increase the range of healthy food outlets and work with current retailers and takeaways to promote healthy food and discourage unhealthy food
- Discover and develop opportunities for local healthy food businesses and social enterprise
- Puketāpapa has one of the most diverse range of food outlets in the country and this makes people proud. The Wesley market is really valued but access can be an issue (days and transport).
- Less junk food marketing especially at bus-stops and around schools
- Neighbourhood projects that celebrate growing, sharing and connecting through local food e.g. fruit tree planting and community composting
- Connecting mental wellbeing, spiritual and environmental wellbeing through food. Bring people together, celebrate cultural identities, build stronger communities and create understanding.

What is happening

- Puketāpapa Low Carbon Action Plan
- Taste of Puketāpapa happens every May
- Healthy Babies, Healthy Futures Programme
- Enviro-schools, Health Promoting Schools and Garden to Plate all have programmes with Puketāpapa schools

How

- A food charter is enabling business and community decisions to promote, sell and access healthy kai
- Community events and facilities promote healthy options
- Organisations work together to create opportunities to build local, sustainable, low carbon kai projects
- Projects led by communities to create access to healthy kai for all

Who

Kai Auckland, Puketāpapa Low Carbon Network and Live Lightly team, Community Empowerment Unit, Auckland Council Events, Puketāpapa retailers and business community, community members, schools, TANI, ProCare, Enviro-Schools, Health Promoting Schools and more...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Action Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Environments where people live, learn, work and play have a focus on improving nutrition and supporting food sustainability</td>
<td>2.1.1 Puketāpapa Food charter is driving availability of healthy food and food sustainability across schools, retail and other settings</td>
<td>We have a food charter 19/20 (Y/N)</td>
<td>Kai Auckland with Healthy Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food charter reach and project progression 20/21 (reporting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2 Identify opportunities to use the food system and structures to improve health outcomes for Puketāpapa residents</td>
<td>Opportunities identified and prioritised Y/N</td>
<td>Low Carbon Team/Live Lightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3 Explore profitable healthy kai as part of a local low carbon economy or regenerative urban agriculture</td>
<td>Implementation plan developed Y/N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.4 Partnering to design and deliver sustainable (low carbon) healthy kai community initiatives including kickstart small grants</td>
<td>See enable measures below</td>
<td>Low Carbon Team/Live Lightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.5 Support actions relating to low carbon food in the Puketāpapa Low Carbon Action Plan that align to Healthy Puketāpapa</td>
<td>As per Live Lightly reporting measures in Low Carbon Action Plan</td>
<td>Low Carbon Team/Live Lightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of the Eco-neighbourhoods initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.6 Explore opportunities to cross promote Healthy Puketāpapa Kai, Wai and Active/Public transport initiatives</td>
<td>Number of cross promotional activities Evaluation indicates uptake of cross-objectives activities</td>
<td>Healthy Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Healthy Puketāpapa partners are leading by example by improving structures that promote healthy, fresh, local and sustainable food</td>
<td>2.2.1 Healthy Puketāpapa partners have implemented the healthy environment guidelines for healthy kai through activities, events and/or grants</td>
<td>Partners report implementation of guidelines at all event (% compliance) Partners grant reports indicate HEG used in awarding grant decisions (% compliance)</td>
<td>Healthy Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2 Community and leased facilities are using the Healthy Environment Guidelines across venues and settings eg recreation centres, sport clubs, schools.</td>
<td>As per TSI reporting measures</td>
<td>The Southern Initiative and Parks Recreation and Sport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1.3 Encourage movement

What you said

- Puketāpapa residents love to walk especially with others
- We want to know where to access cheap friendly activity sessions that meet different cultural and ability needs
- Our green spaces are great, and you want to see them keep improving
- There are concerns about safety, fear of crime, poor lighting and use of alcohol in our public places which are deterrents to their use.
- Our road design could improve to feel safer for bikes and walking, so everyone can be mobile whatever ability or age.
- Create green and fun destinations that work across the generations and support mental health
- A desire to connect and care for Puketāpapa’s maunga, parks and coastline

What is happening

- Since 2015 there has been significant investment in urban cycle ways in Puketāpapa
- Community activities by AC Parks Recreation and Sport, AC Facilities and through Sport Auckland
- Auckland Transport and Local Board initiatives to develop greenways
- Bike Kitchen a community cycling and skills initiative

How

- Continue to improve public and active transport options for Puketāpapa residents
- Continue to develop our parks and greenways for ease of use
- Local events offer ‘give it try’ activities that encourage movement
- Work in partnership to enable people to access a great choice of activities

Who

Auckland Council Parks Recreation and Sport, Auckland Council Facilities, Puketāpapa Local Board, Auckland Transport, Travelwise, local schools, Sport Auckland and ProCare, Community and Community organisations, TANI, Live Lightly and more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Action Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Walking and cycling are the first or easiest choice</td>
<td>3.1.1 Further develop and promote greenways and cycleways through the Puketāpapa Greenways and Open Spaces Network Plan 3.1.2 Promote and develop public transport in Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Auckland Council Parks Recreation and Sport and Auckland Transport plan measures</td>
<td>Auckland Council Parks Recreation and Sport Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Puketāpapa spaces are valued and encourage activity for everyone</td>
<td>3.2.1 Continue park developments to meet community need through the Puketāpapa Open Space Network Plan 3.2.2 Promote the connections of nature and being active to mental wellbeing 3.2.3 Connect residents to Puketāpapa’s whenua and maunga to build pride and sense of belonging</td>
<td>Auckland Council Parks Recreation  # and reach of mental wellbeing messaging through communications Auckland Council Parks Recreation measures</td>
<td>Auckland Council Parks Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Residents can connect locally and easily with movement opportunities</td>
<td>3.3.1 Healthy Puketāpapa partners have implemented the healthy environment guidelines for active movement through activities, events and/or grants 3.3.2 Healthy Puketāpapa partners are connecting residents to local movement opportunities • Primary care linking patients to activity and/or locally led Green Prescription and Active Families • Local activity opportunities are easy to find (online media explored) • Continued delivery of free movement activities that are intergenerational and responsive to diversity 3.3.3. Puketāpapa Sport and Rec Clubs have the capability and connections with their local communities 3.3.4 Puketāpapa Sport &amp; Active Recreation Facility Plan supports locally led programmes 3.3.5 Prioritise activity funding that links communities and engages with those who miss out</td>
<td>Partners report implementation of guidelines at all event (% compliance) Partners grant reports indicate HEG used in awarding grant decisions (% compliance) Auckland Council Parks Recreation measures Sport Auckland/ProCare measures We know what physical activities are available across Puketāpapa Y/N Progress We are promoting activities to locals Y/N progress As per Parks Sport and Rec reporting measures</td>
<td>Healthy Puketāpapa Auckland Council Parks Recreation Sport Auckland Healthy Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Item 13 | attachment b item 13 |
Appendix 1.4 Improving access to healthy housing

What you said

- How to access insulation support and ensure requirements for insulation are met/ reward great landlords, hold others accountable
- Free health checks with recommendations for rental properties
- Educate tenants on how to care for their rented homes so they get the greatest benefit
- Improve the quality and availability of social housing especially Housing NZ homes
- Change is hard, work with communities going through transition during new builds. Build communities and relationships across long-term residents and newcomers, all ages and ethnicities
- Homes that are fit for purpose meets the needs across cultural family size, aging and accessibility needs
- Houses are the buildings, the neighbourhood and the environment they are in, needs to be nurtured to make homes and communities

What is happening

- Healthy rentals with Eco Matters to improve private rentals
- Kāinga Ora supporting tamariki and whānau whose health is impacted by poor housing
- HLC community development and planning as part of the Pukeatapa intensification
- Community cohesion projects through Council’s Community Empowerment Unit and Local Board support

How

- Continue the work of Healthy Rentals and Kāinga Ora in partnership with local Doctors and other services
- Targeted Healthy Pukeatapapa activities with communities going through housing change

Who

ADHB Kāinga Ora, Habitat4 Humanity, Eco Matters, HLC, Live Lightly, Auckland Council Community Empowerment Unit (CEU), Local Board, communities and more
### Attachment B

**Item 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Action Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Tenants and landlords are supported to create healthy rental homes in Puketāpapa</td>
<td>4.1.1 Promoting new healthy homes standards and rights and responsibilities with landlords, tenants and agencies</td>
<td>As per Low Carbon Action Plan measures</td>
<td>Live Lightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2 Explore need for Ready to Rent Course for Puketāpapa business case</td>
<td>Ready to rent course recommendation report Y/N</td>
<td>HPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3 Support the Low Carbon Homes and Buildings targets of the Low Carbon Puketāpapa Action Plan including Healthy Rentals programme</td>
<td>As per Low Carbon Action Plan measures</td>
<td>Live Lightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• local primary care and schools linked with programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.4 Continue engagement of Healthy Puketāpapa partners and Housing NZ on improving social housing quality</td>
<td>Qualitative feedback from partners engaging directly with Housing NZ</td>
<td>Kāinga Ora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Intensifying Puketāpapa neighbourhoods build sustainable healthy homes with current and future communities</td>
<td>4.2.1 Support the Low Carbon Homes and Buildings targets of the Low Carbon Puketāpapa Action Plan including sustainable homes</td>
<td>As per Low Carbon Action Plan measures</td>
<td>Live Lightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2 Social Cohesion projects in new housing areas</td>
<td>As per CEU social cohesion project measures</td>
<td>CEU /HLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3 Healthy Puketāpapa Partners continue to work with social housing developers, along with local schools and community groups to ensure the delivery of community-centred housing.</td>
<td>Qualitative reporting - Description of concerns raised, and solutions provided</td>
<td>Local Board HLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Residents’ voice shapes healthy home support in Puketāpapa</td>
<td>4.3.1 Puketāpapa residents have defined what healthy homes means culturally, socially and physically</td>
<td>Meaning of Healthy Housing in Puketāpapa Student Report produced</td>
<td>HLC &amp; Kāinga Ora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2 Puketāpapa partners have identified who is most in need and how to reach them.</td>
<td>Health Puketāpapa Coalition identifies networks and systems to support need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1.5 Less use of harmful substances

What you said

- No more bottle stores and other places to buy alcohol
- Alcohol advertising and sponsorship should be removed or replaced, as happened with tobacco advertising and sponsorship
- More Smokefree and liquor ban areas.
- Reduce the availability of tobacco and support people to quit
- Drugs are an emotive subject with strong views on responsibilities and enforcement as well as a need for a supportive health approach to addiction and prevention that addresses the wider factors of isolation, opportunity and poverty that contribute to addiction
- Programmes to bring together communities and whānau, with a focus on tamariki to educate, support and improve safety and spaces that connect people
- Celebrate cultural identity as a source of strength and protector for our people

What is happening

- Community cohesion project run jointly in Puketāpapa and Eden-Albert local boards
- Toolkits available to support community to oppose new alcohol outlets
- Auckland Council Smokefree Policy and Action Plan

How

- Work with communities to oppose new bottle store licences
- Implement the Auckland Council Smokefree policy for our meeting spaces
- Implement programmes that focus on community cohesion
- Work with communities to identify their issues around drugs and alcohol and potential solutions

Who

CAYADS, NZ Drug Foundation, Alcohol HealthWatch, Auckland Public Health, Auckland Council Community Empowerment Unit (CEU), community and youth NGOs, community and more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Action Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Healthy Puketāpapa partners are working together to reduce the harm of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs</td>
<td>5.1.1 Healthy Puketāpapa partners have implemented the healthy environment guidelines for alcohol, tobacco and other drugs through activities, events and/or grants</td>
<td>Partners report implementation of guidelines at all events (% compliance) Partners grant reports indicate HEG used in awarding grant decisions (% compliance)</td>
<td>Healthy Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.2 No more bottle stores • Build advocacy and capability at all levels • Systems set up for new applicant notifications</td>
<td>Bottle stores are decreasing in Puketāpapa # and outcome of advocacy on bottle stores Process evaluation of community advocacy</td>
<td>Community and Healthy Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.3 Reduce alcohol sponsorship and advertising in Puketāpapa (areas for consideration include) • Sport sponsorship • Outlet signage and advertising • Alcohol promotion activities (direct/indirect)</td>
<td># and outcome of alcohol related marketing advocacy activities</td>
<td>Alcohol HealthWatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.4 Explore a Puketāpapa bottle store accord on opening hours and alcohol outlets signage compliance</td>
<td>Accord project scope developed Y/N Accord project engagement &amp; implementation progress</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.5 Work towards smokefree Puketāpapa town centres and parks</td>
<td>Additional Smokefree areas defined in Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 The community is leading on the issues and solutions for alcohol and other drugs harm reduction in Puketāpapa</td>
<td>5.2.1 Healthy Puketāpapa partners are working with local Puketāpapa communities to determine issues, priorities and solutions for alcohol, tobacco and drugs harm reduction</td>
<td>19/20 Issues identified by community Y/N 19/20 Community Project options prioritised &amp; scoped Y/N Partnerships determined Y/N Project(s) implemented Y/N</td>
<td>CAYADs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.2 Community voice on access to services is communicated to service providers</td>
<td>Community voice captured in reporting Y/N Links with ADHB Funding &amp; Planning and services Y/N</td>
<td>Health Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Puketāpapa is focused on prevention by building inclusion and valuing identity</td>
<td>5.3.1 Align with CEU community cohesion and Māori engagement projects • Explore the interest in a multi-cultural community space to provide a sense of place, welcoming, maraikotanga and healing for all based on Te Ao Māori principles</td>
<td>Progress and engagement measures as per CEU Innovation Fund milestones</td>
<td>CEU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.2 Scope Friendship benches proposal</td>
<td>Scope including budget developed Y/N</td>
<td>Healthy Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.3 Puketāpapa celebrates its identity and cultural diversity and Puketāpapa communities are resilient and have good access to information and resources</td>
<td>Reporting through library LB workplan • Support customer and community connection • Celebrate cultural diversity and local places, people and heritage</td>
<td>Auckland Libraries ACE Events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1.6 Enabler Objective: Leadership, Engagement and Learning

This objective reflects the work that needs to be done across the five priorities to keep achieve the Healthy Puketāpapa vision. It builds structure and processes into the framework and action plan, committing to a process of learning and sharing success and lessons learnt.

How

- We have the relationships, structures and process to know what we’re doing is making a difference.
- We are communicating effectively with communities and partners
- Healthy Puketāpapa partners consider health and wellbeing impacts when making decisions

Who

HPAP Backbone organisation (CEU), HPAP project manager, Coalition partners, Puketāpapa Local Board, Auckland Public Health and Puketāpapa communities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Action Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E1 Knowledge empowers communities and decision making and builds new opportunities | E1.1 Community capacity and capability building  
- Long term planning for HPAP sustainability  
- Topic based wānanga generate actions | Event quantitative reporting  
Partnership feedback survey | CEU |
| E1.2 Engage Researchers to build knowledge and community research voice & skills | See evaluation plan (partnerships & Outcomes & Impact assessment) | Healthy Puketāpapa |
| E1.3 Sharing success / evidence base findings (including evaluation) | 2019/20 Evaluation plan Y/N  
2019/20 Implementation progress Y/N  
2020/21 Findings and recommendations report including future iteration plans Y/N  
19/20 Evidence sharing opportunities | Healthy Puketāpapa |
| E1.4 HPAP annual progress report | | |
| E1.5 Puketāpapa Health and Wellbeing Baseline Indicator Dashboard (including strengths-based indicators) | Baseline Indicator dictionary Y/N  
Baseline Indicator Dashboard Y/N | Auckland Public Health |
| E2 Communications and engagement drives action | E2.1 Communications plan (including social media and possible platform) | Communication plan produced and implemented | Healthy Puketāpapa |
| E2.2 Matariki celebrate and reward (our people, our stories, our success) | Number of nominees | Coalition partners |
| E3 Health and wellbeing is embedded in our decision-making, practices and policies | E3.1 Healthy Puketāpapa partners who provide grants and support, prioritise increasing diverse community participation in community-led projects | Partners Report and reach (partners survey for evaluation) | Coalition partners |
| E3.2 Systems support Healthy Puketāpapa partners to consider health and wellbeing impacts in all decisions  
- Local Board 2021-25 Plan is influenced by HPAP action and evidence | H&W decision toolkit developed Y/N  
H&W decision toolkit training developed and delivered Y/N  
H&W is included in decisions (document review evaluation)  
Impact of H&W in decision making | Healthy Puketāpapa / Auckland Public Health |
| E3.3 Town centre planning (Three Kings, Stokes and Road) includes health and wellbeing impact assessment | Health Impacts Assessment or Health needs questions included in planning discussions Evaluation of HIA impact | Local Board |
| E3.4 Community participatory budgeting for community led design and change- small kickstart grants ($200-500) | Evaluation report on priority setting by HPT  
HPT Grant allocation review demonstrates CP/priorities and principles alignment (%) | Coalition Partners |
| E3.5 Kaihautū Group set up as Governance Group with TOR | Group has ToR Y/N  
Group meets regularly and with quora (%) Partnership evaluation survey demonstrates satisfaction (%) | Healthy Puketāpapa |
| E3.6 Ongoing administration groups formed | Number and remit of groups  
Partnership evaluation survey demonstrates satisfaction with group’s mafi (%) | Healthy Puketāpapa |
Appendix 2 Implementation Framework
2.1 Implementation including roles and responsibilities

**Kaitiaki Group**
- Plan Reporting
- Risk and mitigations
- Financial Reporting
- Strategic Networks

**Healthy Puketāpapa Together**
- Priority setting
- Grant allocation
- Activity Workshops
- Project working group members
- Operations Updating
- Networking and info sharing

**Future Focus**
This implementation framework provides a flexibility for Healthy Puketāpapa to develop its infrastructure according to opportunities and on lessons learnt from implementation.

**Backbone Organisation**
Community Empowerment Unit (CEU)
Auckland Council

**Project Manager**
- HPAP Backbone functions
- Project oversight
- Strategic oversight
- Strategic relationships
- Groups Co-ordination
- Reporting

**Project Working Groups**
- Project Implementation and deliverables
- Partnership delegations
- **Ongoing Admin Groups**
- Eg Fundraising and Grant allocation

*It is proposed that the kaitiaki group is comprised of community, mana whenua, NGO, Local Board, Auckland Council (CEU) and Public Health representatives. Relationships for this group in the process of being developed.*
## Appendix 3 Delivery Timeframes

Delivery of a medium or long-term action can begin within the first 2 years of Healthy Puketāpapa but may not show significant traction for several years or have a longer delivery period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Short Term (1-2 years)</th>
<th>Medium Term (2-5 years)</th>
<th>Long Term (5-10 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wai</td>
<td>• Equable spread of Refill NZ sites across Puketāpapa</td>
<td>• Displace sugary drink marketing in public places</td>
<td>• 100% of proposed new drinking fountains installed across Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement the healthy environment guidelines for wai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Connect and promote the cultural value of water as drink of choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote quality of tap water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Puketāpapa ECEs and schools are water only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support actions on drinking water in the Puketāpapa Low Carbon Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plastic straw reduction community project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai</td>
<td>• Development of a Puketāpapa Food Charter</td>
<td>• Puketāpapa Food charter is driving availability of healthy food and food sustainability across schools, retail and other settings</td>
<td>• Profitable local healthy kai businesses contribute to a local low carbon economy or regenerative urban agriculture for the benefit of Puketāpapa residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnering to design and deliver sustainable (low carbon) healthy kai community initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation of the Eco-neighbourhoods initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cross promote Healthy Puketāpapa Kai, Wai and active/public transport initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement the healthy environment guidelines for healthy kai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community and leased facilities are using the Healthy Environment Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Area</td>
<td>Short Term (1-2 years)</td>
<td>Medium Term (2-5 years)</td>
<td>Long Term (5-10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Encourage Movement** | • Promote the connections of nature and being active to mental wellbeing  
• Promotion of greenways and cycleways  
• Implemented the healthy environment guidelines for active movement  
• Connecting residents to local movement opportunities  
  ○ Primary care linking patients to activity and/or locally led Green Prescription and Active Families  
• Puketapapa Sport & Active Recreation Facility Plan supports locally led programmes  
• Prioritise activity funding that links communities and engages with those who miss out | • Connect residents to Puketapapa’s whenua and maunga to build pride and sense of belonging  
  ○ Local activity opportunities are easy to find  
• Puketapapa Sport and Rec Clubs have the capability and connections with their local communities  
• Further develop and promote greenways and cycleways through the Puketapapa Greenways and Open Spaces Network Plan | • Continue park developments to meet community need through the Puketapapa Open Space Network Plan  
• Promote and develop public transport in Puketapapa |
| **Healthy Housing** | • Promoting new healthy homes standards and rights and responsibilities with landlords, tenants and agencies  
• Explore need for Ready to Rent Course for Puketapapa business case  
• Low Carbon Homes and Buildings targets of the Low Carbon Puketapapa Action Plan including Healthy Rentals programme  
• Local primary care and schools linked with Healthy Rental programmes | • Social Cohesion projects in new housing areas | • Support the Low Carbon Homes and Buildings targets of the Low Carbon Puketapapa Action Plan including sustainable homes  
• Healthy Puketapapa Partners continue to work with social housing developers, along with local schools and community groups to ensure the delivery of community-centred housing. |
### Attachment B

#### Item 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Short Term (1-2 years)</th>
<th>Medium Term (2-5 years)</th>
<th>Long Term (5-10 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Housing continued</strong></td>
<td>• Continue engagement of Healthy Puketāpapa partners and Housing NZ on improving social housing quality&lt;br&gt;• Puketāpapa residents have defined what healthy homes means culturally, socially and physically&lt;br&gt;• Puketāpapa partners have identified who is most in need and how to reach them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Use of Harmful Substances</strong></td>
<td>• Implement the healthy environment guidelines for alcohol, tobacco and other drugs&lt;br&gt;• Working with local Puketāpapa communities to determine issues, priorities and solutions for alcohol, tobacco and drugs harm reduction&lt;br&gt;• Community voice on access to services is communicated to service providers&lt;br&gt;• Align with CEU community cohesion and Māori engagement projects&lt;br&gt;• Scope friendship benches proposal</td>
<td>• No more bottle stores&lt;br&gt;○ Build advocacy and capability at all levels&lt;br&gt;○ Systems set up for new applicant notifications&lt;br&gt;• Reduce alcohol sponsorship and advertising in Puketapapa (areas for consideration include)&lt;br&gt;○ Sport sponsorship&lt;br&gt;○ Outlet signage and advertising&lt;br&gt;○ Alcohol promotion activities (direct/indirect)&lt;br&gt;• Puketāpapa bottle store accord on opening hours and alcohol outlets signage compliance&lt;br&gt;• Work towards smokefree Puketāpapa town centres and parks&lt;br&gt;• Puketāpapa celebrates its identity and cultural diversity and Puketāpapa communities are resilient and have good access to information and resources</td>
<td>• Explore the interest in a multi-cultural community space to provide a sense of place, welcoming, manāhitanga and healing for all based on Te Ao Māori principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Area</td>
<td>Short Term (1-2 years)</td>
<td>Medium Term (2-5 years)</td>
<td>Long Term (5-10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabler Actions</td>
<td>Community capacity and capability building</td>
<td>Engage Researchers to build knowledge and community research voice &amp; skills</td>
<td>Town centre planning (eg Three Kings, Stoddart Road) includes health and wellbeing impact assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- HPAP annual progress report</td>
<td>- Sharing success / evidence base findings (including evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Puketāpapa Wellbeing Baseline Indicator Monitoring Report (including strengths-based indicators)</td>
<td>- Healthy Puketāpapa partners’ who provide grants and support, prioritise increasing diverse community participation in community-led projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Communications plan</td>
<td>- Community participatory budgeting for community led design and change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Matariki celebration and reward (our people, our stories, our success)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Systems support Healthy Puketāpapa partners to consider health and wellbeing impacts in all decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local Board 2021-25 Plan is influenced by HPAP action and evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kaitiaki Group set up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ongoing administration groups formed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 Healthy Puketāpapa Signposts

Mana Rangatiratanga – our community, our responsibility
This is about autonomy and community leadership at all levels. It reminds us that we are looking for voice and decision making to reflect community aspirations and priorities, especially those most impacted for a particular priority or action.

It also reminds us that responsibility sits at different levels of our community, from family, neighbourhood or schools through to high level decisions that affect the whole board area. It encourages thinking about how to integrate health and wellbeing into those discussions and decisions.

Business and Community Protecting Māori Ora
This signpost reminds us when planning and implementing that business communities are part of the make-up of a healthy and wellbeing in Puketāpapa.

The consultation had strong themes of business as a place for creating innovation and opportunity and a wish for commitment and compliance to improve our lived environments from a business and retail perspective.

Wāhi Takāro Wāhi Ora – Connecting People Through Welcoming Spaces
This Signpost reflects the value local residents put on their greenspaces and their pride in the diversity of our communities.

It addresses the concerns about the transition and growth that is part of Puketāpapa story going forward and what great looks like for our future health and wellbeing. This signpost encourages thinking about how actions bring people together formally and informally across ethnicities, life stages and time lived in the area. It encourages actions and thinking around our changing environment and to make these people-centred.
Appendix 5 Te Pae Mahutonga

- Ngā Manukura (community leadership)
  Leadership for the promotion of health and wellbeing in our communities needs to occur at a range of levels from leadership for the community through community role models and among peer groups. Communication, collaboration and alliances between all social leaders and groups are important.

- Te Mana Whakahaere (autonomy)
  Communities – whether they be based on hapū, marae, iwi, whānau or places of worship, interest or residence – must ultimately be able to demonstrate a level of autonomy and self-determination in promoting their own health and wellbeing.

- Tōtora (Healthy lifestyles)
  Healthy lifestyles are more than just physical health. It includes a balance of physical health, spiritual health, family health and mental health. A healthy lifestyle is holistic and can provide protection against health and wellbeing risks.
  How we live our lives impacts on how our body grows and ages. We know that lives that experience many risks have poorer health. However, it would be an oversimplification to suggest everyone has the same degree of choice to avoid these risks.

- Te Oranga (Participation in society)
  Wellbeing depends on how people are included so they can participate in society. It is about the confidence with which they can access good health services or job opportunities or sport and recreation. Wellbeing is also about our connections, the relationships that build a supported and rich community. Participation helps us to belong.

- Waiora (Physical environment)
  Health and wellbeing is shaped by where we live, learn, work and play. The nature and quality of this interaction between people and their surrounding environment and how this plays out has positive or negative impacts on people’s wellbeing. This impact can be two-way, with people impacting positively or negatively on the environment which predicts how healthy or sustainable is it for future generations.

- Mauriora (Cultural Identity)
  Good health and wellbeing depends on many factors, and cultural identity is a critical foundation. The promotion of security of identity through opportunities for cultural expression held privately, publicly and within our institutions supports wellbeing. Identity is more than a sense of belonging, it celebrates sharing a group’s cultural, social and economic resources - valuing yourself and being valued for who you are.
### Appendix 6 Glossary and Acronyms

#### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awa</td>
<td>Waterway or river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>The official count of the people and dwellings in New Zealand. It occurs approximately every five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile</td>
<td>A population divided into 10 equal groups according to what is being measured. In New Zealand, income is scaled 1 wealthiest to 10 poorest. School deciles 1 poorest to 10 wealthiest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Charter</td>
<td>A statement of aims which bring together businesses, communities and organisations that are involved or interested in how and where our food comes from. It aims to improve local food production and delivery systems making them sustainable and increasing local, affordable, healthy food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality</td>
<td>An uneven distribution across a population as an outcome eg the gender pay gap, or age groups impacted by respiratory illness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequity</td>
<td>The unfair, avoidable differences arising from social factors, including education, employment status, income level, gender and ethnicity, which in turn influence on how healthy a person is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Local boards provide governance at the local level within Auckland Council. They enable democratic decision making by, and on behalf of communities within their local area. There are 21 local boards in Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maunga</td>
<td>Mountain or volcanic cone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>The figure that divides household incomes across a set area into two equal parts (half fall below the figure and half above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moana</td>
<td>Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Determinants of Health</td>
<td>The systems that are part of our everyday life, the environment where we live, learn, work, travel and play and how it shapes our opportunities and choices in life. These in turn impact on our ability to achieve good health and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamariki</td>
<td>Children. Defined as birth to 15 years. Note Young people are defined as 16-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-2 Diabetes</td>
<td>Type 2 diabetes is the most common form of diabetes. For many people (but not all) it can be prevented through following a healthy lifestyle. Type 1 is caused by insulin not being made in the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADE index</td>
<td>The Walkable Access to Destination Index (WADE index) measures how close a population is to a range of services and destinations from their home. The final score is made up of all the indicators in the index and has a range of 0-100. A score of 80/100 is moderately walkable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AoD</td>
<td>Alcohol and other Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAU</td>
<td>Census Area Units: A statistic NZ geographical area or neighbourhoods calculated by a defined population size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEU</td>
<td>Community Empowerment Unit Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Emergency Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSF</td>
<td>Living Standard Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELAA</td>
<td>Middle Eastern, Latin American, and African. A census ethnicity category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thanks to the Co-creation group for their mahi on developing the Healthy Puketāpapa Strategic Health and Wellbeing Framework and Health and wellbeing Action Plan. An especially big thank you and acknowledgement to all the organisations and individuals who gave up their time to contributed to the consultation which underpinned the work of the Co-creation Group.

**Healthy Puketāpapa Co-Creation Group**

- ADHB
  - Health Promoting Schools
  - Kāinga Ora
- Alcohol Health Watch
- Auckland Council
  - Environment Services Infrastructure and Environmental Sustainability Initiatives
  - Community Empowerment Unit
  - CAYADS
- Auckland Regional Public Health Service
  - Healthy Auckland Together
  - WaI Auckland
- ProCare
- Roskill Together
- Sport Auckland
- TANI The Asian Network
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To fund, part-fund or decline applications received for Puketāpapa Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 including multiboard applications and Puketāpapa Quick Response Round One 2019/2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. This report presents applications received for Puketāpapa Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 (refer Attachment B) including multiboard applications (refer Attachment C) and Puketāpapa Quick Response Round One 2019/2020 (refer Attachment C).


4. The local board has set a total community grants budget of $72,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year. The local board has an unallocated budget of $2,500 from a grant that was not uplifted. This grant was allocated to the 5Tunz Communications Limited trading as Humm FM for the ‘Colors in the Park - Holi 2019’ event (LG1915-122), which will no longer proceed. A total of $12,000.00, from this budget, was allocated for the two quick response grant rounds. The remaining $62,500.00, from this budget, was allocated for the two local grant rounds.

5. Twenty applications were received for Puketāpapa Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020, requesting a total of $76,558.22 and thirteen multiboard applications were also received requesting a total of $36,611.71.

6. Two applications were received for Puketāpapa Quick Response, Round One 2019/2020, requesting a total of $2,000.00.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in Puketāpapa Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-103</td>
<td>Somali Education and Development Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of delivering the &quot;Ethnic Youth Wellbeing project&quot; in the local board area, specifically the meeting and</td>
<td>$4,316.80</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-107</td>
<td>Communicare-Civilian Maimed Association (Auckland) Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the weekly venue hire cost for the Hillsborough Friendship Centre for the period of 1 October 2019 to 30 September 2020.</td>
<td>$2,100.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-112</td>
<td>YMCA North Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards “Raise Up” Puketāpapa crew, volunteer programme and event costs between 2 September 2019 to 31 May 2020.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-114</td>
<td>Bhartiya Samaj Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of running Te Reo classes for senior citizens from 2 September 2019 to 31 July 2020, specifically the cost of promotion and Maori language instructor fees.</td>
<td>$4,200.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-115</td>
<td>Community Approach Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of pool entry tickets, barbecue hire, prizes for games and food and drinks for the &quot;Family Fun Day&quot; at Point Erin Pools on 6 December 2019.</td>
<td>$1,071.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-116</td>
<td>Auckland Regional Migrant Services Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of rent, English language tutors' fees, volunteer travel reimbursement and transport for participants to attend the Safari Playgroup for the period of 2 September 2019 to 30 June 2020.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-120</td>
<td>New Zealand Centre for Gifted Education Limited</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the specialist educators' salary to allow subsidies for the MindPlus programme for the period of 2 September 2019 to 20 December 2019.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-121</td>
<td>Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of two laptop computers for youth workers.</td>
<td>$2,485.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-122</td>
<td>Refugees As Survivors New Zealand Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the stakeholder engagement coordinator's salary for the period of 1 September 2019 to 1 September 2020.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-123</td>
<td>Migrant Action Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of event banners, posters, flyers, stationery, marketing and communication, coordinator's salary, donations for the volunteers and catering for the three community hui in 2020.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-124</td>
<td>Mountains To Sea Conservation Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of the &quot;Wesley Kaitiaki Programme&quot; for seven and eight year students from Wesley Intermediate School.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-129</td>
<td>Almanar Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the accommodation, instructor fees, gifts and prizes, tee-shirts, transportation, games and miscellaneous costs for the Youth Camp in Waihi from 27 September 2019 to 29 September 2019.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-131</td>
<td>Kids Safe with Dogs Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards instructor wages, administration, and printing of activity booklets to deliver</td>
<td>$4,887.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Puketāpapa Local Board Grants Round One 2019/2020 and Puketāpapa Quick Response Round One 2019/2020 grant allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-133</td>
<td><strong>Te Karanga Charitable Trust</strong> Community towards the mentor wages to facilitate the &quot;Mentoring and Counselling Programme&quot; for Puketapapa youth from 2 September 2019 to 16 December 2019.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-113</td>
<td><strong>Friends of Wairaki Stream</strong> Environment towards equipment and community engagement costs.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-117</td>
<td><strong>Waikowhai Community Trust</strong> Events towards the Molley Green Community Day on 28 March 2019 including the cost of sound equipment hire, generators, port-a- loos, fun activities, waste management and prizes.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>$4,985.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-128</td>
<td><strong>New Zealand Nepal Society Incorporated</strong> Events towards 2020 Nepali Festival specifically the cost of audiovisual hire and lighting.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-104</td>
<td><strong>Chinese Senior Citizens Health Exercise Group Incorporated.</strong> Sport and recreation towards the venue hire cost to run Tai Chi, Qi Gong and other exercise classes for Chinese seniors at Fickling Convention Centre.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-110</td>
<td><strong>Winstone Park Tennis Club Incorporated</strong> Sport and recreation towards the purchase of tennis balls to be used for from 1 September 2019 to 1 December 2019.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>$1,485.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-111</td>
<td><strong>Aisea Hau Ma Over the Fence (umbrella organisation)</strong> Sport and recreation towards the costs of Puketāpapa Youth Basketball League, specifically, the costs of venue hire and volunteer donations from 19 October 2019 to 14 December 2019.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>$4,228.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in Puketāpapa Multiboard Round One 2019/2020, listed in Table Two below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-123</td>
<td>Connect the Dots</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the assistant tutor fee, printing of the postcards and art materials for workshops delivered in the local board area.</td>
<td>$2,887.58</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-152</td>
<td>Mika Haka Foundation Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the cost of running the &quot;YES Creative Hub&quot; from 10 October 2019 to 10 October 2020, specifically the costs of rent, public liability insurance, utilities, safety officer’s salary and administration cost.</td>
<td>$4,897.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-153</td>
<td>The Operating Theatre Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards 2,000 free tickets and free transport for children from low decile schools to attend the theatre production &quot;Greedy Cat&quot; by Joy Cowley.</td>
<td>$3,103.55</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-146</td>
<td>Roopa Aur Aap Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of providing counselling services, victim support services, office rent and volunteer reimbursements from 2 September 2019 to 28 August 2020.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-157</td>
<td>PHAB Association (Auckland) Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of running &quot;Youth With Disabilities Disco&quot; event on 28 September 2019 at</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Code</td>
<td>Organisation Name</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-161</td>
<td>The Parkinson's New Zealand Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the salary of six Auckland Parkinson’s community educators from 1 October 2019 to 1 October 2020.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-171</td>
<td>Basava Samithi of Australasia (New Zealand Chapter) Inc.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the costs of delivering the “Ageing Gracefully” workshop and seminars.</td>
<td>$2,526.13</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-103</td>
<td>The ReCreators Limited</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Towards the costs for the upcycling workshops and to provide educational services.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-170</td>
<td>Environmental Education for Resource Sustainability Trust</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of native plants from Te Whangai Trust and Gulf Trees including courier costs for classroom bins, administration and office expenses for schools and preschools</td>
<td>$2,547.45</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-145</td>
<td>5Tunz Communications Ltd</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the delivery of “Holi - Festival of Colours 2020” on 14 March 2020, including the cost of the generator, stage lighting and decor, sound, port-a-loos, waste management, security, advertising, and marquees.</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 14
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14</th>
<th>MB1920-159</th>
<th>United North Piha Lifeguard Service Incorporated</th>
<th>Sport and recreation</th>
<th>Towards the costs of structural engineering, detailed design and project management, consent fees for Lifeguard Facility Replacement Project.</th>
<th>$1,750.00</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB1920-167</td>
<td>Auckland Indian Sports Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards annual hockey turf hire fees from 1 September 2019 to 31 August 2020.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB1920-110</td>
<td>The Korean Society of Auckland Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the annual event costs for the Korean Day event</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,611.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in Puketāpapa Quick Response Round One 2019/2020, listed in Table Two below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QR2015-101</td>
<td>Urdu Hindi Cultural Association of New Zealand Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards venue hire (Fickling Convention Centre), sound system and musician fees for the Ghazal Night.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR2015-105</td>
<td>Roskill Chinese Group</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the monthly meeting costs of the Roskill Chinese Group specifically venue hire, printing, and marketing costs.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Horopaki Context
6. The local board allocates grants to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders and contribute to the vision of being a world class city.
7. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy supports each local board to adopt a grants programme.
8. The local board grants programme sets out:
   - local board priorities
   - lower priorities for funding
   - exclusions
   - grant types, the number of grant rounds and when these will open and close
   - any additional accountability requirements.


10. The community grant programmes have been extensively advertised through the council grants webpage, local board webpages, local board e-newsletters, Facebook pages, council publications, radio, and community networks.

11. The local board has set a total community grants budget of $72,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year. The local board has an unallocated budget of $2,500 from a grant that was not uplifted. This grant was allocated to the 5Tunz Communications Limited trading as Humm FM for the ‘Colors in the Park - Holi 2019’ event (LG1915-122), which will no longer proceed. A total of $12,000.00, from this budget, was allocated for the two quick response grant rounds. The remaining $62,500.00, from this budget, was allocated for the two local grant rounds.

12. Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

13. The aim of the local board grant programme is to deliver projects and activities which align with the outcomes identified in the local board plan. All applications have been assessed utilising the Community Grants Policy and the local board grant programme criteria. The eligibility of each application is identified in the report recommendations.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

14. The main focus of an application is identified as arts, community, events, sport and recreation, environment or heritage. Based on the main focus of an application, a subject matter expert from the relevant department, will provide input and advice.

15. The grants programme has no identified impacts on council-controlled organisations and therefore their views are not required.

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

Local impacts and local board views

16. Local boards are responsible for the decision-making and allocation of local board community grants. The Puketāpapa Local Board is required to fund, part-fund or decline these grant applications against the local board priorities identified in the local board grant programme.

17. The board is requested to note that section 48 of the Community Grants Policy states; ‘we will also provide feedback to unsuccessful grant applicants about why they have been declined, so they will know what they can do to increase their chances of success next time’.

18. A summary of each application received through Puketāpapa Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020, multi-board and Puketāpapa Quick Response, Round One 2019/2020 is provided in Attachment B, Attachment C and Attachment D.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

19. The local board grants programme aims to respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to improving Māori wellbeing by providing grants to individuals and groups who deliver positive outcomes for Māori. Auckland Council’s Māori Responsiveness Unit has provided input and support towards the development of the community grant processes.

20. Seven applicants applying to local grant round one, has indicated that their project targets Māori or Māori outcomes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

21. The allocation of grants to community groups is within the adopted Long-term Plan 2018-2028 and local board agreements.

22. The local board has set a total community grants budget of $72,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year. The local board has an unallocated budget of $2,500 from a grant that was not uplifted. This grant was allocated to the 5Tunz Communications Limited T/A Humm FM for the ‘Colors in the Park - Holi 2019’ event (LG1915-122), which will no longer proceed. A total of $12,000.00, from this budget, was tagged for the two quick response grant rounds. The remaining $62,500.00, from this budget, was tagged for the two local grant rounds.

23. Twenty applications were received for Puketāpapa Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020, requesting a total of $76,558.22 and thirteen multiboard applications were also received requesting a total of $36,611.71.

24. Two applications were received for Puketāpapa Quick Response, Round One 2019/2020, requesting a total of $2,000.00.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

25. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy and the local board grants programme. The assessment process has identified a low risk associated with funding the applications in this round.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

26. Following the Puketāpapa Local Board allocating funding for the local grants, quick response and multiboard round one, Commercial and Finance staff will notify the applicants of the local board’s decision.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A‡</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Grants Programme 2019/2020</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B⇨</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 grant applications (Under Separate Cover)</td>
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Puketāpapa Local Board – Local Grants Programme 2019/2020

Our Local Grants Programme aims to provide community grants to local communities through public and open grant rounds.

Outcomes sought by the Puketāpapa Local Board

Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the following outcomes, as outlined in our local board plan:
- Connected communities with a sense of belonging
- Improved wellbeing and safety
- Thriving local economy and good job opportunities
- Transport choices meet our varied travel needs
- Urban developments meet community needs
- Vibrant and popular parks ad facilities
- Treasured and enhanced natural environment

Our priorities sought from grant applications

The Puketāpapa Local Board welcomes grant applications that align with the following local board plan priorities:

Note: these priorities relate to the local board initiatives as outlined in the local board plan:

- Our cultural diversity is valued and communities feel recognized and included
- People want to learn about and contribute to their neighbourhoods and society
- Neighbourhoods where people know each other and feel safe and valued
- Local character and heritage is widely celebrated and reflected through arts, culture and language
- Provisions and promotion of opportunities and services supporting healthy and active lifestyles
- The community has the skills and knowledge to protect the local environment

Higher priorities:

The Puketāpapa Local Board will prioritise projects which:

- demonstrate collaboration e.g. involves working with other like-minded organisations and/or different parts of the community
- also seeking other funding
addresses two or more of the "Five ways of Wellbeing" outlined by the Mental Health Foundation NZ

- support and promote volunteerism
- can demonstrate community match funding (groups who demonstrate that 40% of project costs have already been met, including the approximate value provided by volunteers as a contribution to projects, events and/or initiatives)
- encourages people to engage with their wider community
- projects or events that align with the healthy environment principles of:
  - water is the first choice
  - good kai (food) for all
  - smokefree, alcohol and drug free movement is encouraged
  - promotes waste reduction initiatives

Lower Priorities:

The Puketāpapa Local Board has identified the following activities as lower priorities:

- entry fees for programmes or events
- projects or events that are outside the local board area
- air travel and overseas costs
- wages or operational costs
- catering
- gifts/prizes
- grants which support the purchase of assets and/or equipment with limited future use (single use)

Eligibility

Refer to paragraphs 71, 72 and 73 of the Community Grants Policy:

Commercial entities may apply for grants only where there is a clear and direct benefit for the wider community. "Profit generated by a grant-funded project, event or activity may only be retained by the grant recipient if it is reinvested in a social, environmental or cultural mission."

In addition to the eligibility criteria outlined in the Community Grants Policy, the Puketāpapa Local Board will not fund:

- projects and activities where funding is the responsibility of central government (e.g. core education, primary health care);
- schools, unless one of the following can be demonstrated:
  - community need and benefit to the wider community
  - accessibility to the public out of school hours
- applicants who have failed to complete or provide a satisfactory accountability form from previous grants
- individuals or sole traders or limited liability companies; unless the benefit to the wider community can be demonstrated

Applicants can only apply for the same project or activity once every financial year.
Investment approach

The Puketāpapa Local Board grant rounds will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant name</th>
<th>Quick Response Grants</th>
<th>Local Project Grants</th>
<th>Strategic Relationships Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum and maximum amounts</td>
<td>Minimum amount per grant: $300</td>
<td>Minimum amount per grant: $1,000</td>
<td>Indicative amount per grant: $10,000-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum amount per grant: $1,000</td>
<td>Maximum amount per grant: Indicative $5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rounds per year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Small (quick response) grants to supplement other funding to ensure a project/event can take place. Simplified application process</td>
<td>Medium (local) sized grants</td>
<td>Large (strategic) grants to support organisations that are delivering on outcomes that are aligned with the board’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accountability measures for Local and Quick Response Grants:

The Puketāpapa Local Board requires that all successful applicants provide:
- photos of the activity
- invitations to the local board for any event or function funded, are requested
- public acknowledgement of local board funding including the use of the local board logo on any advertising materials
- meet council standard financial accountability requirement

Application and decision dates for 2019/2020 will be as follows:

a) Quick Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/2020 grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>28 June 2019</td>
<td>15 August 2019</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>3 February 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>21 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Local Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/2020 grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>12 July 2019</td>
<td>15 August 2019</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-board funding

The Puketāpapa Local Board welcomes multi-board funding applications. However, the activity or initiative will need to clearly benefit the Puketāpapa community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiboard grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Grant Round One</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>15 August 2019</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Grant Round Two</td>
<td>20 January 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>21 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Puketāpapa Local Board funding opportunities:

c) Neighbours Day 2020

Applications will be open for Neighbours Day in February 2020, for events around the national Neighbours Day Aotearoa.

Please contact the Puketāpapa Local Board office at the Fickling Centre, 546 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings or phone (09) 367 4301

d) Strategic Relationships Grant 2020/2021

Applications for the Strategic Relationships Grant will be available in 2019/2020 for projects in 2020/2021. For further information, please refer to the Strategic Relationships Grant Terms of Reference or check the Auckland Council website.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Puketāpapa Local Board (the Board) on transport-related matters in its area and an update on its local board transport capital fund (LBTCF). Also included is a progress report on the Connected Communities project and brief updates on other significant projects in the Board’s area. Relevant public consultations and decisions of Auckland Transport’s (AT’s) Traffic Control Committee as relevant to the Board area are also included.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Progress on the Board’s Mt Roskill Streetscape upgrade is briefly discussed in the report. The project is due to begin in September 2019 and be completed by December 2019.
3. Information is given on the progress on the Board’s funded local board capital fund projects (LBTCF). The current balance is zero, as the Board has allocated all of its LBTCF for this electoral term. If any savings are made on projects, it will be credited back to the fund. The Board will receive another allocation on 1 July 2019.
4. The report provides a brief update to the Board on significant Auckland Transport (AT) projects in the Board area.
5. Details of progress on AT’s Connected Communities project is included as well as information on the routes in the Board area that will be affected by this project.
6. Relevant consultations and decisions of AT’s transport control committee are noted, as they affect the Puketāpapa Local Board area.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport August 2019 report.

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Mt Roskill Streetscape Upgrade

10. The Board has been assisted by Auckland Council to design a streetscape upgrade project in the Mt Roskill Village area. (refer Attachment A). The project will provide a discrete enhancement to the village and it will be delivered by Auckland Transport. Based on the successful tenderer’s programme, the works are expected to be completed by the end of November 2019.

11. AT will engage with the local business owners to ensure that they are fully aware of the work when it takes place and that any disruption is kept to a minimum.

Update on Puketāpapa Local Board Transport Capital Funded Projects

12. The table below reflects the status of projects which have been supported by resolution and are progressing using the LBTCF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Hay Park Lighting</td>
<td>Continuing the lighting project from the northern section to the southern end of the park past Noton Road carpark to Richardson Road.</td>
<td>This project is now completed.</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Cycling Project – Route D (modified)</td>
<td>This route includes shared paths on Frost Road and then a combination of traffic calming measures, signs, markings along Britton and Dornwell Roads, shared paths through the laneways and then traffic calming on Hayr Road and Haughey Avenue through to, but not across Hillsborough Rd.</td>
<td>Public consultation closes on the 26 July 2019. AT has already responded to queries from our major stakeholders. The next step is to respond to queries from the public followed by the approval of the consultation closeout report.</td>
<td>$600,000 (allocated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Road Crossing (1)</td>
<td>The installation of a pedestrian refuge on Hillsborough Road, vicinity of Haughey Street/Delargey Avenue. This will support the greenway cycle route by aiding access to Monte Cecilia Park.</td>
<td>Resolved March 2019, project being set up. Funding stream now confirmed.</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Road (2) Signalised Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>The installation of a signalised crossing of Hillsborough Road in the vicinity of Goodall Street. Residents have reported that Hillsborough Road can be very difficult to cross as there is a considerable distance between pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td>Resolved March 2019, project being set up. Funding stream now confirmed.</td>
<td>$338,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Road Bus stop 8345</td>
<td>Improvements at bus stop 8345 on Dominion Road, including extending the hard surface and area and the provision of a new seat.</td>
<td>This is now completed.</td>
<td>$14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Roskill</td>
<td>The Board approved a small allocation</td>
<td>A start date for the</td>
<td>$244,787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Village Upgrade

- from its local board transport capital fund to move this project forward.
- The aim is to create an improved environment for pedestrians, bus passengers, shoppers and the business community at Mt Roskill village.
- Improved footpaths, seating and landscaping are proposed within the road corridor.
- project has not yet been confirmed but the project is expected to start in September and be completed by December 2019.

### Progress being made on significant investigations and projects in the Board area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Safer Communities 2018-21      | This programme focuses on walking improvements in the Mount Roskill community. It aims to create safer walking environments for local people to get to and from key destinations such as schools, public transport hubs, shops, community centres and more, on foot. | AT is currently finalising the drawings for the Carr Rd and Frost Rd proposals and expect to report back to the public and close out consultation around mid-August 2019.  
AT will attend the Cluster workshop in September 2019 to report back on the Three Kings Plaza section. |
| Dominion Road Double Decker Route | Changes are being made to the bus stops in the village area to accommodate double decker buses.                                      | Line marking and signage is now completed. The new bus shelter has been completed and the new LED luminaires installed. |
| Carlton Street                 | AT has reviewed the safety audit completed by consultants and provided responses to the matters raised at the May 2018 public meeting.
AT has designed bus-friendly infrastructure designs that will ensure all vehicles travel slowly on Carlton Street. | The consultation results and report has now been sent out to submitters. Changes to Carlton Street are expected to take place later in 2019 to allow the 68 bus route to use the road. |
| Mt Eden Road Buslane Upgrade   | Tender documents have been finalised and approval from the Traffic Control Committee has been obtained. The work in the Puketapapa Board area between Mt Albert Road and Landscape Road is on hold. Mt Eden Road reseal in the same area will be confined to the traffic lanes and flush median. | The work in the Puketapapa Local Board area is on hold. Reasons for this were discussed with the Board in March 2019. |
Item 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke Street Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Speed calming devices will be constructed on Duke Street similar in design to the existing devices. The project is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Road pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>AT is developing a design for two new signalised crossings on May Road, in the vicinity of Glynn Street and Roma Road. A pedestrian refuge is proposed close to Denny Avenue. Board and public consultation was completed in May 2019. Some minor changes are being made to the design as a result of the consultation. The final design will be posted online once the consultation closeout is completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport</td>
<td>Delivered an alcohol CBT in partnership with the NZ Police. Delivered two motorcycle/moped workshops. Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport</td>
<td>Deliver a Motorcycle Awareness Month campaign In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introducing ‘Connected Communities’

13. You may remember AT introduced the Integrated Corridor Delivery Programme in a workshop in late 2018/early 2019. We have now renamed this programme ‘Connected Communities’ to better reflect the outcomes we are aiming to achieve.

14. Connected Communities aims to make public transport, walking and cycling more attractive to Aucklanders, and provide safer, healthier streets. It brings together a range of bus, cycling, walking and road safety projects across 12 major routes and the CBD, to address traffic congestion in key parts of our growing city. AT will roll out the programme over 10 years, partially funded by the RFT and NZTA. The roads/streets included in the programme have been named by their primary road name.

- Ponsonby Road
- Great North Road
- New North Road
- Sandringham Road
- Mt Eden Road
- Manukau and Pah Roads
- Remuera Road
- Parnell Road
- Ellerslie Panmure Highway
- Pakuranga Road
- Massey Road
- Great South Road.

15. Given the size, complexity and scope of the programme, we are taking the time to build the right team and to coordinate with other major projects and the wider Auckland Council group to ensure we take a joined-up approach.

16. Connected Communities brings together a range of bus, cycling, walking and road safety projects across 12 major routes and the CBD, to address traffic congestion as Auckland continues to grow.

17. AT has now established a highly experienced, multi-disciplinary team to support the Connected Communities programme. This took longer than expected, but expert staff are now working collaboratively as the Connected Communities team.
18. To ensure we get things right, and given the size, complexity and scope of the programme, this team is taking the next few months to work through the planning process. This includes coordinating with other major projects and the wider Auckland Council group to ensure we take a joined-up approach.

19. After the local elections, we will initiate what we hope will be an on-going collaboration with impacted Local Boards over the life of this programme. We have already booked two workshops with directly affected Local Boards for early 2020.

20. The first workshop will be to provide an update on the programme, and capture your feedback on this. At the second workshop, we will seek your insights on local needs/issues, community plans we need to be aware of and how best to effectively engage with our communities. We look forward to working with Local Boards to improve our communities’ transport choices.

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

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

Infrastructure and Heritage Meeting – July 2019

22. A cluster meeting was held with the Board in July 2019. This provided an opportunity for the board to be briefed on the outcome of the tender process for the Mt Roskill Streetscape project.

Auckland Transport Consultations

23. AT provides the Puketapapa Local Board with the opportunity to comment on transport projects being delivered in their area. Consultations in this period include the Board’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Board Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Avenue, Lynfield</td>
<td>AT is proposing Broken Yellow Lines (BYLs) parking restrictions on The Avenue in Lynfield. This proposal responds to a request from the Puketāpapa Local Board to investigate the issue of parked vehicles blocking visibility for drivers entering and exiting the carpark to the shopping complex. The proposed restrictions are expected to make it easier and safer for those visiting the shops by preventing vehicles from parking near the carpark driveway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Control Committee resolutions

24. There were no Traffic Control Committee decisions that affected the Board area in June 2019. The report for July 2019 was not ready at the time of the writing of this report, so any relevant decisions will be reported next month.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
25. 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
26. There are no financial implications that result from receiving this report.

Local Board Transport Capital Fund Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puketapapa Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds Available in current political term</td>
<td>$2,702,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount committed to date on projects approved for design and/or construction</td>
<td>$2,702,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget left</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
27. There are no risks associated with receiving this report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
28. At will provide a further update report next month.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek the local board’s views on the future development of Liston Village at Monte Cecilia Park, Hillsborough.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Retaining housing for older people at Liston Village and expanding the entrance to Monte Cecilia Park was selected by Puketāpapa Local Board as their One Local Initiative. Funding of $17 million to $33 million was earmarked for the project.

3. To enable decision-making on the future use of the site, staff identified four options:
   - Option one: Develop the whole of the site as open space to enhance Monte Cecilia Park (status quo)
   - Option two: Develop approximately half of the site as open space and half as social housing (up to 49 units) (One Local Initiative)
   - Option three: Develop approximately two-thirds of the site as open space and one third as social housing (up to 45 units) (enhanced One Local Initiative).
   - Option four: Develop the whole site as open space and investigate the development of temporary social housing at the Korma Road entrance to Monte Cecilia Park.

4. This report seeks the board’s in principle support for one of these options.

5. The options have been assessed for alignment to council strategy, open space amenity, ability to cater to growth, and value for money. Option one (status quo) scores highest against these assessment criteria. Option three and option four also score favourably.

6. Of the three top scoring options, option three best reflects the local board’s objectives of achieving a meaningful increase in social housing for older people, low disruption to Liston Village, and improved access to Monte Cecilia Park. However, it would entail some loss of open space amenity, and carries high legal and financial risk.

7. Option one delivers the best open space outcomes and poses a low reputational risk for council associated with the demolition of social housing stock during a time of perceived rising need. It poses a moderate reputational risk to the local board, which has long advocated for the expansion of social housing.

8. Option four scores moderately across all criteria. It’s ability to maximise amenity at Monte Cecilia Park main entrance is largely offset by a countervailing loss of amenity at the Korma Road. It’s focus on temporary social housing outside Liston Village helps to mitigate legal and financial risk. However, this also limits its potential scale.

9. Option two scores lowest, as it offers the least open space amenity, carries high legal risk, is most costly, and would offer only four additional units over the next best option.

10. The next step is to prepare a report to the Environment and Community Committee (or equivalent) after the 2019 local body elections, taking into account the board’s views. Staff will engage with the incoming board to reconfirm its preferred option prior to reporting to the Committee.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

EITHER

a) agree in principle its preferred option for the future development of Liston Village, Hillsborough from one of the four options below:
   i) the development of approximately half of Liston Village site as open space and half as social housing (Option two – One Local Initiative)
   ii) the development of approximately two-thirds of Liston Village site as open space and one third as social housing (Option three – Enhanced One Local Initiative)
   iii) the development of the whole of Liston Village site as open space and investigate the development of temporary social housing at the Korma Road entrance to Monte Cecilia Park (Option four)
   iv) the development of the whole of the Liston Village site as open space (Option one – status quo).

Horopakí
Context

11. Monte Cecilia Park is centrally located on the isthmus of Tāmaki Makaurau. It is situated on an elevated site with expansive views of the Manukau Harbour and Maungakiekie.
12. The park features Pah Homestead, a ‘Category A’ heritage building, as its centrepiece. It also contains two large amphitheatre-shaped landforms and an outstanding mature tree collection.

Liston Village is being acquired as part of a major expansion and upgrade of Monte Cecilia Park

13. Liston Village was established by the Catholic Diocese of Auckland in 1982. It sits on an 18,500m² site, and comprises of 25 retirement homes targeted at people on lower incomes, aged 60 years of age and over.
14. On 14 May 1998, the former Auckland City Council endorsed a concept plan for a ‘Proposed Premier Park, Hillsborough’ and resolved to commence negotiations with neighbouring landowners to acquire an additional 20,000m² of land to expand Monte Cecilia Park.
15. This resulted in decisions to acquire several parcels of land, including Pah Homestead, Monte Cecilia Primary School, Liston Village and residential properties on Hillsborough and Korma Roads.
16. In 2010, the legacy council initiated a process under the Public Works Act 1981 to compulsorily acquire Liston Village from the Diocese.
17. The reason given for the compulsory acquisition was that public ownership of the land was needed to provide for “…the public recreation area and associated facilities of Monte Cecilia Park.”
18. At the time of acquisition all existing residents of Liston Village were granted licenses-to-occupy. This means that while they do not own the units, they may inhabit them for the rest of their lives or until they choose to vacate.
19. To date the council has acquired 12 out of the 25 units. Council is also acquiring the underlying land. Full possession of Liston Village is estimated by 2027. The Diocese continues manage Liston Village in the interim.
20. Liston Village is the last major acquisition anticipated by the legacy council for the expansion of Monte Cecilia Park. No further acquisitions at Monte Cecilia are anticipated.

21. As it is being acquired for open space purposes, Liston Village is not part of the council’s wider social housing initiatives.

**Provision of housing for older people at Liston Village is a priority for the local board**

22. From as early as 2011 Puketāpapa Local Board has advocated for more housing development in Puketāpapa.

23. The board has an oversight role in respect of Monte Cecilia Park as a local park and has raised its concerns about the merits of removing functional housing for older people to expand an already large park.

24. In 2014, the Local Board Plan sought to “…investigate options for increasing supply of affordable community and social housing, including advocating to retain existing social housing at Liston Village.”

25. In 2015, the board commissioned an external report which concluded, amongst other things, that:
   - there should be an assessment of the potential for redevelopment of the Liston Village site to increase the amount of housing on the site
   - the merits of an alternative option of using the site to increase the street frontage and open space footprint of Monte Cecilia Park and enhance its public recreation role.

26. In 2016, the board endorsed a report, *Liston Village: Urban Design Assessment and Concept Plans* prepared by consultants Harrison-Grierson. That report proposed that approximately half of the site be used for open space and half for social housing. This is illustrated in figure one below, with the indicative area for social housing shown in red.

*Figure 1: Liston Village site showing indicative future land use*
The board sought funding through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 to develop Liston Village

27. In 2018, the board selected Liston Village as its One Local Initiative for funding under the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

28. The board’s objectives for its One Local Initiative are to:
   • address a perceived need for social housing for older people
   • minimise disruption to existing residents at Liston Village
   • improve public access to Monte Cecilia Park.

29. Following acquisition, development of the site could proceed in two phases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase one: Reconfiguration</th>
<th>Phase two: Intensification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Six units at the front of site to be demolished and</td>
<td>• 21 units at the rear of site would be demolished and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebuilt at the rear of site</td>
<td>replaced by 45 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cleared land to be incorporated into Monte Cecilia Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pah Stables and surrounds to be incorporated into</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Cecilia Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Four units at front of site to be retained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 21 units at the rear of site would be demolished and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>replaced by 45 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Funding of $17 million to $33 million has been earmarked for the project, subject to the availability of the site and a business case process.

Legacy decisions pose a barrier to the local board’s initiative

31. All resolutions of legacy councils are treated as if they were council’s own in accordance with the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009.

32. Without a new decision by the governing body, council is required to implement the resolutions of the legacy council.

33. In its initial consideration of the Puketāpapa One Local Initiative, the governing body directed staff to assess and report back on whether the whole of Liston Village is still required for open space purposes.

34. A full assessment on the need for social housing, either at a local or regional level is beyond the scope of this advice and has not been undertaken. This will be assessed as part of any future business case.

There is shared decision-making allocation for open space acquisition

35. The decision-making allocation for council to acquire or dispose of land for parks and open spaces is set out in the allocation of decision-making for non-regulatory activities in Volume Two of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

36. The governing body is responsible for:
   • the number and general location of all new parks and the prioritisation of major upgrades to existing parks (including sports fields within parks)
   • acquisition and divestment of all park land, including the disposal of surplus parks, excluding any disposal and reinvestment made in accordance with the Service Property Optimisation Approach.

37. Local boards are responsible for the specific location of new local parks and open spaces (including the prioritisation for acquisition), and for their subsequent design and development within budget parameters agreed with the governing body.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Development of Liston Village is consistent with Auckland Plan 2050

38. The development of Liston Village as either open space or housing would be consistent with the following outcomes under the Auckland Plan 2050:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: Belonging and participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Direction One:</strong> Foster an inclusive Auckland where everyone belongs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Direction Two:</strong> Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: Homes and places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Direction Three:</strong> Shift to a housing system that ensures secure and affordable homes for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Direction Four:</strong> Provide sufficient public places and spaces that are inclusive, accessible and contribute to urban living.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The open space provision policy sets out the requirements for destination parks

39. The Open Space Provision Policy 2016 informs council decision-making on the type, size and location of parks and open space. Under this policy, Monte Cecilia Park is defined as a destination park.

40. Destination parks are intended to serve large sub-regional catchments, drawing users from across Tāmaki Makaurau. Successful destination parks often become tourist attractions, bringing economic benefits to their host communities. Destination parks also serve as neighbourhood and suburb parks to nearby residents.

41. Destination parks are typically large, capable of hosting large numbers of people for extended periods of time. Typical destination parks are more than 300,000m$^2$, and have specialised facilities and significant or unique attributes.

42. As a destination park, Monte Cecilia Park provides a range of amenities, including:

- large events space for movies and music in the park
- networks of walking circuits and trails
- distinct natural, heritage or cultural features such as the mature tree collection, Pah Homestead and geological features
- multiple places for gathering and socialising such as barbeque and picnic areas.

The demand for open space in Puketāpapa is increasing

43. The population of Puketāpapa was 56,300 at the last census in 2013. This represents a 4.5 per cent increase between 2006 and 2013.\(^1\)

44. Council projects the population will grow by 13,900 people, or 4630 households by 2028.

45. Puketāpapa has several areas where Housing New Zealand has a large ownership of properties. Significant redevelopment of these areas is now planned with an emphasis on an increase in housing density.

46. In the neighbourhood of Waikowhai to the south of Richardson Road there are 298 existing Housing New Zealand homes, which are estimated to increase to 769 homes. The area of Mount Roskill South has 278 existing Housing New Zealand homes, which is expected to increase to 888 homes.

---

\(^1\) Census 2013 projects that the population of Tāmaki Makaurau will grow from 1.6 million in 2016 to 1.9 to 2.1 million in 2028.
47. The populations of the neighbouring local boards of Whau, Albert-Eden and Maungakiekie-Tāmaki have also increased and will continue to do so. This will place additional pressure on the existing open space network.

The demand for housing for older people is also increasing

48. Census data shows the number of older people living within Puketāpapa is small but growing. In 2013 the proportion of usual residents 65 years of age and over was 6147, up 8.3 per cent since 2006. The 2013 census indicated those 65 years of age and over formed 12 per cent of the population of the local board area.

49. By 2028, the population of people who are expected to be 65 years of age and over in the area will increase to 11,000. This age group is on the increase following national and global trends as people are living longer.

50. Between 2015 and 2019, the number of building consents issued for retirement village units in the Puketāpapa local board area was 143. This is 14 per cent of the total number of building consents (1041) issued over the same period.

Monte Cecilia Park is not fully functioning as a destination park

51. In 2015, park-user research was undertaken at Monte Cecilia Park. The objective of the research was to gain an understanding of the awareness, usage and attitudes of park users.

52. The research found:
   - extremely high satisfaction among existing users
   - 17 per cent visited the park every two to three days, 23 per cent visited the park once every two to three months
   - 71 per cent of users access the park on foot, 26 per cent drive
   - 82 per cent of walkers travel less than 10 minutes to access the park
   - 78 per cent of drivers travel under five minutes to access the park
   - 20 per cent of users are 65 years of age and over.

53. While there are limitations with the data, it suggests that the park is mainly used by residents, but not attracting visitors from further afield as would normally be expected of a destination park.

The Liston Village site has high value as open space

54. Prospective disposals of open space are assessed against the Parks and Open Space Acquisition Policy and the Open Space Provision Policy.

55. Staff performed two assessments of the site against the policy. The first considered the open space value of Liston Village as a whole. The second considered the potential loss of those parts of the site affected by the One Local Initiative. The key findings are outlined below:

56. There is a need for additional open space in the surrounding area:
   - there is a gap in provision for a neighbourhood park to the immediate west of Monte Cecilia Park between Hillsborough Road and Dornwell Road.
   - neighbourhood parks are typically 3000m² to 5000m² in size.
   - the addition of 18,500 m² of open space would increase the capacity of the local parks network.

57. Monte Cecilia Park is small by regional standards:
   - in its current configuration, Monte Cecilia Park is approximately 144,000m². This is less than half the size of a typical destination park.
the addition of Liston Village to Monte Cecilia Park would increase the park's area to approximately 162,700 m². This would enhance the recreational amenity of the park and improve its ability to function as a destination park.

58. Monte Cecilia Park has a low street presence:
- The park's eight entry points all have narrow road frontages. The main entrance off Hillsborough Road has a current street frontage of only 33 metres. This limits visual connection between the park and the street.
- the addition of the front portion of the Liston Village site (Figure two, green area) would:
  - increase street frontage to approximately 83 metres²
  - improve visual connection from Hillsborough Road to Pah Homestead
  - create an entrance that is easily located by tourists and more suited to a regionally significant open space
  - enhance public safety by allowing the widening of the main access way from Hillsborough Road, via Delargey Avenue, including separation of pedestrians and cyclists from vehicles
  - support the creation of a greenway link through the park.

59. Liston Village is a site of cultural and heritage significance:
- both Liston Village and Monte Cecilia Park were once part of a larger fortified Maori Pa (Whataroa), which gives this space significant meaning to mana whenua.
- the Liston Village site includes a protected heritage building, the Pah Stables (Figure two, yellow dotted area). This forms part of the original Pah Homestead. Incorporating Liston Village into Monte Cecilia Park would reconnect the Stables with the Homestead.

60. A partial disposal would limit, but not prevent, some positive open space outcomes:
- the proposed retention of up to four units along Delargey Avenue is problematic, as it would materially limit council's ability to extend Monte Cecilia Park's street frontage and improve accessibility and visibility into the park.
- other aspects of the board's proposal support open space outcomes
  - the rear of the site off Steins Avenue (Figure two, red area) is less integral to the physical or visual connectivity of the park. This comprises the majority of land proposed for social housing
  - a partial disposal would limit but not prevent the potential greenway link
  - no specific ecological, heritage or cultural places of significance have been identified in the parts of the site proposed for disposal
  - the proposed area of land to be retained is large enough to support informal recreational activity, while also enabling some widening of the main entrance and street frontage.

2 The street frontage will remain modest compared to other regionally significant open spaces: Western Park (154 metres), One Tree Hill (236 metres), Auckland Domain (256 metres), Western Springs Park (576 meters), Cornwall Park (615 metres).
There are a range of other factors to consider

Regional policy on social housing is unclear

61. The council does not have a policy or objectives for acquiring land to expand social housing provision.

62. The council is currently reviewing its role in the provision of social housing. A decision on the priorities around social housing has not been made.

63. Once council’s policy has been clarified, a rationale and benefit case will need to be completed. Prioritising housing for the elderly over other social housing needs and identifying Puketāpapa over other parts of Auckland will need to be determined.

It will be legally difficult to change the use of the site

64. There is a legal risk to council if does not carry out the public works purpose by which Liston Village is being acquired.

65. The original decision to acquire the land and council’s compliance with the requirements of the Public Works Act 1981 could be subject to judicial review. This could result in the council being required to offer the land back to the Diocese.

66. This risk could be mitigated if the council can demonstrate that the land is required for an alternative public work, such as social housing. This may be difficult given the site was already being used social housing prior to acquisition.

67. Even if a new public works purpose could be established, the Diocese may still consider deviation from the original public works purpose to be contrary to its contractual agreements with council. This could result in legal action to uphold the agreement.

68. Council could be found to be in ‘breach of contract’ because the Diocese may have not entered into the agreement if the land was to be used for another public work.

69. The Diocese has previously written to council warning it to uphold agreement.
Open space budgets will no longer be available to fund the acquisition

70. The purchase and conversion of Liston Village as open space is being funded from the open space acquisition budget. The primary source of this funding are development contributions charged for the provision of new open space.

71. Development contributions can only be spent for the purpose for which they are charged. This has two implications:

- any development contributions used to fund the acquisition of those parts of Liston Village not required for open space will need to be repaid to the open space acquisition budget or re-invested in alternative open space in the local area
- the open space acquisition budget will be unable to fund the future acquisition of any parts of Liston Village not required for open space.

72. In both cases, One Local Initiative funding will be needed to compensate for the loss of development contribution funding to complete the acquisition.

There are four options for decision-makers to consider

73. Staff have identified four options for Liston Village:

- **Option one**: Develop the whole of Liston Village as open space (18,500 m²) *(status quo)*
- **Option two**: Council to provide housing for older people at Liston Village (8300 m²), while using a portion (10,200 m²) of the site to widen the main entrance to Monte Cecilia Park *(One Local Initiative)*
- **Option three**: Develop provide housing for older people at Liston Village (6070 m²), while using a larger portion of the site (12,430 m²) to widen the main entrance to Monte Cecilia Park *(enhanced One Local Initiative)*.
- **Option four**: Council to provide housing for older people at the Korma Road entrance (4376 m²) to Monte Cecilia Park and develop the whole of the Liston Village site as open space.

**Option one: Develop the whole of Liston Village as open space (status quo)**

74. This option reflects the status quo under the legacy resolution. It would see council continue the approved acquisition of Liston Village as open space.

75. The benefits of this option are:

- it would deliver the best open space outcomes, including improved visual and physical connectivity from the Hillsborough Road to Monte Cecilia Park, reconnection of the Pah Stables with Pah Homestead and would increase the park’s street frontage to 83 metres.
- it has no legal risks associated with the delivery of this option
- it carries low financial risk. The acquisition of the site, demolition of existing units, and restoration of the site to grassland, will be met from within existing open space budgets. However, potential costs for the restoration and maintenance of the heritage Pah Stables building are unknown and unbudgeted.

76. This option would not meet the local board’s intention to provide social housing in Puketāpapa. This would create a reputational risk for the local board within the local community.

**Option two: Develop half of Liston Village as open space and half as housing for older people (One Local Initiative)**

77. Under this option, the Liston Village site would be divided in two:

- approximately 10,200 m² would be developed as open space
- approximately 8300 m² would be deemed surplus to open space requirements, and available for another public purpose.
The surplus land could be developed as social housing. Four of the 10 existing accommodation units along Delargey Avenue could be retained, while up to 45 accommodation units could be developed at the rear of the site off Steins Avenue.

This option reflects the agreed scope of the Puketāpapa One Local Initiative.

The benefits of this option are:

- it would constitute a large scale, long-term response to social housing pressure
- it would deliver some open space benefits, including some improvement to the main entrance of Monte Cecilia Park, reconnection of the Pah Stables with Pah Homestead and would increase the park’s street frontage to 60 meters.

However, it would carry several risks:

- it may be difficult to establish an alternative public works purpose
- the opportunity to maximise the functionality of Monte Cecilia Park will be lost
- the four retained units on Delargey Avenue may be visually and physically isolated from the main concentration of 45 units off Steins Avenue
- the local community may oppose the development of social housing as contrary to the legacy council’s original plans to expand Monte Cecilia Park
- the Diocese may oppose the development of social housing as contrary to terms of its sale and purchase agreement with council. This could result in legal action against the council to uphold the original agreement
- the council could be forced to offer back the land to the Diocese if it is not used to provide open space in accordance with the original public works purpose
- a resource consent would likely be required for building works. This could be challenged by the Diocese or the wider public
- it would trigger additional legal compliance obligations, some of which would requiring further community consultation. For example, the revocation of reserve status from part of the Liston Village site under the Reserves Act 1977.

This option is a variation on option two. It maintains the key aspects of the One Local Initiative, while also taking the findings of the open space policy assessment into account.

Its single point of difference is that all housing units along Delargey Avenue would be removed under this option. This would result in the loss of four units proposed for retention under option two.

The development of up to 45 units at the rear of the site could still occur.

The benefits of this option are:

- it would enable all the key open space outcomes under option one to be delivered, including improved visual and physical connectivity from the Hillsborough Road to Monte Cecilia Park, reconnection of the Pah Stables with Pah Homestead and would increase the park’s street frontage to 83 metres
- it would still constitute a large scale, long-term response to social housing pressure
- clustering all social housing together at the rear of the site could improve internal connectivity and sense of community within the village
- it would cost an estimated $5 million less to implement than option two

However, it would deliver less total open space than option one, and four fewer accommodation units than option two.
87. The same financial and legal risks associated with option two would apply.

Option four: Develop the whole of Liston Village as open space and investigate the provision of temporary housing for older people at the Korma Road entrance to Monte Cecilia Park

88. Under this option, the entire Liston Village would be converted to open space as planned. The council would investigate developing temporary social housing on 4376m² of public open space land at Monte Cecilia Park’s Korma Road entrance. The official classification of this land would remain public open space. Those areas of the site used for social housing could be subject to a lease or licence.

89. This option has several benefits:
   • it would deliver the same open space outcomes at main entrance to Monte Cecilia Park as under option one
   • the site is already in council ownership and has no existing structures. This means it can be developed quickly and easily
   • the site was not acquired under the Public Works Act 1981. This eliminates many of legal risks associated with the Liston Village site under option two and option three
   • the proximity of Korma Road to Liston Village site will help minimise disruption to Liston Village residents and the wider community
   • the site is close to the existing Selwyn Village on Herd Road. This could result in operating efficiencies if the Selwyn Foundation were ultimately appointed to manage the Korma Road site on the council’s behalf.

90. However, it would carry some risks:
   • it would entail some loss of open space amenity at the Korma Road site
   • a temporary housing solution would be much smaller and lower density then what is possible under option two or option three. The actual number of units is likely to be the same or fewer then currently at Liston Village. As such, it would not constitute a large scale, long-term response to social housing pressure
   • like Liston Village, the acquisition of the Korma Road site was largely funded from development contributions. Even the temporary use of the site for social housing may be considered by some to deviate too far from the original open space purpose. This could result in pressure for council to refund the development contributions or acquire replacement open space
   • a resource consent would likely be required for building works. This could be challenged by the Diocese or the wider public
   • council’s demolition of housing from the Korma Road site was opposed by some members of the local community. Possible use of the site for social housing carries some reputational risk.

Staff have developed evaluation criteria to assess the four options

91. Staff have developed four evaluation criteria to enable the comparison of the proposed options. These criteria are:
   • strategic alignment
   • amenity and function
   • responding to growth
   • value for money.

92. The first criterion focuses on alignment with the provision targets and network principles in the Open Space Provision Policy and the Auckland Plan 2050 focus areas.
93. The second considers improvements in visibility, accessibility and recreational opportunity that support the realisation of Monte Cecilia Park as a successful destination park.

94. The third acknowledges the need to account for population change, and the ability to cater to the competing goals of open space and housing for older people.

95. The fourth focuses on value for money. This includes consideration of legal and financial risks with the potential to increase the complexity and cost of delivery.

96. The criteria are unweighted; each are deemed to be of equal importance. Table one provides an assessment of the option against the specific evaluation criterion.

### Table 1: Assessment of options against criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Strategic alignment</th>
<th>Amenity and function</th>
<th>Responding to growth</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option one: Develop the whole of the site as open space (status quo)</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option two: Develop half of the site as open space and half as social housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option three: Develop two-thirds of the site as open space and one third as social housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option four: Develop the whole of Liston Village as open space and provide temporary social housing at Korma Road entrance</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rating scale key

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

**Options one performs best, but option three and option four also favourable**

97. When the criteria are applied, option one scores highest. Option three and option four also score favourably. Staff seek the board’s in principal support for progressing one of these three options.

98. All options involve some trade-off between maximising open space against the ability to accommodate some social housing outcomes. The three top scoring options all recognised the value of the front portion of the Liston Village site as open space but differ in their ability to support growth or deliver value for money.

99. Option one would entail no loss of open space amenity. It also presents no legal risk to council, low financial risk and a moderate reputational risk. However, it fails to accommodate social housing.

100. Option four scores moderately across all criteria. It's ability to maximise amenity at Monte Cecilia Park’s main entrance is largely offset by a countervailing loss of amenity at the
Korma Road. It’s focus on temporary social housing outside Liston Village helps to mitigate legal and financial risk. However, this also limits its potential scale.

101. Of the three top scoring options, option three best reflects the local board’s objectives of achieving a meaningful increase in social housing for older people, low disruption to Liston Village, and improved access to Monte Cecilia Park. However, it would entail some loss of open space amenity, and carries high legal and financial risk.

102. Option two scores lowest, as it offers the least open space amenity, carries high legal risk, is most costly, and would offer only four additional units over the next best option.

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

103. The acquisition of Liston Village will continue to take place as units become available. No development of the site can be considered until acquisition has been completed.

104. Once acquisition has been completed, Customer and Community Services will be responsible for the development and ongoing maintenance of the parks.

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

105. The local board has been an advocate for social housing since 2011, with a specific interest in Liston Village since 2014.

106. The local board selected Liston Village as its One Local Initiative in May 2018.

107. The views of the local board are sought through this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

108. Both Liston Village and Monte Cecilia Park were once part of a larger fortified Maori Pa, which gives this space significant meaning to mana whenua.

109. The provision of quality parks and open spaces has broad benefits for Māori, including:

- helping to facilitate Māori participation in outdoor recreational activity
- helping make Tāmaki Makaurau a green, resilient and healthy environment consistent with the Māori world view of the natural world and their role as kaitiaki of the natural environment.

110. Mana whenua will be consulted on the development of the open space.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

111. Table two details the indicative costs associated with the assessed options. Option one has the lowest cost implications, as it entails no housing development, and the open space acquisition aspects can be fully funded from existing budgets. Any restoration costs associated with the heritage Pah Stables building have not been budgeted for and will require separate funding.

112. Options two, three and four would involve significant additional costs associated with the reimbursement of development contribution funding to the park acquisition budget on a pro rata basis, and the development of housing stock.

113. It may be possible for council to offset the costs of developing social housing. Options include accessing the Income Related Rent Subsidy, administered by the Ministry of Social Development, or securing upfront partnership funding from the government or a community housing provider. These should be assessed as part of any future business case.
Table 2: Indicative financial costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option one: Develop the whole of the site as open space</th>
<th>Reimbursement of open space budget</th>
<th>Cost of acquiring remaining units</th>
<th>Costs of delivering social housing</th>
<th>Net additional required funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option two: Develop half of the site as open space and half as social housing</td>
<td>$13.61m</td>
<td>$3.60m</td>
<td>$15.75m</td>
<td>$17.21m~$33.00m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option three: Develop two-thirds of the site as open space and one third as social housing</td>
<td>$9.09m</td>
<td>$3.60m</td>
<td>$15.75m</td>
<td>$12.69~$28.44m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option four: Develop the whole of Liston Village as open space and provide temporary social housing at Korma Road entrance</td>
<td>$6.13m (if required)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8.75m</td>
<td>$8.75~$18.82m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

114. Table three details the risks associated with the assessed options.

Table 3: Risks pertaining to assessed options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option one: Develop the whole of Liston Village as open space</th>
<th>Legal risk</th>
<th>Financial risk</th>
<th>Reputational risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Acquisition of open space is funded</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Development of social housing is contrary to the terms of the sale and purchase agreement. Council may have to ‘offer back’ the land to the Diocese.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Development contributions will need to be refunded and reinvested in alternative open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As per option two</td>
<td>As per option two</td>
<td>As per option two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Development contributions may need to be refunded and reinvested in alternative open space.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

115. Staff will prepare report to the incoming local board following the 2019 local body elections to reconfirm the board’s preferred option.

116. Staff will then report to the Environment and Community Committee with final recommendations.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Local Board feedback on the Productivity Commission inquiry into local government funding and financing

File No.: CP2019/13424

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 Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) provide 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 92300, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142.

3. Please direct any enquiries to Matthew Walker, Group Chief Financial Officer, at matthew.walker@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz and/or on 021-229-4094.
Introduction

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

Executive summary

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

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

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

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

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

7. The council also considers there is scope for the government to make changes to enhance the flexibility of existing funding tools reflecting the developing trust between government and the council. These tools include rates, fuel taxes, development contributions and New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) subsidies. Useful changes could include:
   - allowing the regional fuel tax and development contributions to be set based on broad future funding intentions rather than specific identified projects that limit the council’s ability to respond to the development market and changing transport priorities.
• amending NZTA subsidy level rules to reflect the agreement on the share of local and central government funding in the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP)
• provide the council with greater information gathering powers to establish how properties are being used so rates can be set fairly. At present ratepayers aren’t required to advise the council on how they are using their land.
Financing and funding challenges

Infrastructure and investment demand

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

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

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

11. In particular the cost of transport investment is rising as construction is conducted with greater attention to management of environmental issues and worker and public safety. Councils experiencing higher growth also face proportionally higher road maintenance costs 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 road network now congestion in the morning peak compared to 18 per cent less than four years ago. Congestion outside peak times and on weekends is also becoming more frequent with over 10 per cent of the network now experiencing inter-peak congestion. Auckland has also seen a near-doubling in road deaths and serious injuries over the past five years.

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

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

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

Financing

18. The council’s lack of debt headroom is the primary constraint on our ability to provide the infrastructure to meet the demands identified above. The council has a credit rating of AA2 and AA from Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s, respectively. Borrowing beyond our debt ceiling – which the council is very close to – would risk a downgrade to the credit rating, meaning a higher interest costs across all our borrowing and a reduced ability to access capital markets. A downgrade in Auckland Council’s credit rating would also impact on the credit rating of the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA) thus also impacting the borrowing costs of all other councils that raise funds through the LGFA.

Funding

19. Even if we could raise the debt to finance all the required investment the council is likely to face constraints in generating the on-going funding to support additional borrowing. Rates (including targeted rates) are a highly visible form of tax that account for 46 percent 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 take to meet these investment needs. The community supported these changes and they were adopted as part of the 10-year Budget.

Solutions

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

New sources of financing

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

---

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

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

Regional fuel tax and NZTA transport funding

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

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

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

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

Funding economic growth

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

---

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 fall to ratepayers. Legislation requires development contributions charges to be supported by detailed planning at a project level over a 10-year horizon. However, Auckland has a wide range of potential development areas and effective prioritisation of scarce capital has to be responsive to the market. A more flexible approach is needed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other funding commentary

Taxation relationship with government

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

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

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

Rates and funding fairness and affordability

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

• setting rates or charges at similar levels for those for whom similar levels of service are provided or available

• balancing the relative ability to pay of differing groups

• the degree of change in rates that any alteration to funding would lead to.

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

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

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

45. When considering the level of cost recovery when setting fees the council assesses the financial implications for those who will be paying. Examples in this context are the provision of free pool entry for under 16’s, 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 commits the council to considering. This has also featured directly and indirectly in subsequent rating policy considerations.

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

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

**Rates rebates**

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

**Expansion of local government responsibilities**

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

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

Local income and sales taxes

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

55. The council promoted the introduction of the regional fuel tax allowing for additional investment in transport infrastructure and to replace the ITL. A regional fuel tax has a better correlation between who pays and who benefits but has a greater impact on 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 share this burden between accommodation providers. A bed tax would distribute the costs between operators based on their revenue and hence benefit from increases in visitor numbers. The APTR distributes the costs based on capital value which is related to revenue but not as directly as a bed tax. In addition, the ownership structure of accommodation providers varies and the liability for rates does not fall evenly between the parties involved in the sector. For some properties the rates may fall on land owners and for others on the operator depending on the contract structure.

58. Changes in technology are changing the way in which business is conducted and properties are used. Current rating legislation was designed for a time when it was very clear how properties were being used. At present ratepayers have no obligation to advise the council of how they are using their properties and face no penalty if a use other than that which we have recorded is subsequently discovered. Changes to rating legislation to require ratepayers to advise the council how 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 ratepayers who over the last ten years would have seen their rates more than double.
Attachment One

7.2 Financing growth infrastructure

Purpose

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

Summary

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

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

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

5. While this general approach will continue, there are several reasons why we need to consider making some adjustments:

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

6. To complement and enhance our existing approach, we are proposing to:

   a) review development contribution pricing in key growth areas
   b) be ready to introduce new growth infrastructure targeted rates in key growth areas
   c) work with central government on the establishment of new legal entities to take a lead role in financing this infrastructure in a way that doesn’t rely on significant increases in council debt.

Background

The growth challenge

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

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

9. The current financial strategy provides that the costs of growth will be met by those who are benefiting from that growth. When the council invests in infrastructure to support growth the beneficiaries are:

a) land owners whose properties rise in value as they can now be developed
b) developers who undertake construction
c) future buyers of the homes constructed.

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

Development contributions

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

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

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

Infrastructure growth charges

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

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

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

Growth infrastructure targeted rates

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

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

19. There are some practical implications that will need to be considered as part of any proposal to implement targeted rates. These include:

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

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

Infrastructure demand in key growth areas

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

22. The remainder of Auckland’s growth is expected to occur in rural and coastal areas (15 per cent) and on around 15,000 hectares of land identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) as areas for future urban growth (25 per cent). These future urban areas are located primarily in:
   - Kumeu, Whenuapai and Redhills in the Northwest
   - Silverdale, Dairy Flat, Wairua and Warkworth in the North
   - Pukekohe, Drury, Paeraa and Takanini in the South.

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

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

Investment partnership model

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

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

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

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

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

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

15
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>
### 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.</td>
<td>• No additional charges, would only pay current development contributions and infrastructure growth charges if they are able to develop.</td>
<td>• Auckland’s housing issues highly likely to be further exacerbated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option Two:</strong></td>
<td>Adopt a strategy of using higher development contributions (DC) and infrastructure growth charges (IGC) in the key growth areas to help pay for the additional infrastructure.</td>
<td>• Developers should make a fair contribution to the cost of the infrastructure that enables their development.</td>
<td>• Developers would pay higher combined (DC plus IGC) charges as follows.</td>
<td>• May enable faster housing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt a strategy of using higher development contributions (DC) and infrastructure growth charges (IGC) in the key growth areas to help pay for the additional infrastructure.</td>
<td>• Consistent with well-established approach to paying for growth infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The use of this strategy may be limited by the availability of council debt headroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potentially creates a greater incentive to land bank rather than release land early for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This policy tool does not provide a mechanism to recover any proportion of infrastructure costs that primarily benefit existing housing units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

¹ The cost per house for the infrastructure to support the development of all the land provided for in the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (FULLS) is in the range of $80k to $110k. The costs per house noted in the table have been assessed on a marginal approach based on the infrastructure to support the developments in these areas even though they may benefit from some of the wider investments in the FULLS.
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<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>
| 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. | • Land owners would pay new targeted rates in addition to current DCs and IGs as follows:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Proposed new rate*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>$900-$1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>$1,300-$3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>$1,100-$2,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNZ areas</td>
<td>$500-$1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Rates would apply for a 20 year period from when land is development ready. | • Likely to enable and incentivise faster housing development.  
| • Land owners would be able to develop and would be required to pay regardless of whether they choose to develop now or wait. | • The use of this strategy may be limited by the availability of council debt headroom.  
| • Where land is held in large blocks, the annual targeted rate will also be charged (e.g. a block large enough for 100 houses with a $2,000 targeted rate would pay $200,000 per annum). | • 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. | • 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 (ii) 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 experience to help deliver the infrastructure. | • 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 IGs, new targeted rates, higher user charges or voluntary payments under a negotiated contract. | • 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 unfunded. | |

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

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

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

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

1. Timing

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

Commencement

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

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

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

Lifespan

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

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

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

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

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

**Capital value**

Capital value is the value of land and improvements (e.g. a house). Capital value does not share the costs of infrastructure required for development based on the benefits in terms of potential land value uplift. A growth infrastructure targeted rate set on capital value will be higher for a more developed property. While more developed properties are better able to take advantage of service improvements, they don’t gain 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 its 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
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legislative change to provide for an entirely new type of charge to be available to the council. Rates are incident on current land owns and designed accordingly. Substantial changes would be required to provide for a new type of charge incident on buyers, akin to stamp duty but location specific, or for rates to be incident on buyers in particular circumstances.

4. Informed buyers

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

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

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

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

From: Waitematā Local Board

15 February 2019

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

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

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

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

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

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

How funding and financing currently works

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

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

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

**Pressure points**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Future Funding and Financing

As the Productivity Commission has already concluded in its 2015 and 2017 reports there is considerable scope for Value Capture to be introduced in New Zealand, as already applies in many United States cities. This would enable major increases in land values generated by public action, such as investments in infrastructure that directly benefit private landowners, to have part of the windfall gains returned to councils. This could be achieved by directly levying this uplift in land values. At the core of the Waitomata 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 2016 Governance Framework Review found that “The funding policy is highly paternalistic, the governing body sets the budgets for each local board and directs where the majority of funding can be spent”. Additionally, it noted that “local boards lack clear accountability to their voters for their decisions. … Ultimately any decision-making role is undermined where the decision-maker does not have the responsibility for funding those decisions.”

4. The council submission notes that there is an increasing delegation from central government to local authorities in the delivery of services, particularly in the areas 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
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](http://www.productivity.govt.nz), email us at [info@productivity.govt.nz](mailto: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

Local government spending growth has focused on essential infrastructure

- Roads and 3 waters accounted for 56% of capex over the last decade.
- Capex has had a slow-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 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 to 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

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

Reforms and new tools

- Streamlined Long-Term Plans
- Fundamental review of performance reporting regime
- Encourage uptake of existing performance improvement and benchmarking programmes

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
- Mandatory, independently-chaired assurance committees
- Streamlined Long-Term Plans
- Fundamental review of performance reporting regime
- Encourage uptake of existing performance improvement and benchmarking programmes

Terms of Reference

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

The inquiry evidence base:

- 136 submissions
- 70+ engagement meetings
- Four in-depth case studies
- Expert advice and input

Attachment C

Item 17
Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

File No.: CP2019/14438

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol, and to seek local board feedback on the recommended changes to the document.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council is currently reviewing the Auckland Film Protocol. The Auckland Film Protocol sets out:
   • the commitment of the council group to supporting filming in Auckland;
   • expectations and rules that filmmakers must abide by when filming in Auckland; and
   • provides guidance for filmmakers on the process for approval to film in Auckland.
3. The purpose of the review was to ensure that the Auckland Film Protocol is up-to-date and identify emerging trends, issues or opportunities that should be addressed. Content of the Auckland Film Protocol was reviewed against legislation referenced in the document and against policies and plans of the Auckland Council group to identify areas where the Auckland Film Protocol should be updated. Engagement with staff involved in the process of assessing and approving film permit applications, from across the council group, was undertaken to inform the review and proposed amendments to the Protocol.
4. A revised draft of the Auckland Film Protocol was reported to the Environment and Community Committee in June 2019 for consideration and was approved for public consultation (resolution number ENV/2019/73).
5. The following is a summary of the key changes made to the Auckland Film Protocol before public consultation was undertaken:
   • **Native species**: new content added stating that Auckland Council may place additional conditions on film permits to protect native species
   • **Kauri dieback**: new content added providing information about kauri dieback and stating that filmmakers will be required to clean equipment to council specifications when filming in areas where kauri are present.
   • **Drones**: new content added stating that a film permit is required for commercial filming and requiring filmmakers to comply with Civil Aviation rules, Auckland Council bylaws and conditions.
   • **Historic heritage**: new content added stating that filming in proximity to historic (including cultural) heritage will be subject to conditions to protect these sites.
   • **Health and safety**: new content added to reflect the new Health and Safety at work Act 2015 and requirements to prepare a site specific health and safety plan.
   • Content of the Auckland Film Protocol was updated to reflect current policy, plans and bylaws of Auckland Council. Some structural and editorial amendments were also made to improve the logic, flow and readability of the document.
6. Public consultation was undertaken over a three week period between 21 June and 12 July 2019.
7. A total of 74 submissions were received during the public consultation period. Puketāpapa Local Board residents provided a total of one submission on the draft Auckland Film Protocol, representing 1% percent of all submissions. The views of Puketāpapa Local Board submitters were insufficient to allow a comparison with regional views or to present a summary of key submission points for the Puketāpapa Local board area. Staff are proposing some changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol to address submitter concerns; the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film protocol are shown in track changes in Attachment B.

8. This report provides a summary of public feedback and of proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol to address feedback. The following is a high-level summary of the key changes proposed to the Auckland Film Protocol in response to public consultation:

- **Natural environment**: include stronger messaging about the importance of respecting Auckland’s natural environment, that film permits may be subject to conditions to manage impacts and/or that filming may be subject to restrictions where these impacts cannot be appropriately managed.

- **Native species**: include stronger messages around the potential impact of filming on native species, such as birds and that filming permits may be subject to conditions to manage impacts and/or that filming may be subject to restrictions where these impacts cannot be appropriately managed.

- **Kauri dieback**: amend to ensure that conditions may be placed on film permits in any public open space (controlled by Auckland Council) where kauri are present.

- **Drones**: include additional guidance on the use of drones around native birds and in proximity to other users of public open space and adjoining private properties.

- **Impact on access to public open space**: include stronger messages around the need for filmmakers to be respectful of other users of public open space and state that film permits give limited permission to occupy public open space.

- **Compliance and enforcement**: include stronger messages around the requirement for filmmakers to comply with the Auckland Council policies, plans, bylaws and the terms and conditions of their film permit.

9. Submission themes and proposed changes are summarised in Attachment A.

**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol

b) provide feedback on the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in August 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

**Horopaki Context**

10. The first version of the Auckland Film Protocol (the protocol) was adopted by the Regional Development and Operations Committee (resolution number RDO/2013/27) on 14 March 2013. A review of fees for filming in the Auckland Region was undertaken in 2014 and a new set of region-wide charges was recommended; providing a simplified and harmonised

11. Since the Protocol was adopted in 2015 there have been a number of changes to legislation and to Auckland Council’s policy and planning framework. The purpose of the review of the Protocol was to:

- ensure that the Protocol is up-to-date; and
- identify emerging trends, issues or opportunities to be addressed in the Protocol.

Content of the Protocol was reviewed against legislation referenced in the document and against policies and plans of the Auckland Council group to identify areas where the Protocol should be updated. Engagement with staff involved in the process of assessing and approving film permit applications, from across the Council group, was undertaken to inform the review and proposed amendments to the Protocol.

12. Workshops were held in September and October 2018 to engage with local boards that experience a high volume of filming.

13. Engagement to inform the preparation of the revised draft Protocol was also undertaken with:

- mana whenua: mana whenua interests are represented by 19 iwi (tribal) authorities in Tāmaki Makaurau, Auckland. The 19 iwi authorities were invited, in writing, to inform the review of the Protocol.
- staff of the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority to inform the review.
- screen sector: the screen sector was invited to participate in a survey in April 2019 to inform the review. The survey asked a series of general questions about the Protocol and experiences of filming in public open space in Auckland.
- public: the People’s Panel in September 2018; a total of 4,762 responses were received. The survey asked a series of questions on views on and experiences of filming in Auckland.

A high-level summary of feedback (including local board feedback) is provided in Attachment C.

14. The review recommended that a range of changes be made to the Auckland Film Protocol, the following is a summary of the key changes proposed to the Environment and Community Committee:

- **Native species**: include new content stating that Auckland Council may place additional conditions on film permits to protect native species
- **Kauri dieback**: include new content providing information about kauri dieback and stating that filmmakers will be required to clean equipment to council specifications when filming in areas where kauri are present.
- **Drones**: include new content stating that a film permit is required for commercial filming and requiring filmmakers to comply with Civil Aviation rules, Auckland Council bylaws and conditions.
- **Historic heritage**: include new content stating that filming in proximity to historic (including cultural) heritage will be subject to conditions to protect these sites.
- **Health and safety**: include new content to reflect the new Health and Safety at work Act 2015 and requirements to prepare a site specific health and safety plan.
- **Filming on Tūpuna Maunga**: update content to reflect that applications to film on Tūpuna Maunga are assessed by the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority.
- **Updates to content**: update content to reflect current policy (e.g. smokefree policy), plans (Auckland Unitary Plan) and bylaws of Auckland Council.
• **Structural and editorial:** amend some parts of the document to improve the logic, flow and readability of the document.

15. The revised draft of the Auckland Film Protocol was approved by the Environment and Community Committee for public consultation in June 2019 (resolution number ENV/2019/73).

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

16. Consultation on the revised draft of the Auckland Film Protocol took place from 21 June to 12 July 2019. A total of 74 submissions were received; this represents a substantial increase on the 21 submission which were received in response to the 2015 review of the Auckland Film Protocol. Of the submissions received, 72 were submitted using the online form and 2 non-form hardcopy submissions were received.

17. Submitters were asked to identify if they worked in the screen sector or not, with:

- 29 submissions (39%) received from individuals or organisations that identified themselves as working in the screen sector
- 45 submissions (61%) received from individuals or organisations that do not work in the screen sector.

The questions included in the online form varied depending on whether the submitter identified themselves as working in the screen industry or not.

18. A breakdown of all submissions received by local board area is shown in Table 1 below. The small number of responses from individual local board areas means that a analysis of views by local board area was not possible for all local board areas.

**Table 1: Breakdown of submissions made by local board area.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Area</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtahuhu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. A series of closed questions were asked of non-screen sector individuals and organisations; a summary of the responses to these questions is shown in Table 2 below. Table 2 shows that:

- most respondents are supportive of Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach and that;
- most respondents think that the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming has on residents and businesses, on public open space and historic and cultural heritage.

Table 2: Feedback on the Auckland Film Protocols management of the impacts of filming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of regional submissions (number of respondents is shown in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75% (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>20% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact of filming on residents and businesses?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56% (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>19% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming has on our public open space and environment?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53% (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>33% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact of filming on our historic and cultural heritage?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>29% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. The main reasons given by those who supported Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of key reasons for supporting Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>• generates employment and economic growth;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• benefits communities and local businesses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• benefits a broad range of trades and industries;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• attracts investment and businesses to Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and creative</td>
<td>• has cultural benefits allowing and supporting the telling of stories visually;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• supports the creative economy and enables people to find a future in the creative...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>industries;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It’s fun and exciting to see Auckland on the screen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• promotes and showcases Auckland to the world;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• creates a positive image of Auckland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Table 4 shows the key reasons that respondents gave for partially supporting Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach.

Table 4: Summary of key reasons given for partially supporting Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Access        | • the impacts on resident, including parking restrictions, road closures and ability to use public open space while filming is taking place need to be considered and managed;  
• need to ensure that film-makers are respectful of other users of public open space. |
| Notification  | • there needs to be sufficient notification to ensure that residents and businesses are aware of open space being used for filming and are not inconvenienced. |
| Balance       | • need to consider and manage the impact that filming has on the environment and impacted residents;  
• need to balance the cumulative impacts of filming. |
| Equity        | • need to ensure that fees for commercial use of public places are fair. |

22. The key reasons given for not supporting Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach were:

• the cost to ratepayers of enabling filming;
• that there is not enough protection for individuals, businesses and residents affected by filming being carried out on private property.

23. A series of open-ended questions were also included to elicit further information about responses to these questions and about a range of other topics. Staff have worked through submissions to determine any changes to be recommended for the final revised Auckland Film Protocol. Attachment A identifies key themes and submission points along with proposed staff responses.

A summary of the most common submission themes and the proposed staff responses are shown in table 5.

Table 5: Summary of key submission themes and proposed staff responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key themes</th>
<th>Summary of proposed responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of drones for filming</td>
<td>Include additional guidance on the use of drones around native birds and in proximity to other users of public open space and adjoining private properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on natural environment</td>
<td>Include stronger messaging about the importance of respecting Auckland’s natural environment, that film permits may be subject to conditions to manage impacts and/or that filming may be subject to restrictions where these impacts cannot be appropriately managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauri dieback</td>
<td>Amend to ensure that conditions may be placed on film permits in any public open space (controlled by Auckland Council) where kauri are present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on native species</td>
<td>Include stronger messages around the potential impact of filming on native species, such as birds and that filming permits may be subject to conditions to manage impacts and/or that filming may be subject to restrictions where these impacts cannot be appropriately managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on access</td>
<td>Include stronger messages around the need for filmmakers to be respectful of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to public open space | other users of public open space and state that film permits give limited permission to occupy public open space.
---|---
Compliance and enforcement | Include stronger messages around the requirement for filmmakers to comply with Auckland Council policies, plans, bylaws and the terms and conditions of their film permit.
Health and safety | Amend to enable production companies to arrange alternative timeframes for the submission of a site specific health and safety plan by agreement with Screen Auckland.
Notification | Screen Auckland to consider operational approaches to achieving wider public notification.
Impact on business | No change to the Auckland Film Protocol. The protocol is intended to provide a framework that enables decisions to be made on a case-by-case basis.
Equity | No change to the Auckland Film Protocol. Fees for commercial use of public open space are set under the Auckland Council Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw 2015 and amended through the long term plan and annual plan.

24. This report seeks formal feedback from the board at its August 2019 business meeting on the recommended changes to the revised draft Auckland Film Protocol in response to consultation feedback.

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

25. Engagement with staff involved in the process of assessing and approving film permit applications, from across the Council group, was undertaken to inform the review and proposed amendments to the Protocol. This included engagement with Auckland Transport, Panuku Development Auckland, and with Auckland Council community facilities, region-wide planning, social policy and bylaws, visitor experience and heritage

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

Role of local boards in film permitting

26. Landowner approval is required to film on any public open space in the Auckland region. Local boards are responsible for landowner approvals for local parks and reserves. Engagement with local boards that experience a high volume of applications for film permits was undertaken in September and October 2018 to inform the review of the Auckland Film Protocol. A summary of the key engagement themes is included in Attachment C and was reported to the Environment and Community Committee in July 2019.

27. A key theme from local board engagement was that the film permit timeframes mean that landowner approval timeframes are very tight, particularly when considering complex or contentious applications. It was also noted that the current timeframes do not allow sufficient time to consider applications at full board meetings or to consult key stakeholders. Given this, the following options on film permit timeframes were presented to the Environment and Community Committee at a workshop in May 2019 and at the June 2019 meeting.

Option one: Status Quo
Option two: amend the permit timeframes
- **Option 2(a)** the permit time frame is amended to be “up to five working days”.
- **Option 2(b)** the permit time frame is increased to 5-7 working days.

28. Following direction from the Committee, that increasing timeframes could act as a disincentive making Auckland internationally uncompetitive, the status quo option was retained in the draft Auckland Film Protocol.
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Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

29. ATEED has an ongoing relationship with several mana whenua and mataawaka groups, across its whole portfolio of activity. To inform the review of the Protocol the 19 Iwi Authorities were invited, in writing, to inform the review. In relation to film permit applications Māori views and input may be obtained in several ways where there is a potential impact on particular land or sites. This is usually coordinated either by the film facilitator, or through the relevant parks manager.

30. Specific processes are in place for the tūpuna maunga, with all commercial filming on the maunga requiring the approval of the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority (Tūpuna Maunga Authority). Screen Auckland facilitates all requests for approval to film on the tūpuna maunga. Approval to film will be subject to conditions and restrictions set by the Tūpuna Maunga Authority. Meetings were held with staff of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority to inform the review and ensure that proposed amendments are consistent with the policy of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

31. The proposed amendments to the Protocol do not impact on existing levels of service and will not impact on operational budgets.

Ngā raru túpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

32. There are no significant risks arising from the board giving feedback on the proposed changes to the revised draft Auckland Film Protocol at this time.

33. If adoption of the revised Auckland Film Protocol is delayed this would impact on council’s ability to implement the proposed changes.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

34. Public feedback and proposed amendments to the Auckland Film Protocol will be presented to the Environment and Community Committee for approval.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Key submission themes and responses</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Draft 2019 Auckland Film Protocol (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Summary of preconsultation engagement</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Marie Jenkins – Screen Facilitation Manager ATEED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza – Acting General Manager Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A: Key submission themes and recommended amendments to the draft Auckland Film Protocol based on consultation feedback

Staff are working through the detailed submissions received to determine and recommend changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol. Table 1 shows key submission themes where change to the Auckland Film Protocol was suggested. For each key submission point, a proposed staff response and recommended amendments to the Auckland Film Protocol are shown. Table 2 shows minor changes suggested to the Auckland Film Protocol by submitters where staff recommend that these changes be made for clarity. Table 3 shows a summary of themes where submissions indicated a broad level of support for the inclusion of these topics in the Auckland Film Protocol.

All recommended amendments to the Auckland Film protocol are shown in track changes in Attachment B.

### Table 1: Key submission themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
<th>Proposed staff response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of drones</strong></td>
<td>Drones can be harmful to native birds, disrupting nesting and feeding. The potential negative effects, particularly on endangered native species need to be prevented. Need to consider restricting or prohibiting filming in some locations at some times of the year.</td>
<td>The use of drones is regulated by the Civil Aviation Authority. Auckland Council as a landowner has put in place a Code of Conduct to regulate the use of drones in public open space. The draft Auckland Film Protocol included a new section on the use of drones for commercial filming and requires film makers to apply for a permit to film and to comply with the Auckland Council Code of Conduct and bylaws. As the use of drones for both commercial and recreational purposes has increased concerns about drone may be the result of both recreational and commercial use and the Protocol only manages use for the purpose of commercial filming. The Auckland Council Code of Conduct does restrict the use of drones around birds, to some extent; however, this was not restated in the draft Protocol. It is recommended that a summary of key provisions from the Code of Conduct is included in Section 4.3.11 of the draft Protocol. It is also recommended that Section 3.4.11 be amended to note that filming in some locations may be restricted or subject to additional conditions to avoid harm to native birds and to include additional guidance on drone use where native birds are present at a film location and reference to the protection of native species under the Wildlife Act 1953.</td>
<td>Amend Sections 2.3, 4.3.11 and Key New Zealand Legislation section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drones can spook livestock and horses; in some areas where horse riding is a common</td>
<td>The Auckland Council Code of does restrict drone use in proximity to livestock; however, this was not restated in the draft Protocol.</td>
<td>Amend section 4.3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
<th>Proposed staff response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity this can result in safety risks for the horse and rider. The impact of drones on livestock and horse riders needs to be managed.</td>
<td>It is recommended that a summary of key provisions from the Code of Conduct is included in Section 4.3.11 of the draft Protocol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drones can cause concerns for other users and neighbours of public open space. Need to ensure that drone use does not impinge on the privacy of other users and neighbours and that it does not overly impact on other users’ enjoyment of public places.</td>
<td>The Auckland Council Code of does restrict drone use in proximity to other users of parks and over adjoining private properties, however, this was not restated in the draft Protocol. It is recommended that a summary of key provisions from the Code of Conduct is included in Section 4.3.11 of the draft Protocol.</td>
<td>Amend section 4.3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Screen sector submitters generally supported the need to permit and regulate the use of drones for commercial filming in public open space. Some submitters noted that other commercial uses of drones should also be regulated as it can result in negative public perceptions of drone use.</td>
<td>When a drone is being used for commercial filming purposes over public open space Auckland Council requires drone users to apply for a permit to film. This requirement is stated in the draft Auckland Film Protocol. Regulating the use of drones for other commercial purposes is out of the scope of the Auckland Film Protocol.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall most submitters agreed that it was important to ensure that the impact of filming on Auckland’s natural environment is managed and most public submitters felt that the Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming on the environment. However, some submitters felt that the Protocol should contain stronger messaging around the importance of respecting and protecting the natural environment.</td>
<td>The Auckland Film Protocol includes a number of sections which refer to managing the impact of filming on natural environments. To address submitter concerns it is recommended that section 3.9 be amended to include:  - stronger messaging about the importance of respecting and protecting Auckland’s natural environment  - clarify that film permits may be subject to conditions to manage effects of a film proposal and filming in some locations may be restricted or prohibited where the effects of a film proposal cannot be appropriately managed</td>
<td>Amend Section 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the natural environment</td>
<td>There is a need to consider the environment impact of filming when assessing permit applications, including the potential impact of special effects on the natural environment.</td>
<td>Assessing the potential impact of filming on a particular natural environment or location requires the consideration of a range of factors, including but not limited to consideration of the nature of the film proposal and scope and scale of filming activity. While one film proposal may be able to appropriately manage the potential impacts on a particular location, another may not be able</td>
<td>Add a new section to Table One and amend section 4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauri dieback</td>
<td>Most submitters agreed that it was very important to protect kauri and supported the inclusion of requirements in the draft Protocol. However, it was suggested that the Protocol needs to ensure that these requirements apply to all public open space.</td>
<td>Auckland Council regulates vehicles on beaches in the Auckland Council Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw and Council must also give effect to Policy 20(1) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. This is reflected in section 4.3.6 of the Auckland Film Protocol. To reinforce existing provisions on the use of vehicles on beaches it is recommended that section 4.3.6 be amended to state that vehicle use should where ever possible be avoided kept to the minimum necessary.</td>
<td>Amend Section 4.3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on native species</td>
<td>Most submitters supported the addition of section 3.12 and noted that it is very important to protect native species. However it was noted that the section largely focuses on biosecurity and suggested that the Protocol should contain more emphasis on protecting native flora and fauna, in particular native birds from the potential impact of filming.</td>
<td>The impact of filming on native flora and fauna is considered in a number of sections of the Auckland Film Protocol. To address submitter concerns it is recommended that section 3.12 be amended to note that the impact of filming on native flora and fauna will be assessed and filming may be subject to conditions and / or restrictions to protect native flora and fauna. Noise and lighting can have a negative impact on native birds. It is recommended that section 3.1.5 be amended to note that in some</td>
<td>Amend Sections 3.1.5 and 3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on access to public open space</td>
<td>Overall most submitters felt that the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming on public open space. Some submitters noted that while some areas of an open space might be in use for filming there was generally still plenty of space for other users. However, some submitters felt that filming had resulted in significant inconvenience due to restricted access to public spaces such as footpaths, local roads, parks, reserves and beaches.</td>
<td>Under the terms and conditions of a film permit film makers are provided with limited permission to occupy public open space. This means that the public are still able to access public open space, although access to some areas may be restricted for a period of time to avoid interruptions to filming and ensure public health and safety. This condition is not explicitly restated in the Auckland Film Protocol. The draft Protocol requires film makers to ensure (Section 3.1.3), unless expressly permitted, continued public pedestrian access. In addition, film permit terms and conditions require that film makers ensure access for residents, businesses and emergency vehicles are available at all times, that the public is not unduly inconvenienced and that public and private access ways are clear at all times. All part or full road closures, for the purpose of filming, are undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1974 and are publicly notified. For avoidance of doubt, it is recommended that sections 2.1 and 3.1 are amended to state that a film permit gives production companies limited permission to occupy and use public open space.</td>
<td>Amend sections 2.1 and 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Notification of local residents. Some submitters noted that they or other residents have been inconvenienced due to filming in their local area. Noting that filming may for example, restrict access to parking, footpaths,</td>
<td>Section 3.1.8 sets out minimum requirements for the notification of residents and businesses in the area impacted by filming, including in relation to road closures. Road closures (including closures of footpaths) for the filming are undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1974 and must be notified in printed news media.</td>
<td>Amend section 3.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and some parts of a local park or to local roads. In contrast some submitters noted that they experienced filming in their local area and felt that they were well informed.</td>
<td>In addition to this Auckland Transport publishes information about road closures on its website. It is recommended that section 3.1.8 is amended to reference requirements for public notification by print media and that further information about road closures is available on Auckland Transports website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider notification of filming should occur to enable:  - Avoidance of areas where filming is taking place. Some submitters noted that residents travel some distance to access public open space for recreational purposes and can be inconvenienced if filming is occurring.  - Interested residents of Auckland to watch filming on location. Some submitters noted that they would like to know where filming is occurring so that they have to opportunity to see filming on location.</td>
<td>Notification requirements in the Protocol focus on informing residents and business in the area impacted by filming. Wider notification of filming could reduce the risk of inconvenience to residents who may intend to use public open space but effective notification would be complicated by a range of operational factors including:  - the date and / or timing of location filming is subject to change at short notice, as a result of weather and other considerations, and if notifications were not up-to-date it may not effectively inform potential users;  - it would be difficult to put in place a single notification platform or media that would reach all potential users of public open space. Putting in place mechanisms for wider notification does not require an amendment to the Auckland Film Protocol and it is recommended that Screen Auckland consider potential operational approaches to achieving wider notification.</td>
<td>No change Screen Auckland to consider operational approaches to achieving wider notification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and enforcement</td>
<td>Many submitters noted that while for the most part film makers act responsibly some do not and there needs to be:  - a stronger emphasis on compliance in the Protocol;  - a stronger focus on enforcement when production companies do not comply with their film permit, rules, regulations or policy of Auckland Council. There should be consequences and / or disincentives for those who do not comply.</td>
<td>The Auckland Film Protocol states in a number of places that film makers are required to comply with Auckland Council policies, plans, bylaws and the terms and conditions of their film permit and that non-compliance may result in enforcement. Enforcement is limited to the powers available to Auckland Council under legislation such as the Local Government Act and the Resource Management Act to enforce breaches of bylaws and policies and plans like the Auckland Unitary Plan. To address submitters concerns it is recommended that sections 3.2 and 3.3 be amended to increase emphasis on compliance.</td>
<td>Amend Sections 3.2 and 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety</td>
<td>Most submitters generally agreed that health and safety, for screen sector workers and members of the public, is important and supported the addition of section 4.6. However some screen sector submitters noted that it is challenging to meet the timeframes specified for submitting a site specific health and safety plan.</td>
<td>Health and Safety in New Zealand workplaces is regulated by the Health and Safety at work Act 2015. Section 4.6 was added to draft Auckland Film Protocol to recognise Auckland Councils obligations under the Act when filming is occurring in public open space. It is recommended that section 4.6.1 be amended to enable production companies to arrange an alternative timeframe for the submission of a site specific health and safety plan under some circumstances. It is also recommended that this section be amended to require production companies to provide general crew safety notes which typically specify general health and safety provisions in place for all crew regardless of location.</td>
<td>Amend section 4.6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact on business    | Overall most submitters felt that the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact on businesses who are in areas where filming is taking place. However, some screen sector submitters noted:  
  - that the permitting process can seem overly bureaucratic and conditions and restrictions placed on filming in some locations can have a negative impact on businesses working with the screen sector  
  - the addition of new requirements and conditions was resulting in increased red tape.                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | The Protocol is intended to create a framework that enables decisions to be made on a case-by-case basis. This will mean that sometimes conditions or restrictions are required to balance potential impacts of filming in a particular location.                                                                 | No change               |
| Equity                | The use of public open space needs to consider the cost of providing public open space to ratepayers and ensure that the rates for commercial use of open space are fair and equitable.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Fees for commercial use of public open space including commercial and organised filming are set under the Auckland Council Trading and Events in Public Places 2015 bylaw and are amended through the long term plan and annual plan process.                                                                 | No change               |

Table 2: Minor changes to the Protocol in response to submittor feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Submitter suggestion</th>
<th>Proposed staff response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Heritage Areas Act</td>
<td>The draft Protocol made a small number of references to the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Areas Act. It was suggested that the Act needs to be referenced in a number of other parts of the document and that more information about the objectives of the Act should be included.</td>
<td>The Waitākere Ranges Heritage Areas Act recognises the national, regional and local significance of the Waitākere Ranges area. It is recommended that sections 2.1 and 4.2 are amended to refer to the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Areas Act and that the Key Legislation section is amended to include reference to the objectives of the Act.</td>
<td>Amend sections 2.1, 4.2 and Key New Zealand Legislation section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Auckland Reserved Parking document</td>
<td>Section 4.2.1 refers to the Screen Auckland Reserved Parking (SARP) document. It was suggested that this should be defined in the document.</td>
<td>The Auckland Film Protocol refers to the Screen Auckland Reserved Parking Document which outlines operational requirements when reserving parking areas for film activities. It is recommended that a definition be added to the glossary to state this.</td>
<td>Amend glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recces</td>
<td>Recces are undertaken to assess the suitability of locations for filming. It was suggested that the Protocol could be clearer that any filming activity undertaken during a recco must be low impact in nature.</td>
<td>Recces are undertaken by screen production companies before a film permit has been granted to assess the suitability of a location for filming. It is recommended that section 2.3 is amended to include a new frequently asked question which clarifies that any recces undertaken must be low impact and production companies must comply with the requirements of the Auckland Film Protocol during recces.</td>
<td>Amend Section 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Summary of key support for topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Submitter views</th>
<th>Recommended response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on cultural heritage</td>
<td>Overall most submitters felt that the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming has on cultural heritage. Most submitters noted that it was important to ensure cultural heritage sites are treated with respect.</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filming on the water</td>
<td>Most submitters supported the addition of section 4.3.7, noting that health and safety considerations on the water are important. Note all those who commented on this matter were individuals or organisations working in the screen sector.</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and sustainability</td>
<td>Most submitters, including those submitters who work in the screen sector, agreed that it was important to minimise and manage waste to landfill and agreed that it was important for the screen sector to play their part. Many of the screen sector submitters noted that they feel practice in this area is improving and agreed that it should continue to be a focus.</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Commitments</td>
<td>Most submitters were supportive of the streamlined Core Commitments section, although some submitters noted that it was important to ensure that the process of film permitting is also streamlined.</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment C: Summary of key themes from pre-consultation engagement

High-level summary of feedback provided in local board workshops.

Economic benefits
- Filming has economic benefits for Auckland but the potentially negative impacts of filming must be managed and mitigated.
- It is important to get the criteria for determining when and where filming should or should not take place right.

Landowner approval timeframes
- Landowner approval timeframes are very tight, particularly when considering complex or contentious applications.
- The current timeframes do not allow sufficient time to consider applications at full board meetings or to consult key stakeholders.

Impact on public access
- Need to give greater consideration of the extent to which filming will reduce service levels or restrict access to public open space and community facilities.
- Usage varies at different times of year, for example many places are busier during school and public holidays, and this needs to be taken into account when assessing applications. Should consider restricting filming in public open spaces and community facilities during periods of high demand.

Environmental impacts
- Need to ensure that the potentially negative effects of filming on the environment are managed and mitigated.
- Filming can have a cumulative impact on the environment, particularly in areas of high demand. This needs to be taken into account when assessing applications.

Drones
- The increasing use of drones for filming is resulting in a number of issues which need to be managed. Drones can be harmful to birds, for example by disrupting nesting or interrupting feeding. Negative impacts on birds, particularly endangered native species need to be prevented.
- Drones can also cause concerns for other users and neighbours of public open spaces. Filmmakers need to ensure that their use of drones does not impinge on the privacy of other users or neighbours and that they do not unduly impact on other users’ enjoyment of public places.

Content
- There should be greater scrutiny of applications where content may be offensive or injurious to the public good. Applications where content does not comply with New Zealand law or is inconsistent with Auckland Council’s legal and policy obligations should not be approved.

Notification
- Neighbours, local businesses and affected parties don’t always get sufficient notice of filming and are not always provided enough information about the proposed filming; this impacts on their ability to give feedback.
Other legislative or regulatory matters which should be covered in the protocol

- The Waitakere Ranges Heritage Areas Act 2008 needs to be taken into consideration when assessing applications to film within the area of the Act. This needs to be reflected in the Protocol.
- Reserve Management Plans are site specific plans which set out what types of activities may, or may not, be undertaken in a public open space classified as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Reserve management plans need to be taken into account when assessing an application to film in a reserve; this needs to be reflected in the Film Protocol.
- The Film Protocol must communicate that all filming must comply with New Zealand law. For example, the film sector have a legal obligation, as employers, to provide a smokefree workplace.

High-level summary of feedback from the screen sector

- Auckland is a great place to film because of the variety of great locations within easy reach
- 69% of survey respondents felt that the Protocol was reasonably easy or very easy to understand
- 67% of survey respondents felt that the Protocol provides reasonably clear or very clear guidance on expectations of film makers behavior
- Main challenges to filming in Auckland include:
  - Length of time required to get a permit
  - Uncertainty around whether a permit will be granted
  - Process can be complex, especially when consultation with multiple stakeholders is required

High-level summary of People’s Panel survey

- When asked about professional filming in Auckland:
  - 84% agree or strongly agree that “filming creates job opportunities”
  - 80% agree or strongly agree that “filming is good for tourism”
  - 69% agree or strongly agree that “filming is great for my community”
  - 57% agree or strongly agree that “filming is vital for our economy”
  - 23% agree or strongly agree that “filming has an effect on the environment”
  - 12% agree or strongly agree that “filming is an nuisance or an inconvenience”

- When asked if they would like to see more or less professional filming in Auckland:
  - 70% of survey respondents would like to see more professional filming in Auckland
  - 18% would like to see the same amount of professional filming
  - 2% would like to see less professional filming

- 62% of survey respondents had encountered professional filming in Auckland.
- Those who had encountered filming were asked what impact it had had on them:
  - 44% said that filming had no impact on them
  - 39% said that filming had a slightly positive or very positive impact on them
  - 16% said that filming had a slightly negative or very negative impact on them
Those who were negatively impacted by filming were asked how they were negatively impacted.

Further information on the Peoples Panel survey can be found at: [https://aucklandcouncil.uq.co.nz/surveys/reports/xpQ8xLxr0kG1DQjWLYzGzg](https://aucklandcouncil.uq.co.nz/surveys/reports/xpQ8xLxr0kG1DQjWLYzGzg)
Auckland Council submission on Governments Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount proposals

File No.: CP2019/14461

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek formal feedback from the Puketāpapa Local Board on Auckland Council’s submission on the Ministry of Transport’s Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount proposals.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Government has produced a discussion document on proposals to reduce emissions in the light vehicle fleet (cars, SUVs, utes, vans, light trucks).
3. The focus is on light vehicles because they account for almost two-thirds of transport emissions. Light vehicles have an average life of 19 years which means that the vehicles imported into New Zealand over the next five years will lock in emissions out to 2043.
4. The closing date for submissions on the discussion document is 20 August.
5. Staff have prepared a draft submission for Auckland Council (refer Attachment A).
6. The draft submission notes that:
   - in November 2018, Auckland Council recommitted to its membership of the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group. This is a collective of 94 international cities acting against climate change. This committed the Auckland region to progress towards limiting the increase in temperature from climate change to within 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels
   - Auckland Council recently declared a Climate Emergency, which highlights the urgency required to transition Auckland towards a net zero carbon future
   - Auckland’s Climate Action Framework (ACAF) was endorsed for public consultation in June 2019. This document outlines a pathway to align with the C40 1.5 degrees Celsius warming limit while ensuring Auckland is prepared for future climate challenges.
7. The key points of the draft submission are:
   - Auckland Council strongly supports the intent of the proposed Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount set out in the discussion paper
   - The proposals are integral for Auckland Council to achieve the emission reductions required for a 1.5 degrees Celsius warming limit
   - Auckland Council seeks that the proposals be amended to the extent required to meet New Zealand’s 2030 target level of emissions reduction.
8. Auckland Council’s draft submission recommends:
   - additional initiatives that directly incentivise the purchase of zero emission vehicles
   - an expansion of the approach to other zero emission modes of transport, in particular electric buses and bicycles
   - continued investigation of complimentary initiatives
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- additional sub-regional social impact assessments to understand potential impacts on Māori, rural households and lower income households in Auckland.

9. The draft submission will be reported to the Environment & Community Committee on 13 August. The submission will then be finalised, and feedback local boards feedback attached, before being submitted to the Ministry of Transport.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) provide feedback on Auckland Council’s submission to the Ministry of Transport’s Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount proposals
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Submission to the Ministry of Transport
In the matter of the Clean Car Standard and the Clean Car Discount
Auckland Council, July 2019
### Mihimihī

| Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero, | I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place, |
| ki ngā pari whakarongo tai, | there I greet the cliffs that have heard the |
| ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua, | ebb and flow of the tides of time, |
| ōna mana a-iwi taketake mai, tauiwi atu. | and the rivers that cleansed the forebears |
| Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini, | of all who came those born of this land |
| wenerau a te mano. | and the newcomers among us all. |
| Kāhore tō rite i te ao. | Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed |
| | among the multitude, envy of thousands. |
| | You are unique in the world. |
Ko te tāpaetanga o te Kaunihera o Tāmaki Makaurau
Auckland Council Submission 2 August 2019

Title: Auckland Council Submission on the discussion paper on the introduction of a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount

Submission to the Ministry of Transport

Key Points
1. Auckland Council strongly supports the intent of the proposed Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount set out in the discussion paper.
2. The proposals are integral for Auckland Council to achieve the emission reductions required for a 1.5 degrees Celsius warming limit.
3. Auckland Council seeks that the proposals be amended to the extent required to meet New Zealand’s 2030 target level of emissions reduction.
4. Auckland Council recommends:
   - additional initiatives that directly incentivise the purchase of zero emission vehicles.
   - an expansion of the approach to other zero emission modes of transport, in particular electric buses and bicycles.
   - continued investigation of the complimentary initiatives.
   - additional sub-regional social impact assessments to understand potential impacts on Māori, rural households and lower income households in Auckland.

Introduction
5. Auckland Council would like to thank the Ministry of Transport for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Clear Car Standard and Clean Car Discount to address light vehicle emissions. Auckland Council’s submission is based on the strategic goals and commitments of the Auckland Plan 2050 and the draft of Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework (ACAF), which is currently out for public consultation.
6. In November 2018, Auckland Council recommitted to its membership of C40 and joined 94 international cities taking bold action against climate change. This committed the
Auckland region to progress towards limiting the increase in temperature from climate change to within 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels. This commitment, and the council’s recent declaration of a Climate Emergency, highlights the urgency required to transition Auckland towards a net zero carbon future. We recognise the importance of the proposal for a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount for achieving Auckland’s greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.

7. ACAF was endorsed for public consultation (ENV/2019/71) in June 2019. This document outlines a pathway to align with the C40 1.5 degrees Celsius warming limit while ensuring Auckland is prepared for future climate challenges.

8. ACAF has been developed with collaboration and partnerships across sectors, including central government. For central government this has included a collaboration agreement, a seat at the working group table throughout framework development and refinement, agreed workstream alignment, key involvement in major events like the Auckland Climate Symposium and co-resourcing like secondments.

9. The framework has 11 key moves, including one that focuses on the delivery of clean, safe and equitable transport options. This key move emphasises the importance of both a shift towards public transport and active modes, and an increase in the percentage of electric and zero emission vehicles on Auckland’s roads.

10. Transport related emissions make up 43.6% per cent of Auckland’s total emissions. This makes the transport sector the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in the Auckland region. On road transport accounts for 86.1 per cent of transport emissions (37.6 per cent of total emissions), with private cars and light commercial vehicles responsible for the majority. As a proportion of total emissions, Auckland’s transport related emissions are more than double that of New Zealand, where transport accounts for 20 per cent of total emissions.

11. Low and zero emission technologies already exist to reduce emissions in the transport sector. This is not the case for all sectors and some sectors may need to rely on future advancements in technology and innovation to significantly reduce emissions. It is therefore important that the transport sector rapidly adopts low and zero emission technologies to support the delivery of our climate commitments.

12. While large-scale uptake of zero emission vehicles is an important part of a future climate-compatible transport system, ACAF acknowledges that the price of electric cars is

---

currently too high to be affordable for everyone. In the July 2019 submission to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill, Auckland Council advocated for a stronger emphasis to be placed on a just transition to a net zero future. It is essential that all Aucklanders are supported and able to participate in this transition. To this end we welcome the proposals set out in the discussion document to incentivise the uptake of electric vehicles (EVs) through discounting and other financial mechanisms.

13. Auckland Council strongly supports the intent of the proposals set out in the discussion paper. However, we are concerned that the proposals do not sufficiently support central and local government obligations in respect of emissions reductions and global warming limits. Bold action is required if we are to reverse recent increases in transport related emissions\(^2\) and achieve the kinds of reductions necessary to keep global warming to a 1.5 degrees Celsius limit.

14. Below, we expand on our concerns and outline improvements we believe should be made to ensure the proposal’s delivery of emission reductions in line with the 2030 target under the Paris Agreement. Our response also addresses the social impacts, impacts on Māori and additional considerations.

Our response to the Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount

Auckland Council supports the introduction of a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount

15. Auckland Council supports these and any other proposals which will improve average vehicle fuel efficiency and encourage the purchase of electric and zero emission vehicles. These moves are essential to achieving Auckland’s and New Zealand’s climate change objectives.

16. With our declaration of a climate emergency and our commitment to reducing our emissions to net zero by 2050, Auckland Council has been clear on the urgency for action on climate change and the need to affect significant change now or risk widespread social, cultural, environmental and economic catastrophe.

\(^2\) Xie, S (2019). Auckland’s greenhouse gas inventory to 2016, Figure 2-5. Auckland Council technical report, TR2019/002
17. As the transport sector is the largest contributor of emissions in the Auckland region, changes to the level of vehicle emissions are critical to reducing Auckland’s overall greenhouse gas emissions.

18. The council and Auckland Transport are working together to provide cleaner modes of transport as an attractive and realistic alternative to the private vehicle and are in the longer-term process of creating a more compact urban form to reduce the need to travel. However, any reduction in emissions as a result of this mode shift will likely constitute a small portion of overall emissions reductions.

19. Most of the reductions in Auckland’s vehicle emissions will need to come from a massive increase in the number of electric and zero emissions vehicles combined with an increase in the fuel efficiency of the remainder of the fleet.

20. While Auckland Council has taken a leadership role in the development of ACAF, the goal of net zero is not its sole responsibility and cannot be achieved by it acting alone. This is especially true regarding vehicle emissions, as responsibility for the setting of vehicle emission standards and the ability to offer financial incentives to purchase more efficient or zero emissions vehicles rests with central government.

21. The council therefore supports the introduction of a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount as integral to achieving the emissions reduction required for a 1.5 degrees Celsius warming limit.

**Auckland Council seeks that the proposals be amended to the extent required to meet New Zealand’s 2030 target level of emissions reduction**

22. While Auckland Council strongly supports the introduction of methods to reduce light vehicle emissions we are concerned that the proposed policies do not go far enough and will not deliver the emission reductions required to achieve the 2030 target under the Paris Agreement.

23. To achieve Auckland Council’s goal of reducing our emissions and limiting temperature rise requires near immediate, substantial change. Despite the benefits of the proposals outlined in the consultation material released it is unlikely that the proposals will deliver sufficient change to limit temperature change to 1.5 or even 2 degrees Celsius.
24. As admitted in both the cabinet paper and regulatory impact statement, released as part of the consultation, the proposals will not achieve the 2030 target level of emissions reduction until 2037\(^3\).

25. This would be of less concern if there was more time to implement further changes following the introduction of the initial schemes. Yet, with these schemes not being planned to be implemented until 2022 at the earliest, there is little ability to make further, later changes in time to achieve Auckland’s and New Zealand’s 2030 targets.

26. As noted in the consultation material, decisions made now in relation to motor vehicles will have implications for the next 20 years. Failing to generate enough change in the next decade will make the challenge of achieving our 2050 target’s much harder, more disruptive and more expensive.

27. Auckland Council therefore request that amendments be made to the proposals to the extent required to meet New Zealand’s 2030 target level of emissions reduction.

**Clean Car Standard (fuel efficiency standard)**

28. Auckland Council supports the introduction of a light emissions vehicle standard but advocates for a more ambitious response, as outlined below.

29. Auckland Council is concerned that the average emissions target of 105 gCO\(_2\)/km is not low enough to meet the region’s and New Zealand’s climate commitments. We understand that the 105 gCO\(_2\)/km limit is aligned to the Australian Government report “Improving the efficiency of new light vehicles” findings\(^4\), however, this is a weaker limit than the European Union, Canada, and Japan\(^5\). The Australian Government’s report analysed three different limits, 105 gCO\(_2\)/km, 119 gCO\(_2\)/km and 135 gCO\(_2\)/km, indicating that the lowest limit investigated was adopted. There are standards in approximately 80 per cent of the global light vehicle market to incentivise manufacturers to supply low emission vehicles, and it is likely that the global supply of new vehicles will become increasingly compliant with these international targets\(^6\). New Zealand is currently behind most international countries with an average of 180 gCO\(_2\)/km, and bold action is required to rapidly improve this. As the Ministry has identified, even with the successful implementation of this proposal New Zealand will overshoot it’s 2030 emissions reduction target by 7 years. This is clearly of

---

\(^3\) Cabinet Paper: Moving the Light Vehicle Fleet to Low-Emissions: Agreement to consult on a vehicle fuel efficiency standard and a fee/tax scheme; and Regulatory Impact Statement: Moving to a low emissions light vehicle fleet


considerable concern. Auckland Council seeks that the government set lower emissions limits which will achieve its 2030 Paris Agreement target.

30. Auckland Council is concerned that the exemption of people who import three or less vehicles from the clean car standard can lead to loopholes that could still allow for high cumulative numbers of higher emission vehicle imports. The total number of vehicles in New Zealand that are sold by suppliers who currently import three or less cars per year is unclear. If this number accounts for a significant share of imports, it is important that all loopholes that could be created by the exemption are removed.

31. Auckland Council supports a penalty scheme for non-compliance with the emissions target and for misreporting data. In order to ensure compliance, we recommend that the rate of penalties should be higher than the potential revenues that suppliers could make by not complying with the emission target.

32. Auckland Council has concerns about the flexibility given to suppliers in meeting their emission targets. We understand that a degree of flexibility can be beneficial for the transition stage. However, we believe that too much flexibility is given in the banking mechanism that allows over-achievement of an annual emission target to be used to cover under-achievement in the three years to follow. Auckland Council is concerned that this timeframe may not drive commercial behaviour in line with the vehicle emission target. We recommend that flexibility of the mechanism should be limited to allow banking of emission savings only possibly within one year following the year of over-achievement, instead of the following three years.

33. Auckland Council is strongly supportive of the alignment of this proposal with the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill. We support the inclusion of future light vehicle emissions targets within the Climate Change Commission’s role, and for this advice to be implemented by the Ministry of Transport.

34. We support the sanction of disqualification from being a registered motor vehicle dealer if a supplier deliberately attempts to evade meeting annual targets. Compliance of suppliers is critical to ensure the success of the proposed emissions standard. Auckland Council believes that the sanction of disqualification from being a registered motor vehicle dealer will be effective in driving behaviours in line with the vehicle emissions standard.

35. Auckland Council supports the amendment of the Fuel Consumption Information Rule that limit vehicle import to those vehicles tested to the Worldwide Harmonised Light Vehicles Test Procedure (WLTP), the New European Drive Cycle (NEDC) and the
Japanese JC08 standard. We also support the adoption of the WLTP as an international unified measure for the assessment of new imported vehicles to ensure valid comparison of vehicles. The adoption of WLTP will also simplify the comparison between vehicles as administration and training for vehicle analyses can be condensed for one single testing method.

36. We support setting stronger future emissions targets beyond 2025. While we are aware that the effects of technological changes and market uptake in the future are uncertain, we strongly recommend that minimum targets are set for each of the periods beyond 2025 in line with the commitments under the Paris agreement. We support the alignment of the 5-yearly emission targets for the clean vehicle standard with the timeframes of the emissions budgets set by the Climate Change Commission.

Clean Car Discount (Feebate scheme)

37. As outlined in paragraph 13, Auckland Council is concerned that the average 105 gCO₂/km is not in line with limiting climate change to 1.5 degrees Celsius temperature rise. To deliver this target, the average emissions target for light vehicles needs to be significantly lower, in line with other countries.

38. Auckland Council supports the feebate scheme, however it is concerned that there is financial compensation for purchase of vehicles above the 105 gCO₂/km target. We acknowledge the top 10 preferred models from 2017 mainly fall within the zero-band width, and that it is important to incentivise on the lower emission versions of these models. However, we would like for the zero-band width to be extended out to the 106 to 120 gCO₂/km range and use the money that would have been used for incentivisation of the higher emitting cars to further subsidise low emission vehicles. It is important to acknowledge that the cars purchased under this scheme are likely to be on the roads for around 19 years, and we need to reduce our reliance on a high emitting fleet as urgently as possible.

39. Emissions modelling completed to inform the development of ACAF indicates that within a decade 50 to 60 per cent of new car sales in Auckland are likely to need to be zero emission to align with a 1.5 degrees Celsius warming pathway. Auckland Council will utilise its position to support this transition, however this specific action is outside of local government’s mandate. Bold leadership is critical for successful implementation of ACAF. Auckland Council recommends additional initiatives that directly incentivise the purchase of zero emission vehicles to ensure substantial reduction of vehicle emissions.
40. We encourage a transparent, long-term forecasting on the price shift of the Clean Car Feebate Scheme. We understand that it is likely for the Climate Change Commission to include future progress of the feebate scheme in the release of the five-year emissions budget. It is important that there is open communication around the future of the scheme. This would enable several benefits, including early adoption of low emission vehicles to maximise the incentivisation pay-off, while also acting as a deterrent to purchase high-emission vehicles for future increased penalties. Long-term price forecasting will enable people to account for the lifetime of their vehicle (depending on how long they intend to own the car). It also could act as a motivator for people to upgrade to a more sustainable vehicle early, when the incentivisation is higher.

41. We support the discount at car sale, and the mechanisms in place to prevent people from cheating the system. We support the emphasise on ensuring that the prices and discounts are separated to reduce the hiking of prices and would like to see additional method to ensure that the buyer gets the benefits of the scheme.

42. As mentioned earlier, the cars that are purchased now will likely be on the roads for the next 19 years. In response to this, is very important to prioritise the investments into zero emission vehicles. While the scheme does provide larger benefits for the purchase of zero emission vehicles, it would be good for there to be additional direct incentives to zero emission vehicles.

Additional considerations

Social impacts

43. The Ministry undertook national-level social impact assessments for both proposals to understand their impacts on lower income households. The assessments note that there are short-term impacts to low income households in terms of vehicle price and choice, but that these impacts could be mitigated by buying vehicles from the domestic second-hand market or buying low emissions vehicles. The assessments also note that there are plans for finer-grained sub-regional social impact assessments to be undertaken at a later stage, without any specific deadlines.

44. There is a lack of information on the likely behavioural responses of vehicle buyers and importers, and the flow-on impacts onto the domestic used cars market, especially at the regional and sub-regional levels. Better understanding of both proposals’ impacts on Auckland communities is required, particularly for lower income households, rural households and Māori. Auckland Council recommends that a sub-regional, Auckland-focused social impact assessment is undertaken as soon as possible to inform
decision-making. It may be possible for Auckland Council to assist the Ministry with the analysis if required.

45. The council also recognises the potential impacts on those who require specific vehicles for work, such as utes. For this type of vehicle there may be no affordable low emission model with the required functionality on the market at present. Manufacturers are investing in the development of electric utes, however it is uncertain when these will be available on the New Zealand market. While the proposals must be designed to achieve their objective of emissions reductions in line with New Zealand’s commitments, we encourage the Ministry to remain cognisant of this situation and its potential impact.

46. Auckland Council supports the use of complementary initiatives to mitigate against the negative impacts of the proposals on communities, and to enable all Aucklanders to benefit fully from the proposed discounts. This includes second-hand electric vehicle leasing schemes and expanding the discounts to cover other modes, such as e-bikes.

Complementary initiatives

47. The four complimentary initiatives proposed by the Ministry of Transport are necessary to support the implementation of this proposal. This includes a focus on ensuring that there is sufficient charging infrastructure to support a fleet of zero emission vehicles. To ensure that the proposals are successfully implemented, Auckland Council recommends that progress of the complimentary initiatives is prioritised.

Other low emissions vehicles

48. Auckland Council would like to emphasise that low emission light vehicles are only part of the solution to a net zero future, and recommend a scheme that includes incentivisation for low emission buses and e-bikes.

49. The proposals are limited to changing the composition of the light vehicle fleet, however additional legislation could provide a focus on electrifying public transport and increasing active alternatives. The proposal was limited to light vehicles due to lack of technology advancement in the heavy vehicle space, however there has been considerable progress in the development and use of electric buses in recent years and it is the view of Auckland Council that this constraint does not apply to buses. Similar to the light vehicle scheme, we recommend the introduction of a subsidy for low emission buses, which would enable a closer price parity.

50. Another important area of focus is on active modes, which could remove vehicles from the roads for short trips. In New Zealand, 40 per cent of trips are less than 2 km and 68 per cent are less than 5 km, highlighting that many trips could be replaced with clean, active modes.
These modes have additional benefits for Aucklanders, such as improving health levels and reducing traffic congestion, and should be considered in parallel to low emission light vehicle incentivisation.

51. One of the key themes adopted by the Ministry in the preparation of the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport was ‘mode neutrality’, which suggests that all transport options are considered when identifying the best value-for-money transport solution to deliver transport outcomes. The Ministry should apply this ‘mode neutral’ approach to achieving the desired climate outcomes and should not limit these financial incentives to motor vehicles. Recent research released in the United Kingdom showed that the cost of saving a kilogram of CO₂ via schemes to boost e-bikes was less than half the cost of existing UK grants for electric cars⁷. For these reasons, as well as the significant health benefits, some form of subsidy of bikes and e-bikes, as a clean mode of transport, should be introduced.

Consultation information

52. The Government has committed to greenhouse gas emission targets under the Paris Agreement. Consideration of climate change related proposals should not therefore be benchmarked solely against the business as usual position but also the emissions targets that the Government has committed to.

53. No analysis has been released comparing the proposals to the change required to meet the Government’s climate goals. Likewise, no acknowledgement is made in any of the cost benefit assessments to the costs from climate change of not transitioning and meeting the country’s climate targets in time.

54. Auckland Council suggests that future consultation documents for climate related policies are clear on the extent to which they will help meet, or not, the countries climate change commitments.

On-going involvement

55. As transport is a significant source of Auckland’s greenhouse gas emissions and a critical section in ACAF, we stress the importance for a strong ongoing partnership with Government. We would like to see participation of local government in the development of the proposal and the further initiatives, such as building local charging infrastructure.

Feedback on Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw and amendments to the Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw

File No.: CP2019/14603

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To update the local board on the local board’s formal feedback from Member D Holm on Auckland Council’s Waste Management Bylaw and amendments to the Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. At the Puketāpapa Local Board Business Meeting on the 6 June 2019, the local board delegated member Holm to provide formal feedback to the hearings panel on 26 July 2019 about the proposed new Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw and amendments to the Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw (resolution number PKTPP/2019/94).
3. In Member Holm’s presentation to the hearings panel on 26 July 2019 he stated that the local board supports the proposed Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw and amendments to the Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw, noting specific comments on a number of the proposed changes that were publicly consulted on.
4. Further information on Member Holm’s presentation to the hearings panel can be found in Attachment A and the Local Board Feedback Attachment B.
5. The hearings panel will consider these comments before making a final recommendation to the Governing Body for adoption of the bylaw (and amendment to the Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw) in August or September 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) note that Member D Holm presented to the hearings panel on the 26 July 2019 the formal local board feedback on the Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw and amendments to the Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Puketāpapa Local Board Feedback

The Local Board supports the Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw and amendments to the Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw

Specific Comments:
- Proposal 1 – building site material
- Proposal 5 – ‘satellite’ resource recovery facilities
- Proposal 7 – temporary activities in private places
- Proposal 8 – de-cluttering footpaths
- Proposal 9 – location devices on shopping trolleys
- Proposal 10 – voting papers
PUKETAPAPA LOCAL BOARD

WASTE MANAGEMENT BYLAW

Proposal 1

Agreed by 100% of feedback submitters.

Comment – this is the most important proposal. Particular concern relates to disposal of building site material. Puketapapa has many instances where material such as polystyrene is not secure and can be blown into neighbouring properties by wind. There is also concern about building site waste polluting waterways.

Proposal 2

Agreed by 67% of feedback submitters.

Proposal 3

Agreed by 100% of feedback submitters.

Proposal 4

Agreed by 100% of feedback submitters.

Proposal 5

Agreed by 100% of feedback submitters.

Comment – It is presumed that the Wai O Rea resource recovery and education centre proposed for Western Springs will have little trouble gaining approval as it is to be council operated. The Board is very keen for the work on this to bear fruit. Puketapapa is also keen to establish a satellite resource recovery facility in its board area.

Proposal 6

Agreed by all but one of feedback submitters.

Proposal 7

Agreed by all but one of feedback submitters.

Comment - the plans in operation for events in council controlled places in Puketapapa including personal education are excellent. Other locations lack similar plans. Some events at the Epsom Showgrounds have clear disposal alternatives but the Easter Show has an overwhelming majority of bins labelled as going to landfill with no guide as to where you can dispose of recyclables.
PUKETAPA LOCAL BOARD
WASTE MANAGEMENT BYLAW

Proposal 8

Agreed by all but one of feedback submitters.

Comment – Cluttered footpaths on rubbish collection days are a major problem in Puketapapa especially on streets like Dominion Road with many multi-unit developments. The suggestion that plans will be required for existing as well as planned multi-unit developments is welcome. We presume that Housing New Zealand and its associates will have plans that provide good models for other developers.

Proposal 9

Agreed by all but one of feedback submitters.

Comment – Since hired electric scooters have location devices, is it possible that shopping trolleys could have these?

Proposal 10

Agreed by all but one of feedback submitters.

Comment – A contributor to waste mail during local election periods is voting papers to voters who have gone no address. While the exemption for election material is needed, an effort to get correct addresses on electoral rolls would help reduce this waste.

Proposal 11

Agreed by all but one of feedback submitters.

Proposal 12

Agreed by all but one of feedback submitters.

Proposal 13

Agreed by all but one of feedback submitters.

Proposal 14

Agreed by all but one of feedback submitters.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Puketāpapa Local Board with an integrated quarterly performance report for quarter four, 1 April – 30 June 2019, and the overall performance for the financial year, against the agreed 2018/2019 local board work programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report provides an integrated view of performance for the Puketāpapa Local Board and includes financial performance and delivery against work programmes for the 2018/2019 financial year.
3. Deferral of budgets of unfinished activities will be added into 2019/2020 work programmes by quarter one reporting.
4. 76 activities within the agreed work programmes were delivered including multi-year projects that have progressed as expected. 8 activities were cancelled, put on hold or deferred and 12 projects/activities have not progressed as expected during 2018/2019.
5. Key highlights for quarter four include:
   - Events Delivery Support (ID 91): The Matariki Manu Aute Kite Day was delivered on 29 July on Puketāpapa/Pukewiwi maunga.
   - Harold Long Reserve and Fearon Park – Stage 3 (ID 2282): The new playground within Fearon Park was completed in this quarter.
   - Youth Development (ID 1033): The Puketāpapa Youth Board organized an event for local rangatahi (young people) to connect with police officers informally through sport. They also delivered a youth summit at the Mt Roskill Memorial Hall.
6. Key activity achievements from the 2018/2019 work programme include:
   - Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan (ID 624): A Healthy Puketāpapa Framework has been developed and consultation has occurred to inform the draft action plan before it is presented to the local board in August 2019.
   - Māori Naming of Reserves and Facilities – Phase Two (ID 584): At an extraordinary Business Meeting on 6 September 2018 the local board invited mana whenua to provide dual Māori names and narratives for 32 parks in the local board area.
   - Community Grants (ID 336): The local board granted $129,363 in strategic relationship grants this year while also undertaking a review of the grant’s terms of reference and accountability reports.
7. Key activities not delivered / not progressed as expected include:
   - Open Space Service Provision Planning (ID 464): This activity includes several parks planning related projects. Some of these projects have been delayed and will be completed in the 2019/2020 financial year.
• Waikowhai Coastal Walkway – development of priority walkway routes (ID 2738): Detailed design of priority walkway routes was not undertaken this financial year. The local board adopted the Waikowhai Walkway Action Plan in September 2019 and allocated capital budget to investigate, design and undertake physical works over the next two financial years on 20 June 2019 (resolution PKTPP/2019/106).

8. The 2018/2019 financial performance report is attached but under confidential cover. This is due to restrictions on releasing annual financial reports and results until the Auckland Council Group results are released to the NZX – expected to be made public 30 September 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive the performance report for the financial quarter and year ending 30 June 2019.

b) note the financial performance report in Attachment B of the report will remain confidential until after the Auckland Council Group results for 2018/2019 are released to the NZX which are expected to be made public 30 September 2019.

Horopaki

Context

9. The Puketāpapa Local Board has an approved 2018/2019 work programme for the following operating departments:

• Community Services (Arts, Community and Events; Libraries and Information; Parks, Sport and Recreation; and Service Strategy and Integration)
  o All budgets, excluding the Wesley Community Centre and Roskill Youth Zone Budget, were approved on 21 June 2018, resolution PKTPP/2018/93
  o The Wesley Community Centre and Roskill Youth Zone Budget was approved 19 July 2019, resolution PKTPP/2018/123

• Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew and Community Leases, approved on 19 July 2018, resolution PKTPP/2018/122

• Infrastructure and Environmental Services, approved on 21 June 2018, resolution PKTPP/2018/98

• Local Economic Development, approved on 21 June 2018, resolution PKTPP/2018/104

• Plans and Places, approved on 19 July 2018, PKTPP/2018/121

• Youth Connection activities moved from the Arts, Community and Events work programme to The Southern Initiative work programme in quarter two.

10. The graph below shows how the work programme activities meet Local Board Plan outcomes. Activities that are not part of the approved work programme but contribute towards the local board outcomes, such as advocacy by the local board, are not captured in this graph.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Local Board Work Programme Snapshot

11. Operating departments have provided the last quarter delivery update against their work programme (Attachment A).

Key highlights for quarter four

12. The key achievements to report from the quarter four period include:

- Events Delivery Support (ID 91): The Matariki Manu Aute Kite Day was held on Puketāpapa/Pukewiwi maunga on 29 July. Approximately 500 people attended this event.

- Te Auaunga Placemaking (ID 2972): On 16 May 2019 the local board adopted Te Tohu Auaunga Implementation Strategy for Puketāpapa. This document will guide how the tohu will be implemented along the upper catchment of Te Auaunga.

- Harold Long and Fearon Parks – Stage 3 (ID 2282): The new playground within Fearon Park was completed in this quarter. Further upgrades are expected to be investigated in the 2019/2020 financial year.

- Youth Development (ID 1033): The Puketāpapa Youth Board organized an event at the Wesley Community Centre in April for local rangatahi to connect with police officers informally through sport, 90 people participated in this event. The youth board also held a youth summit at the Mt Roskill Memorial Hall in June, with representatives from all three local high schools.

Overall performance against the Puketāpapa Local Board 2018/2019 work programme

13. The graph below identifies work programme activity by RAG status (red, amber, green and grey) which measures the performance of the activity. It shows the percentage of work programme activities that have been delivered as expected (completed by the end of July 2019) or multi-year activities which have progressed as planned (green), in progress but with issues that are being managed (amber), and activities that are undelivered or have significant issues (red) and activities that have been cancelled/deferred/merged (grey).
Item 21

14. The graph below shows the activity status of activities which shows the stage of the activity in each department’s work programmes. The number of activity lines differ by department as approved in the local board work programmes.

Graph 3: work programme activity by activity status and department

15. The table below shows the overall performance of work programme activities (RAG status and activity status by work programme). Further details on the activity status of each work programme activity is provided in the ‘Q4 Commentary’ column within Attachment A.

Table 1: End of year Local Board Work Programmes Status
Key activity achievements from the 2018/2019 work programme

16. The key achievements in the delivery of the local board work programmes for 2018/2019 include:

- Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan (ID 624): A contractor has developed the Healthy Puketāpapa Framework and undertaken consultation with community groups, council units and health subject matter experts. A baseline health needs assessment was presented to the local board in May 2019 and the finalised plan is expected to be presented to the local board in August 2019.

- Māori Naming of Reserves and Facilities – Phase Two (ID 584): At an extraordinary Business Meeting on 6 September 2018 the local board invited mana whenua to provide dual Māori names and narratives for 32 parks in the local board area. This project will support the visibility of te reo Māori and help capture and tell the unique Māori stories of Puketāpapa and Tāmaki Makaurau.

- Community Grants (ID 336): The local board granted $129,363 in strategic relationship grants this year while also undertaking a review of the grant’s terms of reference and accountability reports. New changes include multi-year funding and a Capacity Development Tool. Theses changes were introduced at two public meetings in the second quarter of this financial year to representatives from more than 30 organisations.

Overview of work programme performance by department

Arts, Community and Events work programme

17. In the Arts, Community and Events work programme, there are 17 activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), three activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled or deferred in quarter four (grey).

Parks, Sport and Recreation work programme

18. In the Parks, Sport and Recreation work programme, there are four activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), one activity that is in progress but delayed (amber), two activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled or deferred in quarter four (grey). Activities that are significantly delayed are discussed below.

19. Open Space Service Provision Planning (ID 464): This project has a 'red' status and is significantly delayed. This activity includes several parks planning related projects. Projects within this activity to be completed in the 2019/2020 financial year include:

- Consultation and approval of the Hillsborough Cemetery, Margaret Griffin and Mt Roskill War Memorial Park concept plans.
- Approval of the Shade and Shelter Provision Assessment.
- Investigation into story-telling opportunity in local open spaces.

20. Māori Naming of Reserves and Facilities FY19 – Phase Two (ID 584): This project has a ‘red’ status and is significantly delayed. The first tranche of names is expected to be gifted back to the local board late 2019.

Libraries and Information work programme
21. In the Libraries and Information work programme, there are seven activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), no activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled or deferred in quarter four (grey).

Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew work programme

22. In the Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew work programme, there are 35 activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), two activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), four activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and one activity that has been cancelled or deferred in quarter four (grey). Activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered are discussed below.

23. Monte Cecilia Park – restore historic Whare (ID 2279): This project has a ‘red’ status and is on hold. The local board will be updated once the James Wallace Arts Trust confirms how they wish to proceed in relation to the potential lease and restoration of the Whare.

24. Pah Homestead – install HVAC system (ID 2281): This project has a ‘red’ status and is significantly delayed. This activity will not be completed by the end of the first quarter of the 2019/2020 financial year due to a need to reduce the scope of works due to budget constraints.

25. Waikowhai Coastal Walkway – development of priority walkway routes (ID 2738): This project has a ‘red’ status and is on hold. The local board has allocated capital budget to investigate, design and undertake physical works over the next two financial years (as resolved on 20 June 2019, resolution PKTPP/2019/106)

26. Belfast Reserve – renew structure and furniture (ID 2913): This project has a ‘red’ status and is significantly delayed. This activity will not be completed by the end of the first quarter of the 2019/2020 financial year due to extensive unforeseen erosion causing significant structural risk. Sections of track have been closed while a detailed assessment is completed.

Community Leases work programme

27. In the Community Leases work programme, there are five activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), no activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and two activities that have been deferred in quarter four (grey).

Infrastructure and Environment Services work programme

28. In the Infrastructure and Environment Services work programme, there are six activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), one activity that is in progress but is delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled or deferred in quarter four (grey).

Local Economic Development work programme

29. In the Local Economic Development work programme, there is one activity that was completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), no activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and one activity that has been cancelled in quarter four (grey). The one activity that has been cancelled is discussed below.

30. Puketāpapa Business Engagement (ID 356): This project has a ‘grey’ status and has been cancelled. $17,500 from this budget was reallocated to other activities (resolution PKTPP/2019/10). $7,500 was also allocated to support a PopUp Business School event from 29 April to 10 May 2019 in partnership with the Whau Local Board, Henderson-Massey Local Board and the Ministry of Social Development (resolution PKTPP/2019/9).
Plans and Places work programme

31. In the Plans and Places work programme, there are no activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), no activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), one activity that is significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and two activities that have been cancelled or deferred in quarter four (grey). The activity that is significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered is discussed below.

32. Mt Roskill Village revitalisation (ID 1444): This project has a ‘red’ status and is significantly delayed. Planned synchronised construction with an Auckland Transport delivered project is no longer possible and new delivery options are being investigated.

Deferred activities

33. As part of the local board funding policy, activities funded through the Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) operating fund that were not delivered in 2018/2019 will either be counted as savings for the organisation or will be deferred into 2019/2020 work programmes.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

34. When developing the work programmes council group impacts and views are presented to local boards. As this is an information only report there are no further impacts identified.

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

Local impacts and local board views

35. This report informs the Puketāpapa Local Board of the performance for quarter ending 30 June 2019 and the performance for the 2018/2019 financial year.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

36. The Puketāpapa Local Board is committed to strengthening and formalising its relationships with mana whenua and mataawaka. “Māori are recognised and affirmed as mana whenua” is an objective within the Puketāpapa Local Board Plan 2017.

37. The local board continues to work with the Ngāti Tamaoho Trust to grow the relationship that was formalised in the Relationship Agreement signed in Manukau in July 2018.

38. The local board has included, in its Local Board Plan and work programme projects, a number of activities which mana whenua have been engaged in. These include:
   - Te Auaunga Awa Placemaking (ID 2972): Mana whenua have been engaged as a partner throughout the development of Te Auaunga 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 provided advice to guide development of the design guide at multiple hui and on a site walkover.
   - Māori Naming of Reserves and Facilities, Phase Two (ID 584). Work has continued with mana whenua to identify opportunities for Māori names for local parks to enhance and recognise Auckland’s Māori identity and heritage.
   - The local board has invested funding to elevate te Manu Aute Kite Day as a regional Matariki Festival event. The event was held on Puketāpapa/Pukewiwi maunga on 29 June 2019. Approximately 500 people attended the event.

39. The local board seeks to acknowledge Te Ao Māori and tikanga through karakia before meal breaks, special meetings/workshops with mana whenua on key projects of mutual interest, and blessings when large local board projects are undertaken or concluded in the community.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

40. This report is provided to enable the Puketāpapa Local Board to monitor the organisation’s progress and performance in delivering the 2018/2019 work programmes and to report this to the public. This report is for information only and therefore there are no financial implications associated with this report.

Financial performance

41. Auckland Council currently has a number of bonds quoted on the NZ Stock Exchange (NZX). As a result, the Council is subject to obligations under the NZX Main Board & Debt Market Listing Rules and the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 sections 97 and 461H. These obligations restrict the release of annual financial reports and results until the Auckland Council Group results are released to the NZX expect to be made public on 30 September.

42. Due to these obligations the financial performance attached to the quarterly report is under confidential cover.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

43. While the risk of non-delivery of the entire work programme is rare, the likelihood for risk relating to individual activities does vary. Capital projects for instance, are susceptible to more risk as on-time and on-budget delivery is dependent on weather conditions, approvals (e.g. building consents) and is susceptible to market conditions.

44. Information about any significant risks and how they are being managed and/or mitigated is addressed in the ‘Activities with significant issues’ section

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

45. Deferral of budgets of unfinished activities will be added into 2019/2020 work programmes by quarter one reporting.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or COO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Christmas Festival</td>
<td>Deliver the annual Puketāpapa Christmas Festival</td>
<td>Approved plan and expenditure budget</td>
<td>CS ACE: Events</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>LDI: Open</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The event was delivered on 1 December 2019. No activity was scheduled to occur in Q4. Event was delivered in Q2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Movies in Parks - Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Program and deliver a Regional Movies in Parks series event.</td>
<td>Provide recommendations for venue, movie and delivery packages from venues available.</td>
<td>CS ACE: Events</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>LDI: Open</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Movies In Parks, &quot;Despicable Me&quot; was scheduled for screening on Friday 8 March 2019 at Monte Cecilia Park. Mild weather however due to bad weather the event was cancelled. A detailed debrief report will be presented to the local board post-screening. No activity was scheduled to occur in Q4. Event was delivered in Q3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 91  | Puketāpapa Events - Delivery Support | Support event delivery in the local board for the following events:  
- Taste of Puketāpapa (Contracted) $12,000  
- International Cultural Festival (Regional Delivery) $6,000  
- Kite Day - $20,000  
LDI to elevate event as part of the regional Matariki Festival programme - $8,000  
Total $40,000 | 1. confirm dates 2. confirm contract(s)/providers 3. confirm event programmes | CS ACE: Events           | $46,000 | LDI: Open      | Completed | Green | Taste of Puketāpapa has been implemented against the measures agreed by the local board and the project is now complete. The project received over 18,000 video views on Facebook.  
- International Cultural Festival was delivered on 7 April 2019 with approximately 16,000 attendees.  
- Men’s Auto Idle day was delivered on 30 June 2019 with approximately 500 attendees. |
| 92  | ANZAC Services - Puketāpapa     | Deliver Anzac services and parades within the local board area:  
- Mt Roskill $4,000 | No further decision required | CS ACE: Events           | $4,000 | LDI: Open      | Completed | Green | Events in Christchurch resulted in the consolidation of Mt Roskill Anzac Day services at Mt Roskill War Memorial Centennial, 13 May 2019. Mt Roskill due to police resourceing and security review. |
| 93  | Local Civic Events - Puketāpapa | Deliver and/or support civic events within the local board area including:  
- The public launch of the horohoro building  
- The opening of Te Ausaua Hall and open stage  
- Puketāpapa Community Awards  
Confirm programmes and activities that are to be supported by this line. | CS ACE: Events           | $27,000 | LDI: Open      | Completed | Green | The Fearon Park and Harold Long Reserve playground opening planned to occur in March has been delayed and is now scheduled for May 2019.  
The Fearon Park and Harold Long playground opening was held on Sunday 18 May 2019 and included a sausage sizzle, face painting and crafts with 56-60 people attending. Kumanata Pape Fried Holloway opened with a kororā, followed by speeches from the local board chair Harry Doig and local MP Michael Wood.  
The Civic Events team delivered one citizenship ceremony on one occasion during Q3 with 97 people from the local board area becoming new citizens.  
The Civic Events team delivered one citizenship ceremony on one occasion during Q4 with 91 people from the local board area becoming new citizens. |
| 94  | Citizenship Ceremonies - Puketāpapa | Deliver an annual programme of citizenship ceremonies in conjunction with the Department of Internal Affairs. | No further decisions anticipated | CS ACE: Events           | $16,436 | ABS: Open      | Completed | Green | The Civic Events team delivered one citizenship ceremony on one occasion during Q3 with 97 people from the local board area becoming new citizens.  
The Civic Events team delivered one citizenship ceremony on one occasion during Q4 with 91 people from the local board area becoming new citizens. |
| 228 | Operational Grant - Tāmaki Bank Wallace Arts Centre (Pātai Homestead) | Administer a funding agreement with the James Wallace Arts Trust at Pātai Homestead for operational funding of and funding for programmes at the arts centre, including an exhibition programme plus associated events and administration of a relationship agreement. | No further decisions anticipated | CS ACE: Arts & Culture | $449,364 | ABS: Open      | Completed | Green | During Q3 Pātai Homestead ran 25 programmes involving a combined total of 19,287 attendees and participants. Thes programmes covered a range of forms from visual art, through to performance, dance and music. Highlights included a collaboration between the Arts Trust and Mihi, the Refugee Youth Arts Programme. Other highlights were the Art Club sessions with artist Susan Te Kuroihi King, and a major new exhibition called Old Energies. This last exhibition was produced in association with the Auckland Arts Festival. In addition to these programmes, Pātai Homestead also hosted a live streamed conference for International Women’s day.  
During Q4, Pātai Homestead ran 31 programmes, with a combined total of 17,396 participants and attendees. A broad range of exhibitions were held, including a major retrospective of Andy Lalas/bank art spanning 20 years of his practice, and an exhibition by Hanaa Odd with Hadi. A major exhibition was produced in association with the Auckland Arts Festival. The Civic Events team delivered one citizenship ceremony on one occasion during Q4 with 91 people from the local board area becoming new citizens.  
The Civic Events team delivered one citizenship ceremony on one occasion during Q4 with 91 people from the local board area becoming new citizens. |
| 230 | Auckland Council - Jawa Joint Liaison Board relationship monitoring | Provide communications and record documentation and performance updates on the activities of the Auckland Council - James Wallace Arts Trust Joint Liaison Board. | No further decisions anticipated | CS ACE: Arts & Culture | $0 | Regional | Completed | Green | Operational and governance meetings have been held in Q3.  
Operational and governance meetings continued being held in Q4. |

---
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### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit/CCD</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Community grants (PK/TP)</td>
<td>Support local community groups through contestable grant funding. <em>Note: budget breakdown:</em> - $110k: strategic relationship grants - $60k: local board grant round - $12k: quick response grant round - $20,363: the Governing Body defer $20,363 of the 2017/2018 community grants budget (WP ID 344) to the 2018/2019 proposed community grants budget (WP ID 386); Resolution number: PK/TP/2018/64 Total: $194,303</td>
<td>CS ACE, Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$194,303 LDI, Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Local Grant Round Two closed in March 2019. Decisions on grants allocations will be made by the local board in Q4. In Q3, all accountability reports/presentations for the Strategic Relationship Grants were submitted. 11 of the 12 recipients will deliver their presentations to the local board in Q4 and one will submit a written report. For the Strategic Relationships Grants 2018/2020, the community forums were held to introduce new changes, multi-year funding and the Capacity Development Tool. About 40 people representing more than 30 organisations attended. Funding rounds opened on 16 February 2019, closing 12 April 2019. In Q4, the local board allocated $21,349 under local grants round two and $4,371 Q4 under quick response round three leaving a balance of $1,000.95. Recipients of the Strategic Relationships Grant 2018/2019 presented their March 2019 accountability reports at a workshop with the local board on 23 May 2019. The presentations received positive feedback from both the local board and the community. Final accountability reports are due on 31 July 2019. Twenty applications were received for the Strategic Relationships Grant 2019/2020. Staff held two workshops with the local board to discuss the allocations of the grant. The final approval for grant distribution will be finalised at the July 2019 business meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 634 | Healthy Puketapapa Action Plan - Year one of proposed three year programme | Note: project plan for year one and indicative activities for years two and three to be developed and provided. Year one of three year HPAP development and delivery programme Manage the scoping and development of the Healthy Puketapapa Action Plan on behalf of the local board, ensuring central government agencies, community organisations, groups and members are engaged in the process. Contract provider to develop action plan, including a framework for future governance and delivery of activities. | CS ACE, Advisory | $35,000 LDI, Opex | In progress | Amber | In March 2019, a contractor was appointed to progress the Healthy Puketapapa Action Plan Framework. The framework is due to be completed by end of June 2019. Designs in securing a provider meant project delivery only began at the end of Q3 and not all project budget was able to be spent in 2018/2019. Remaining budget will be carried forward to 2019/2020. A contractor has developed the Healthy Puketapapa Framework and undertaken consultation with community groups, council units and health subject matter experts. A baseline health needs assessment was presented to local board in May 2019. | |

<p>| 633 | Enabling shared use of space - Year one of proposed three year programme | Note: project plan for year one and indicative activities for years two and three to be developed and provided. Contract provider to work closely with five identified community lease groups to support them to effectively and efficiently share use of their space. - Implementing findings from a stocktake commissioned by the local board in FY18 - this integrated project will allow work across two local board areas (AEBL and Pihatapapa). (Year one of three year “Enabling shared use of space” programme) | Q1: Scope and brief work, including identify five lease groups | CS ACE, Advisory | $10,000 LDI, Opex | In progress | Amber | A workshop was held on 26 February 2019 to update the local board on progress with the shared spaces project. Potential shared space opportunities have been identified and are being progressed. Tools and systems to be developed to support groups wanting to participate in the project. The project was initiated in November 2018 starting later than planned. This timing impacted upon the project coordinator’s ability to contact groups especially over the Christmas period. The project has been significantly progressed but there is a remaining budget which will be carried forward to 2019/2020. A workshop was held on 13 June 2019 to update the local board on progress with the project and key learnings to date. An Information package of available spaces has been developed to increase awareness. To date 15/27 lease holders have been contacted. Potential shared space opportunities are being progressed and tools and systems developed to support groups wanting to participate in the project. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CGO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Wesley Community Centre and Roskill Youth Zone programme delivery</td>
<td>Plan, develop, deliver and evaluate a programme of activities that - aligns to the outcome area of “Connected communities with a sense of belonging”, - ensures community participation - ensures more residents feel connected to their community spaces - allows participants to learn, grow and come together to have fun - has a strong focus on supporting the ACE focus area by including arts outcomes, and participation by seniors</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$222,703</td>
<td>ARS: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The Wesley Community Centre highlight for Q3 was the start of Ta Aru Roi Mihi classes in partnership with Te Wairua O Aotearoa. The class has 20 students enrolled. Learning focuses on pronunciation, kōrero, introductions, basic vocabulary and sentence structures and gaining a Level 2 Te Aru Roi Mokeri certificate at the end of the course. Students will attend a day long whakanga in August 2019. The Roskill Youth Zone highlight in Q3 was holding the centres first International Women’s Day celebration. The event brought together 145 women from 27 different nationalities and included activities, demonstrations, workshops, dancing, and speeches. It concluded with a shared meal by a local women’s catering collective. Feedback was that participants enjoyed the chance to celebrate and make new friends and would like more opportunities to connect. The Place Manager for Puketapapa and Albert Eden reported to the board on Thursday February 14 The Wesley Market stallholder fees collected $24,900 in Q3 with a range of 30 to 40 stallholders at each market day. During Q3, staff updated the local board on fees and charges for 2019/2020. Community drop in sessions were held across Auckland to help hirers with the online booking process. This gave hirers the opportunity to raise questions with the hire process of the venue they hire. Bookings for 2019/2020 opened on 5 March 2019 by the end of the day there were over 18,000 bookings across the network. 81 per cent was self-service online bookings. Hire satisfaction shows that 88 per cent would recommend the venue they have visited within the local board area. The statistics are based on the first eight months of 2019/2019. Forty-eight local community groups were contacted about their interest in involvement with this initiative. Two responses were received. The March 2019 workshop with the local board will lead to further discussion with one respondent and understanding opportunities from the Healthy Puketapapa Action Plan and upcoming local event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>Venue Hire Service Delivery - PK</td>
<td>Provide, manage and promote venues for hire, and the activities and opportunities they offer by - managing the customer centre, booking and access process - continue to develop and deliver service improvement initiatives - aligning activity to local board priorities through management of the fees and charges framework. These include whether activities contribute to community outcomes, offered by not-for-profit and community groups</td>
<td>Q4 - Local Board to approve fees and charges schedule for 2019/2020</td>
<td>CS ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ARS: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During Q4, 86 per cent of hirers indicated that they would recommend the venues they have visited. Participant numbers have increased by 2 per cent and booking hours have stayed the same compared to the same period last year. The top two activity types for Puketapapa were mariathings and religious. During Q4 we have started receiving results from Google analytics. This shows that Pickton Convention Centre is the most searched venue on our website Wesley Community Centre is also within the top ten most searched venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>936</td>
<td>Capacity building for delivery - Out and About programme</td>
<td>Note: project plan for year one and indicative activities for years two and three to be developed and provided. Support the March 2019 workshop of community led delivery in Puketapapa local board by: - Develop and deliver a capacity and capability programme to build specific skills to support communities to own and manage projects and programmes on their own. - Pilot programme for activity delivery focussing on the Out and About programme - Build their skills to allow for successful and sustainable delivery of these community events. Synergies have been identified with the PS1 program, specifically $55 Social recreation projects. PS1 will work collaboratively with ACE to develop shared outcomes.</td>
<td>Q2 - select community groups for pilot “increasing diversity” in Out and About programme Q1 2019/2020 allocation of carry forward funding from 2018/2019 financial year</td>
<td>CS ACE: Advisory</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>The delay in confirming a service provider has resulted in remaining budget, which will be carried forward to 2019/2020. A possible service provider to utilise this funding was identified in Q4. A workshop with the local board to discuss the proposed option was held in June 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Further Decision Points</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Unit / COG</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
<td>Q4 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026</td>
<td>Build capacity - Support Roskill Community Network</td>
<td>Enable the Roskill Community Network to support local groups to make connections and build their capacity to deliver community-lad initiatives and partnering opportunities. This activity is part of an ongoing support for the Roskill Community Network, funded by the Puketapapa Local Board. Roskill Community Network $10k - monthly community network meetings.</td>
<td>CS ACE Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$18,000 LDr/ Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In Q3, Roskill Community Network held two meetings, relented to reflect feedback from a community survey undertaken by Roskill Together in 2018. The first daytime providers meeting explored the topic of a Ngā Hiaunga Waka Project Workshop. This project is led by Roskill Together in partnership with community groups in the Puketapapa Local Board area. Positive feedback has been received. The evening community meeting focused on identifying potential projects for the community. The new format will take time to develop. Roskill Together is committed to monitoring the outcomes. A review of the new network structure is proposed to take place in the 2019/2020.</td>
<td>The Roskill Community Network (RCN) held a meeting on the topic of the Mā Roskil Parketaupapa Youth Board to increase awareness of the activities of the youth board, with the intention of increasing collaboration and encouraging support from community organisations especially those who work with young people. Eighteen community workers attended and networks were established with Wānanga Community Centre, Roskill Together and Healthy Puketapapa Project Manager to discuss a collaborative effort to improve the operation and community participation in the Roskill Community Network in 2018/2020. Staff organised a meeting in July 2018 to plan a re-launch of the network and to agree on themes and calendar dates for the next year. The new plan is intended to attract more community providers who are already active in the network.</td>
<td>The Roskill Community Network (RCN) held a meeting on the topic of the Mā Roskil Parketaupapa Youth Board to increase awareness of the activities of the youth board, with the intention of increasing collaboration and encouraging support from community organisations especially those who work with young people. Eighteen community workers attended and networks were established with Wānanga Community Centre, Roskill Together and Healthy Puketapapa Project Manager to discuss a collaborative effort to improve the operation and community participation in the Roskill Community Network in 2018/2020. Staff organised a meeting in July 2018 to plan a re-launch of the network and to agree on themes and calendar dates for the next year. The new plan is intended to attract more community providers who are already active in the network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1033</td>
<td>Build capacity: Youth Development</td>
<td>Fund key community partners to develop and support youth engagement, youth initiatives and build youth capacity. Review of current delivery for Children and Young people (CAYP) to ensure it is meeting the local board and communities expectations. (Note: also includes review of initiatives funded through ID 1032 - Children's participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS ACE Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$27,000 LDR Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The Puketāpapa Youth Board recruited four new members and will recruit another representative from Manukau Institute of Technology. Following the 2018 summit, the Youth Board organised several initiatives, activities and services to engage young people in the community. Their Q2 focus has been on transportation and strengthening the relationship between the youth community and police. The Youth Board have designed postcards to send to Auckland Transport detailing the voices of young people. These will be distributed and collected at youth sausage sizzles throughout Q3 and Q4. They have organised a basketball tournament between young people and police officers in collaboration with RYS above the rim, to engage young people in an informal environment with police officers in the area. It is anticipated that this will help build the relationship between the two groups. This will take place mid-April 2019.</td>
<td>The Puketāpapa Youth Board (PYB) gathered the voices of over 600 young people in a postcard campaign aimed at understanding the views and experiences of young people about Auckland Transport. Lynfield, Manukau and Rosedale Grammar participated in this campaign. In April 2019, the PYB organised an event at the Wesley Community Centre for local rangatanga to connect with Police officers informally through sport. 'Basketball with the Cops' was attended by 60 participants. Police officers engaged with young members of their community and shared ideas after the game. The 2019 Youth Summit took place at the Mt Roskill War Memorial Hall in June 2019. All three high schools were represented at the summit. Breakout sessions were held to hear from rangatanga on council facilities and Auckland Transport, Mental Health and Wellbeing and Cultural Identity. A full report will be available in September 2019. Members of the PYB spoke at the Puketāpapa Manu Aute Kite Day in June 2019 where they engaged with community about the Youth Board’s upcoming activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1034</td>
<td>Community-led placemaking, Support Neighbours Day Campaign</td>
<td>Fund a community organisation to support communities to engage with their neighbours and the wider community through community place-making activities. Note breakdown of budget as follows: $2,000 neighbours day grants $1,300 administration $200 peer support and mentoring Total $2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS ACE Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$2,500 LDR Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Twenty groups received Neighbours Day 2019 grants compared to 15 in 2018 and 12 in 2017. Forty per cent of the recipients were new participants, 50 per cent were from 2018 and 10 per cent were participants in 2017 but did not apply in 2018. Neighbourhood Support distributed the funds using the Neighbours Day grants allocations guide. Auckland Emergency Management (AEM) donated $1,000 to the local board area for Neighbours Day. Each group was given a pack with information on community resilience and wellbeing to be promoted at their celebrations. Most of the events took place in the Mt Roskill area, the others were spread across Hillsborough, Three Kings, Lynfield and Rosedale. The Rakowhai school incorporated a family fun day/beach clean-up. Some groups requested that police and local board members visit their events. Neighbourhood Support Auckland will provide a report and presentation to the local board in Q4.</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Support provided the local board with a comprehensive report of the 2019 Neighbours Day campaign, outlining the range of activities and including photos and short paragraphs about each event. In response to the local board’s concerns about criteria regarding political campaigns and business involvement, staff have developed additional criteria for 2020/2021 which clarifies that Neighbours Day events funded by the local board must be politically neutral and not include any business promotion unless that business is contributing to the Neighbours Day event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit / CCO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>Apply the empowered communities approach – connecting communities (ECCP)</td>
<td>Broker strategic, collaborative relationships and resources within the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>GS ACE Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>LDR, Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>Increase participation in innovation and enterprise</td>
<td>Fund the development of social enterprises to seed entrepreneurship and innovation. Provide seed or development funding to emerging enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td>GS ACE Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>LDR, Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Further Decision Points</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Unit or OCD</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Full Facilities Contracts</td>
<td>The Full Facilities maintenance contracts include all buildings, parks and open space assets, sports fields, coastal management and storm damage.</td>
<td>None further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Operations</td>
<td>$3,490,481</td>
<td>ARB: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Arboriculture Contracts</td>
<td>The Arboriculture maintenance contracts include tree management and maintenance.</td>
<td>None further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Operations</td>
<td>$280,613</td>
<td>ARB: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Ecological Restoration Contracts</td>
<td>The Ecological Restoration maintenance contracts include pest plant and animal pest management within ecologically significant parks and reserves.</td>
<td>None further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Operations</td>
<td>$153,572</td>
<td>ARB: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Native forest restoration and ecological restoration programmes</td>
<td>Ecological program top up to target particular areas across the board, including intensive ecological improvement, community education funding, and control pest weeds.</td>
<td>None further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Operations</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Waiwhetu Conserv - remove pine trees</td>
<td>Removal of pines and revegetation along the Manukau Harbour foreshore.</td>
<td>None further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Operations</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Further Decision Points</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Unit or CCD</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262</td>
<td>Renew Pool - renew source</td>
<td>Renew the sauna to establish correct insulation, isolation and ventilation. Work includes renewal of heater and heating case, as well as floor strengthening work for the upstairs fitness room to allow for high impact classes to resume. This project was a multi-year funded project with works scheduled for completion in mid-2018.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$50,000 ARB - Capex - Renovations</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2263</td>
<td>Keith Hay Park - renew car park - Holton Road and Richardson Road</td>
<td>Upgrade of the existing carparks and lighting. Formalise the entrance way. This project is a multi-year project initiated in FY16/17 (Previous SP18 ID 305). The work will be tendered in mid-2018 followed by physical works.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$100,000 ARB - Capex - Renovations</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Richardson Road carpark is near completion, awaiting for final compact testing in order for the asphalt to be laid and carpark handed over for use by the user groups. Next steps: Commerce work on Holton Road carpark at the end of cricket season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2264</td>
<td>Lynnmall Recreation Centre - replace CCTV system</td>
<td>Renew CCTV System. Project was straight forward for delivery in FY2017/18 as part of the approved Risk Adjusted Programme Finance budget remains in FY2018/2019.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$28,000 ARB - Capex - Renovations</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2265</td>
<td>Mt Roskill Library - renew furniture, fittings and equipment</td>
<td>This project is a continuation of the 2017/18 programme (previous SP18 ID 2086).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$84,300 ARB - Capex - Renovations</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2266</td>
<td>Mt Roskill War Memorial Hall - renew kitchen</td>
<td>Renew kitchen to be fit for current use. Year one - investigation (including options for sites that would benefit from an increase level of support to propose to the local board), reprogramming and design. Year two - physical works</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$2,500 ARB - Capex - Renovations</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Alterations to the kitchen have been discussed and a quotation received with various options available. An option for the works appears to provide very good value for money. The budget for installation is currently scheduled in financial year 2019 and 2020. Next steps: Consider bringing forward the 2020 budget to enable the much needed alterations to be completed as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2267</td>
<td>Pan Homestead - renew light fittings</td>
<td>Update the lighting in the facility to fit for purpose lighting. This project is a continuation of the 2017/18 programme (previous SP18 ID 3150).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$25,000 ARB - Capex - Renovations</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2268</td>
<td>Puketapapa - LDB mara capex fund 2018/19</td>
<td>Funding to deliver minor capex projects throughout the financial year as approved in the monthly local board workshops.</td>
<td>Options to be approved by local board</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$10,000 LDB - Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Proposed works to be identified. Next steps: Proposed works to be works shopped with the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2269</td>
<td>Puketapapa - renew park buildings FY18+</td>
<td>Renew toilets, May Road War Memorial Park (changing sheds and toilet), Seymour Park, Three Kings Reserve, Wantak Stream Reserve. Year one - investigation (including options for sites that would benefit from an increase level of service to propose to the local board), scoping and physical works.</td>
<td>Options to be approved by local board</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$15,000 ARB - Capex - Renovations</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Cost estimates and scope confirmed for the three toilets and change rooms identified for renewal. Next steps: Preparation of physical works contract with view to commence in new financial year in line with budget allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2270</td>
<td>Puketapapa - renew ponga and courts FY17+</td>
<td>Arthur S Richards Memorial Park, John Rouse Reserve, Margaret Giblet Park, May Road War Memorial Park, Quake Reserve, Sylvania On.......</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$100,000 ARB - Capex - Renovations</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit (CCD)</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2771</td>
<td>Potters Reserve - renew playground</td>
<td>Renew the playground at Potters Reserve. This project was previously a bundler</td>
<td>No further decisions</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$88,000 ARS - Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>renewal programme for play spaces in the Puketāpapa area. Stage one includes</td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>investigations and scoping (including options for assets that would benefit from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an increase in services to propose to the local board). Physical works to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>undertaken in Stage 2. This is a multi-year funded project and is a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 3167). Line item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>previous named &quot;Puketāpapa - renew play space FY 17&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2772</td>
<td>Roselli Youth Centre - renew CCTV system</td>
<td>Replace CCTV system at the facility.</td>
<td>No further decisions</td>
<td>CF - Investigation</td>
<td>$25,000 ARS - Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Installation of new closed circuit television system completed, with</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td>and Design</td>
<td>- Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enhanced camera images and improved security for the library, staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>members and general public. Project complete in February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019 ahead of scheduled date of May 2019. Next steps: Twelve-month warranty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and maintenance of new closed circuit television system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2773</td>
<td>Roselli Youth Zone - refurbish floor</td>
<td>Refurbish wooden floor including re-marking for sports. This project is a</td>
<td>No further decisions</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$33,500 ARS - Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2489).</td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2774</td>
<td>Waterkwa Reserve - renew play space</td>
<td>Renew the play space. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme</td>
<td>Local board to is</td>
<td>CF - Investigation</td>
<td>$210,000 ARS - Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: A concept has been produced for the playground. Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(previous SP18 ID 2494).</td>
<td>to approve (through</td>
<td>and Design</td>
<td>- Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consultation is underway with the landllf team and parks, sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>workshop) design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and recreation specialists. The community consultation meetings have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>been held. Next steps: Confirm with the closed landfill team that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>works at this site can start. Proceed playground equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2775</td>
<td>Wesley Community Centre - renew play space</td>
<td>Renew the play space adjacent to the Wesley Community Centre. This project has</td>
<td>Local board to is</td>
<td>CF - Investigation</td>
<td>$55,000 ARS - Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Consultant has been engaged. Undertake investigation to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>been requested by the facility manager and is of high priority to the Community</td>
<td>to approve (through</td>
<td>and Design</td>
<td>- Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>understand if this playground needs renewal. Next steps:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>centre. This project is intended to be a community led project. Stage 1 involves</td>
<td>workshop) design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>investigating priority works between Wesley Community Centre play space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>investigations and scoping (including options for assets that would benefit from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and the Keith Hay Park South playground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an increase in services to propose to the local board). Physical works to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>undertaken in Stage 2. This may be a multi-year funded programme to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initiated in FY 2018/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776</td>
<td>Wesley Community Centre - replace operable wall</td>
<td>Replace operable wall in Taupuna room and repaint throughout. This project is</td>
<td>No further decisions</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$75,000 ARS - Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and repaint throughout</td>
<td>a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2492).</td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Further Decision Points</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Unit / FCD</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
<td>Q4 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2277</td>
<td>Harold Long and Freerun Reserve - Develop grassy mounds and linkages</td>
<td>Implementation of the concept plan to improve the connection of the two parks.</td>
<td>Options to be approved by local board</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$60,000 ARS: Capex Development</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Stage two, playground, remaining section of greenway path, planting, driveway entry from Pakaraka Avenue and ramping in front of kindergarten. The works have now received practical completion and the site was opened to the public on 16 March 2019. Some minor outstanding items still required addressing, including the storm water repair adjacent to the rugby club, remaining specimen tree planting (which will occur in the planting season in May) and lawn reinstatement. Next steps: Complete the outstanding minor items. Formalise the practical completion and close out this stage of works including all resource consent and as-built documentation.</td>
<td>Project completed March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2278</td>
<td>Keith Hay Park development</td>
<td>This is a grant to the Three Kings United Football Club to install and replace changing rooms. This project is being led and managed by the Football Club via a Facilities Partnership Agreement. The project is funded in the 2018/19 work programme with external funding of $840,000 provided by the Auckland Council Facility Partnership Fund.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$1,200,000 ARS: Capex - Growth, External funding</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Auckland Council contribution is to go towards the installation of toilets and changing rooms. This project is being led and managed by the football club. A facilities partnership agreement to be prepared by Community Facilities needs to be executed before any funding is paid out. Currently awaiting council’s confirmation of their funding. Next steps: Preparation of facilities partnership agreement.</td>
<td>Current status: A facilities partnership agreement is to be prepared by Community Facilities and needs to be executed before any funding is paid out. Currently awaiting council’s confirmation of their funding. Next steps: Preparation of the facilities partnership agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2279 | Monte Cecilia Park - restore historic Whare | Restore the historic Whare at Monte Cecilia Park. This is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2567). | No further decisions anticipated | CF: Investigation and Design | $50,000 ARS: Capex Development | On Hold | Red | Current status: The James Wallace Arts Trust are undertaking a review of their operational business plan for the Whare prior to committing to a lease and the restoration of the building. Next steps: The project has been placed on hold until the Trust has completed their review and confirmed how they wish to proceed. | This project is on hold because Auckland Council is writing the business case for the grant to the Wallace Arts Trust as a contribution to the upgrade of the whare. Current status: This project has been placed on hold. Staff are developing advice for the local board in response to a request from the James Wallace Arts Trust for funding. The James Wallace Arts Trust would use this to pay a consultant to develop a business case and high level financial projection in relation to the proposed lease of the Paki Homestead located next to the Palace and explore a potential commercial lease arrangement for the plant works. |}
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit / EDC</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2738</td>
<td>Waitemata Coastal Walkway -</td>
<td>Development of Waitemata Coastal Walkway: Stage 1 will include</td>
<td>Options to be approved</td>
<td>CF, Investigation and</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Project on hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>priority routes</td>
<td>scoping of existing routes as outlined in the [Waitemata Coastal</td>
<td>by local board</td>
<td>and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walkway Action Plan (to be formally adopted at the July Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting). Physical works to be undertaken during Stage 2. This project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 3249).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2739</td>
<td>Keith Hay Park - install lighting</td>
<td>Install lighting to light fields #19 and #13 at Keith Hay Park. Project</td>
<td>No further decisions</td>
<td>CF, Investigation and</td>
<td>$385,000 External funding</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Detailed design for five sports lights and irrigation is underway. Resource consent is currently at Stage 1. It is recommended we start the design and construction of the irrigation system at this stage. The anticipated period to be completed will be September 2019 – December 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is funded in FY19 with external funding from Te Māhia Urban Reforestation Programme (2018-2020).</td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td>and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2741</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Accessibility</td>
<td>Improvements: Review of minor works required in response to the</td>
<td>Options to be approved</td>
<td>CF, Investigation and</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Locally driven initiative to be completed when further information is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to the 2019/2020 programme. Options to be approved in response to</td>
<td>by local board</td>
<td>and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the BiAccessirome report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776</td>
<td>Arthur Faulkner Reserve - remove</td>
<td>Investigate and scope potential works to remove three tennis courts</td>
<td>Options to be approved</td>
<td>CF, Investigation and</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Various options have been explored to remove the southern tennis courts. A Quantity Surveyor has estimated the cost of works. The current stage of works under the Reserve Programme is Stage 1. The anticipated completion period will be September 2019 – December 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>southern tennis courts</td>
<td>and return to grass as per the concept plan, in order to</td>
<td>by local board</td>
<td>and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mitigate drainage problems and prevent flooding. Options to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>presented to the Board for approval prior to physical works being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2912</td>
<td>Puketāpapa - renewal signage FY17</td>
<td>Description of works: Renewal of signage in the Puketāpapa area. This</td>
<td>No further decisions</td>
<td>CF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Renewal of signage in the Puketāpapa area. This project was carried over from the 2016/2017 programme (previous ID 2956).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project was carried over from FY2017/2018, previous ID 2958.</td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2913</td>
<td>Belfast Reserve - new structure</td>
<td>Belfast Reserve boardwalk, fence, bridge, steps, fire escapes, and</td>
<td>No further decisions</td>
<td>CF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>$108,760 ARMS - Remodels</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Renewal of signage in the Puketāpapa area. This project was carried over from the 2016/2017 programme (previous ID 2944).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and furniture</td>
<td>two fire escapes. This project is carried over from the 2016/2017</td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>programme (previous ID 2944).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2914</td>
<td>Hillborough Cemetery - renovation</td>
<td>Renewal of a fence, retaining wall and road at Hillborough Cemetery.</td>
<td>No further decisions</td>
<td>CF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>$188,120 ARMS - Remodels</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>path and structure</td>
<td>This project is carried over from the 2016/2017 programme (previous ID 2944).</td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2 Commentary**

- **Current status**: Waitemata Coastal Walkway report has been approved by the local board. Next steps: A report will be presented to the local board in quarter four seeking funding and enable of priority for the proposed walkways.

- **Q2 Commentary**: Project on hold.

- **Current status**: Detailed design for five sports lights and irrigation is underway. Resource consent is currently at Stage 1. It is recommended we start the design and construction of the irrigation system at this stage. The anticipated period to be completed will be September 2019 – December 2020.

- **Q4 Commentary**: Locally driven initiative to be completed when further information is available.

- **Current status**: Various options have been explored to remove the southern tennis courts. A Quantity Surveyor has estimated the cost of works. The current stage of works under the Reserve Programme is Stage 1. The anticipated completion period will be September 2019 – December 2020.

- **Q4 Commentary**: Renewal of signage in the Puketāpapa area. This project was carried over from the 2016/2017 programme (previous ID 2956).

- **Current status**: Renewal of signage in the Puketāpapa area. This project was carried over from the 2016/2017 programme (previous ID 2944).

- **Q4 Commentary**: Project completed.
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2972</td>
<td>Te Awanuiwa Ave Placemaking</td>
<td>Programme to be decided after wet engagement. This project may include landscaping and interpretive signage, trail marker, storytelling and significant sites along the whole of Oakley Creek in the Puketāpapa Local Board area. This project is carried over from the 2016/17 programme (previous ID 2849).</td>
<td>Options to be approved by local board</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$72,345</td>
<td>LDI, Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Parks, Sports and Recreation team are leading the project through current stage including discussions with Mana Whinaua, and then investigation and design team to compile the strategic assessment. This discussion is still in progress with the three local boards, regarding the budget. Next steps: Start tendering process, and award contract and engage contractors for physical works. Issues and risks: Potential delay in the timeline. Current status: On 16 May the local board approved a Puketāpapa Implementation Strategy for the 2018/2019 financial year. Discussion to be held with this local board to confirm the local board’s priority for the installation of the placemaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2974</td>
<td>Arthur Faulkner Reserve - renew tennis courts</td>
<td>Resurface 2 tennis courts to provide suitable surfacing for tennis users. This project was carried over from FY2017/2018, previous SP ID 2918.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$37,225</td>
<td>LDI, Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: There is insufficient budget to progress this project. Next steps: Work Programme Lead to advise the local board of the status of all projects within the reserve with a view to prioritising expenditure for all proposed projects with Arthur Faulkner Reserve. Current status: The local board have agreed this budget will be used to create a pathway connection to the tennis courts from the Hazel Road carpark. Next steps: Undertake these works when undertaken the tennis court renewal works which is due to commence in financial year 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2980</td>
<td>Mt Roskill War Memorial - install lights on field 1</td>
<td>Install sports floodlighting for rugby and baseball at Mt Roskill War Memorial Park. Lighting is to accommodate shortlist of training hours for rugby and baseball in the Puketāpapa Local Board area. This project is carried over from the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP ID 2565).</td>
<td>Design to be agreed with local board</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$437,163</td>
<td>ARS, Capex, Growth</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Physical works are well underway - the new light poles are installed; underground services connected; switchboards and controller installed - a new mains power cable has been has been installed and is scheduled to be connected by Trustpower. Next steps - remove site container and storage material - main power connection - nighttime light aiming. The lights are expected to be fully functional by mid April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3014</td>
<td>Puketāpapa - small park improvements - LDI</td>
<td>A capex fund that provides for small one-off items and projects in parks in the Puketāpapa area. This may include but is not limited to the replacement of streetlights, signage, bollards, fencing, seating/furnishing or small assets that are identified throughout the year as being required. Currently four projects have been identified: 1. Install a new seat in Monte Cocita Park/Install bollards in Hibiscus Reserve to Takanini boundary; 2. A pointer sign to the sea sculls at Margaret Griffin Reserve; 3. A sign for the new toilet in Arundel St carpark at Keith Hay Park. This project was carried over from FY2017/2018, previous SP ID 2590.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$8,155</td>
<td>LDI, Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A list of completed projects was included in the report ‘Locally Driven Initiatives Small Improvement projects programme update FY2016 – 2018’ presented at the September 2018 business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021</td>
<td>Lynfield Cove Reserve - renew tracks</td>
<td>Renew tracks. This project is carried over from the 2017/18 programme (previous ID 3061).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$64,967</td>
<td>ARS, Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3119</td>
<td>Roskill Youth Zone - replace washdown tank</td>
<td>Renew washdown area to provide a fit for purpose system for the users of this facility</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>ARS, Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3134</td>
<td>Puketāpapa - install new signage</td>
<td>Installation of new signage to improve the visibility of the Dominion Road car park and Roskill south car park. This project was carried over from FY2017/2018, previous SP ID 2390.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$6,285</td>
<td>ARS, Development</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3374</td>
<td>Roskill Youth centre - Ventilation system (Health and Safety requirement)</td>
<td>Roskill Youth centre - The ventilation system in the existing technology room at the Roskill Youth Zone is not adequate to accommodate paint fumes and chemicals. The room use changed to a silk screen print room. This is an (Health and Safety requirement)</td>
<td>No further decisions required</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>ARS, Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: The design is under review for effectiveness. Next steps: Submit for building consent. The appropriate and approved design requires an additional funding of $20k to cover additional design/feasibility, contingency, and pre-construction management. Current status: The design drawings have been submitted for building consent. Next steps: Install the ventilation system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Contact</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3375</td>
<td>Puketāpapa - Handy Close - interior - exterior</td>
<td>To ensure the continued protection of this heritage building it requires repaint with the next 2-3 years.</td>
<td>Workshop all design options with the local board to seek direction before implementation.</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$469,300</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Project has been awarded to the contractor. Works to be commenced soon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Infrastructure and Environmental Services

**888 Puketāpapa: Healthy Rentals**

The Healthy Rentals Project aims to support landlords and tenants to create warmer, dryer rental homes, and reduce household energy use and associated carbon emissions. The project is targeted at private rental properties with housing quality issues, low income tenants, or tenants who have health conditions exacerbated by cold, damp housing. It delivers home advice and free installations for tenants, and a housing report and subsidies for the landlord. It is designed to align with and complement the national government Healthy Homes Guarantee Bill. Regardless of future potential legislative changes, the project provides a valuable catalyst for many action by landlords to improve their rental properties. It also supports tenants in creating healthy and energy efficient homes.

- No further decisions anticipated

- IES: Environmental Services
  - $26,000
  - Completed

  Green

  Quarter three has been a slow period for the Healthy Rentals project due to the holiday period and it being the warmest time of year when issues with cold, damp homes are of less concern to residents. One home that was assessed during the 2017/2018 project had fasteners initiated with curtains pending completion by the Habitat curtain bank for a further two homes. One home received healthy rentals energy efficiency installations via the partnership with the Kainga Ora initiative. The majority of the project will be delivered during quarter four when the colder weather typically generates greater uptake. Healthy rentals flyers have been distributed to all libraries in the local board area, and meetings have been held with the strategic team to tap into local community networks to promote the project. Promotion through local board channels, social media, and door-knocking in the community has also been undertaken during quarter three and will be continued in quarter four.

### Puketāpapa Low Carbon Network

Establish a low carbon network for Puketāpapa Local Board area. This is a network of individuals, households, community groups, and businesses working together within the local board area to promote, support and implement community level low carbon activities. This community-led network will support implementation of the local board’s newly approved low carbon action plan. In collaboration with the local board and the council’s staff, the interests of participants will determine the direction of the network and priority areas they would like to focus on. This could include elements such as: promote low carbon-related activities in the local board area to their networks via online channels; host low carbon events; such as pepe kaha presentations on low carbon initiatives; implement carbon reduction actions in accordance with the action plan. During establishment the network will be supported by a facilitator, who will coordinate regular meetings, lead planning sessions and provide support for activities. Over time it is hoped that the network will become self-sustaining, with the majority of activities being volunteer led and budget being primarily used to deliver low carbon activities.

- No further decisions anticipated

- IES: Environmental Services
  - $16,000
  - Completed

  Green

  In quarter three there was continued networking through the Wesley Community Hub, connecting local groups and building on the awareness of the local Puketāpapa low carbon network. The database of people receiving regular updates is now at 115. Activities undertaken in quarter three were: continued promotion of Pacific Puketāpapa with Global Lighthouse and the Bike Kitchen; reconnection of participants with projects in previous quarters.

In quarter four, the community broker continued to raise the profile of the Puketāpapa Low Carbon Network through networking and developing the network through supporting other activities. The database of people receiving regular updates increased to 127. Support was provided at Wesley Market ahead of the plastic bag ban on 1 July 2019, including showcasing reusable re-usable “bagbox/container/take away” repurposed packaging and carbon free ways of replacing plastic bags.

In quarter four, the community broker continued to raise the profile of the Puketāpapa Low Carbon Network through networking and developing the network through supporting other activities. The database of people receiving regular updates increased to 127. Support was provided at Wesley Market ahead of the plastic bag ban on 1 July 2019, including showcasing reusable re-usable “bagbox/container/take away” repurposed packaging and carbon free ways of replacing plastic bags.
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCC</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>New project: Puketāpapa Low Carbon Lifestyles</td>
<td>The project will support and empower households to lead low carbon lifestyles. Targeted advice will be provided to residents on home energy efficiency with the potential to extend this to water conservation, waste reduction, smarter mobility and low carbon food choices. In February 2019, the Puketāpapa Local Board allocated an additional $10,000 towards this project, bringing the total budget to $45,000 (resolution PKTP/2019/10). The project involves a doorstep conversation with residents and may also include the provision of energy saving devices. The aim will be to target 275 to 300 households in high priority locations within the Puketāpapa Local Board area, as determined via census data. The project also includes a follow up survey of participants to evaluate behaviour change and carbon emissions reduction from the initiative.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>RE&amp;S: Environmental Services</td>
<td>$45,000 L&amp;D: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Due to an increase in funding of $10,000, a contract variation for this project will now aim to engage a total of 400 households and provide tailored home energy advice. Calculations of carbon and financial savings from participants completing recommended actions will be provided in the final report. While this is the first time the project has been undertaken in Puketāpapa, it follows a process that has been undertaken on six previous occasions in other local board areas. The project will take place in the Lynfield and New Windsor area in May 2019 to ensure discussions are taking place in early winter. The project is on track for spend to be completed by the end of this financial year.</td>
<td>Engagement with 413 households (1,190 residents) has been completed in Puketāpapa, over the intended target of 400 households. Follow up conversations with participating residents are now complete and a report will be prepared to establish which energy saving actions were planned and completed, as well as the carbon and financial savings that have resulted from those behaviour changes. This will be finalised in September 2019 and be made available to the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>Keith Hay Park Stream Daylighting Detailed Design Stage Two and Resource Consenting</td>
<td>In 2017/2018 the board has funded detailed design for daylighting of a section of the streams that runs through Keith Hay Park (alongside the Auckland Golf Course). This project would involve completing detailed design for the remainder of the stream. This would include: * carrying out a survey of the area*; <em>developing an erosion and sediment control plan</em>; <em>planting plan</em>; <em>providing construction drawings and construction specifications</em>; *developing a design for a small boatwalk liaison with Community Facilities and the Akarana Golf Course would also be carried out to ensure they are aware of the project and have input into the design. Mana whenua would be engaged in the project and local schools would also be invited to input into the design. Once detailed design is completed the resource consent application would be developed and lodged (this includes a $4,000 lodgement fee). A building consent application for the boardwalk would also be lodged ($4,215 application fee).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>RE&amp;S: Healthy Waters</td>
<td>$45,155 L&amp;D: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The detailed design is underway for the daylighting of Keith Hay Park, and will be completed by 17 April 2019. Once the plan has been peer reviewed by council staff it will be discussed with the local board at a workshop at the end of May 2019. Delays in procurement have meant that this presentation could not occur in quarter three but the project is still on track to finish this financial year.</td>
<td>During geotechnical investigations for the detailed design the contractor discovered unstable soil sects behind the Cameron Pools and Gymnasiums. These soils pose stability risks to the buildings should the stream be daylighted in those areas. A workshop was held with the local board 30 May 2019 to discuss the stability issues and to present three options for mitigating these issues. The local board preferred option and the contractor was instructed to complete the detailed design. When finalised the design will be added to the ecological bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905</td>
<td>Keith Hay Park Plant Maintenance</td>
<td>Three visits to maintain 2017/2018 invasive plantings in Keith Hay Park in spring, summer and autumn. Manual removal of alligator weed from stream when water level is low (late summer or early autumn)</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>RE&amp;S: Healthy Waters</td>
<td>$2,000 L&amp;D: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The contractor has been engaged and will begin plant maintenance for existing plantings in quarter four.</td>
<td>Weed control of existing plantings was carried out in May 2019. The contractor identified areas of infest plantings are required where some of the plants have not survived. This infest planting was carried out in June 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>New project: Increasing Employment through Freeland Reserve Stream Restoration Project</td>
<td>The Freeland Reserve Stream Restoration Project is a regionally funded stormwater project that is being delivered in the local board area. The project is expected to support the regional project to achieve social outcomes. The mechanisms for achieving this would be similar to those used on the Te Puaunui Waiwhetu-Underwood project. For the Te Puaunui project, Te Wāhanga Trust was employed to provide a nursery and planting service for the project. The trust provides local people who have struggled to obtain work (for example, those with mental health conditions, discharged prisoners and people coming from drug and alcohol services) with training and employment. It is proposed that Te Wāhanga Trust will be asked to achieve additional social outcomes by targeting unemployed youth in this catchment to be involved in the Freeland Reserve stream restoration project. This is a regionally funded stream restoration project which will be delivered in the local board area in 2019/2020.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated.</td>
<td>HES, Healthy Waters</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>LDP, Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A service agreement is being finalised to allocate funds to Te Wāhanga Trust. Te Wāhanga is working with Mount Roskill Grammar School to develop a learning programme for disengaged youth. This is linked with the police youth engagement programme Tu Tangata, which targets youth who are not in employment, education, and training. Police are working with Te Wāhanga Trust to engage youth offenders in a programme to equip them with the skills to develop positive life and work skills, values change, and an attitude shift. The focus is on youth support and model of wellbeing delivered through a kapauku Māori philosophy. Local board funding will enable one person to be supported into full-time employment within Te Wāhanga as a role model for other participants. The local board’s funding will allow for a mentor and the design of a bespoke pastoral care programme for each participant, involving the services of other agencies within the board. In quarter four Te Wāhanga Trust engaged with five students from Mount Roskill Grammar. These students had a 25% per cent school attendance rate with complex family and personal issues that the school was struggling to resource. They undertook one day a week with Te Wāhanga where teaching was undertaken in preparing and dispatching plants in the area. Teaching was focused on communication skills, interpersonal relationships – health and safety skills, problem solving as a team, understanding workplace documentation. All students participated in team activities and worked alongside a designated mentor. Additionally all students had a 100% attendance rate with all Te Wāhanga students received positive feedback with this experience. A report will be provided to the board in quarter one 2019/2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>Puketapapa: Manukau Harbour Forum</td>
<td>To implement the Manukau Harbour Forum programme. The proposed work programme includes a governance review, communications plan, symposium, and an education project.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated.</td>
<td>HES, Healthy Waters</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>LDP, Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In February the forum supported a community-focused Manukau Harbour Forum stall at the Chekenui Festival, presenting an integrated display with the Our Water Future engagement staff and resulting in at least 80 face to face interactions with the public. The stall was well attended by elected members and supported by council’s Sustainable Schools team and participants from the youth leadership programme. February also saw the distribution of the forum’s newsletter and the online publication of the forum’s video project, which was shared and promoted via social media channels. The governance and management review, which was due to begin in quarter three, will begin in April 2019. Planning is underway for a one-day symposium event to be held in March 2019. This work programme was not able to be delivered within this financial year due to the governance and management review not beginning until June 2019, and the symposium and community forum event being rescheduled from June to August 2019. Accrual of the 2016/2019 budget allocation for the symposium event will occur in later costs. In April 2019, the Sustainable Schools team delivered a three-day youth leadership programme withanga which supports secondary students from across the Auckland region to develop action projects for the Manukau area. This year’s programme attracted a total of 43 students to participate, 20 of those from forum member local boards. April also saw the delivery of the model small site field day event in Pukekohe which aimed to educate builders and tradespeople about the installation of sediment control and the management of efficient and compliant work sites. Staff from council’s compliance team, along with building industry suppliers, presented to attendees. The governance and management review of the Manukau Harbour Forum is underway and a draft report will be presented to the forum for its consideration in August 2019. As part of this review, interviews of council staff and elected members are being undertaken between mid-June to mid-July 2019. The Manukau Harbour Symposium and community forum event at the University of Auckland, which has been rescheduled to a later date of 3 August 2019, in order to better maximise awareness raising and event attendance. Plans are being progressed and will be communicated with the board as they become finalised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>1165</td>
<td>Provision of Library Service - Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Deliver a library service - Help customers find what they need, when they need it, and help them navigate our services and digital offerings. Providing information, library collection lending services and eResources as well as support for customers using library digital resources, PCs and WiFi. Hours of service: 56 hours over 7 days per week.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$892,703</td>
<td>ARS: Operx</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Customer interest in our digital and eCollections remains popular with team members offering support in downloading eBooks to a variety of devices. The last month of this quarter saw a steep increase in visitor numbers at two nearby libraries, Mt Albert and Onehunga, closed for refurbishment. Our digital and eCollections usage has increased over the last quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166</td>
<td>Additional hours to network standard - Puketāpapa</td>
<td>1 additional opening hour at Mt Roskill Library.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$9,700</td>
<td>LDI: Operx</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Our bi-lingual Storytimes have started again for 2019 on a Sunday with a special Lunar New Year Storytime during the Lunar New Year festival. With the extra hour of opening on a Sunday, we were also able to provide additional Lunar New Year events this quarter, including a Matcha Tea Ceremony attended by 77 customers. During our extra hour of opening, Music Month events took place. Four different workshops played in the library on Sunday mornings with very positive feedback received from customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1167</td>
<td>Preschool programming - Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Provide programming for preschoolers that encourages early literacy, active movement, and supports parents and caregivers to participate confidently in their children’s early development and learning. Programmes include: Wriggle and Rhyme, Rhymetime, Storytime.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ARS: Operx</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This quarter the librarians delivered a Pride storytime attended by 24 children and their parents. Teams members made their first visit to the lgs Elementary School with the Auckland Libraries’ Mobile Tāmaki Van. All classes visited the mobile van to receive library cards and hear about the library and borrow books. The libraries also visited Pilitera’I Childcare and Kids Kampus to deliver Storytime sessions. Library staff participated in two Wriggle ‘Il Rhyme sessions at the Zoo with an audience of 150, visitors were made to ‘Brilliant Minds’ Childcare and Mt Roskill Baptist Kindergarten. A storytime was held at Hilbrough Road to celebrate New Zealand Sign Language Week. With the theme of ‘Top Secret’ for our school holidays in April/May, we ran a Robotics workshop for 13-12 year olds, attended by 48 customers and a QR Karate workshop. Families enjoyed the movie ‘Lion King’ at the library. A visit was made to St Therese Primary School as part of their fundraising dress-up event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1168</td>
<td>Children and Youth engagement - Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Provide children and youth services and programmes which encourage learning literacy and social interaction. Engage with children, youth and whānau along with local schools to support literacy and grow awareness of library resources. Provide a flagship language and literacy building summer reading programme for 5-13 year olds.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ARS: Operx</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The No Tales to Wairere to Explore Summer Reading programme included events such as a penis check activity, reading parties with local author Melinda Syzmanski and dogs from the Royal Foundation for the Blind and the R2 Epilepsy Assisted Dog Trust. Our celebration party was attended by 110 children and adults and the opportunity to learn circus skills, participate in a Secret Code Treasure Hunt and enjoy activities with a prata theme, supported by the Auckland Libraries’ mobile pātane bus. With the school year underway, we have worked with Mt Roskill Primary School as part of their Reading Together programme and provided a programme in the library to all the classes at St Therese School. With the theme of ‘Top Secret’ for our school holidays in April/May, we ran a Robotics workshop for 13-12 year olds, attended by 48 customers and a QR Karate workshop. Families enjoyed the movie ‘Lion King’ at the library. A visit was made to St Therese Primary School as part of their fundraising dress-up event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1169</td>
<td>Support customer and community connection and Celebrate cultural diversity and local places, people and heritage - Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Provide services and programmes that facilitate customer connection with the library and empower communities through collaborative design and partnerships with Council and other agencies. Celebrate local communities, cultural diversity and heritage. Gather, present and share the stories, old and new, that celebrate our people, communities and Tāmaki Makaurau.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ARS: Operx</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Lunar New Year was celebrated in the library with a variety of workshops including calligraphy, Chinese Water colour painting, paper cutting and origami. An average of 50 customers attended each session. Cosmopolitan lanterns were hung in the library with bright displays around the library. During Practices we ran workshops on tea making, paper weaving and tape cloth making. Eid Storytime was held in the library to celebrate this Muslim festival with children and their families. Enjoying songs and stories. A Chinese class in classical scriptures in Chinese was held in the library during June. These free classes are run by volunteers from the Yuanda Charitable Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1170</td>
<td>Celebrating Te Ao Māori and strengthening responsiveness to Māori - Whakapupu i te reo Māori - Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Celebrate te ao Māori with events and programmes including regionally coordinated activities, promoting programmes. Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Mātāra and Māori Language Week. Engaging with iwi and Māori organisations. Whakapuupi te reo Māori - champions and enablers to re Māori in our libraries and communities.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ARS: Operx</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Recently we made changes to our Māori collections to increase the space and focus of this collection, promoting it also with more face-out display. The team are gaining confidence in the Māori greetings with customers. At present we are working with students from St Therese school on artwork for our Kōwhai corner. The children are very excited about contributing to the library in this way. Mātoriki was celebrated with poi making and iwi design workshops. During Matariki children participated in &quot;Navigating the Migration Path of your Tūpārū&quot;. The Puketapapa Mātoriki event. Māori Art Week 2019 was an excellent celebration with library participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>1171</td>
<td>Learning and literacy programming and digital literacy support - Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Provide learning programmes and events throughout the year. Support our customers to embrace new ways of doing things. Lift literacy in the communities that need it most. Help customers and whānau learn and grow, and provide opportunities for knowledge creation and innovation.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS, Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0 AB</td>
<td>Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Our requests for Book a Librarian sessions continues to increase, with 41 sessions being delivered this quarter. The requested support covers a wide range of topics, including CV writing, social media and genealogy questions. The request for sessions in Mandarin is steadily increasing with the main focus being on language translating options, google maps and websites such as Auckland Transport to assist customers travel around Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Business Engagement</td>
<td>The proposed 2018/19 Business Engagement Programme aims to increase the level of engagement with local businesses through establishing new and supporting existing local business user groups across the local board area. The local business user group will be represented by local businesses in one particular business area. The function of the local business users group is to provide an opportunity for networking amongst local businesses and enable contacts and relationships to be formed on an informal basis. It is envisaged that local businesses will see each other as part of a connected business community through these local business user groups, which may then empower them to form into a local business association. To work together to develop a strategy to address any issues while promoting Puketāpapa and attract more customers to the area. The local board funding will be used to employ a contractor to lead the engagement with local businesses and support the current local business users groups. The contractor will arrange activities such as business meet ups and provision of capability development workshop and seminars.</td>
<td>ATEED: Local Economic Growth</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Local Board agreed to reallocate $7,500 to support a PopUp Business School event at Kopu PopUp Business School (contracted) and will run from 26 April to 10 May 2019 in partnership with Whau and Henderson-Massey Local Boards and MSD</td>
<td>The local board reallocated $7,500 to support a PopUp Business School event from 29 April to 10 May 2019 in partnership with Whau and Henderson-Massey Local Boards and MSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>Young Enterprise Scheme (PKTP)</td>
<td>The Auckland Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of the Young Enterprise Trust, delivers the Young Enterprise Scheme (YES) in Auckland. ATEED as the economic development agency is a strategic partner supporting the delivery of YES. YES is a practical, real-life programme for year 12 and 13 students. Through the programme, students develop creative ideas into actual businesses, complete with real products and services and experience real profit and loss. The funding from the local board will support the delivery of the Young Enterprise Scheme Kick Start Days in February 2019. The Kick Start days are held in sub-regions (north, south, east, central/east) and are the first day students get to meet the Young Enterprise team, and first cut about their 2019 year, what YES is all about, and what is in store for them.</td>
<td>ATEED: Local Economic Growth</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The Auckland Chamber of Commerce invoiced for the allocated funds from local boards and payment has been made.</td>
<td>No further action was required as this activity was completed in the last quarter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or COG</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>PKIPP Open Space Service Planning</td>
<td>To undertake investigation at network level to prioritise future projects and programmes within parks and open space, and to deliver parks planning initiatives included in the Puketāpapa Local Board Plan. • Develop concepts plans for Hillsborough Cemetery, Margaret Griffin Reserve and May Road War Memorial Park. • Undertake a shade and shelter assessment. • Access and plan for water fountain provision in parks. • Investigate and continue planning for heritage signage. • Further key moves from Open Space Network Plan.</td>
<td>Workshops and business meeting reports are scheduled for Q1/Q2</td>
<td>CS, PKP, Park Services</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Projects agreed with the Puketāpapa Local Board in August 2019. Progress on each is outlined below: 1. Mt Roskill War Memorial Park Spatial Plan: Following workshop feedback, draft concept plan will be amended and shared with stakeholders. Final draft to be workshopped prior to public consultation in May. Final feedback will be sought prior to adoption in Q4. 2. Hillsborough Cemetery Spatial Plan: Draft concept plan completed. Final consultation draft will be put out for public consultation in May. Final feedback will be sought prior to adoption in Q4. 3. Margaret Griffin Spatial Plan: Draft concept plan completed. Following workshop feedback, the amended draft plan will be put out for public consultation in May. Final feedback will be sought prior to adoption in Q4. 4. Shade and Shelter Provision Assessment: Draft Report has been discussed at a Green Cluster Workshop. Document to be amended to reflect additional recommendations, prior to adoption in Q4. 5. Toilet and Drinking Fountains Provision Assessment: Complete. 6. Accessibility Maps: Draft Accessibility Maps discussed at a Green Cluster Workshop. Maps to be amended to incorporate feedback and provided to the Website/Redevelopment Team to upload during Q4. 7. Storytelling Investigation - Project underway and will be workshopped with the local board early in Q4 to discuss progress made.</td>
<td>Some activities delayed and will not be completed by the end of Q4. These will progress into 2019/2020. Projects agreed with the Puketāpapa Local Board in August 2019. Progress on each is outlined below: 1. Mt Roskill War Memorial Park Spatial Plan: Final version complete. Mana Whenua forum scheduled for 31 July 2019. Public and user group consultation in September/October. Report for adoption Q2 2019/2020. 2. Hillsborough Cemetery Spatial Plan: Draft concept plan completed. Mana Whenua forum scheduled for 31 July 2019. Public and user group consultation in August. Report for adoption Q1 2019/2020. 3. Margaret Griffin Spatial Plan: Draft concept plan completed. Mana Whenua forum scheduled for 31 July 2019. Public and user group consultation in August 2019. Report for adoption Q4 2019/2020. 4. Shade and Shelter Provision Assessment: Draft report workshop and finalised. Report for adoption Q1 2019/2020. 5. Toilet and Drinking Fountains Provision Assessment: Complete. 6. Accessibility Maps: Draft Accessibility Maps workshopped and finalised. Maps will be uploaded to the Council website Q1, with Waitakere/Unured Reserve completed first – in time for opening event on 6 July 2019. 7. Storytelling Investigation - Project workshopped with the local board. Defined to the 2018/2020 work programme for completion in Q4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Pktpa: specific implementation plan for Auckland's Urban Forest (Kihapaire) Strategy</td>
<td>This project is to develop a local board specific programme which will identify, increase and protect Auckland’s Urban Forest (Kihapaire). An information session was held with the local board’s ‘Green Cluster’ on the Urban Forest Strategy on 23 August 2017. This is a three year project: Year one ‘knowing’ phase: complete spatial mapping of the existing tree canopy cover on public and private land in the local board areas. Determine the extent, type and age of urban Kihapaire. Develop options and identify any funding required for programmes in years two and three. Year two ‘growing’ phase: Find space for planting new trees using partnerships, including community groups, schools and the Million Trees Program. Year three ‘protecting’ phase: direct and indirect methods for the community to nominate and protect trees. This project will help to deliver the local board’s Low Carbon Action Plan 2017.</td>
<td>Final Kihapaire Assessment Report will be presented for approval in Q1.</td>
<td>CS PSR, Park Services</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Analysis ongoing of the data from the regional LiDAR mapping. Maps to show tree cover and locations of notable trees and NIA areas is in progress. Initial drafting of the Local Urban Kihapaire assessment report is underway and a first draft is expected for board review in June.</td>
<td>The draft Kihapaire local assessment report has been completed for review by the local board at a Green Cluster meeting in July. Following feedback, a final report will be prepared for adoption at the September 2019 business meeting. This will complete the Knowing phase. The local board has allocated funding for the Growing phase in 2019/2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>Lynfield Youth &amp; Leisure Centre Operations</td>
<td>Operate Lynfield youth &amp; Leisure Centre in a safe and sustainable manner through a management agreement with the YMCA. Deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. These services include fitness, group classes, team to swim, early childhood education, aquatic and recreation services. Along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS PSR, Active Recreation</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Lynfield Youth &amp; Leisure Centre experienced a slight decrease of 2% in centre visits when measured against the same period last year (December–February), particularly stadium usage in February. Membership has grown 10% from Q2, along with improved member retention - March cancellations were at a record low. The holiday programme saw a 40% increase in attendance in Dec/Jan. This is believed to have been because of the structure change (offering 1 day programme rather than 3 split timetables) which is easier for parents. YMCA have provided the community with $4,426 of fee assistance to local families this quarter. Customer experience scores were down 3% during quarter 3 (using a 12-month rolling average).</td>
<td>Lynfield Youth and Leisure Centre was a finalist in the New Zealand Exercise Awards, achieving runners up awards for the group fitness class category of the year and small group trainer of the year. Staff continued to support the community by helping to organise and support ‘Summer Fun’ activities and the ‘Views’ for a ‘Healthy Hearts’ initiative. The Holiday Programme grew by 40%, aided by the implementation of a programme to make the booking process easier and more flexible for parents. Year to date visitor numbers 5% increase in centre visits. This is due to the increase in group fitness, stadium visits and staff directed programmes. Customer Satisfaction Q3 NPSyte score (measured by Fiit Promoter Score surveys) = 18.20, a decrease on Q2. This may be a result of issues with the fitness centre music and cancellation of some group fitness classes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Puketapapa Local Board**

15 August 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or OCO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>PKTPP: Informal social recreation projects</td>
<td>Supporting &quot;Out and about&quot; programmes and initiatives that encourage participation in sport and recreation. Synergies have been identified with the ACE program #039 (Capacity building for delivery). PSR will work with ACE to deliver shared outcomes.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS PSR Active Recreation</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A busy summer delivery schedule with 22 activations in total. CSM led activations (with attendance) included: - Amazing Race (87) at Mt Eden Park - Beach Day (11) at Lyndhurst Cove. Attendance was low as tide was not favorable - Play day (78) at Three Kings Reserve - Kids Day (48) at Manukau Utd - Park fun day (39) at Motley Green Reserve. Attendance lower than expected as there were some works being completed on Monere Lane Ave. - On ya wheels treasure hunt (67) at War Memorial park. From mid-January to the beginning of March, outdoor yoga classes were delivered twice a week for 7 weeks at War Memorial Park. There was an average of 18 people per class with one class on a Wednesday evening and the other class on a Saturday morning. There was a diverse group of participants. February saw the delivery of 2 x girls wellness skate clinics at Westly Community Centre, which had an average of 17 participants (capped at 20) including mothers and daughters learning together. The location was good and staff are keen to fund more of these activations in the future. A Walk Streets Festival of Play event was held at Three Kings Reserve which had around 200 in attendance. This included a series of facilitated games with some requiring both parents and kids to work together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>PKTPP: Ecological volunteers and environmental programme FY19</td>
<td>Programmes of activity supporting volunteer groups to carry out ecological restoration and environmental programmes in local parks including -Community planting events - Harvest and animal pest eradication - Litter and green waste removal - Contractor support - Tools and Equipment - Beach/stream Clean Ups - Brochures/Pacific oyster shell removal</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS PSR Park Services</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The volunteer focus has been on maintaining planting and the continuing animal pest control programme on coastal reserves. Several public clean-up days have been carried out at Lynfield Reserve and Waitakere Stream Esplanade. Planning on planting areas at Lynfield Reserve is underway with the community in accord with the Ecological Restoration plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>PKTPP: Māori naming of reserves and facilities FY19 Phase Two</td>
<td>Identifying opportunities for park and facility naming/re-naming and engaging with Māori Whānau to develop Māori names and enhance Auckland’s Māori identity and Māori heritage</td>
<td>Approval of names for parks in Tāmaki Reg 1 by the end of 2019</td>
<td>CS PSR Active Recreation</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Work has focussed on managing overlapping interests and getting more reserves access to GIS systems. Of note is that January is down time for many reserves and Council so time in this quarter has been limited. The naming programme has been more area-based than anticipated, however it is currently forecast that there will be new names and a workshop held before the end of the financial year. Reporting and adoption of names however will not occur until later in 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCD</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>Scoping centre planning for</td>
<td>Scoping of what local planning or master planning is</td>
<td>CPO: Plans and Places</td>
<td>$83 Regional</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td></td>
<td>The situation is unchanged from Q2 and scope is postponed to Q3 financial year</td>
<td>The situation is unchanged from Q3. It is intended to postpone this to Q3 financial year 2019/2020 and undertake the scoping of planning for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Kings town centre</td>
<td>required for Three Kings Centre to be undertaken early in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three Kings town centre in the event this is required to support the local board’s housing programme. A report to this effect was considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoddart Road centre</td>
<td>Stoddart Road Centre, to occur after the alignment of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1444</td>
<td>Mt Roskill Village</td>
<td>Investigation into improvements to the town centre</td>
<td>CPO: Plans and Places</td>
<td>$25,000 LDI OpeX</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Local Board was updated by Auckland Transport and counsel staff at the</td>
<td>Auckland Transport changed delivery of its project. Synchronised construction is no longer possible and new delivery options are being investigated. There was a positive response to the competitive tender which closed at the end of the 4th quarter. A contract will be awarded early in 2019 for construction to commence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>revitalisation</td>
<td>including streetscape enhancement design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure cluster held on 10 April 2019 about the delay in the delivery of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Youth Connections - Puhinui</td>
<td>Youth Connections will...</td>
<td>Local board to approve</td>
<td>$25,000 LDI OpeX</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>DINE Academy engaged with 13 young people out of this four are engaged in</td>
<td>Capacity and capability development of local community groups with HLC – Currently we are on the process of signing the agreement for HLC to work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Puhinui)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Youth Connections youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>further education or training and nine went on to employment.</td>
<td>local community groups to capacity and capability development. HLC has identified the community groups that they are looking to capacity build to provide employment broker coach work to fill construction roles that are coming up in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Unit or CCO</th>
<th>CL- Lease Commencement Date</th>
<th>CL- Right of Renewal</th>
<th>CL- Annual Rent Amount (excluding GST)</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>Buckley Road Reserve, 50 Buckley Road, Epsom: Lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust (Greenwoods Corner)</td>
<td>Renew building lease for five years from 1 January 2019 to existing group</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/09/2009</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>31/12/2023</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Leasing project completed in quarter two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359</td>
<td>BSA Mt Albert Road, Mt Roskill: Lease to Scout Association of New Zealand (Royal Oaks)</td>
<td>New ground lease to existing group</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/07/1987</td>
<td>1 x 10 years</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Granting of new community lease to The Scout Association of New Zealand completed in quarter one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td>Orakei Reserve, 16 The Avenue, Lynfield: Lease to Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Renew building lease for five years from 1 January 2019 to existing group</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/09/2009</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>31/12/2023</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Lynfield Tennis Club has applied for land owner approval to include drainage and underground services for its proposed new garage. Workshop to be held with Puketapapa Local Board in quarter four to discuss proposed new community lease to the club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>Bob Bodt Reserve, 1235 Dominion Rd, Gatemar, Mount Roskill: Lease to Scout Association of New Zealand (Walkworth)</td>
<td>New ground lease to existing group</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/07/1998</td>
<td>1 x 10 years</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Lease proposal completed in quarter one - Resolution number PKTP/2018/139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2621</td>
<td>Three Kings Reserve, Mt Roskill Community Library Building, 546 Mt Albert Road, Mt Roskill: Lease to Citizens Advice Bureau</td>
<td>New ground lease to existing group Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>30/09/2008</td>
<td>4 x 3 years</td>
<td>30/09/2020</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>The draft lease has been returned from council’s consultant solicitors following the review of input from Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) and council staff. The draft deed is being checked by Legal Services and will be sent to CAB for execution. This is anticipated to be finalised in quarter four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2624</td>
<td>War Memorial Park, 75A Clifford Ave, Mt Roskill: Lease to Eden/Roskill Softball Club Incorporated</td>
<td>New ground lease to existing group Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme. Group to complete application.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/12/2002</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>30/11/2017</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Draft concept plan for the park currently being developed which will map out future investment into the park and include a number of major future development projects. This is anticipated to be completed in the 2018/2019 financial year. Options for a new community lease to the club to be discussed with the Puketapapa Local Board upon adoption of the concept plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2625</td>
<td>Keith Hay Park, 669 Richardson Road, Mt Roskill: Lease to Three Kings United Soccer Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Short term lease to club for existing clubrooms. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/01/1985</td>
<td>1x5 years</td>
<td>31/12/2014</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>An agreement to lease, new lease and licence to occupy was granted by the Puketapapa Local Board (PKTP/2012/225) for Three Kings United Football Club’s proposed new build. The deeds will be drafted once ownership and maintenance is finalised between Auckland Council and the club - discussions are on-going. Proposal to reclassify Keith Hay Park North and South as a recreation reserve is to be completed within the next six months. Proposed interim lease to be granted to the club for current clubrooms once re-classification of Keith Hay Park is complete. Workshop to be held with Puketapapa Local Board in quarter four.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. The Auckland Council Annual Report 2018/2019 is being prepared and needs to be adopted by the Governing Body by 26 September 2019. As part of the overall report package, individual reports for each local board are prepared.
3. Auckland Council currently has a series of bonds quoted on the New Zealand Stock Exchange (NZX) Debt Market maintained by NZX Limited. As council is subject to obligations under the NZX Main Board and Debt Market Listing Rules and the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 (FMCA), local boards may not release annual financial results in any form. Therefore, the attached annual report is being presented as confidential and will be tabled at the meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) adopt the 2018/2019 Puketāpapa Local Board Annual Report as set out in Attachment A.

b) note that any proposed changes will be clearly communicated and agreed with the chairperson before the report is submitted for adoption by the Governing Body by 26 September 2019.

c) note that the draft 2018/2019 Puketāpapa Local Board Annual Report (refer to Attachment A to the agenda report) will remain confidential until after the Auckland Council group results for 2018/2019 are released to the New Zealand Stock Exchange which are expected to be made public by 30 September 2019.

Horopaki

Context
4. In accordance with the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 and the Local Government Act 2002, each local board is required to monitor and report on the implementation of its 2018/2019 Local Board Agreement. This includes reporting on the performance measures for local activities, and the overall Financial Impact Statement for the local board.

5. In addition to the compliance purpose, local board annual reports are an opportunity to tell the wider performance story with a strong local flavour, including how the local board is working towards the outcomes of their local board plan.

6. Auckland Council currently has a series of bonds quoted on the NZX Debt Market (quoted bonds) maintained by NZX Limited. As a result, the council is subject to obligations under the NZX Main Board and Debt Market Listing Rules (listing rules) and the Financial Markets
Conduct Act 2013 (FMCA). Under these obligations, local boards may not release annual financial results in any form, including publishing their agenda/minutes containing their results, until council group results are released to the NZX on 27 September 2019. Therefore, the attached annual report is being presented as confidential.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

7. The annual report contains the following sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mihi</td>
<td>The mihi relates to the local board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message from the chairperson</td>
<td>An overall message introducing the report, highlighting achievements and challenges, including both financial and non-financial performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local board members</td>
<td>A group photo of the local board members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our area</td>
<td>A visual layout of the local board area, summarising key demographic information and showing key projects and facilities in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance report</td>
<td>Provides performance measure results for each activity, providing explanations where targeted service levels have not been achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding information</td>
<td>Financial performance results compared to long-term plan and annual plan budgets, together with explanations about variances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local flavour</td>
<td>A profile of either an outstanding resident, grant, project or facility that benefits the local community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Council group impacts and views**

8. Council departments and council-controlled organisations comments and views have been considered and included in the annual report in relation to activities they are responsible for delivering on behalf of local boards.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

9. Local board feedback will be included where possible. Any changes to the content of the final annual report will be discussed with the chairperson.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

10. The annual report provides information on how Auckland Council has progressed its agreed priorities in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 over the past 12 months. This includes engagement with Māori, as well as projects that benefit various population groups, including Māori.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

11. The annual report reports on both the financial and service performance in each local board area.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

12. The annual report is a legislatively required document. It is audited by Audit New Zealand who assess if the report represents information fairly and consistently, and that the financial statements comply with accounting standard PBE FRS-43: Summary Financial Statements. Failure to demonstrate this could result in a qualified audit opinion.

13. The annual report is a key communication to residents. It is important to tell a clear and balanced performance story, in plain English, and in a form that is accessible, to ensure that council meets its obligations to be open with the public it serves.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

14. The next steps for the draft 2018/2019 Annual Report for the local board are:

- Audit NZ review during August and September 2019
- report to the Governing Body for adoption on 26 September 2019
- release to stock exchanges and publication online on 27 September 2018
- physical copies provided to local board offices, council service centres and libraries by the end of October 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>David Gurney - Manager Corporate Performance &amp; Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Kevin Ramsay - General Manager Corporate Finance and Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza – Acting General Manager Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puketāpapa Local Board
15 August 2019

Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward Councillor Update

File No.: CP2019/13639

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To enable the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward Councillors to verbally update the Board.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) thank Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward Councillors Cathy Casey and Christine Fletcher for their update.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2019/13640

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Chairperson, Harry Doig, with an opportunity to update board members on the activities he has been involved with since the last meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. It is anticipated that the Chairperson will speak to the report at the meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) receive Chair Harry Doig's report 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>Chair Harry Doig's report, 01 July - 31 July 2019</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Chair Harry Doig's Local Government 2019 Conference report</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Council workshops, meetings and briefings

01 July – 06 July  On leave
07 July  Local Government NZ Conference
08 July  Local Government NZ Conference
09 July  Local Government NZ Conference – Conference report attached
10 July  Chair/ Deputy Chair catch up
10 July  Chair/ Deputy Chair meeting with advisors and relationship manager
11 July  Board Workshop
12 July  Quarterly Police/PLB meeting
12 July  Michael Wood MP/PLB Chair/Deputy - Bi Monthly Meeting
13 July  Fearon Park public art work blessing
15 July  Auckland Transport quarterly briefing – by Skype
15 July  Chair/PA catch up
17 July  Chair/ Deputy Chair catch up
17 July  Members Cluster
17 July  Chair/ Deputy Chair meeting with advisors
18 July  Draft minutes meeting between Chair, Deputy Chair, Advisor and Democracy Advisor
18 July  **Board Business Meeting**
19 July  Chair/Deputy Chair meeting with HLC over road naming procedure
19 July  Comms catch up
23 July  Chair/PA catch up
24 July  Meet with Strategic Broker
24 July  Chair/ Deputy Chair catch up
24 July  Green Cluster working group meeting
24 July  Chair/ Deputy Chair meeting with advisors and relationship manager
25 July  Board Workshop
31 July  Chair/ Deputy Chair catch up
31 July  Chair/ Deputy Chair meeting with advisors
31 July  Meet re Chair’s message for Healthy Puketāpapa Strategic Framework

Other meetings, events

20 July  Take part in Friends of Wairaki stream planting
23 July  Facilitate meeting between community members concerned with cross/star and Tūpuna Maunga Authority Chair and officers
25 July  Chair and Aunty Jo presentation of letter of appredation to Mt Roskill Fire Brigade
26 July  Meet with Mark Graham candidate for Albert- Eden-Puketāpapa ward

Other Issues/challenges

Nil
Disclosures
Nil

Recommendation/s
a) That the report be received.
b) That the Chair's report on the Local Government Conference be received

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>H Doig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Attachment A
Local Government 2019 Conference (LGNZ)

Report by Harry Doig Chair Puketāpapa Local Board

Date: Sunday 7 July to Tuesday 9 July 2019
Location: TSB Bank Arena. Wellington
Theme: Riding the localism wave:

Localism: Localism was not clearly defined for me at the conference but by referring to the material provided it seems to mainly mean:

- a state where citizens are enabled “...to be actively involved in shaping their own futures, working together with their governments of all levels to define issues and design appropriate solutions, noting the particularities of their own circumstances.”

- which would involve “… moving New Zealand from being one of the most centralised countries in the developed world to one that is prepared to trust its communities to play a meaningful role in our social, economic, and cultural development.”

This sounds to me like the well-known principle that underlies the establishment of local boards – that of subsidiarity - but this time on a national scale. As such, we should wholeheartedly embrace it.

However, presentations often showcased how councils could engage with their own communities around the decisions that they made as if this was a new idea. Rather than identifying what services central government could devolve to councils or how councils and our communities should be better consulted by central government. As such, I was surprised that councils weren’t already fully committed to this process as local boards are.

Speakers (a sample)

Jacinda Ardern – PM spoke on: wellbeing, climate change, regional development, and the importance of local government. Also receiving honourable mention were tourism, housing and the primary role local government has in three waters.

Dave Cull – President of LGNZ focused on giving local government a greater role in the economy. “In NZ 90c in $1 of all public expenditure is made by central government. This compares with 50c in $1 on average for OECD countries”. Education, health and social

---

1 Reinvigorating local democracy: The case for localizing power and decision-making to councils and communities. LGNZ A discussion paper July 2019, page 9.
2 Ibid page 10
welfare expenditure were identified as areas where local government expenditure in NZ is currently absent.

Another point he made was that the “...role of local government is to activate what the people want”. Its hard to argue against that in principle but the discussion being promoted is around defining where local government should be active.

Lance O’Sullivan spoke of how present systems were failing Maori and the need for transformation that may need to come “...through disruption”. He also stated that “...sometimes you need to be autocratic...”. It wasn’t clear how this sat with the localism agenda.

Phil O’Reilly ex of Business NZ speaking to the topic of “Incentivising communities to take a more proactive approach to local government” raised the importance of local government providing infrastructure, doing away with the rates differential and the problems with RMA/consent approvals. BUT he admitted that local government had an important role in the provision of amenities as this supported the recruitment of talent for business.

Jacqui Dean, opposition spokesperson for small business and local government, also spoke of a wider role for local government and committed herself to the retention in legislation of the four well beings.

Panel on Managing Fresh Water

Clearly an issue that councils around the country are wrestling with.

Quotable quote: “You look after the water and the water will look after you”

Three obligations (priorities?) for dealing with conflicting demands on water:

1. Look after water for its own sake
2. Use for essential human needs
3. Consider other consumptives uses

Awards

Fitting to see that Penny Hulse received an excellence award for making an Outstanding Contribution to Local Government. Congratulations Penny.

Finally

Thank you for the opportunity to attend this year’s LGNZ Conference. It will be interesting to watch where the discussion promoted will lead over the coming years.

Harry Doig

August 2019
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the local board members on the activities they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. It is anticipated that Board members will speak to their reports at the meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
   a) receive the member reports 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>Ann-Mare Coury's Report, 01 July - 31 July 2019</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Julie Fairey's Report, 05 July - 01 August 2019</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>David Holm's Report, 01 July - 31 July 2019</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ella Kumar's Report, 01 July - 31 July 2019</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne-Marie Coury’s monthly report
1st July – 31st July 2019

Auckland Council workshops, meetings and briefings

3rd July Community Forum
4th July Board Workshop
11th July Board Workshop
15th July Senior Panel public session – arranged speakers
17th July Member’s Cluster Workshop
18th July Board Business Meeting
24th July Green Cluster
25th July Board Workshop

Other meetings

6th July attended opening of Te Auaunga Oakley Creek and Underwood and Walmsley Parks, (with Fale, and Mara Hupara)
7th July attended Local Govt NZ Conference in Wellington
8th July attended Local Govt NZ Conference, went on site visit to observe new social housing, and had discussion on housing issues with other delegates.
9th July attended the morning sessions of the Conference, especially interested in the communications and engagement issues in one of the sessions
13th July participated in Roskill Together’s Strategy Visioning Workshop

Other issues/challenges

1st July participated in discussion at Human Rights Commission workshop on rights issues for seniors at Mt Eden War Memorial Hall
2nd July dialogue re “Generations” session covering ageism in the workplace.
16th July meeting with community leaders on social housing issues for 50 plus
16th July responded to seniors concerned about social housing locally
16th July attended meeting on Climate Change with Gen Zero
21st July meeting with planner Dory Reeves to discuss possible future projects with an accessibility lens

28th July attended Local meeting hosted by Michael Wood MP with Board colleagues on the future of Roskill Town Centre

Disclosures

My advocacy on issues relating to accessibility will be declared as and when it is relevant. I am associated closely with Access Alliance, and currently work on strategy and policy matters with the Steering Committee for the up-coming International Conference in March 2020.

I continue to support the programmes of the Auckland Women’s Centre. I am renewing my membership of the Auckland Art Gallery and continue to support Migrant Action Trust volunteering with mentoring as and when needed at the Puketapapa Community Driving School. I make radio programme on social issues related to seniors 50 plus at Planet FM 104.6 FM which are broadcast Sundays at 5.25 pm to provide interviews and information on what’s happening for seniors.

Recommendation/s

a) That the report be received.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Anne-Marie Coury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Report Name:** Board Member Julie Fairey’s report  
**Report covering the period 5th July to 1st August 2019**

For the period 21st June to 9th July, inclusive, I have been Acting Chair while the Chair was on leave overseas.

**Auckland Council workshops, meetings and briefings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 July</td>
<td>Catch-up with Chair (including handover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 July</td>
<td>Regular advisor catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 July</td>
<td>Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Members Coury, Holm, and Member Kumar from 9.47am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 July</td>
<td>Catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 July</td>
<td>Attended combined Infrastructure and Heritage Cluster and Members Cluster with Member Holm (facilitating first part), Member Coury (facilitating second half), Members Kaushal and Kumar, Chair Doig,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 July</td>
<td>Regular advisor catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 July</td>
<td>Continued catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>Attended Draft Minutes meeting (preparation for business meeting) with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>Monthly business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 July</td>
<td>Monthly communications meeting, with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 July</td>
<td>Took notes at meeting Chair facilitated between Chair of Tupuna Maunga Authority and staff, local Ministers Association members, and petitioners on the issue of the future of the cross/star formerly on the tihi of Puketapapa / Pukehiwi / Mt Roskill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 July</td>
<td>Regular catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 July</td>
<td>Facilitated monthly Green Cluster meeting with Chair, Members Coury, Holm, Kaushal and Kumar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 July</td>
<td>Regular advisor catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>Attended regular local board workshop from 1.55pm, with Chair, Members Coury, Holm, Kaushal and Kumar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July</td>
<td>Regular catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July</td>
<td>Regular advisor catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 August</td>
<td>Attended regular local board workshop with Chair Doig, Members Holm, Kaushal and Kumar, Member Coury from 1.37pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other meetings, events

6 July  
Attended Dawn blessing for Te Auaunga project

6 July  
Attended, spoke at, helped with local board stall for, grand opening of Te Auaunga project, with Members Coury, Holm, Kaushal, Kumar, the Mayor, Michael Wood MP, and elected members from other areas, as well as mana whenua, community members.

12 July  
Regular meeting with Local Member of Parliament, with Chair.

19 July  
Meeting with HLC regarding approach to road naming in their redevelopments, with Chair.

20 July  
Attended Friends of Wairaki Stream planting event at Lynfield Reserve, with Chair Doig, Local Member of Parliament Michael Wood.

22 July  
Meeting with Mental Health Foundation regarding opportunities to share 5 Ways to Wellbeing, cooperate for Mental Health Awareness Week later in the year.

22 July  
Attended review interview for Manukau Harbour Forum with Member Holm.

Other issues/challenges

Over the reporting period I have worked on issues in response to constituent queries or my own observations in regard to the following list of areas. This has usually involved seeking and supplying information, a request for service, and/or forwarding to relevant Board members/officers for their action/information. Often these are conversations on social media (Facebook and Twitter, sometimes Neighbourly):

- Illegal dumping
- Local resource consent applications and alcohol licences monitoring
- Keith Hay Park sports fields, clubroom development, parking enforcement
- Noton Rd and Richardson Rd carpark projects (part of Keith Hay Park)
- Arthur Faulkner Reserve concept plan implementation, including pickleball and VHF club
- Fearon and Harold Long Park park upgrade – current project and future possibilities, including liaison with Mt Roskill Rugby Club and Winstone Park Tennis Club.
- Faded parking lines, particularly mobility parks at Denny Ave’s carpark for Mt Roskill War Memorial Park, outside small block of shops on Hillsborough Rd
- Mowing and overgrowth issues in Ernie Pinches area, on Housing NZ property
- Mt Roskill Village upgrade works
- Dog off-leash areas signage
- Te Auaunga Project – including outstanding issues around signage, slippery boardwalks
- Playground upgrade queries for Waikowhai Park and Keith Hay Park south
- 68 bus timetable changes and 68- associated roadworks on Carlton St
- The Avenue bus stop changes and issues with visibility and bus driver behaviour
- Dog bylaw review
- Freedom camping bylaw changes
- Sandringham Rd Ext pedestrian crossing maintenance (and nearby cycling infrastructure)
- Repeated flooding at Molley Green Place
- Graffiti on public assets
- Benches at The Avenue Reserve
• Lynfield College accessway on Kimberhall Ave
• Contractors (including for council and CCOs) parking on footpaths
• Privet in local park
• Lights out at Turner Reserve basketball court
• Local volunteering opportunities for youth group
• Broken yellow lines request for Kimiora St
• Privacy issue at West Park
• Lighting at the local board office
• Hillsborough Cemetery maintenance and planting
• Possible illegal tree pruning along coast
• Progress on private retail/apartment development in Roskill South

Thank you to our PA Liaison and other officers and elected members, including AT, for their assistance with these and other matters

Disclosures
I am an individual member of the Auckland branch of the National Council of Women. During the reporting period I did not attend any meetings, however I have accepted an invitation to attend their annual conference as their procedural advisor, on 31st August. I am paying for the flights myself. www.ncwnz.org.nz

I am a trustee, and board secretary, for The Aunties, a charity established to expand and make sustainable work done to meet the needs of families dealing with domestic violence. During the reporting period I attended a monthly trust board meeting on 22nd July. www.aunties.co.nz

I am also a trustee on the HE Fairey Family Trust, which gives grants to people with disabilities through CCS/Disability Action, but I am not currently one of the two “active” trustees. I attended part of the AGM on 25th July.

I travelled to Wellington, from Auckland, return with my three children, on Friday 12th July returning Tuesday 16th July, paid for by Parliamentary Services to accompany my partner, a Member of Parliament, in his work, during the school holidays.

I attended the 9th Annual Indian Newslink Lecture, a black tie event at the Pullman Hotel, with my partner as his plus one, accepting a free ticket valued at $150, on 29th July.

Recommendation/s

a) That the report be received.

Signatories

| Author       | Julie Fairey |
Board Member Report – David Holm

1 to 31 July 2019

Board Workshops and Meetings Attended

4 July  Attended Board Workshop.
11 July  Attended Board Workshop.
18 July  Attended Board Business Meeting.
25 July  Attended Board Workshop.

Transport Meetings and Issues

12 July  Quarterly meeting with police.
15 July  Auckland Transport Quarterly briefing for Local Boards.
17 July  Infrastructure and Heritage Cluster Meeting. Covered Mt. Roskill Streetscape Upgrade project.

Environmental Meetings and Issues

6 July  Te Auaunga Stream Restoration Grand Opening including Board stall.
22 July  Manukau Harbour Forum Governance Review interview with consultant Nigel Bradley. Deputy Chair and Forum Alternate Julie Fairey also took part.
24 July  Tread Lightly Litter Blitz at Waikowhai Primary with Member Kumar.
24 July  Green Cluster including Auckland’s Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy.
26 July  Presented Board Submission to Waste Minimisation By laws Hearing Panel.

A business subject to complaints has been issued an abatement notice under the Resource Management Act.

Other Meetings/ Functions

13 July  Blessing of public art work Te Tatua by Chris Bailey at Fearon Park with Chair Doig.
17 July  Members cluster working group.

Other organisations

9 July  Roskill Together Board meeting.
20 July  Roskill Together hui on inclusive initiatives for Mt. Roskill with Member Coury.

Declaration of interest  I am Treasurer of Roskill Together.

Recommendation
That the Puketapapa Local Board:-
receive the report from Member Holm.
Report Name: Board Member Ella Kumar report
Report covering the period 01st July to 31st July 2019

Auckland Council Workshops, meetings and briefings

4th July
- Climate Change Response
- Out and About Programme for 18/19 and proposal option for 19/20
- ACE events
- Community Facilities Update
- Developing an Integrated Plan for Mt Roskill to support the Auckland Housing Programme

6th July
Awa Opening

11th July
- Agenda Run Though
- Margaret Griffin and Hillsborough Concept Plans, Pre Consultation
- Akina Social Enterprise
- Community Empowerment Work programme Update 19/19 excluding integrated lines
- Healthy Puketapapa Action Plan
- Board Member discussion area
- Weekly 5

13th July
- Fearon Park Blessing

17th July
- Auckland Transport and Infrastructure, Heritage and Community Cluster meeting

18th July
- Puketapapa Local Board Business Meeting

24th July
Green Cluster Workshop
25th July
- Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan
- Property Rationalisation Process

Other meetings
3rd July
KHPUG meeting
6th July
Somali Independence Day

Disclosures:
Contractor for YMCA as an aerobics instructor to deliver fitness classes. (Cameron Pools Leisure Centre and Lynfield Leisure and Recreation Centre is situated in PLB area who own the buildings).

Roskill Together Committee Member

I volunteered for many years before being on the local board and will continue with community as requested in my personal capacity in various ways like events, support, fitness or as required at many organisations where the board may have funded or will fund in the future and will declare these situations as they arise and applications come to the local board and when local board engages and funds groups.

Recommendation
a) That the report be received.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Ella Kumar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present the Puketāpapa Local Board with its updated governance forward work programme calendar (the calendar).

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The calendar for the Puketāpapa Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.
3. The calendar was introduced in 2016 as part of Auckland Council’s quality advice programme and aims 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 Puketāpapa Local Board:
  a) receive the governance forward work programme calendar for August 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Programme Calendar, August 2019</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 December 2018</td>
<td>RFA First Quarter Report 2018-2019</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 2018</td>
<td>Annual Plan 2018/2020 Local Consultation Get-together</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>inputs to regional decision making</td>
<td>Defers board position and feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 April 2019</td>
<td>Local Board Agreement - Advocacy and Finance</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Defers board position and feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 June 2019</td>
<td>Adopt Local Board Work Programme FY19</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 July 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add a New Member</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 September 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillsborough Cemetery</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Griffin Park</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Board Update</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 November 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Climate Change Action Plan - Low Carbon Auckland</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Defers board position and feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance Forward Work Programme Calendar**

*Puketāpapa Local Board 15 August 2019*
Record of Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Notes

File No.: CP2019/14664

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide a summary of Puketāpapa Local Board (the Board) workshop notes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The attached summary of workshop notes provides a record of the Board’s workshops held in July 2019.
3. These sessions are held to give an informal opportunity for board members and officers to discuss issues and projects and note that no binding decisions are made or voted on at workshop sessions.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) receive the Puketāpapa Local Board workshop records for 04 July, 11 July, 25 July 01 August 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record, 04 July 2019</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record, 11 July 2019</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record, 25 July 2019</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record, 01 August 2019</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 04 July 2019 commencing at 9.30 am.

## PRESENT

**Chairperson:** Julie Fairey  
**Members:** Anne-Marie Coury arrived 9.41 am  
David Holm  
Shail Kaushal arrived 9.32 am  
Eila Kumar arrived 9.52 am

**Apologies:** Harry Doig  
**Also present:** Mary Hay, Ben Moimoi and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declarations of Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>No declarations noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 1: Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill**  
**Ben Moimoi**  
Local Board Advisor  
Local Board Services  

- **Input into regional decision making**  
A report was presented at the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting 20 June delegating a member to provide feedback. This session was used for the board to provide their feedback.  
Next steps the delegated person to provide feedback to the Environment and Community Committee.

**Item 2: Out and About programme for 18/19 and proposed options for 19/20**  
**Peter Cacioppoli**  
Activation Team Leader  
Parks Sports and Recreation  
**Sunny Karan**  
FSR Portfolio Manager  
Parks Sports and Recreation  
Services Programmes  

- **Setting direction/priorities/budget**  
The officers provided a summary of the FY18/19 Out and About Programme and the draft recommendations for 19/20.  
Next steps: The 19/20 Out and About programme to be presented in September 2019.

**Item 3.0: ACE Events**  
**Sherry Bekhet**  
Event Facilitator  

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The officers discussed with the board the opening of Te Auaunga (Walmsley & Underwood Park)
### Item 4: Community Facilities Update

**Rodney Klaassen**  
Stakeholder Advisor  
Community Facilities  
Stakeholder & Land Advisory

**Katrina Morgan**  
Work Programme Lead  
Jody Morley  
Project Delivery Area Manager

- **Oversight and monitoring**

The officer introduced the team to the board. The following was highlighted:

- Project Delivery work programme update.
- Discussion on the FY2019/2020 projects.

**Operational Maintenance update.**

- Underwood and Walmsley Reserve grand opening.
- Line marking completed in lower Fickling Centre carpark.
- Plants ordered for Molley Green Reserve
- Boat set on fire at Hillsborough Cemetery.

### Item 5. Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill

**Ben Moimoi**  
Local Board Advisor  
Local Board Services

The board confirmed their feedback.

### Item 6: Developing on Integrated Plan for Mt Roskill to support the Auckland Housing Programme

**David Wong**  
Principal Planner  
Plans & Places  
**Nicola Mochrie (HLC)**  
**Tanya Mead (HLC)**  
**Celia Davison**  
Manager Planning – Central South Plans and Places apolos

- **Local Initiative/specific decisions**

The officer introduced the team. The officer gave an overview and advised on the area plan now being developed. He further advised the board that a report would be put forward to the Puketapapa Local Board 18 July Business meeting.

Next steps a report to be provided to the 18 July Puketapapa Local Board Business meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marc Dendale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader, Planning Places Plans and Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7: Weekly 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delwyn Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/Liaison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The officer provided an update of events in calendars over the next fortnight.

The workshop concluded at 2.35 pm.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 11 July 2019 commencing at 9.30 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig
Members: Anne-Marie Couy
Julie Fairey
David Holm
Shail Kaushal
Eli Kumar

Apologies:
Also present: Trina Thompson and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Member Kumar declared an interest for Roskill Together Item 4 Community Empowerment Unit. Member Holm declared an interest for Roskill Together Item 4 Community Empowerment Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Agenda Run Through</td>
<td></td>
<td>The board reviewed the business meeting agenda for the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting for 18 July 2019 and noted questions for officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Harry Doig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role: Chair</td>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: Margaret Griffen and Hillsborough Cemetery Concept Plans – pre consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>The officer gave a comprehensive overview of the concepts plans for: Margaret Griffen Park Hillsborough Cemetery. Next steps the plans will go to consultation and then final approval at the Puketāpapa Local Board Business Meeting 19 September 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Netty Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role: Parks and Placces Specialist</td>
<td>Department: Park Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Little</td>
<td>Manager Landscape Architect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3: AKINA</td>
<td></td>
<td>The officer gave the board a brief on the social and innovation sector and then introduced AKINA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Sunita Kashyap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role: Specialist Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: Community Empowerment WP Update 18/19 excluding Integrated lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Name:** Juanita de Senna  
Strategic Broker  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment  
**Tanya Moredo**  
Specialist Advisor, Youth  
Specialist  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment |
| *Oversight and monitoring* |
| The officers gave an update on the following: |
| • Children’s Panel  
• Youth Development an update on the summit held 13 June  
• Strategic Relationship Grants noting the 15/16 reports will be provided to the 01 August workshop  
• Social cohesion |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5. Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ailsa Wilson**  
Project Manager  
**Ronelle Barker**  
Practice Manager - Operations  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment |
| *Local initiative/specific decisions* |
| The Project Manager updated the board on the progress of the project. The Project Manager provided a draft of the Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan. The board provided feedback. Next steps a report to be presented at the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting 15 August 2019. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 6: Board members discussion on the area plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 7: Weekly 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The officer updated the board on invites in their calendar and also followed up on their attendance for events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.00pm.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday 25 July 2019 commencing at 1.00 pm.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig
Members: Anne-Marie Coury
Julie Fairey arrived 2pm
David Holm
Shail Kaushal
Elia Kumar

Apologies:

Also present: Victoria Villaraza, Ben Moimoi and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Member Kumar for Sports Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 1: Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Oversight and monitoring</strong></td>
<td>The Project Manager presented the updated version of the draft Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan the board reviewed and provided their feedback. Next steps the Healthy Puketāpapa Local Board Plan to be presented at the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting on 15 August 2019 to be endorsed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Ailsa Wilson**  
Project Manager  
Arts Community and Events, Community Empowerment | | |
| **Item2: Property rationalisation process** | • **Input into regional decision making** | The officer gave an update to the board on Panuku’s activities and then discussed the rationalisation and intended transfer of a site. The board provided their feedback to the officer. |
| **Anthony Lewis**  
Senior Advisor Portfolio Review, Portfolio Review Strategy & Operations Panuku Development | | |

The workshop concluded at 3.00 pm.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 01 August 2019 commencing at 9.30 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig
Members: Anne-Marie Coury
           Julie Fairey
           David Holm
           Shail Kaushal
           Elia Kumar

Apologies: Mary Hay by SKYPE (item 1.0), Ben Moimoi and Selina Powell

Also present: Mary Hay by SKYPE (item 1.0), Ben Moimoi and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>No declarations given.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Item: 1.0 Current and upcoming Regional/central government feedback | • Input into regional decision making | The officers gave the board the opportunity to provide draft feedback on the following submissions:
Auckland Council submission Governments Clean car standard and Clean Car discounts proposal
Government has produced a discussion document designed to seek feedback on proposals to reduce emissions in the light vehicle fleet (cars, SUVs, utes, vans, light trucks).

Next steps
02/08 deadline for local board formal feedback to be appended to the final Auckland Council submission for Environment and Community submission
13/08 report to the Environment and Community Committee
20/08 closing date for submission. |
## Film Protocols

The Auckland Film Protocol:
Information for filmmakers about
the legislation, policies, plans and
rules that apply when filming in
public open spaces across
Auckland.

Next steps:
Report for the Puketāpapa Local
Board Business August meeting
seeking formal local board
feedback prior to decision from
Environment and Community
Committee in September.

## Productivity Commission

inquiry into local government
funding and financing: release
of draft report and call for
submissions:
Draft report released relating to its
local government funding and
financing inquiry. 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

Next steps: feedback will be
formalised at the 15 August
Puketāpapa Local Board
Business meeting and then sent
to the relevant Auckland Council
Committee

### Item 2: Weekly 5

**Delwyn Burke**
PACL Liaison

The board was updated on events
in their calendar for the next
fortnight.

### Item 3: Quarter 4 WP Update

- Setting direction/priorities/budget

The officer provided an update on
the quarter 4 report.

Next steps a report to be
presented at the Puketāpapa
Local Board Business meeting on
15 August 2019

### Item 4: Community Facilities

**Streetscapes**

Richard Duimel
General Manager AIM Services

- Oversight and monitoring

The officer introduced the team.
A presentation was given on
Streetscape.
### Sports Parks update

**Graeme Hibberd**  
Senior Maintenance Delivery Coordinator  
Community Facilities

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The officer gave an update to the board. He gave updates on the following parks:
  - Keith Hay Park
  - Margaret Griffin Park

### Katrina Morgan

**Work Programme Lead**

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The officer gave an update on:
  - Fearon Park
  - Signage at Belfast

### Jody Morley

**Project Delivery Area Manager**

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The officer updated members on operational maintenance matters:
  - Waikowhai Toilet Blocks
  - Molley Green
  - Cape Horn Road
  - Walmsley Reserve
  - MT Roskill Carpark
  - Keith Hay Park
  - Hillsborough cemetery
  - West Reserve

### Justin Cash

**Senior Maintenance Delivery Coordinator**  
Community Facilities  
Operational Management & Maintenance

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The officer gave an update on accountability reports from 2015-2016 from the seven groups. Board now has a complete set of reports.

### 6.0 Accountability for 2015/2016

**Strategic Partnership Grants**

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The officers gave a presentation on the project now that it has been completed. The boards provided feedback on the project and congratulated the officers for their work.

### Marion Davies

**Grants & Incentives Manager**  
Commercial & Finance

### Daylyn Braganza

**Advisor**  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment

### Juanita de Senna

**Strategic Broker**  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment

### Item 6: Joint Workshop with Whai/Albert Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board to discuss Te Auaunga

- **Local initiative/specific decision.**  

---

**Julie Huddleston**  
Head of Service Delivery  
AMM Services
### Item 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nick FitzHerbert</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Management Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Advisory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Mansell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Social Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Donovan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Waters Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Eden Local Board members attending:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Rose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Easte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.00 pm.
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Puketāpapa Local Board

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities. In particular, the report contains detailed financial adjustments, assumptions and judgements that have impact on the financial results of the Auckland Council group as at 30 June 2019 that require Audit New Zealand sign-off and release to the New Zealand Stock Exchange.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>