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Terms of Reference

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

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

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

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

Those who are not members of the public

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2 **Declaration of Interest**

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

3 **Confirmation of Minutes**

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 13 August 2019, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

4 **Petitions**

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

5 **Public Input**

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

5.1 **Public input: Eastern Bays Songbird - Rachel Fewster**

Te take mō te pūrongo

**Purpose of the report**

1. To provide an update regarding the Eastern Bays Songbird project.

Whakarāpopotanga matua

**Executive summary**

2. Rachel Fewster, Professor, Department of Statistics, University of Auckland will be present.

Ngā tūtohunga

**Recommendation/s**

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) thank Rachel Fewster, Professor, Department of Statistics, University of Auckland for her presentation and attendance.
5.2 Public input: Glenfern Sanctuary

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. The Trustees of the Glenfern Sanctuary will provide an update on the progress of the business case for the environmental education centre in Glenfern Regional Park.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the update and presentation from Glenfern Sanctuary and thank them for their presentation.

6 Local Board Input

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

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

6.1 Local Board Input: Manukau Harbour Forum

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To discuss the recommendations from the Manukau Harbour Forum governance and support the review prepared by Envirostat Consulting Limited.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. Saffron Toms, Manukau Harbour Forum Chair will be present to address the committee.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) thank Saffron Toms, Manukau Harbour Forum Chair for her presentation and attendance.
7 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting,

(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.”
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To receive a presentation and report from Cr Penny Hulse, Environment and Community Committee Chair regarding the committee’s work programme for the full term (2016-2019).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This is a late covering report for the above item. The comprehensive agenda report was not available when the agenda went to print and will be provided prior to the 10 September 2019 Environment and Community Committee meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
The recommendations will be provided in the comprehensive agenda report.
Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

File No.: CP2019/16257

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide a summary of public feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol, and to adopt the Auckland Film Protocol 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council is reviewing the Auckland Film Protocol (the Protocol). The Protocol sets out:
   - the commitment of the Auckland 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 update the Protocol to better reflect the emerging trends, issues or opportunities that should be addressed. Content of the Protocol was reviewed against legislation referenced in the document and against policies and plans of the council group to identify areas where the Protocol should be updated.
4. A revised draft of the 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. Public consultation was undertaken over three-weeks (21 June to 12 July 2019). A total of 74 submissions were received during the public consultation period. Overall, most submitters were supportive of Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach and most felt that the Protocol does enough to manage the impact of filming on residents, businesses, public open space, the environment and historic and cultural heritage. However, some submissions identified several key themes/areas of concern and staff are proposing some changes to address these. The proposed changes to the draft the Protocol are shown in track changes in Attachment B.
6. This report provides a summary of feedback from public consultation, from local boards and proposed changes to the draft The Protocol to address submitter feedback. Submission themes and proposed amendments are set out in Attachment A. The key changes recommended in response to public feedback are:
   - **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.
Item 9

- **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 once granted, 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 council policies, plans, bylaws and the terms and conditions of their film permit.

Ngā tūtohunga

**Recommendation/s**

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the summary of feedback obtained during public consultation and from local boards on the draft The Protocol.

b) approve, subject to further direction from the Committee, the proposed amendments to the Protocol shown in Attachments A and B of the agenda report.

c) adopt the amended The Protocol 2019 in Attachment B of the agenda report

d) delegate approval to the Chair of the Environment and Community Committee the power to edit the Protocol 2019 to correct any identified errors or typographical edits, and to give effect to changes to the final plan requested by the Committee at this meeting.

e) delegate to the Manager Creative Industries, Screen Auckland, the authority to make any minor changes to the Protocol to ensure accuracy, as well as alignment with legislation and policies of Auckland Council

**Horopaki Context**

7. 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 range of charges. The Governing Body adopted a region-wide schedule of film fees and revised The Protocol on 28 May 2015 (resolution number GB/2015/36).

8. Since the Protocol was adopted in 2015 there have been several 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.

9. 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.

10. Workshops were held in September and October 2018 to engage with local boards that experience a high volume of filming. A memo outlining the proposed amendments to the Protocol was circulated to all local boards for information.

11. Engagement to inform the preparation of the revised draft Protocol was also undertaken with mana whenua, staff of the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority, the screen sector and with the public through the People’s Panel.
12. The revised draft of the Protocol was approved by the Environment and Community Committee for public consultation in June 2019 (resolution number ENV/2019/73). Public consultation was undertaken over a three-week period from 21 June to 12 July 2019. During the consultation period 74 submissions were received on the draft The Protocol. A summary of submissions is included in Attachment A, including key submission themes, proposed staff responses, recommended amendments to the draft The Protocol and submitter demographics.

13. The summary of key submission themes and proposed staff amendments to the draft The Protocol was reported to local boards August 2019 business meetings. A summary of key feedback from local boards on the proposed changes to the Protocol is included in local impacts and local board views section of this report.

14. The next step is to adopt the revised the Protocol 2019, considering concerns raised through the submission process.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Consultation summary

15. Consultation on the revised draft of the Protocol took place from 21 June to 12 July 2019. The consultation was promoted on the Auckland Council Have Your Say webpage, in Our Auckland and through Auckland Council and ATEED social media channels. The consultation was promoted to the screen sector by email and at an ATEED sector meeting.

16. 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 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.

18. The questions included in the online consultation form varied depending on whether the submitter identified themselves as working in the screen industry or not. 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 1 and shows that:
   • the majority respondents are supportive of Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach and that;
   • most respondents think that the Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming has on residents and businesses, on public open space and historic and cultural heritage.
Table 1: Feedback on the 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 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 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 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>

19. The main reasons given by those who supported Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: 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 industries;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It’s fun and exciting to see Auckland on the screen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and tourism</td>
<td>• promotes and showcases Auckland to the world;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• creates a positive image of Auckland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Table 3 shows the key reasons that respondents gave for partially supporting Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach.

Table 3: 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on access</td>
<td>• the impact 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;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• need to ensure that film-makers are respectful of other users of public open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notification of filming</td>
<td>• there needs to be enough notification to ensure that residents and businesses are aware of open space being used for filming and are not unreasonably inconvenienced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact on the natural environment and native species | • need to consider and manage the impact that filming has on the natural environment and on native species;  
  • importance of ensuring that the natural environment is treated with respect;  
  • need to balance the cumulative impacts of filming on the natural environment and native species. |
| Equity                                     | • need to ensure that fees for commercial use of public places are fair.                                                                                                     |

21. 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.

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

23. A summary of the most common public submission themes and the proposed staff responses are shown in table 4; with a more detailed summary of key public submission included as Attachment A.

### Table 4: 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 to public open space</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and enforcement</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Screen Auckland to consider operational approaches to achieving wider public notification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on business</td>
<td>No change to the Protocol. The protocol is intended to provide a framework that enables decisions to be made on a case-by-case basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Staff also recommend that a few other corrections and minor changes are made to the Protocol, such as ensuring alignment with the requirements of the Waste Management and Minimisation bylaw 2019 adopted on 22 August 2019 (Resolution number GB/2019/83). In response to the bylaw staff are currently working through operational arrangements to require some film proposals to prepare a waste minimisation plan as part of their film permit application. All recommended minor amendments to the Protocol are also shown in track changes in Attachment B.

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 council’s relevant teams (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

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 Protocol. A summary of the key engagement themes was reported to the Environment and Community Committee in July 2019. A memo outlining the recommended changes to the draft The Protocol was sent to all local boards for information.

27. In August 2019 a summary of public feedback and the proposed response to public feedback was reported to all local boards. Local boards provided formal feedback through resolutions at the August business meetings. The full resolutions from each local board are shown in Attachment C. Waitākere Ranges Local Board also provided written feedback, during the public consultation period, in response to the draft The Protocol; this feedback was considered in conjunction with submissions received during public consultation.

Summary of local board feedback

28. Local boards were generally supportive of the changes that have been made to the Protocol in response to public feedback. Several local boards specifically noted their support for strengthened provisions or messaging around:

- respecting and protecting Auckland’s natural environment
- protecting native species such as native birds
- kauri dieback
- guidance on the use of drones, including for the protection of native species and to ensure the privacy of other users and neighbours of public open space
- ensuring ongoing access to public open space and respecting other users of public open space
- compliance with Auckland Council policies and bylaws
- encouraging filmmakers to support Auckland Council’s zero waste goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key themes</th>
<th>Summary of proposed responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>No change to the 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Local boards were also supportive of the Protocol continuing to promote the use of local businesses during filming and the continued reimbursement of fees for filming on local parks to local board budgets for reinvestment in those parks.

30. Whilst generally supportive of the changes staff propose be made to the Protocol in response to public submissions, there are a few areas where local boards request further amendments to the Protocol. A summary of key feedback and proposed responses to feedback is shown in Attachment D. Changes made to the Protocol in response to feedback from local boards is shown in blue text in Attachment B.

**Sector response to the revised version of the Protocol**

31. In response to the revised version of the Protocol reported to local boards for feedback at August business meetings, a few screen sector associations and individuals have provided feedback. Although this feedback was provided after the public consultation on the Protocol was completed, it is included as Attachment E for information.

32. A summary of the key concerns expressed by the screen sector in this feedback are shown in Table 5. The summary focuses on feedback made in response to changes made to the Protocol after public consultation was completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Summary of proposed response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental emphasis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deletion of the word “sensitive” from the heading of section 3.9, now entitled “Protecting natural environments”. The sector has expressed concern that the removal of the word sensitive and the more general emphasis on protection of the natural environment may result in a more prohibitive approach to filming by enabling landowners to say no to filming more often based on environmental concerns.</td>
<td>The revisions made to section 3.9 of the Protocol in response to public consultation included strengthening this section and broadening it to refer to Auckland’s natural environment more widely. Whilst the public consultation showed that many submitters felt that the Protocol provides enough protection for the environment, there was also feedback from many submitters noting that protecting the natural environment is important and more could be done. The deletion of the word sensitive was intended to reflect the amendments of section 3.9 to refer more generally to the natural environment and was not intended to result in a more prohibitive approach. In response to sector concerns staff recommend that the word sensitive is retained in section 3.9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drone use for recces</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sector expressed some concern that drone use for recces requires a film permit and that activity associated with a recce must be low impact.</td>
<td>Recces are undertaken before a film permit application is submitted, given this staff believe that it is reasonable to expect that any activity associated with a recce should be low impact as low impact film activity often may not require a film permit. Drone use for filming was a key submission point made during public consultation. All drone use for commercial or organised filming requires a film permit. Staff recommend no change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

**Māori impact statement**

33. 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.

34. 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 the Tūpuna Maunga Authority to inform them of the review and ensure that proposed amendments are consistent with the Authority’s own policies.

### Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

**Financial implications**

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

### Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

**Risks and mitigations**

36. There is a risk that there will be some level of negative reaction to the revised The Protocol from the screen sector. Screen Auckland will work with the sector to inform them of the changes to the Protocol and of any operational implications.

### Ngā koringa ā-muri

**Next steps**

37. Once approved the revised The Protocol 2019 will be made available on the Screen Auckland website and promoted to the screen sector by email and more widely through social media channels.

38. Operational implementation will have effect from adoption. Staff of Screen Auckland will work with affected parties to enable a smooth transition.

### 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 <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Auckland Film Protocol <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Local Board feedback and resolutions on the proposed changes to the Auckland Film Protocol <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Summary of key local board feedback and recommended amendments to the draft Auckland Film Protocol <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Feedback from the screen sector on the track change version of the Auckland Film Protocol on August local board business meeting agendas <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā kaihaina
Signatories
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<th>Author</th>
<th>Marie Jenkins – Screen Facilitation Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jasmine Millett - Manager Creative Industries</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Te take mō te pūrongo  
Purpose of the report  
1.  To approve the transfer of the David Lange Memorial, 2008 (Attachment A) from the David Lange Memorial Trust (the Trust) to council’s public art portfolio.

Whakarāpopototanga matua  
Executive summary  
2.  The David Lange Memorial (the memorial) was completed in 2008 by artist Virginia King and is permanently installed on council land to the north of Tōia, the library, pool and leisure centre in Ōtāhuhu.

3.  The David Lange Trust approached the public art team in April 2018 about transferring ownership of the memorial to council via deed of gift because they are winding-up as a registered charity.

4.  Council owns the associated footings, landscaping, and lighting and currently maintains the memorial at a cost of less than $1,000 a year, under a bailment agreement with the Trust.

5.  The Trust have requested that the deed of gift is subject to council contributing $6,000 to the Trust to assist with their wind-up as a registered charity.

6.  Staff recommend that the committee approve the transfer of the memorial from the Trust to council’s public art portfolio because of council’s investment to date, the significance of the memorial and its connection to the community.

7.  The Public Art Advisory Panel has reviewed the deed of gift proposal and unanimously recommends accepting the offer.

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

a)  approve the transfer of the David Lange Memorial from the David Lange Memorial Trust to council’s public art portfolio by deed of gift.

Horopaki  
Context  
8.  The David Lange Memorial was completed in 2008 by artist Virginia King and is permanently installed on council land to the north of Tōia, the library, pool and leisure centre in Ōtāhuhu.

9.  It is a significant artwork that celebrates the life of David Lange, the 32nd Prime Minister of New Zealand, who was born in Ōtāhuhu and was the member of the New Zealand Parliament for Māngere.

10.  Construction of the memorial cost $150,000, which was funded by the Trust and council funded $99,000 for enabling works, landscaping, and infrastructure. The current estimated value of the memorial is $250,000.

11.  Council owns the associated footings, landscaping, and lighting and currently maintains the memorial at a cost of less than $1,000 a year, under a bailment agreement with the Trust.
12. The Trustees have indicated that they are winding up the Trust and approached the public art team in April 2018 (Attachment B) about transferring ownership of the memorial to council via deed of gift.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
13. Under the charities act, the Trust must dispose of assets before winding up and council is considered the most suitable candidate to transfer the memorial to because of the long-standing relationship between the Trust and council and current maintenance agreement.

14. The Trust have requested that the deed of gift is subject to the following considerations, which council is able to agree:

- The memorial should remain in situ.
- A commitment by Council to ongoing maintenance.
- Settlement would be conditional upon the documents outlining the memorial and its iconography being available through the Council's website.
- Upon the winding up of the trust any surplus funds would be transferred to Council in trust to be used for maintenance and upkeep of the memorial.
- The current trustees to be considered stakeholders to be consulted whenever necessary or appropriate.

15. The Trust have also requested that the deed of gift is subject to the following consideration, which council is not able to agree:

- Council will pay the trust $6,000 plus GST for the memorial.

16. The mechanism of transfer of ownership of the memorial is by a deed of gift, which means that council cannot pay for it. However, council can assist with a payment of $6,000 for wind-up of the trust.

17. Staff recommend that the committee approve the transfer of the memorial from the Trust to council’s public art portfolio by deed of gift for the following reasons:

- This is an existing artwork with an estimated replacement value of $250,000.
- It meets public art policy outcomes of ‘unique and distinctive’ and plays a significant role in transforming the Tōia precinct into a community hub.
- Council currently maintains the memorial at low cost so there will be no additional maintenance costs to council.
- Council has invested in the surrounding grounds, lighting and infrastructure associated with the memorial.

18. The Public Art Advisory Panel has reviewed the deed of gift proposal and unanimously recommends accepting the offer based on the memorial’s site, cultural significance, current care and ownership arrangement, and alignment with public art policy outcomes.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
19. The proposed decision has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
20. Local board feedback is being sought and will be provided prior to the committee meeting.
21. The memorial is a significant artwork, which is cherished by the local community as David Lange was as a leader, orator and charismatic figure from the local area.

22. Staff will inform the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board of the intended asset transfer. In this instance because it is an existing asset, landowner approval will not be sought.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

23. The proposed decision has no identified impacts for Māori.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

24. The Trust have requested that the deed of gift is subject to council contributing $6,000 to the Trust to assist with their wind up as a registered charity.

25. Council currently maintains the memorial at a cost of less than $1,000 a year, so there will be no additional maintenance costs to council.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

26. The Trust is seeking to wind up in part because it operates at a small annual loss and its activities are not sustainable. The Trust must dispose of assets before winding up and if a new partner cannot be found for the memorial, then council’s site investment to date and the condition of the memorial could be jeopardised.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

27. Staff will inform the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board of the intended asset transfer. In this instance because it is an existing asset, landowner approval will not be sought.

28. Staff will draw up the Deed of Gift documentation for signing by the relevant Trustees and council staff.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>David Lange Memorial catalogue listing</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>David Lange Memorial letter of offer</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Tilley - Art Collection Manager, Arts, Community and Events</td>
<td>Graham Bodman - General Manager Arts, Community and Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Wilson - Governance Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Public Art gift offer: David Lange Memorial, 2008

**Title:**  
*David Lange Memorial*

**Maker:**  
Virginia King

**Production Date:**  
2007-2008

**Media and Materials:**  
stainless steel, wood, basalt, landscaping

**Size:**  
Vessel: L 9000 x W 2500 x D 1200mm

**Credit Line:**  
A memorial to David Lange, commissioned by the David Lange Memorial Trust

**Accession No:**  
L2009.1

**Location:**  
Töia, 28-34 Mason Avenue, Ōtāhuhu, Auckland

**Coordinates:**  
-36.9444444444444 174.840833333333
Appendix 2: Letter of Offer, 16 April 2018

BRIAN FITZPATRICK
134 Tui Street, Pakuranga, AUCKLAND 2010
PO Box 251 035
Pakuranga, AUCKLAND 2140
Ph: (09) 576 1069
email: brian@brianfitzpatrick.co.nz
Mob: 021-664 577

Monday 16 April 2018

City Manager
The Auckland Council
Private Bag 92-300
Welsh Bridge, West
Auckland 1142

Attention: Peter Tilly

David Lange Memorial

The Trustees of the David Lange Memorial Trust wish to explore the possibility of selling the memorial to Council.

The Trust has been advised that it must sell the memorial subject to GST to avoid incurring a large GST refund. The Trust does not have the resources to meet such a liability.

The sale should be incorporated into a Deed to include the following considerations:

- Council will pay the Trust $9,000.00 plus GST for the memorial
- The memorial should remain in situ
- A commitment by Council to ongoing maintenance
- Settlement would be conditional upon the documents outlining the memorial and its iconography being available through the Council's website.
- Upon the winding up of the trust any surplus funds would be transferred to Council in trust to be used for maintenance and upkeep of the memorial
- The current trustees to be consulted with stakeholders to be consulted whenever necessary or appropriate

The Trust does not have a time or date by which a sale must be effected.

The Trustees look forward to talking to you to progress this matter.

Kind regards

David Lange Memorial Trust

[Signature]
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve for consultation a change to the Retrofit Your Home Programme, to introduce mandatory HomeFit assessments for all Retrofit Your Home applications with a value over $2,000.
2. To recommend to the Governing Body that this proposed change be included in the consultation document for the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

3. The Retrofit Your Home programme provides finance to Auckland homeowners for clean energy, insulation or heating retrofits, which are repaid through a targeted rate.
4. Currently, when homeowners apply to the Retrofit Your Home programme, they typically only receive advice from one supplier for a single intervention (e.g., insulation). They do not receive advice about the optimal combination of interventions to improve their building performance. Improving building performance generates health, environmental and financial benefits for homeowners.
5. Staff analysed four options for encouraging homeowners to engage in a broader assessment of how to make their homes warmer and drier.
6. All options for change involved engaging in a partnership with the New Zealand Green Building Council and using their HomeFit assessment and certification process. This is a tool for assessing the performance of residential homes. It involves an online checklist and an assessment by a specialist.
7. Options considered ranged from the status quo (i.e., no HomeFit assessment required) to making HomeFit assessments mandatory for all applications, regardless of value.
8. Staff recommend option three: Partnering with New Zealand Green Building Council to support high volume delivery of HomeFit assessments, by making HomeFit assessments a mandatory requirement for all Retrofit Your Home applications over $2,000 (all prices excluding GST).
9. Under option three, the cost of a HomeFit assessment would be approximately $260 over a nine-year repayment schedule. This will impact on approximately 87 per cent of all applications to Retrofit Your Home, or 2,350 homeowners per annum (based on average loan uptake).
10. Staff recommend that the threshold for mandatory HomeFit assessments is set at $2,000 (rather than for all applications of any value). This is because for applications under $2,000 the $260 fee would represent a significant proportion of the finance applied for by homeowners.
11. Since the Retrofit Your Home programme is managed through a targeted rate, introducing the HomeFit assessment must be consulted on through an Annual Plan. Staff recommend that the Environment and Community Committee recommend this change to the Governing Body for inclusion in the consultation document for the Annual Plan 2020/2021.
12. The additional cost to homeowners of the mandatory HomeFit assessments is approximately $611,000 per year. This will be managed within the existing debt cap for the programme of $35 million.
Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendations

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve, subject to consultation, that the following changes be made to the Retrofit Your Home programme:
   i) that a New Zealand Green Building Council HomeFit Assessment be required for all Retrofit Your Home applications with a value greater than $2,000 (excluding GST)
   ii) that the cost for assessment and certification of approximately $260 (excluding GST) associated with the HomeFit assessment be included in the Retrofit Your Home applicant’s balance and paid back through the Retrofit Your Home targeted rate.

b) recommend that the Governing Body include the proposed changes to the Retrofit Your Home programme and the associated targeted rate in the consultation document for the Annual Budget 2020/2021

c) note that final decisions on the proposed changes to the Retrofit your Home programme associated targeted rate will be made by the Governing Body (or relevant committee) as part of the decisions on the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

Horopaki

Context

13. The Retrofit Your Home programme was originally established by Waitākere City Council to provide a financing option for homeowners to install insulation and clean heating. It was extended across the Auckland region in 2011.

14. Auckland Council is one of ten councils around New Zealand that currently offers a Retrofit Your home-type scheme (commonly referred to as a voluntary targeted rate scheme).

15. The programme provides homeowners with access to a loan of up to $5,000 finance towards energy efficient retrofits. This is recovered through a targeted rate on the property for a maximum period of nine years.

16. To date, Retrofit Your Home has supported over 23,700 homeowners. It currently delivers funding support to around 2,800 Auckland homes each year.

More comprehensive advice to homeowners would increase effectiveness

17. The only advice Retrofit Your Home applicants currently receive is that delivered by the supplier. This means homeowners do not always receive comprehensive advice from an independent expert about the best combination of interventions for their house.

18. Home performance rating tools educate and inform homeowners about what defines optimal energy performance and a healthy living environment. They also establish a clear pathway for homeowners to achieve those outcomes. Improving building performance generates health, environmental and financial benefits for homeowners.

19. Research conducted by the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy found that homeowners are more likely to implement more than one energy efficiency retrofit if they are aware of:
   • the multiple opportunities for improving building performance; and
   • the benefits of having a permanent record of building performance certification that can be used to show their home meets a quality standard.
HomeFit rating tool for residential buildings

20. The New Zealand Green Building Council offers a user-friendly ‘tool’ to assess the performance of homes and how this can be improved. This tool is called HomeFit.

21. A strategic partnership with New Zealand Green Building Council to provide HomeFit assessments would support Auckland Council’s objective of educating homeowners about the multiple options available for improving energy efficiency and air tightness of homes.

22. Several councils around the country are either already using HomeFit as the recognised benchmark for building performance or plan to adopt it in future.

23. The Wellington Regional Healthy Housing Response Group, which comprises Hutt, Porirua, and Wellington City Councils, Kāpiti Coast District Council and Wellington Regional Council, have committed to using HomeFit as the minimum standard for measuring progress towards their goal of all homes being warm, dry and safe by 2025.

24. Dunedin City Council, Hutt City Council, Porirua City Council and Wellington City Council are also undertaking initiatives to train their social housing providers on HomeFit.

25. Both Dunedin and Wellington Regional Councils have voluntary targeted rate loans and are considering adding a HomeFit assessment to their loan approval process.

26. While there are not yet any results from these programmes using HomeFit, council staff will share information and learnings with other local authorities.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

HomeFit assessment and certification process

27. A HomeFit assessment involves an expert providing the homeowner with impartial advice on how to:
   a) improve the energy efficiency and air tightness of the home;
   b) reduce energy costs; and
   c) prioritise interventions based on energy efficiency and return on investment ratios.

28. HomeFit includes two components:
   - a free online self-assessment tool (checklist) designed to educate homeowners on how to achieve HomeFit certification
   - an independent HomeFit assessment to verify that the home meets the HomeFit criteria.

29. If a home meets the HomeFit criteria, it is awarded certification. Homes that fail to meet the criteria are provided with a comprehensive report detailing the upgrades required to achieve certification.

30. The market price of HomeFit is $300 (all prices excluding GST) to the homeowner. If a HomeFit assessment is included in the Retrofit Your Home programme, New Zealand Green Building Council has agreed to discount the fee to $260. This discount is possible because of the volume of demand that the Retrofit Your Home programme can generate, i.e. a minimum of 2,000 HomeFit assessments per year.

Options considered for introduction of a HomeFit assessment

31. Four options for encouraging homeowners to engage in a broader assessment of building performance through use of HomeFit were analysed.
   - Option one: Status quo - No HomeFit assessment required. Council continues to promote voluntary use of the Eco Design Advice, the free HomeFit online self-assessment checklist and other self-help resources.
   - Option two: Require all Retrofit Your Home applicants to complete the free HomeFit online checklist. Recommend a HomeFit assessment as an optional choice. The cost would not be discounted and require an up-front payment of $300.
- Option three: HomeFit assessments be mandatory for all Retrofit Your Home applications over the value of $2,000. The cost would be discounted to $260 and homeowners would repay the cost through the targeted rate.

- Option four: HomeFit assessments be mandatory for all Retrofit Your Home applications regardless of value. The cost would be discounted to $260 and homeowners would repay the cost through the targeted rate.

32. Options three and four both require Annual Plan consultation because they involve changes to a targeted rate.

33. Under all four options, if the home achieves HomeFit certification this will be recorded on the Land Information Memorandum report.

Analysis of options against criteria

34. As shown in Table 1, these options were analysed against four criteria. These were:

- more Aucklanders have access to home performance advice and commission multiple retrofits - making their homes warmer, drier and more energy efficient
- the likelihood of HomeFit building certification being achieved
- the level of upfront cost to homeowners
- the probability of a reduction in Retrofit Your Home loan uptake.

Table 1. Options for increasing ‘whole of home’ assessments by loan applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>More people access home advice</th>
<th>Building certification achieved</th>
<th>Least upfront cost to applicants</th>
<th>Least impact on loan uptake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option one: No assessment required. Council promotes Eco Design Advice, optional HomeFit and online information sources.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option two: Applicants required to complete HomeFit online check. HomeFit certification assessment is optional.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300 upfront payment if homeowner opts-in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option three: Mandatory HomeFit certification assessment for all applications over $2,000. Cost of $260 included in homeowners Retrofit Your Home financing.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$260 - paid back over nine years</td>
<td>May have a slight impact on uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option four: Mandatory HomeFit certification assessment for all applications, regardless of value. Cost of $260 included in homeowners Retrofit Your Home financing.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May have a significant impact on loan uptake - reducing no. of people receiving home advice and doing multiple retrofits.</td>
<td>May have a significant impact on loan uptake – reducing no. of buildings achieving certification.</td>
<td>$260 - paid back over nine years</td>
<td>May have a significant impact on uptake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

- Low outcome: ×
- Moderate outcome: ✓
- Positive outcome: ✓ ✓
35. As Table 1 shows, options one and two scored poorly on the potential to have more people accessing comprehensive home improvements advice and commissioning multiple retrofits.

36. Option four was considered but discarded for two reasons. Firstly, it could reduce uptake – staff considered the cost of the HomeFit assessment should not represent a significant proportion of the total value of the Retrofit Your Home application. Secondly, Retrofit Your Home application figures for 2018/2019 indicate only 13 percent of applications were for a value below $2,000.

**Recommended option: Include a mandatory HomeFit assessment for all applications over $2,000**

37. Option three scored well against all criteria but could potentially impact on Retrofit Your Home uptake by creating an additional cost for homeowners.

38. However, staff consider this is unlikely as the upfront cost to homeowners is quite minimal, since the $260 will be paid off through the targeted rate over a nine-year period.

39. Option three should have no impact on the number of applications that can be supported by the council. Even though it will increase the cost of each application, this can be managed within the $9 million annual Retrofit Your Home budget.

40. On balance, staff recommend option three because it will:
   - provide comprehensive building performance advice to more Aucklanders, at a manageable cost, improving the energy performance and living quality of Auckland homes;
   - increase the probability of homeowners undertaking multiple interventions to improve the energy performance and air tightness of their homes;
   - establish a defined building performance benchmark and a clear pathway to achieving certification;
   - ensure that Aucklanders are supported to comply with any future legislation relating to national building performance standards, by getting homeowners on the path to building performance certification.

**Climate impact statement**

41. The programme has achieved a carbon emission saving of approximately 2,915 tonnes of CO2-equivalent, and resulted in warmer, drier, healthier homes for Auckland residents.

42. The recommended changes in this report will contribute to climate change mitigation through increasing carbon emissions savings. This will be achieved through increased awareness and promotion of building performance certification, with the result being a higher number of energy efficient homes in Auckland.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

43. There are no expected impacts on council-controlled organisations from the changes recommended in this report.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

44. While local boards have not been consulted on the specific changes recommended in this report, local boards recently provided feedback in support of climate change mitigation and adaptation through engagement on council’s draft Auckland Climate Action Framework.

45. Nine local boards are also currently funding complementary programmes to promote energy efficiency and healthy homes in their areas. These include Albert Eden, Great Barrier, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Puketāpapa, Waiheke, Waitākere Ranges, Waitematā and Whau.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

46. The recommended changes in this report are not expected to have significant impacts on Māori compared to other Aucklanders. Around 11 percent of those participating in the Retrofit Your Home programme are Māori – a similar proportion to the percentage of Aucklanders who identified as Maori in the 2013 census (11 per cent).

47. Staff will work with the Independent Māori Statutory Board to explore ways to promote the programme to Māori homeowners.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

48. The recommended change has no significant implementation cost for the council as the assessments will be carried out by suppliers who will be billed directly by the Green Building Council.

49. The change will increase the average value of Retrofit Your Home applications by $260 from $2,800 to $3,060. This represents a total additional cost to homeowners of approximately $611,000 per year (excluding GST and interest).

50. This can be managed within the $9 million annual Retrofit Your Home budget (as the council usually supports $6 to $7 million of applications a year). Staff will also manage demand within the total programme debt cap of $35 million.

51. Staff are exploring alternative financing options for Retrofit Your Home. An update on alternative financing options will be provided to the appropriate committee in 2020.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

52. A summary of key risks and mitigations associated with the recommendation to introduce a mandatory HomeFit assessment are provided below in Table 3.

Table 3. Risks and mitigations associated with introducing mandatory HomeFit assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Likelihood and consequence  (L-Low, M-Medium, H-High)</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers do not support the scheme</td>
<td>Likelihood: M Consequence: M</td>
<td>Staff will engage suppliers to ensure buy-in and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers have a negative perception of mandatory assessments</td>
<td>Likelihood: M Consequence: M</td>
<td>Communications and information supporting the process will be included in the application documentation. Suppliers will be trained to describe the benefits of home performance assessments and certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High assessment failure rate leads Aucklanders to question the scheme</td>
<td>Likelihood: M Consequence: M</td>
<td>The council will manage customer expectations, through communicating that the objective of mandatory assessments is not ‘pass/fail’; it is to educate Aucklanders about how to improve their home health and energy efficiency. Much of New Zealand's housing stock is sub-standard. The HomeFit Assessment will help homeowners identify what they can do to improve building performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 11

#### Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Likelihood and consequence (L-Low, M-Medium, H-High)</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived conflict of Interest</td>
<td>Likelihood: M</td>
<td>Involving New Zealand Green Building Council as an accreditation body will add impartiality to building performance assessments undertaken by suppliers. The NZ Green Building Council will manage the training, quality assurance and accreditation of HomeFit assessors. This will include managing conflicts of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the supplier of Retrofit</td>
<td>Consequence: M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interventions is also a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HomeFit assessor, the council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will need to manage any actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and perceived conflict of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on uptake</td>
<td>Likelihood: L</td>
<td>Staff will closely monitor any impact of the assessment on uptake. If uptake falls significantly the contract with New Zealand Green Building Council will give the council the right to revoke the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consequence: M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ngā koringa ā-muri

**Next steps**

53. If Environment and Community Committee approve the proposed change, staff will put the proposed changes to the Retrofit your Home programme and the associated targeted rate to the appropriate committee of council in December 2019 for inclusion in the consultation document for the Annual Plan 2020/2021.

54. If approved through the Annual Plan 2020/2021 process, the new assessments will be introduced from 1 July 2020.

#### Ngā tāpirihanga

**Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.
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Submission on proposed product stewardship schemes for priority products

File No.: CP2019/15191

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve Auckland Council’s draft submission on the Ministry for the Environment’s consultation on proposed product stewardship schemes for priority products.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Ministry for the Environment is consulting on proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines (see consultation document in Attachment A).
3. A product stewardship scheme shifts the main responsibility for recovery, recycling and disposal from local government to private industry, incorporating the costs of disposal into the product price.
4. The consultation document proposes introducing product stewardship schemes for six identified priority products: Tyres, electrical products, agrichemicals, refrigerants, farm plastics and packaging (beverage containers are specifically mentioned).
5. Auckland Council’s Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 recognises product stewardship as an important component of achieving zero waste. It identifies advocacy for product stewardship as one of nine key priority actions to be addressed.
6. Staff have developed a draft submission in alignment with the waste plan (see Attachment B). The draft submission includes the following points:
   • support for the scope of the six priority products identified by the Ministry for the Environment
   • support for the proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship scheme design
   • suggestion of other products that should be considered for product stewardship, including plastic and packaging from commercial sources and cardboard and paper packaging.
7. Due to the constrained timelines for developing the draft submission, local board feedback had not been received by staff at the time of writing. Staff will provide any local board feedback received to the Environment and Community Committee for their consideration at their meeting on 10 September 2019.
8. Staff recommend that the committee approve the draft submission, and delegate authority to the Chair to approve any further minor changes.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the draft council submission on Proposed Priority Products and Priority Product Stewardship Scheme Guidelines and its submission to the parliamentary process
b) delegate approval to the Chair of the Environment and Community Committee to make any minor amendments to the submission
c) nominate an elected member to speak to the submission, if required.
Horopaki

Context

9. The Ministry for the Environment has released a consultation on proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines (see Attachment A). Submissions on the consultation document are due by 4 October 2019.

10. Product stewardship is the responsible management of the environmental impact of a product. It aims to reduce the impact of manufactured products at all stages of its lifecycle. It shifts the main responsibility for recovery, recycling and disposal from local government to private industry, incorporating costs into the product price.

11. This means that when consumers buy a product new they pay slightly more. These funds must be used by the producer to cover the costs of disposing responsibly of the product.

12. To date, no mandatory product stewardship schemes have been introduced in New Zealand by the government.

13. While voluntary schemes exist for some products, such as soft plastics, glass packaging, agricultural chemicals (and packaging), used oil and paint, they are not available nationwide. They have also had limited effectiveness in terms of reducing the volumes of these materials sent to landfill.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

14. Auckland Council staff have developed a draft submission on the Ministry for the Environment’s consultation document (see Attachment B).

15. The draft submission is informed by public and local board feedback received by the council through consultation in March 2018 on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 and the draft Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

16. This feedback showed strong support, with 84 per cent of submitters on the draft waste plan agreeing or strongly agreeing with the council advocating for product stewardship. Nine local boards (Albert-Eden, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki, Manurewa, Ōrākei, Papakura, Rodney, Upper Harbour and Waitematā) also specifically mentioned their support for this.

17. As a result, priority action 2 of the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 outlines the need for Auckland Council to advocate to central Government for product stewardship. This will ensure that the responsibility for end-of-life disposal shifts from ratepayers to producers and consumers.

18. Actions 98 to 100 of the plan also outline specific actions we will take relating to product stewardship and priority products - beverage containers, electrical waste and tyres.

19. Auckland Council is also a member of the Territorial Authority Forum which is an officer led sector group of WasteMINZ. It is made up of 64 city and district councils from around New Zealand. The forum was established to create consistency and efficiency amongst territorial authorities through sharing knowledge and best practice.

20. The forum’s Waste Management Manifesto calls for mandatory product stewardship for three key waste streams; tyres, E-waste and agricultural chemicals and plastics. It also calls for a container deposit scheme to be introduced as a product stewardship scheme.

Process for establishing product stewardship schemes

21. The Ministry for the Environment consultation document proposes a co-design approach be taken, involving industry, community and product stakeholders, to establishing regulated product stewardship schemes for priority products.
22. A two-stage process is proposed:
   - In stage one the Ministry is consulting on the proposed declaration of six priority products. This includes ministerial guidelines to clarify expected outcomes and attributes of accredited priority product schemes.
   - In stage two, the Ministry will consult progressively from 2019 to 2021 on proposed Waste Minimisation Act 2008 regulations for each priority product group.

23. Auckland Council’s draft submission supports the co-design approach but notes that community groups and not-for-profits may lack the resources to adequately engage in this process. It suggests the Ministry resource these groups to participate, in order to secure this important balance of views and expertise.

24. The draft submission also advocates for the Ministry for the Environment to engage and work with mana whenua during Stage Two of the consultation process. This will enable Māori participation in decision-making as per the Ministry’s Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations.

Priority products for product stewardship schemes

25. Six priority products have been selected by the Ministry for the Environment for declaration as suitable for product stewardship schemes.

26. The products proposed are shown below in Table 1, along with the council’s response to the scope of each product group.

Table 1. Scope of proposed priority products and the council’s response to each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority product scope</th>
<th>Auckland Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyres</td>
<td>Supports – The proposed scope for end-of-life tyres is likely to capture all tyre types capable of creating harm to the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and electronic products</td>
<td>Supports – The proposed scope is likely to capture all electronic products likely to cause harm to the environment. Suggests that when a product stewardship scheme is developed a fuller definition of e-waste be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrichemicals and their containers</td>
<td>Supports – The agrichemicals and containers included in the scope capture the products and packaging of concern. Also welcome the addition of household pest and weed control products. Unwanted household chemicals present the same risk to people and the environment as agrichemicals so should be handled in the same way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases</td>
<td>Supports – The proposed scope will capture the substances capable of creating harm to the environment and is aligned with the council’s goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm plastics</td>
<td>Supports – The proposed scope will capture the farm plastics capable of creating harm to the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging, including beverage containers</td>
<td>Supports – The proposed scope for packaging will capture the major components creating harm to the environment. Compostable plastics are also suggested for inclusion. The submission also advocates for a Container Deposit Scheme to be introduced for beverages. This is a specific type of product stewardship scheme which provides a small refund to incentivise people to return used beverage containers for recycling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. As shown in Table 1, the council’s draft submission supports the scope for all six products. Three of the six products (beverage containers, electrical waste and tyres) are included in the council’s waste plan as priorities for product stewardship advocacy.

28. Tyres, e-waste and agricultural chemicals and plastics are also listed in the Territorial Authority Forum’s Waste Management Manifesto, which the council has adopted.

29. Disposing appropriately of some of these products (such as illegally dumped tyres) also creates a significant cost to the council. For example, while Auckland Council tries to redistribute most e-waste items collected through our inorganics service this is not always possible. 12,700 items of e-waste collected through our inorganic collection have had to be re-processed since July 2017. Re-processing alone cost ratepayers $105,000, with further costs for collection.

30. While refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases are not identified as a priority in either the waste plan or the forum’s manifesto the draft submission supports their inclusion. A product stewardship scheme for these products is aligned with the council’s net emissions by 2050 goal, as identified in the draft Auckland Climate Action Framework.

31. Finally, staff support the scope for farm plastics in the draft submission. While these are not identified as a priority product in the waste plan, they are a significant source of waste to landfill and more solutions are needed for rural waste streams.

Expanding list of priority products

32. Auckland Council’s draft submission also calls for the Ministry to establish two more product groups as priority products.

Commercial sources of plastics and packaging

33. The draft submission notes that the council is concerned about the lack of diversion opportunities for plastics and packaging from business/commercial sources, as these generate large volumes of waste.

34. For example, the council’s current estimates are that around 200,000 tonnes of total plastic entering landfill each year are from construction activity. LDPE building wrap is also a significant source of waste and can be recycled in the same way as agricultural silage wrap.

35. Including products like these, which are produced in large volumes and have similar recycling methodologies to other priority products, may increase the scale and feasibility of on-shore reprocessing solutions for mixed plastics.

Paper and cardboard packaging

36. The draft submission asks that paper and cardboard packaging be included as an additional product category.

37. The recent restrictions on export of paper and cardboard to China have put local authorities and recyclers under severe pressure across the country.

38. A mandatory product stewardship scheme would ensure that manufacturers design paper and cardboard packaging to be part of the circular economy. It will also help to support development of on-shore processing solutions.

Recommendation – Approve the draft submission

39. Staff recommend that the committee approve the draft submission. Introducing product stewardship schemes will have many benefits, including:

- responsibility for end-of-life disposal moves from ratepayers to producers and consumers
- the creation of incentives for products to be designed for reuse and recycling, adopting a more circular approach to product use
- product stewardship schemes create a situation where value is placed on items even when they are at the end of their usable life.
• business and employment opportunities at a local level in response to re-use and recycling infrastructure needs.

**Climate impact assessment**

40. The draft submission is aligned to the council’s goal, set in the draft Auckland Climate Action Framework, to get Auckland to zero net emissions by 2050.

41. While not as significant as emissions from transport, emissions from waste in landfill are relatively easy to address through simple changes to our waste practices.

42. Most goods go through a linear process: make, use, dispose. Time, money and resources go into making products, but the ‘use’ stage can be surprisingly short given how much energy and materials they take. Then goods are disposed of, usually to landfill.

43. Adopting a circular approach to the design and use of goods aims to make the best use of resources, with products that are made to last and “made to be made again”. Not only does a circular approach reduce carbon from a landfill perspective but it also ensures that the value of embedded carbon in items is not so easily wasted.

44. By advocating for product stewardship schemes, which encourage more responsible design of products and re-use and recycling of products, the draft submission will contribute to both reducing emissions from waste in landfill and saving embedded carbon.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

45. No significant impacts on other members of the council group from the consultation document or draft submission have been identified by staff at this stage.

46. Council’s Waste Solutions staff will work with the Ministry for the Environment on the product stewardship guidelines through the co-design process. They will inform other parts of the council family about any potential impacts on their business.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

**Local impacts**

47. Through product stewardship scheme, items are less likely to be illegally dumped or to become litter, which has a positive impact on local communities. In particular, reducing illegal dumping of tyres will have a positive impact on rural communities.

48. There is also potential for local community recycling centres to be collection points for products once product stewardship schemes have been established.

**Local board views**

49. Local boards were asked to provide feedback through development of the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 on whether Auckland Council should advocate to the government for product stewardship schemes.

50. Thirteen local boards provided feedback on the draft plan. Nine of these boards (Albert-Eden, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki, Manurewa, Ōrākei, Papakura, Rodney, Upper Harbour and Waiātea) specifically identified their support for product stewardship.

51. Staff also sent a memo to local boards in August 2019 and a copy of the draft submission, advising them of the opportunity to give formal feedback on this consultation. At the time of writing, no feedback from local boards had been received.

52. Staff will provide any local board feedback received by 9 September 2019 to Environment and Community Committee for their consideration on 10 September 2019. The committee can request that changes be made to the draft submission to incorporate local feedback.
Any local board submissions received after 10 September will be attached to the council’s submission but will not be referenced in the text of the submission.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

54. Through development of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 engagement process, Auckland Council committed to five actions guided by mana whenua and mataawaka. Relevant priority actions include ensuring that resource use and waste management occurs in a manner consistent with Te Ao Māori, protection of waterways and ecology which receive waste and wastewater, and the protection of Papatūānuku.

55. The introduction of product stewardship schemes is likely to have a positive impact in terms of environmental protection, particularly the protection of waterways (ie reduction of plastic litter) and the reduction of harm.

56. Product stewardship schemes align well with Te Ao Māori as they recognise the traditional system in which nothing was wasted – everything was able to be returned back to Papatūānuku without detriment to the whenua, awa or moana.

57. Feedback from Māori also shows strong support for product stewardship. Approximately, 12 per cent of submitters on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 identified as Māori. 81 per cent of these agreed or strongly agreed that Auckland Council should advocate for product stewardship schemes. Key relevant themes in their comments included provision of more resources and support for Māori waste reduction initiatives, advocating for product stewardship (particularly a container deposit scheme), action to reduce use of plastic and illegal dumping and a focus on construction and demolition waste.

58. In recognition of this strong interest by Māori, and the significance of the topic to them, the council’s draft submission highlights the need for mātauranga and tikanga Māori to be incorporated into product stewardship solutions and decision-making processes.

59. The draft submission also advocates for the Ministry for the Environment to engage and work with mana whenua during Stage Two of the consultation process, resourcing and enabling Māori participation in decision-making as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations. This will ensure that the implementation of product stewardship schemes will occur in a way that works well for Māori.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

60. The introduction of product stewardship schemes is expected to have positive financial implications for Auckland Council and ratepayers. Shifting the costs and responsibility for end-of-life disposal of items to producers and consumers means that the burden does not only fall to ratepayers, as it does through the current approach.

61. There is also an opportunity for Community Recycling Centres and community organisations to financially benefit from product stewardship schemes. This could occur either through:
   - groups acting as drop off facilities who can access a handling fee
   - charitable donation collections (ie charities collecting items in bulk and receiving the refund fee as a donation upon returning the items).

62. There is likely to be a focus on re-use and recycling infrastructure needs as a result of the introduction of product stewardship schemes. This presents business and employment opportunities at a local level as well as opportunity for investment.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

63. Staff do not consider there are any direct risks to council arising from the draft submission. However, there is a risk to the equity of product stewardship schemes if a Te Ao Māori and community focused approach is not implemented during the co-design process.

64. The draft submission aims to mitigate this risk, through advocating that mana whenua, local government and community representatives are engaged appropriately and included during the co-design.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

65. If approved, staff will provide the draft submission to the Ministry for the Environment by 4 October 2019. Auckland Council has requested to be considered as a key stakeholder in stage two of the co-design process for product stewardship schemes.

66. Updates will be provided to the appropriate committee of the council and local boards on development of product stewardship schemes as these are progressed.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines: Consultation 2019 <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Auckland Council's draft submission on the Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines' consultation <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Signatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Parul Sood - General Manager Waste Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barry Potter - Director Infrastructure and Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Signatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophien Brockbank - Team Leader Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed changes to the legacy Waitākere City Council septic tank pump-out targeted rate and service

File No.: CP2019/16237

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve for consultation proposed changes to the legacy Waitākere City Council septic tank pump-out service and associated targeted rate, and
2. To recommend to the Governing Body that the proposed changes be included in the consultation document for the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

3. In 1998, in an effort to improve water quality, the legacy Waitākere City Council established a targeted rate for property owners with septic tank systems to fund a three-yearly pump-out of their system. These properties now sit within the Waitākere Ranges, Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas.

4. There are 3,461 onsite wastewater systems across 3,210 properties in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area that receive this service, at an annual rate of $198.43 (including GST) per onsite wastewater system. These onsite wastewater systems comprise septic tanks, long drops, grease traps and greywater systems, but not other systems.

5. Public feedback about the proposed removal of the septic tank pump-out service and associated targeted rate was sought during consultation on the Annual Budget 2019/2020.

6. Waitākere Ranges Local Board and residents indicated strong support for retaining the pump-out service. Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour Local Boards and residents did not indicate a strong desire to retain the service in their areas.

7. Following consultation, the Governing Body resolved to retain the pump-out service and associated targeted rate until June 2021 (resolution GB/2019/40). They asked staff to provide options for a future model to respond to the feedback received from the Waitākere Ranges area, including advice on costs and the appropriate level of rate (resolution GB/2019/40).

8. Two options have been developed:
   - Option A – a three-yearly pump-out service that continues the current service at an approximate cost of $277 per year, per system (including GST) in the Waitākere Ranges area only
   - Option B – a three-yearly pump-out service with an additional enhanced inspection of the entire onsite wastewater system to ensure compliance with the current standards at an approximate cost of $314 per year, per system (including GST) in the Waitākere Ranges area only.

9. Both options seek to recover the full cost of delivering the service, which includes council’s overhead, via a targeted rate. Costs included in this report are the likely estimate, not the maximum estimate.

10. The two options were assessed against various criteria such as their convenience for residents, potential to improve water quality, local board views, cost and risk to the council.
11. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board preference is that the pump out service be retained, and an enhanced inspection provided as in option B. However, they recommend overhead costs and the cost of the enhanced inspection be covered by general rates or funded by the water quality targeted rate (see resolution WTK/2019/107).

12. Staff have considered the board’s recommendation and note that it would not be equitable for regional rates to continue to subsidise a private service. Property owners outside the Waitākere Ranges pump-out programme area would be subsidising those in Waitākere. This would include the 36,000 properties outside of the Waitākere Ranges local board area that have onsite waster systems who individually pay the full cost of pump-out and inspection of their onsite wastewater systems.

13. Staff consider that the pump-out service does not provide any additional public benefit to enhance water quality. Staff consider the regional wastewater compliance programme, as funded by the water quality targeted rate, the best way to address water quality issues.

14. While option B is more convenient for homeowners it will cost homeowners more and carries more cost uncertainty and perceived liability to the council.

15. Overall, staff recommend option A, a pump out service funded by a cost recoverable targeted rate which is like the service currently provided. Both options are expected to have a similar impact on water quality outcomes.

**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve, subject to consultation, that the current legacy Waitākere City Council septic tank pump-out service be limited to properties within the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area after 30 June 2021, and that the associated targeted rate be revised to fully recover the cost of the service;

b) recommend that the Governing Body include the proposed changes to the current legacy Waitākere City Council septic tank pump-out service and the associated targeted rate in the consultation document for the Annual Budget 2020/2021;

c) note that final decisions on the service and the associated targeted rate will be made by the Governing Body (or relevant committee) as part of the decisions on the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

**Horopaki Context**

16. To improve water quality, the legacy Waitākere City Council established a targeted rate for property owners with septic tank systems to fund a three-yearly pump-out of their system.

17. It currently services 4,228 systems across the Waitākere Ranges, Henderson-Massey, and Upper Harbour local board areas.

18. There are 3,461 systems across 3,210 properties in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area that currently receive this service. In 2019/2020 the annual rate is $198.43 (including GST) for each onsite wastewater system belonging to the relevant property. Where properties have multiple systems, they pay a corresponding number of targeted rates. 196 properties have two systems and 24 properties have more than two systems.

19. Property owners with onsite wastewater systems outside the pump-out programme area, approximately 36,000 properties, are required to privately arrange and pay the full cost of pump-out and inspection of their onsite wastewater systems.
Regional compliance programme for wastewater systems

20. The Auckland Unitary Plan sets the inspection frequency and requires property owners to provide their service records to council upon request. A primary system (septic tank) must be inspected every three years. A system must be pumped-out when 50 per cent of the tank’s volume is occupied by sludge and solids.

21. A region-wide water quality targeted rate was introduced in July 2018. Two per cent of this rate funds a wastewater compliance programme which will:
   - build and monitor a database of all permitted onsite wastewater systems (primary, secondary, and advanced)
   - work with industry to improve their practices
   - educate property owners on the impact their system can have on the environment
   - emphasizes the property owner’s responsibility to keep their system functioning well to avoid water contamination
   - fund additional compliance staff to monitor system maintenance.

22. The water quality targeted rate compliance programme currently involves targeted investigations in priority areas around Auckland which have shown poor water quality results in Safeswim analysis. Properties in Piha, Little Oneroa, Huia, and Te Henga have been investigated so far.

23. As part of investigations, compliance staff request inspection records from property owners and follow up with enforcement actions if maintenance issues are not addressed. These investigations have shown low compliance with system maintenance, with most properties not having their systems suitably inspected and maintained. Prior to investigations, 10 per cent of properties in the Piha investigation area had compliant inspection records. As a result of the investigations, 98 per cent of properties now have compliant records.

24. From 2021, staff aim to be able to use a database to request inspection records from all property owners with permitted onsite wastewater in the Auckland region - approximately 40,000 properties.

25. The inspection currently offered through the septic tank pump-out targeted rate is not enough for these compliance purposes. This means property owners must pay an additional fee (usually $100 to $180, depending on the system and company) to a private company for a service, consistent with all other properties across Auckland.

26. With the compliance programme being delivered in targeted areas, staff considered the scope of the legacy Waitākere septic tank pump-out service and identified that it:
   - services approximately half the onsite wastewater systems in the local board areas
   - only pumps the sludge out of the septic tank, long drop or grease trap
   - cannot include secondary or advanced systems
   - does not cover the inspection or maintenance of all system components
   - set the expectation that property owners do not need to do any further inspections or maintenance of their systems in between pump-outs.

Consultation on ending the targeted rate through the Annual Budget 2019/2020

27. In the Annual Budget 2019/2020 consultation process, submitters were asked to indicate their support for six proposed changes to targeted rates and fees, including removal of the Waitākere septic tank pump-out targeted rate.

28. In the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area, 253 people provided general feedback on the regional targeted rates proposals.
29. 184 of these submitters specifically mentioned the septic tank pump-out targeted rate. Of these, 7 per cent (12 people) supported removal of the rate and 93 per cent (172 people) opposed the removal of the rate.

30. The Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour Local Boards both supported the removal of the septic tank pump-out targeted rate in their local board areas from 1 July 2021 (see attachment A, resolutions UH/2018/116 and HM/2019/11).

31. Due to this strong support from Waitākere Ranges residents for retaining the septic tank pump-out targeted rate, the Governing Body resolved to retain the service and associated targeted rate until June 2021. They also asked staff to provide options for a future model for a new contract from 1 July 2021 (resolution GB/2019/40).

32. The options that staff have considered all involve restricting the septic tank pump-out targeted rate to the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area. All properties currently paying the rate will receive the current pump-out service prior to the contract expiring.

Timelines

33. The current contract for the pump out service is due to expire on 1 July 2021. To enable procurement on any option a council decision is needed no later than 30 June 2020.

34. Due to the timing of the 2019 local government elections, the committee is asked to forward the endorsed option to the Governing Body for inclusion in the draft 2020/2021 Annual Budget.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Options analysis – Preferred approach to providing the pump-out service

35. Feedback on the Annual Budget 2019/2020 showed both public concern for water quality and strong support for the septic tank pump-out service in the Waitākere Ranges as a convenience to homeowners. Staff have considered these factors, as well as potential risks, in assessing the options.

36. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board has advocated to retain the service, noting that it ensures best practice of a three-yearly pump out of septic tanks (resolution WTK/2019/107).

37. Two feasible options for the Waitākere Ranges septic tank pump out scheme have been developed:
   - Option A: a three-yearly pump-out, equivalent to the current service
   - Option B: a three-yearly pump-out and an enhanced inspection of the entire onsite wastewater system to ensure compliance.

38. The costs of the service (including labour, sucker truck, disposal and contractors’ costs) and council costs (including contract administration and management and the cost of managing the rate) have been estimated as per Table 1 below.

39. Staff have analysed the two options against key criteria such as cost, likely impact on water quality, convenience to rate payers, local board views and noted risks or assumptions for each.

40. In each option it is assumed that regional compliance monitoring will apply to all wastewater systems from July 2021, and that the service will only apply to properties within the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area.

41. Staff have also sought feedback from the Waitākere Ranges Local Board, who provided their views through resolutions at a business meeting on 22 August 2019 (resolution WTK/2019/107).
Table 1. Analysis of options for pump-out service against key criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Rate per system (inc GST)</th>
<th>Water quality</th>
<th>Convenience</th>
<th>Local board view</th>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option A: pump-out of primary systems (recommended)</strong></td>
<td>$277 per year</td>
<td>Moderate: Multiple factors contribute to water quality. Additional service needs are the responsibility of the owner.</td>
<td>Moderate: Additional inspection must be booked separately. Additional maintenance may be required.</td>
<td>Not preferred: Local board supports retaining a pump-out but believes the increased cost should be funded in another way.</td>
<td>Property owners will arrange additional inspections to meet regional compliance requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over three years: Service cost: $571 Council cost: $259 Total: $830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B: pump-out and enhanced inspection of primary systems</strong></td>
<td>$314 per year</td>
<td>Moderate: Multiple factors contribute to water quality. Additional maintenance needs are the responsibility of the owner.</td>
<td>High: Service would provide full 3-yearly service and inspection requirements. Additional maintenance may be required.</td>
<td>Preferred: Local board supports providing both a pump-out and enhanced inspection. Recommends the increased cost of the pump-out and the inspection be funded in another way.</td>
<td>Council will be liable for the cost of failure if any issues with the system are not picked up during inspection. Potential higher cost to manage and respond to complaints (staff and contractor time). The cost estimate is more subject to change than option A as it requires putting in a new service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over three years: Service cost: $682 Council cost: $260 Total: $942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Options Eliminated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceasing the service</strong></td>
<td>This was not considered due to the strong support from local residents and the direction from the Governing Body to develop an alternative option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status quo – a pump out programme at the same cost as 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td>The local board has requested that the service be provided at the same cost as in 2019/2020. An objective of targeted rates is for the cost of the service to be covered by the rate. The contract rates for the service will need to be re-negotiated to reflect the change in geographical scope (from a larger catchment to a smaller more distant one) of service. The contract also needs to reflect additional contract management costs to be incurred by council in managing this local rate and service (for instance due to increased waste disposal fees). This means a status quo option is not practicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Servicing all types of onsite systems</strong></td>
<td>Several contracts would be needed under this option, due to the complexity of advanced systems which, in some cases, can only be inspected by staff qualified by the manufacturer. Due to the complexity of engaging multiple suppliers through different contracts, and the increased pricing that would result, this option is not practicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regionwide service for all system types</strong></td>
<td>This was eliminated as it would be complex to implement and create a significantly increased cost for all owners of onsite wastewater systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increased cost for both options

42. Both proposed options cost more than the status quo. This is because properties that are easy to access and closer to the Rosedale disposal plant are cheaper to service, and therefore subsidise the higher cost of more remote rural properties in areas. There are more remote properties in Waitākere Ranges than in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas.

43. Reducing the number of properties serviced through the pump-out programme from the 4,228 systems currently serviced to the 3,461 in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area will also reduce the service’s efficiency of scale.

44. The proposed rates also fully recover the council’s costs – in 2018/2019 the council absorbed approximately $100,000 of additional costs from delivering the septic tank pump-out service.

Both options will have similar impacts on water quality

45. As faulty onsite wastewater systems are only one contributor to water quality issues, it is difficult to estimate how much changes to the pump-out service, as proposed in option B, will change water quality in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area.

46. Sampling shows that despite the current pump-out programme, there is human faecal contamination in many waterways in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board Area. This could come from septic tanks, advanced systems not covered by the pump-out programme, overloaded public systems, or people not using toilet facilities.

47. The pump-out programme, as it is currently delivered, guarantees that the tank is pumped out. It does not guarantee that the system is suitably treating wastewater or that all faults are repaired. If property owners do not do maintenance in-between pump-outs and part of the system is not functioning properly, contamination can occur. This is the case for both Options A and B (which both involve only visiting properties once every three years).

48. Water quality testing prior to compliance investigations in Piha (May 2018) showed sites with human faecal contamination in wet and dry conditions. Compliance staff then contacted property owners to request proof that inspections and maintenance had taken place. Once records showed that 98 per cent of properties were compliant, follow-up water quality testing showed no sites with human faecal contamination in dry conditions. These results indicate that, despite the pump-out service being provided in this area, human faecal contamination was only reduced after compliance action was taken in the area.

49. The regional compliance monitoring programme funded by the water quality targeted rate will require that all property owners arrange inspections, and undertake any maintenance and repairs, regardless of system type. In turn, this will contribute to enhanced water quality, as demonstrated by the targeted investigations. Staff consider this programme to be the best way to address water quality issues.

50. Based on the data from compliance investigations, staff do not believe that either the current pump-out programme or option B will offer additional public benefit to regional water quality. The primary benefit is increased convenience to the property owner.

Recommended Option A– Provide a pump-out only service in the Waitākere Ranges

51. Within the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area, staff identified that both options are likely to have a similar impact on water quality for the reasons outlined above. Under both options, properties will receive regular pump-outs.

52. Both options will cost more than the current targeted rate because:
   - they will cover the full cost to council for administering the service
   - the service area is reduced, removing the properties that were cheaper to service.
53. Option B is likely to be more convenient for homeowners as they will receive both the pump-out and inspections at the same time and will not have to organise their own inspections.

54. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board has also indicated that they support delivery of an enhanced inspection, as included in option B. It is their view that this will contribute to improved water quality and be responsive to the special protective provisions of the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008.

55. However, option B also has some significant drawbacks. These are described below.

56. Increased cost and cost variability - option B will cost at least $37 more per system per year. Due to the potential variability of inspections, it is difficult to establish a fixed cost per property, as the layout for each onsite wastewater system will vary depending on the location of the disposal field. Staff are undertaking pilot studies to develop some non-invasive inspection techniques to identify disposal field location (such as thermal imaging) but are unlikely to have a proven methodology in place for contract negotiations.

57. Costings in this report assume that one contractor could complete the enhanced inspection at the same time as the pump-out. However, if an enhanced inspection is introduced then suppliers may need to provide the inspections and pump-out separately due to the different skill sets and equipment required. If the tender process reveals the need for additional staff, increased training or additional visits, the current estimated service cost of $314 may significantly increase.

58. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board believe the cost of enhanced inspections should be absorbed by general rates or the water quality targeted rate. The assessment from staff is that it would not be equitable for regional rates to continue to subsidise a private service.

59. Council liability for systems failures - the systems are private assets and the responsibility for maintenance and repair sits with the owner. If the council is inspecting these systems, there is a risk of assumed liability if part of that system fails following a council-run inspection. This would not only result in increased requests for service and management of potential complaints outside of the contract scope, but also potentially complicate compliance actions if required.

60. Contractor capacity - all contractor staff would need to be skilled for the higher level of inspection, which industry has advised to council is typically above the current skills required of sucker truck operatives.

61. For these reasons staff recommend option A - a three-yearly pump-out of septic tanks in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area only.

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

62. Council’s Healthy Waters team continues to work closely with both Watercare and Regulatory Services to improve water quality outcomes. Specifically, in this area staff are working collaboratively on compliance of permitted sites through the water quality targeted rate work programme.

63. Relevant council staff (Healthy Waters, Finance, and Licensing and Compliance) have worked collaboratively to consider the future of this rate so that there is alignment with the objectives and work of the water quality targeted rate.

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

64. The Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour Local Boards will be affected by this proposal. Through the Annual Budget 2019/2020 consultation process both boards indicated support for removal of the septic tank pump-out targeted rate from their local board areas (resolutions UH/2018/116 and HM/2019/41 are shown in Attachment A).
65. Both Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour Local Boards received a memo in July 2019 about the proposal to remove the rate and service from their areas. This memo asked them to indicate if they wished to provide further feedback. Neither local board has provided any further feedback.

66. Any proposal to expand or reinstate the previous targeted rate to include other areas would require full consultation with impacted boards and communities and would not be able to be completed in time for the finalisation of the 2020/2021 Annual Budget.

Waitākere Ranges Local Board views

67. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board had a workshop with staff to discuss the detail of the options, and then passed resolutions at a business meeting on 22 August 2019 (resolution WTK/2019/107). The full text is shown below:

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) recommends the Environment and Community Committee supports a status quo option of continuing to provide the septic tank pump out service to residents within the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area through a targeted rate

b) notes that the proposed option A in the report is to:

i) change the boundary of the Waitākere rural sewage targeted rate area to properties within the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area only

ii) move to a full cost recovery model for the targeted rate which increases the cost

c) notes that the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 contains special protective provisions which requires Auckland Council to have regard

d) notes that the pump out system was introduced by the Waitākere City Council to improve water quality

e) recommends overhead costs be covered by general rates or alternatively, funded by the Water Quality Targeted Rate paid by owners who are part of the sceptic tank pump out programme. Council services are often a mix of funding sources.

f) recommends enhanced inspection costs be covered by water quality targeted rate to reflect the environmental benefits associated with enhanced monitoring

g) considers that retaining the septic tank pump out service for Waitākere Ranges area will:

i) ensure best practice of a 3 yearly pump out of septic tanks

ii) act as a control group for other rural areas while studies are underway to better understand the causes of poor water quality in our harbours, beaches and streams. Many of the polluted beaches are in areas with reticulated sewage

iii) help take the rural community with us while we seek to improve water quality across the region, where the major focus is on urban infrastructure improvements

iv) provide the chance to review the septic tank pump out contract to look for efficiencies and improvements.

68. Staff have considered the board’s recommendation to absorb the council costs and additional inspection cost, rather than making the rate fully cost recovered from the property owners receiving the service.

69. Notwithstanding the regional importance of the Waitākere Ranges, the assessment from staff is that it would not be equitable for regional rates to continue to subsidise a private service. Property owners outside the Waitākere Ranges pump-out programme area, approximately 36,000 properties, pay the full cost of pump-out and inspection of their onsite wastewater systems.
70. As stated above, staff’s analysis is that the pump-out service does not provide any additional public benefit to enhance water quality. Staff consider the regional wastewater compliance programme, as funded by the water quality targeted rate, the best way to address water quality issues.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**  
**Māori impact statement**

71. Preventing waterway contamination is of high importance to Māori. Te Kawerau ā Maki have provided feedback that they support the regional compliance work being delivered by the water quality targeted rate in their rohe.

72. Four mana whenua groups with interests in the affected area were advised of the proposed changes by email on 16 August 2019:
   a. Te Kawerau ā Maki have indicated their preference for option B due to risk of neglected and failing systems and the cumulative implications this will have on local environments. They did not provide specific feedback on the pump-out rate during the 2019/2020 Annual Budget consultation.
   b. Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua have asked to be updated on the outcome of this meeting.
   c. No comment was received from Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei or Ngā Maunga Whakahī o Kaipara prior to the completion of this report.

73. Staff acknowledge the preference of Te Kawerau ā Maki, however note that environmental outcomes are more likely to be improved through the regional wastewater compliance programme, as discussed in this report.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**  
**Financial implications**

74. The cost of the current three yearly pump out for each system is $198.43 (including GST) per annum, an increase of $3.89 from 2018/2019.

75. Auckland Council absorbed approximately $100,000 of additional costs from delivering the septic tank pump-out service in 2018/2019. The existing targeted rate would need to increase to cover these costs, regardless of any changes to the service level and scope from 1 July 2021. The new rate should cover all known costs of council administering the pump-out programme and estimated costs have been calculated to reflect the cost of administrating this service. Components of the total cost of the expected rates under both options are summarised in Table 2 below.
### Table 2: Cost components of proposed Waitākere Ranges Septic Tank Programme Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost type</th>
<th>Total programme cost over one year (inc GST)</th>
<th>Total programme cost over three years (inc GST)</th>
<th>Rate per system per year (inc GST)</th>
<th>Rate per system over 3 years (inc GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Healthy Waters staff costs</td>
<td>$214,666</td>
<td>$643,998</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council overhead costs</td>
<td>$86,263</td>
<td>$258,789</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total council administration costs</td>
<td>$300,929</td>
<td>$902,787</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A: pump out only</td>
<td>$659,333</td>
<td>$1.98m</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B: pump out and inspection</td>
<td>$785,833</td>
<td>$2.36m</td>
<td>$227</td>
<td>$681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contractor costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>$960,262</td>
<td>$2.88m</td>
<td>$277</td>
<td>$831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76. Under option A, homeowners will also have to arrange their own inspections with a private company every three years. This usually costs between $100 and $180.

77. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board requested that the absorb the overhead costs ($258,789 over three years) and some or all of the enhanced inspection costs ($379,500) be covered by the water quality targeted rate to reflect the associated environmental benefits (resolution WTK/2019/107).

78. Staff from Finance and Healthy Waters do not recommend absorbing these costs as it would set an unfair precedent for the management of other targeted rates in the region.

79. If option B was offered, there would be no need for additional monitoring of those systems which would have been provided under the wastewater compliance programme with the regional water quality targeted rate. As such, the Waitākere Ranges local board have recommended that the cost of that monitoring be removed from the total pump-out rate. For the average property, paying a water quality targeted rate of $66 per annum, this would equate to a saving of $1.20 per annum. If option B is approved by the committee, staff support removing this monitoring cost.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

80. The risks and potential mitigations for both options are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Risks and mitigations septic tank pump out options Waitākere Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Mitigations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Compliance enforcement is being introduced to better address wider septic tank issues, particularly regular inspections and maintenance when faults occur. With this option property owners will be required to arrange their own inspections with a private company every three years.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No water quality improvement from investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current pump-out service by itself has not been shown to have a significant impact on water quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B</strong></td>
<td><strong>Additional compliance auditing of the inspection records would be required to monitor quality of inspections and compare current system (as built) to designed system (consent).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The enhanced inspection will be considered enough for compliance purposes as an assessment of the function of the system. However, it will not assess whether the system is being used as originally designed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council liability for failures under enhanced inspection</td>
<td><strong>This risk is difficult to mitigate because the council will hold legal liability for systems functioning effectively. It is more appropriate for private companies to hold this risk and the mitigation is suggested to occur through not recommending this option.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a council-provided inspection declares a system as compliant, and part of the system subsequently fails, the council could be held liable for repair or replacement costs, which could be significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost uncertainties</td>
<td><strong>These risks can be mitigated through the contract negotiation and on-going management of the rate, and through additional work being undertaken under the water quality targeted rate.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option provides a new service and the cost is then more subject to change, depending on the outcomes of the tender process. Costs included in this report are the likely estimate, not the maximum estimate.</td>
<td>Staff have been working closely with suppliers to understand costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both options</td>
<td><strong>The council could absorb some of these internal costs. They would be passed on in the general rates. This recognises the public good benefit of actions improving water quality, given the high value of the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area to all Aucklanders.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputational risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both options incur a cost increase, and a reasonable proportion of the cost is a result of internal council costs. Fully recovering the cost of the service is perceived to not recognise the public good provided by the service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

81. The committee’s decision on the preferred option will be recommended to the appropriate committee of Auckland Council for inclusion in the 2020/2021 Annual Budget process.
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Attachment A

Upper Harbour and Henderson-Massey Local Board resolutions regarding the future of the septic tank pump-out targeted rate

Upper Harbour Local Board Business Meeting 20 September 2018

17 Future of the Upper Harbour septic tank pump-out programme

The Relationship Advisor Infrastructure and Environmental Services was in attendance to support the item.
Resolution number UH/2018/116
MOVED by Member J McLean, seconded by Member N Mayne:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) support the end of the three-yearly septic tank pump-out service, and request that notification be sent to all affected property owners in the Upper Harbour Local Board area of the intention to remove the service and the targeted rate.

CARRIED

Henderson-Massey Local Board Business Meeting 16 April 2019 (see under point d)

15 Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028

Resolution number HM/2019/1
MOVED by Member W Flautny, seconded by Chairperson S Henderson:

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:


b) approve the following advocacy initiatives for inclusion (as an appendix) to its 2019/2020 Local Board Agreement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding for a pool in the north west.</th>
<th>Bring forward funding in the Long-Term Plan to achieve earlier delivery of a pool in the north west to meet existing and expected growth needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Te Whau Pathway.</td>
<td>Allocate funding in the Long-Term Plan to Te Whau Pathway project in recognition of the important contribution it will make to the regional walking and cycling network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfer of legal ownership of properties within the council group.

d) provide the following feedback on the regional proposals in the draft Annual Budget 2019/2020:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase to the waste management targeted rate base charges.</td>
<td>Support the increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending food scraps collection targeted rates to the North Shore former trial area.</td>
<td>Support the extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasing out the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.</td>
<td>Support bringing on-site wastewater systems under a regional compliance scheme, noting that improving water quality is a major issue for Auckland and the existing arrangement in the Waitākere area has not delivered desired improvements. Notes the minimal impact for Henderson-Massey residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting the urban rating area.</td>
<td>Support the adjustment to incorporate areas that receive the same service as adjacent urban neighbours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to rating of religious use properties.</td>
<td>Notes that the proposal in the consultation material was poorly expressed and lacked context for the community and the board to understand adequately the impact of the changes; consequently, the board has no position on this matter. Notes that under the Local Government Act land used for religious worship, religious education or as a cemetery is already not rated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases to some regulatory fees to maintain cost recovery e)</td>
<td>Support the increase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

*Proposed changes to the legacy Waitākere City Council septic tank pump-out targeted rate and service*
Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group progress update for Hauraki Gulf outcomes

File No.: CP2019/15349

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To report on Auckland Council group’s progress against its agreed 2017 work programme to advance council’s shared vision with the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan, which seeks to improve outcomes in Tikapa Moana / the Hauraki Gulf.
2. To review the scope, value and need for the Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

3. The Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan (the Sea Change plan) was released in December 2016.
4. At the Planning Committee’s direction, and as approved by the Environment and Community Committee, staff prepared an agreed council group work programme to advance shared objectives with the Sea Change plan. Additionally, the Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group (the political reference group) was established in late 2017 to provide oversight and guidance to council group staff on the work programme.
5. Staff have recently completed a 2019 progress update (Attachment A), to evaluate progress made against the 2017 work programme. The council group is undertaking a significant amount of work in line with the vision and shared objectives of the Sea Change plan.
6. The council group has also maintained relationships and regular interaction with other agencies in the Hauraki Gulf and the Hauraki Gulf Forum throughout the past two years, at both elected representative and staff levels.
7. Recognising the potential to further integrate council group activities to improve outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf, it is recommended that the political reference group continues through to December 2020. It is proposed this group be renamed to the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group. Membership is also proposed to be broadened to include the Chair or Deputy Chair from the Finance and Performance and the Regulatory Committees, to further integrate council functions, beyond environment, community and planning functions.
8. An updated Terms of Reference that reflects the above is attached (Attachment B).

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) acknowledge Auckland Council group’s progress against the agreed 2017 work programme to advance shared outcomes with the Sea Change plan.

b) approve the continuation of an Auckland Council political reference group to oversee the Auckland Council group’s activities of consequence to the Hauraki Gulf, with the following changes, as incorporated within the updated Terms of Reference:

i) an increased focus on cross-functional council integration between environmental, planning, regulatory and financial disciplines, including broadened councillor membership to reflect these functions
ii) an adjusted title being the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group to reflect a broader range of activities with a bearing on Hauraki Gulf outcomes.

c) reaffirm the ongoing need for the council group to consider and prioritise aspirations and actions for the Hauraki Gulf in all relevant activities to achieve desired positive outcomes, consistent with statutory obligations and strategic directions.

d) delegate to the Chair of the relevant committee authorisation of any membership changes to the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group.

Horopaki Context

Background of the Sea Change Plan

9. The Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan (the Sea Change plan) was released in December 2016, following development by an independent Stakeholder Working Group over the preceding three years.

10. The Sea Change plan’s vision is to ensure that the mauri of the Hauraki Gulf is strong, and it is vibrant with life, productive, and supports healthy and prosperous communities.

11. The Planning Committee meeting of 2 May 2017 (PLA/2017/50) acknowledged the shared vision and intent of the Sea Change plan and Auckland Council’s goals, following the public release of the Sea Change plan.

12. At the direction of the Planning Committee, and with input from across the council group, staff prepared a proposed work programme between May and September 2017. Objectives of the Sea Change plan were assessed against current and planned council activities and considered funding and prioritisation of new activities. The Environment and Community Committee meeting of 12 September 2017 (ENV/2017/115) approved (subject to funding) the proposed work programme as council’s initial response.

Background of the Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group

13. The Planning Committee meeting of 2 May 2017 also resolved to form an Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group. The political reference group’s Terms of Reference and membership were subsequently approved at the 12 September 2017 Environment and Community Committee meeting, with the purpose being:

a) oversight and guidance to council group activities focusing on prioritisation and integration of work programmes and outcomes

b) where possible, integrate the council group work programme with the work programme of other agencies in the Hauraki Gulf and Hauraki Gulf Forum.

14. The Terms of Reference indicated that the group should report back to the parent committee, the Environment and Community Committee, by September 2019, at which point the scope, value and need for the group should be reviewed. This report is the first time since its inception that the political reference group has reported back to the Committee.

15. The initial membership of the political reference group was agreed at the 12 September 2017 Environment and Community Committee meeting and consisted of: Councillors Hulse, Filipaina, Cashmore, Darby and Wayne Walker, Independent Māori Statutory Board member Liane Ngamane and Waiheke Local Board member John Meeuwsen.

16. Subsequently, consistent with discussion at the Environment and Community Committee, additional local board representatives from mainland local boards bordering the Hauraki Gulf (Franklin, Rodney, Hibiscus and Bays, and Central Isthmus representation) were added. The group’s Terms of Reference and membership were finalised in December 2017.
17. The group has met five times since it was finalised, where the progressive embedding of the 2017 work programme has been discussed.

18. In accordance with their Terms of Reference, the group has provided oversight and guidance to staff on activities identified in the work programme. The group has encouraged departments and council-controlled organisations (CCOs) to enhance their initiatives, improve integration of complementary projects, and tailor work programmes to recognise further opportunities.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Progress against the 2017 work programme

19. Staff have recently assessed progress against the 2017 work programme, noting the wide range of council group activities that contribute to shared objectives with the Sea Change plan. This is presented in the 2019 progress update, appended as Attachment A.

20. The 2019 progress update highlights the significant amount of work the council group has undertaken to improve outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf. The breadth of council group activity in the Hauraki Gulf aligns with objectives of the Sea Change plan, and many of these activities have progressed significantly in two years.

21. Additionally, the stocktake of activities has been beneficial in identifying and demonstrating the range of council departments and CCOs working towards shared outcomes and undertaking complementary activities. The council group’s response to the Sea Change plan has enabled more aligned and integrated working towards shared aspirations. This could be improved further to seek multiple wins through initiatives whose primary aim may not be central to Hauraki Gulf outcomes.

22. While many of the council group’s activities contribute to the objectives identified in the Sea Change plan, not all these activities were initiated as a direct response to the plan. There are many statutory and non-statutory drivers for the activities in the 2017 work programme, of which the Sea Change plan is one. The council group has a much broader reach into the community of the Auckland region than possible through one initiative, and several of these other initiatives have long lead-in times.

Integration with other agencies in the Hauraki Gulf and the Hauraki Gulf Forum

23. The second aspect of the political reference group’s Terms of Reference is to integrate the council group work programme with the work programmes of other agencies in the Hauraki Gulf and the Hauraki Gulf Forum, where possible. The council group interacts with other agencies and the Hauraki Gulf Forum regularly, through a variety of means.

24. Five Governing Body members and two local board members from the Hauraki Gulf Islands represent Auckland Council on the Hauraki Gulf Forum. Central government ministries, other councils within the Waikato region, and tangata whenua are also represented. Council staff are members of the technical officers’ group for the Forum, enabling inter-agency coordination at a staff level. Staff provide a constituent party report at each meeting of the Forum, to provide an update on council’s activities associated with the Hauraki Gulf.

25. Council’s 2019 progress update was presented by the political reference group Chair, Deputy Chair and Lead Officer to the Hauraki Gulf Forum at its 19 August 2019 meeting. The aim was to inform the Forum and acknowledge the positive outcomes sought for the Hauraki Gulf. The presentation was well received by Forum members.
Office of the Auditor General report

26. The Office of the Auditor General (OAG) undertook an audit of the process used to develop the Sea Change plan, as it was considered the first attempt at marine spatial planning in New Zealand and used unique collaboration mechanisms. The OAG report, entitled ‘Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari: Creating a Marine Spatial Plan for the Hauraki Gulf’, was published in December 2018.

27. The key findings of the OAG report included observations of limited consultation of interests beyond the Stakeholder Working Group members, and limited consideration by the Stakeholder Working Group of what agencies were already doing, and how agencies would implement the published plan.

Central Government approach to Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari

28. On 22 November 2018, central government announced the establishment of a proposed Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC). The role of the MAC is to provide the Department of Conservation (DoC) and the Ministry for Primary Industries a sounding board and independent advice during the development of a government response strategy to the Sea Change plan. The MAC held its first meeting on 30 July 2019 and is intended to be in place for one year.

29. The final terms of reference for the MAC have not yet been publicly released, but advice from DoC is that the MAC will focus on the central government responsibilities of conservation and fisheries management.

Proposed Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group

30. The existing political reference group acknowledges that Hauraki Gulf aspirations are being progressed through various initiatives. The Sea Change plan is one important reference point amongst a range of strategies, plans and activities with a bearing on the Hauraki Gulf.

31. Since the 2017 council group work programme was agreed, several additional activities have been initiated that contribute to improved Hauraki Gulf outcomes. An example is the America’s Cup 36 programme, which will transform the waterfront area and initiate various legacy and leverage projects across a wider geographic area.

32. The 2017 work programme only includes activities that respond to objectives and/or themes in the Sea Change plan. Some council group activities and programmes that have a significant impact on Hauraki Gulf outcomes, such as development with coastal implications, were not fully considered in the Sea Change plan. Various council-supported community initiatives to improve Hauraki Gulf outcomes have been ongoing for several years but were also not considered in the Sea Change plan. Embracing these other initiatives should lead to greater synergies, awareness and collective buy-in.

33. In recognition of the above points, it is proposed that the political reference group oversee a broader range of initiatives and considerations important to securing positive outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf. It is recommended the current title of the Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group be renamed to the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group.

34. It is proposed that the membership on the political reference group be broadened to include representation (Chair or Deputy Chair) from the Regulatory and Finance and Performance Committees, along with the current representation from the Environment and Community and Planning Committees (or equivalent committee of the whole), along with Independent Māori Statutory Board and Local Board representation. This will enable further integration of a wider array of council group and community activities and aspirations. Such cross-functional integration may also assist in ensuring consideration of Hauraki Gulf outcomes through the Long-term Plan 2021-2031 preparation process.
35. Governing Body membership on the political reference group will be determined based on Chair and/or Deputy Chair roles of the relevant committees.

36. Where existing local board members on the political reference group are re-elected, it is recommended their membership is retained for continuity purposes. Where an existing local board member is not standing or is not re-elected, a replacement will need to be nominated and agreed, encompassing mainland and islands representative(s) as appropriate.

37. It is recommended that the newly constituted political reference group continues for one year, with at least two meetings proposed (approximately March & July 2020), and reporting back to the Environment and Community Committee by December 2020.

38. The changes proposed to the political reference group going forward are summarised in Table 1 below. The updated Terms of Reference are appended as Attachment B.

### Table 1: Proposed changes to the existing Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group following the October 2019 elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>August 2017-September 2019 (Current)</th>
<th>October 2019-December 2020 (Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group</td>
<td>Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Consider Sea Change plan as it informs council group activity in the Hauraki Gulf</td>
<td>Consider broader range of initiatives (including Sea Change plan) that advance Hauraki Gulf outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Linkages between principally two key committees, and Independent Māori Statutory Board and Local Board members, along with interested councillors</td>
<td>Emphasis on further integration across core council committee functions, including regulatory and finance committees, and Independent Māori Statutory Boar and Local Board members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>September 2019 review date in current Terms of Reference</td>
<td>Extend given evolving link with central government initiatives and need for further integrated thinking within council group over next 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee</td>
<td>Appropriate committee of the whole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Recommended areas of focus for the political reference group’s meetings include:
   a) cross-functional integration (regulatory, finance, planning, environment and community), with a focus on closing the ‘policy loop’ on council activities
   b) links to central government initiatives (e.g. growth and urban development, Essential Freshwater, aquaculture, Treaty Settlements)
   c) how initiatives at a local scale affect broader scale outcomes, and whether this is being adequately recognised
   d) growth programmes and their impacts and opportunities for the Hauraki Gulf
   e) ensuring that council group asset management plans, business cases and procurement practices better reflect how Hauraki Gulf and broader environmental outcomes are secured over the longer term.
Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group progress update for Hauraki Gulf outcomes

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

40. As with some council departments, activities undertaken by Watercare, Auckland Transport, Panuku and ATEED influence outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf, in both positive and potentially negative ways. These four CCOs inputted (largely planned) activities to the 2017 work programme. They were invited to provide updates on these activities during the 2019 review process and responded to varying degrees.

41. Many CCO activities are aligned with the objectives of the Sea Change plan. Such activities were not necessarily initiated as a direct response to the Sea Change plan, but in response to a variety of drivers, of which the Sea Change plan is one. Accelerating some of these programmes may be necessary to meet expectations. This will require an evaluation of how that can be done, and reprioritisation to address core responsibilities.

42. Auckland Transport has previously presented to the political reference group on their response to road runoff and associated contaminants. Road runoff continues to be a significant source of pollution of receiving waters in the Auckland region, so it is important that mitigating this remains an ongoing priority for both council and Auckland Transport.

43. In general, there is a clear need for Auckland Council and its CCOs to better assess the impacts of their activities on the values of the Hauraki Gulf, and to respond accordingly.

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

Local impacts and local board views

44. Fifteen local boards have a boundary on the Hauraki Gulf and its tributaries, with two, Waiheke and Aotea / Great Barrier, encompassing key features of the Hauraki Gulf. All local boards were provided a brief written overview of the Sea Change plan and the council group’s response in June 2017 and May 2019.

45. Five local board members are currently included on the political reference group, including four mainland members from local boards bordering the Hauraki Gulf, and one Islands member (representing Waiheke and Aotea / Great Barrier). Local Board representation is intended to continue for the proposed Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group.

46. There is the opportunity for local boards to include in their 2020 Local Board Plans further initiatives that support improved outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf. Local Boards could usefully look at how their environmental initiatives link together with other neighbouring initiatives at a catchment scale.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

47. Mātauranga Māori and the perspective of mana whenua were woven throughout the Sea Change plan, with four of the 14 members of the Stakeholder Working Group representing mana whenua. Several hui to consider Mātauranga Māori input were held throughout the plan’s development.

48. The Sea Change plan reflects the holistic view and interrelationships that mana whenua, mataawaka and, to an extent, the broader community have with the coastal environment. Bringing together the council group’s activities to highlight the shared goal of improving the Hauraki Gulf, and other coastal environments, is an example of a more integrated approach to coastal environmental management.

49. Mana whenua representatives were invited to contact council staff should they wish to discuss the council’s approach to responding to the Sea Change plan, through progress memos provided in July 2017 and May 2019. This is in addition to direct mana whenua and mataawaka involvement in specific council group activities.
50. The political reference group membership includes a representative of the Independent Māori Statutory Board. Representation is intended to continue for the proposed Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group.

51. Treaty claims negotiations with central government are ongoing for iwi and hapū with interests in the Hauraki Gulf. These settlements may continue to change the cultural, economic and political landscape in Hauraki and Tāmaki Makaurau.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

52. With the duration of the political reference group being proposed until December 2020, funding of activities in the Hauraki Gulf will largely remain the same as it is currently. Preparatory work for the Long-term Plan 2021-2031 will begin during this time, providing an opportunity to consider funding and reprioritisation of future focus areas to improve Hauraki Gulf outcomes. The political reference group may be able to provide oversight and better integrate positive Hauraki Gulf outcomes into proposals put forward during this process.

53. Achieving positive outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf does not necessarily require additional funding. Positive outcomes can be achieved through re-prioritising council group funding and resources or through ceasing funding of activities that may result in limited value for money or negative impacts. Similarly, internalising costs within overall project objectives will provide for more durable outcomes in future years. Improvement of underlying systems may also highlight opportunities to improve Hauraki Gulf outcomes. Taking a more holistic and integrated approach to any initiative should prevent unintended consequences.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

54. Potential risks to council of not continuing a political reference group for Hauraki Gulf outcomes over the next year include:

a) missed opportunity to integrate regulatory and finance functions with planning and environment functions through a broadened membership on the group

b) missed opportunity to give effect to the more integrated and holistic approach envisaged by the Auckland Plan 2050 and the Sea Change plan

c) missed opportunity to influence the Long-term Plan 2021-2031 and other internal initiatives to prioritise positive outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf

d) failure to continue to embed consideration of Hauraki Gulf outcomes in work programmes of the council group, particularly where Hauraki Gulf impacts are not a significant consideration but should be

e) missed opportunity to strategically align and canvass council group’s work programmes of consequence to the Hauraki Gulf, with other agencies and central government’s response strategy, which will be progressed over the following year with support from the Ministerial Advisory Committee.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

55. Following a decision on the future title, purpose and membership for the proposed Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group, this group is proposed to meet for the first time in March 2020.
56. The process of nominating and agreeing new members, where existing membership changes, will need to be done following the October 2019 elections and prior to the newly constituted political reference group’s first meeting. For efficiency purposes, it is recommended the Chair of the relevant committee of the whole is delegated to authorise any such changes arising from the local body elections.

57. It is proposed the reference group should report back to the relevant committee of the whole in December 2020. The report back may include:
   a) an outline of the improved integration between the council group’s environmental, planning, regulatory and finance functions
   b) how identified gaps in departmental and CCO awareness and responses can be addressed
   c) a review of how the council group has aligned with and influenced central government initiatives in the Hauraki Gulf, as it relates to council responsibilities
   d) identification of proposed priority areas for the Long-term Plan 2021-2031 process and other future council group initiatives, to enhance positive outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf
   e) an overview of positive outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf that have been achieved and/or enabled through the political reference group.

58. It is not recommended, at this stage, that the political reference group will need to continue for more than one year.
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## Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group progress update for Hauraki Gulf outcomes

### Environment and Community Committee
10 September 2019

#### Theme: Rebuilding fish stocks
Council may choose to advocate for change to fisheries management, but not in Council’s direct mandate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative work programme</th>
<th>Work programmes commenced or augmented</th>
<th>Committed funding and source</th>
<th>More information/decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No statutory role</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Theme: Restoring habitats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role for Council in assessing habitats of importance through existing mechanisms such as SEA-Marine</th>
<th>Council may choose to advocate for change to fisheries management, but not in Council’s direct mandate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ‘Habitats’ project (see Theme 4) is intended to improve data available for and representation of subtidal marine habitats in Significant Ecological Areas (SEA) – Marine.</th>
<th>NETR ($3.9m, $0.4m in 2016/2018 for marine ecology) NETR Update to E&amp;C  Committee Feb 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shuffle rules for aquaculture included in Chapter F.2 General Coastal Marine Zone. Proposed Plan Change (PC 15) – Improving consistency of coastal provisions: includes adjustment of Aquaculture Activities Table (Table F.2 190) and definitions.</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme Proposed Plan Change 15 (Proposed PC15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed PC15 was notified Nov 2018; Submissions closed Jan 2019; Summary of decision requested notified Feb 2019; Further submissions closed Mar 2019; Hearings May 2019; decisions notified June 2019; appeal period closes August 2019. Plan change needs to be approved by the Minister of Conservation before it is made operable.</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role also: draft Aquaculture Strategy (MPS) received July 2019; requesting council feedback.</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme Auckland Council Submission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Theme: Aquaculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unitary Plan rules for Aquaculture</th>
<th>Auckland Council provided a submission during the consultation period for the proposed NES: Marine Aquaculture, 7 Aug 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme Auckland Council Submission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Theme: Restoring healthy functioning ecosystems

The new Marine Habitats programme funded by NETR aims to expand our knowledge of marine habitats in the Auckland region, which are most important for biodiversity, including where they are. Particular focus on subtidal habitats, which are difficult to sample and currently under-represented in the Unitary Plan schedule of Significant Ecological Areas.

The first year of the programme has focused on collecting, curating and stock taking information available to enable identification of gaps and priority areas for sampling, and building collaborative relationships with LINZ, DOC and WRC for data sharing. Specific work to date includes:

- Review of important species for biodiversity for the Auckland region to serve as a foundation document to support identification of areas for protection.
- Report of species and habitat information from 51 subtidal sites around Astrolabe/Great Barrier Island.
- Mapping of intertidal and shallow subtidal rocky reefs on the East Coast using satellite imagery.
- Obtained and processed data from LINZ, which will provide information on the degree of complexity of the seafloor (greater complexity likely to provide more habitat value) – total area of 807km² has been covered around Kawau Bay, Takapuna and between Rangitoto Island, Tiritiri Matangi and the main mainland.

Contributed funding to the ‘Pulse of the Gulf’ research programme (University of Auckland lead), investigating spatial and seasonal use of habitat/forging areas by whales/dolphins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ‘Habitats’ project (see Theme 4) is intended to improve data available for and representation of subtidal marine habitats in SEAs-Marine.</th>
<th>NETR ($3.9m, $0.4m in 2016/2018 for marine ecology) NETR Update to E&amp;C  Committee Feb 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Theme: Protected, enhanced and restored species diversity and abundance

Active management of roosting and nesting areas in place in partnership with community groups and Parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unitary Plan identifies and protects bird habitat in SEA-Tomastal and Marine</th>
<th>NETR ($3.9m, $0.4m in 2016/2018 for marine ecology) NETR Update to E&amp;C  Committee Feb 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community groups were involved in preparing for the first seabird restoration site at Otaia Island (Nestec Group), including a 3D-printed and hand-painted spotted shag colony.</th>
<th>NETR ($3.9m, $0.4m in 2016/2018 for marine ecology) NETR Update to E&amp;C  Committee Feb 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAs are designated for migratory bird roosting, nesting and feeding areas; and wading bird feeding and roosting areas. Many SEA-M designations identity seabird habitats being a key factor. Increased knowledge (see Marine Habitats programme update in Theme 4) may support potential future plan change(s) and other management options.</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council has established (July 2018) an Auckland Fish Passage Advisory Group to coordinate an interdisciplinary approach to fish passage management, lead the development of guidance, tools and collection systems, and encourage best practices. Members of this group are from council’s resource consents, regulatory engineering, healthy waters, plans and places, and biodiversity teams.</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with Crown Research Institutes and Universities to implement seabird research program</td>
<td>NETR ($3.9m, $0.4m in 2016/2018 for marine ecology) NETR Update to E&amp;C  Committee Feb 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISO-HonsMSc/PhD projects put forward to universities on: restoration techniques (including trials), pest issues, stressors (physiology, diet, foraging ecology), pollution (plastics). Collaboration with University of Auckland for seabird distribution monitoring project (MaxEnt)</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintroduce marine habitat monitoring program, and work to inform programme design and track trends (link to Theme 4)</td>
<td>NETR ($3.9m, $0.4m in 2016/2018 for marine ecology) NETR Update to E&amp;C  Committee Feb 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| See updates in Theme 4 for monitoring of subtidal habitats undertaken as part of Marine Habitats programme. | Funded at time of developing work programme |

---

**Item 14**

**Attachment A**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SeeChange Theme</th>
<th>Indicative work programme</th>
<th>Work programmes commenced or augmented</th>
<th>Committed funding and source</th>
<th>More information/decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seabird population and distribution monitoring</td>
<td>Seabird and Shorebird Monitoring and Restoration Programme funded by NETR aims to fill many of the knowledge gaps about Auckland’s seabird and shorebird populations (highlighted by See Change), which will help to develop restoration actions council might take to improve conservation statuses. The first year of the programme has focused on the groundwork required to implement a new regional monitoring network and research programme. Key accomplishments include: - Established key relationships and collaborative project plans with DOC, the University of Auckland, Auckland Museum, the Northern NZ Seabird Trust, and Birds NZ. - Developed, through consultation with DOC and other stakeholders (including iwi) a multi-species, site-based DOC permit application to carry out seabird monitoring research. - Installed first seabird restoration site on Otaia Island (Neihum Group), including an acoustic attraction system for a variety of species and a new spotted shag colony using 3D-printed replica bird models and nesting materials. Collaboration with Auckland Museum. - Conducted a variety of initial seabird surveys and restoration site investigations for several species at mainland locations and in the inner and outer Hauraki Gulf. - Hired a full-time scientist to assist existing seabird scientists to work on the programme. Full seabird review prioritisation (gap analysis) soon to be completed to inform 10-year programme plan. Initial programme design, aims and first actions presented to multiple stakeholder groups (e.g. Birds NZ, Forest &amp; Bird, Northern NZ Seabird Trust seminar).</td>
<td>Additional funding through NETR ($3.9m, $0.4m in 2018/2019 for marine ecology)</td>
<td>NETR Update to E&amp;C Committee (Feb 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine monitoring program (ecology, water quality and sediment contamination)</td>
<td>Three marine environment monitoring programmes: water quality (32 sites), sediment contamination (134 sites) and ecology (approx. 150 sites) – many sites within the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park (HGMMP). Monitoring is ongoing. As of April 2018: - Water quality had improved for the most part since monitoring began, but overall the sites received a Water Quality score of fair or poor. Concerning trends include increasing total nitrogen, soluble phosphorus and water temperature, along with sediment levels exceeding thresholds at many sites. - Ecological health has remained relatively consistent. Many sites throughout the HGMMP are graded as 'poor' or 'unhealthy' in terms of combined ecological health. - Minimal overall change in metal concentrations in sediments. 13% of sites exceed the 'sensitive' sediment quality guideline and 11% were above the 'high' level guideline. Refer to <a href="http://www.knowledgedataauckland.nz/assets/publications/MRR2-04April-2018.pdf">http://www.knowledgedataauckland.nz/assets/publications/MRR2-04April-2018.pdf</a> for summary.</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport Sustainability Framework</td>
<td>Reference is at Sustainability Framework – goal to Conserve and enhance the natural environment (mitigate effects on and enhance biodiversity) through transport projects. Part of the Pest-Free Hauraki Gulf programme (see full update below). Targeted surveillance by the dog team on the Hauraki Gulf Pest Free Islands will provide an indication of improvements achieved through the pest control and eradication initiatives. Behaviour change research being undertaken to assist in targeted effective biosecurity messaging to private boaters. Eradication plans for specific targeted species are prepared for each island.</td>
<td>NEATR ($3.5m, $2.1m in 2018/2019 for island biosecurity)</td>
<td>NETR Update to E&amp;C Committee (Feb 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7: Biosecurity</td>
<td>Unitary Plan controls on discharge of biofouling from vessels cleaning and passive discharge</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td>Proposed Plan Change 15 (Proposed PC15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Islands (protecting conservation islands in the Hauraki Gulf) in partnership with Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Treasure Islands’ rebranded as ‘Pest Free Hauraki Gulf’ (joint programme with DOC). NETR funding – five-fold increase of investment in islands pest control/eradication. Increased capacity to enforce the Hauraki Gulf Controlled Area Halton 1998, which prevents movement of specified pests to, from or between islands in the Gulf – preparing a Hauraki Gulf Controlled Area Biosecurity Management Plan. Specific activities include: - Support provided to community-led Te Korowai o Waitheke – Towards Pest Free Waitheke (complete goat eradication and trial rat eradication of 25% of Waitheke Island). - Pig eradication and significantly upscaled rat control on Waitheke Island. - Significantly upscaled pest plant control on Waitheke and Rakino Islands. - Argentine and Danner’s ant treatment and monitoring on Aotea Great Barrier Island. - Pateke sinks programme on Aotea Great Barrier Island. - Kawau Island multi-species pest eradication proposed in the Regional Pest Management Plan (RPM) – consultation to be undertaken in partnership with DOC and community. - Argentine ant eradication from Kawau Island. - Review of rat control on the Broken Islands, Aotea Great Barrier. - Inner Hauraki Gulf Weed Strategy Review.</td>
<td>NEATR ($3.5m, $2.1m in 2018/2019 for island biosecurity)</td>
<td>NETR Update to E&amp;C Committee (Feb 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SeeChange Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative work programme</th>
<th>Work programmes commenced or augmented</th>
<th>Committed funding and source</th>
<th>More information/decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hauraki Gulf Pest Spread Control</strong></td>
<td>- New inspector/log (14 certified pest detection dogs) team at departure points to Waitemata/Aotea Great Barrier. (also increased island surveillance – Rakiura, Rotonui, Moturau)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ambassadors stationed at ferry terminals over key periods to educate the public on preventing the spread of pests and pathogens to Hauraki Gulf islands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Kauri dieback cleaning station installed at departure point to Waitemata, with other opportunities to improve cleaning facilities being explored.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pest Free Warrant scheme – the RPMP will require warrants for all commercial operators in the Gulf (10 new warrants to be issued in 2019; dedicated pest free warrant - FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in biosecurity activities in the lead up to America’s Cup event (AC36, 2021) e.g. waterfront developments providing opportunity to increase biosecurity facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Biosecurity investigations with MPI

- The Sea Change Plan included an objective to minimise obstacles to mussel reef restoration created by the Biosecurity Act. Auckland Council recognises this, but also acknowledges the risk of potentially introducing or spreading non-indigenous species and pathogens within the region. This risk is assessed on a case-by-case basis to ensure the protection of our marine environment.
- Auckland Council staff have attended shellfish restoration hui (held by The Nature Conservancy) along with MPI staff, where this topic has been discussed and potential solutions evaluated.
- Auckland Council works with MPI on various other marine pest management activities (e.g. potential development of national rules, standards and guidelines).

### Management of Marine Biosecurity program

- Additional marine biosecurity specialist (Environmental Services) hired. Specific activities include:
  - Top of the North Marine Biosecurity Partnership (Hokianga, Auckland, Waikato, Bay of Plenty, Gisborne and Hawke’s Bay councils, Department of Conservation and Ministry for Primary Industries) are working toward developing consistent inter-regional pest pathway management.
  - Education, advocacy, behaviour change; includes advocating for the “Green below”. (Good to go) Biofouling awareness campaign at a national level, at the Hutchwilco and Auckland On-Water Boat Shows, and via ambassadors at high-use boat ramps and marinas over summer.
  - Annual national hul surveillance programme – minimum 600 hulls are inspected in marine non-marine areas across the Auckland region during summer, using SCUBA divers and Remotely Operated Vehicles (ROVs). Year one of two-year contract complete.
  - Mediterranean fanworm response and high-risk site surveillance continues at Aotea/GBI.
  - International Bootie Packs (organised by MPI) inclusion of biosecurity information specific to regional marine biosecurity and Pest Free Hauraki Gulf.

### Pest investigation, research and development

- Detecting new incursions, range extensions, horizon scanning, identifying vector pathways.
- Supporting research and development, including pest-free marinas project; bubble technology to prevent biofouling, development of the Level of Fouling guidelines, species-specific research on Mediterranean fanworm, Japanese marina shrimp and Asian paediatric crab, desktop investigation into the drive-in boatash system; feasibility study for an on-island hull cleaning/maintenance facility at Aotea/GBI.
- Increased surveillance and monitoring and increased readiness to respond e.g. in-house shocker, response team, utilising public sightings. Assessment for potential marine pest monitoring in select SEA-M areas to be identified in 2019/20.

### Theme 8: Marine debris

- **Marine Litter Staff Working Group**
  - Regular workshops held with the group, used to discuss initial scoping of a potential Auckland Council response to marine litter, but no formal continuation of this group since 2017.
  - The Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan was published in 2018, with the aim of achieving zero waste by 2040. The plan includes a specific focus on reducing litter and marine waste, and other waste minimisation actions will contribute indirectly to reduced marine litter.
  - The Hauraki Gulf Islands Waste Plan was also published in 2018, with more specific goals for waste minimisation on Aotea Great Barrier, Waitemata, Kauri and Rakiura Islands.

- **Teal traps on stormwater assets. Approximately 3000 Teal traps have been installed in catchpits jointly by Auckland Council / Auckland Transport and the Local Boards mainly around the central area.**
  - Auckland Transport Teal trap programme ongoing – 3,000 installed, additional 500 in 2019. Auckland Council catchpit management includes maintaining and cleaning of teal traps.
  - Research into effectiveness of removal and optimal maintenance schedule currently being undertaken (by GHE)

### Indicative work programme periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next 2 years (2017-2019)</th>
<th>Next 5 years (2017-2022)</th>
<th>Next 10 years (2017-2023)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funded at time of developing work programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Sea Change Tai Timu Tai Pari – Auckland Council Implementation through existing and new work programmes – September 2019 update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SeeChange Theme</th>
<th>Indicative work programme</th>
<th>Work programmes commenced or augmented</th>
<th>Committed funding and source</th>
<th>More information/decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Funding of litter clean up and behaviour change initiatives** | Auckland Council provides funding to environmental projects through the Regional Environment and Natural Heritage grants programme. In the 2018/19 programme, Sustainable Communities received a $15,000 grant towards the Love your Coast 12-week education and capacity development event. The group ran 44 clean ups over this period and mobilised 3,492 people from schools, community groups, corporates and individuals, removing 30,014 litres of litter from coastal environments. | Local Boards funded several local litter clean up and behaviour change initiatives, including:  
- Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges and Whau Local Boards Love your Stream (EcoMatters) project identifies businesses with the greatest impact on litter and provides pollution prevention advice.  
- Papakura and Manukau Local Boards ‘Be a tidy kiwi’ and Franklin LB Litter Free Franklin litter prevention programmes – engaging with schools, undertaking community litter clean-up events, and encouraging people to take a pledge to ‘Be a Tidy Kiwi’.  
- Ōrākei Local Board funding to Tamaki Estuary Environmental Forum for projects including beach clean ups; Ōrākei schools marine project including experiential education focused on identifying local marine issues and potential solutions, along with beach and snorkel clean-ups; and Plastic Free Ōrākei (with SEA Life Trust) working with local businesses to reduce plastic use.  
- Howick Local Board, Howick stream improvement programme (including seal streets events); Para Kōre programme for business waste minimisation, Waste minimisation in schools projects.  
- Mangere-Otahuhu and Waitakere Local Boards, Wai Cara Schools/Marine Education programmes engage school groups, potential activities include stream clean-ups and litter audits.  
- Ōtara-Papaturu Local Board funded Haat Streets, Papaturu (aims to increase knowledge about responsible waste management and reduce littering impacting walkways) and Ōtara Litter Action Plan (need streets, creek clean-ups, supporting good waste practices).  
- Hibiscus and Bays Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays Zero Waste programme to deliver waste reduction programmes in kindergartens and schools. | 10-year Budget 2018-28 |
| **Obtain better marine litter/debris monitoring protocols to align organisations as well as with international standards** | RIMU began scoping work in partnership with Ministry for the Environment, but MfE decided to develop a monitoring app for community groups rather than develop standardised monitoring. Currently, no council scope to be monitoring marine litter other than through community groups. | Not currently funded |
| **Street sweeping**  
5-year period: Joint review of options/practices to increase the amount prevented from entering harbour for additional investment, and also separate volumes by catchment. | Street sweeping programme ongoing (AT contractors in 2015-16 prevented 6,000+ tonnes from entering the harbour via street sweeping) – updated data not available. | Funded at time of developing work programme |

### Theme 9: Sediment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative work programme</th>
<th>Work programmes commenced or augmented</th>
<th>Committed funding and source</th>
<th>More information/decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated Watershed Management Plans as per HPFSM</strong></td>
<td>Auckland’s 10 watershed plans will be the key tool to communicate an integrated approach to water management. Currently in Stage 1 – capturing and collating existing data on the state of the environment, current interventions and community and stakeholder values of water. The first phase of this was completed in November 2017, with a refresh planned for mid-2019. Stage 2 (scenario development through modelling) is due to be completed 2020. Stage 3 (Watershed Action Plans) is due to be complete 2020/21</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td>Auckland Council watershed current state story maps [Knowledge Auckland, 2017]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unitary Plan supporting Water Sensitive Design, and technical guidance in GD04</strong></td>
<td>The Auckland Unitary Plan promotes the use of integrated water management (similar to water-sensitive design) in new development and redevelopment – specific rules are included for greenfield development/subsection areas, and ‘Stormwater Management Area – Flow’ overlay areas. Examples of water-sensitive design being used include Tamaki Regeneration Project areas, the Long Bay development, and Hobsonville Point, among others.</td>
<td>AUP and GD04 funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td>Funding of WSD initiatives through 18-year Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterway protection fund (funds allocation for catchment improvements that feed to Hauraki Gulf)</strong></td>
<td>Partnership programme between Auckland Council and the community, to fund activities such as waterway and wetland fencing, riparian planting and alternative water supplies for stock. The Waitemata catchment (which flows to the Hauraki Gulf) is included in the programme.</td>
<td>Funding of WSP initiatives through 18-year Budget</td>
<td>WQTR (portion of S$50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil mapping – to help farmers understand soil productivity</strong></td>
<td>No work initiated to date.</td>
<td>Not currently funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring of sediment accumulation rates and sediment loadings as well as ecological responses to increased mudness</strong></td>
<td>RIMU have a small amount of funding to initiate monitoring of sediment accumulation rates in addition to the measurements of grain sizes to track mudness at around 90 sites. Sediment plots have been purchased and sites currently being selected with plans for plates to go out later this year. Integration with monitoring of sediment inputs from land/freshwater is also being considered. Methods and approach are being developed aligning with approach of WRC.</td>
<td>Not currently funded</td>
<td>Pilots funded at time of developing work programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Theme 10: Nutrients

**Integrated Watershed Management Plans as per HPFM**

- See update under Theme 9 (sediment) - Integrated Watershed Management Plans will contribute to reduced nutrient loads entering receiving environments.
- The Freshwater Management Tool (see Theme 13) will simulate the loss and behaviour of nitrogen and phosphorus from urban and rural land use. The future state capability of the FWTM (to be complete March 2020) will be used to identify the optimal mitigation strategies to address nutrient contamination in integrated watershed management plans.

- Funded at time of developing work programme.
- 10-year Budget 2018-28

**Expansion of monitoring to inform nutrient models for Hauraki Gulf (in collaboration with WRC)**

- Not currently funded. Additional water quality monitoring needs will be considered for the next 10-year budget.
- 10-year Budget 2018-28

**State of Environment Monitoring (in collaboration with WRC)**

- Data collected through the marine monitoring programme has been used to inform State of our Gulf reporting, with the next edition scheduled for publication in 2020.
- Not currently funded.
- 10-year Budget 2018-2028

### Theme 11: Heavy metals

**Water Sensitive Design requirements for new development included under the Unitary Plan**

- See update under Theme 9 (sediment) - Integrated Water Management is required in the Auckland Unitary Plan for greenfield developments.
- Examples of water-sensitive design being used for new development include Tamaki Regeneration Project areas, the Long Bay development, and Hobsonville Point, among others.
- Funding of WSD through 10-year budget 2016-2028

**Mapping of impervious surface area by catchment, transport designation and transport network impervious area**

- An updated existing impervious surface layer has been developed (by Opus) for the Freshwater Management Tool and will be used to inform integrated watershed management plans (see update in Theme 9).
- The future impervious surface layer is currently being developed to account for growth and intensification in the existing and future urban zones.
- Funding of WSD through 10-year budget 2018-2028

**Auckland Transport Water Action Plan**

- Improving outcomes for water is included in AT’s Sustainability Framework. A specific AT Water Action Plan has not progressed.
- AT Sustainability Framework funded at time of developing work programme.
- 10-year Budget 2018-2028

**Assessment of transport requirements for urban growth and review of service level agreement for stormwater in road corridor**

- Auckland Transport and Auckland Council have been involved in the Supporting Growth Alliance, assessing transport requirements for future greenfield growth areas.
- The Auckland Regionwide Stormwater Network Discharge Consent determines how stormwater in the road corridor is managed. The NDC was granted April 2019, but it is currently under appeal with the Environment Court.
- 10-year Budget 2018-2028

**Roads and Streets Framework and Transport Design Manual development includes water sensitive design and developing design Levels of Service for each road classification typologies**

- The Roads and Streets Framework promotes fully integrated surface level stormwater design (e.g. rain gardens and green streets) and outlines approved water-sensitive design options.
- The Transport Design Manual (TDM) has not yet been released. The TDM is anticipated to provide design specifications to enable water-sensitive design and green streets.
- 10-year Budget 2018-2028

**St Mary’s Bay Water quality improvement programme - project for tetrapods is a collaboration between AT and Healthy Waters**

- More than 100 tetrapods were installed on roads throughout St Mary’s Bay in 2019. The project has advanced to addressing wastewater overflows (Healthy Waters/Waterec) – see Western Infrans Water Quality Improvement Programme update in Theme 12.
- Funded at time of developing work programme.

**AT supports the installation of water sensitive devices as a way of managing stormwater where appropriate. The future cost to operate and maintain devices, management of vegetation and its replacement and associated traffic management needs to be accounted for in the future**

- Water sensitive devices are implemented in some AT projects, dependent on operation/maintenance costs, traffic management, vegetation, etc.
- Funded at time of developing work programme.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sea Change Theme</th>
<th>Indicative work programme</th>
<th>Work programmes commenced or augmented</th>
<th>Indicative work programme periods</th>
<th>Next 2 years (2017-2019)</th>
<th>Next 5 years (2017-2021)</th>
<th>Next 10 years (2017-2028)</th>
<th>Committed funding and source</th>
<th>More information/decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of stormwater management plans for growth and championing of source treatment</td>
<td>Healthy Waters has provided stormwater management plans for the structure planning process for growth areas (e.g. Warkworth and Silverdale West industrial area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation of how to retrofit water sensitive design (WSD) into existing urban areas (and implement findings of investigation in 5-year period)</td>
<td>Existing urban areas in Stormwater Management Areas – flow is the immediate priority for retrofitting water-sensitive design. Project to retrofit stormwater devices in Glen Innes (partner funding arrangement with HLC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake further investigation on the contribution of marine vessels to heavy metal discharges</td>
<td>Currently not scoped and unfunded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of landfills to ensure compliance with Unitary Plan (Closed Landfill Asset Management Plan - 2018 refresh)</td>
<td>Approximately 37 sites (regionwide) with landfill discharge consents, with 31 currently fully compliant and 6 with minor non-compliance. This is an improvement from 2017, when 17 sites had minor non-compliance. The Closed Landfill Asset Management Plan is due for a 2021 update which is planned to be undertaken in the 2019/20 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent compliance team inspecting industrial trade areas and new housing areas.</td>
<td>Compliance monitoring is ongoing with industrial trade activities and new housing areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of contaminant reduction strategy based on findings of integrated watersheds plans</td>
<td>Contaminant Reduction Programme urban focus is on the capture of both gross pollutants (i.e. litter) and contaminants from heavily trafficked roads. Project to retrofit stormwater devices in Glen Innes (partner funding arrangement with HLC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WQTR (portion of $54 million, $4.3 million in 2016/17 for Contaminant reduction programme, urban)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of contaminants in marine environment as part of SOE monitoring (with expansion of monitoring into specific areas to monitor effectiveness of policies and interventions in 5-year period)</td>
<td>Comprehensive monitoring of heavy metals in marine sediments is ongoing – see Theme 6. New sites are sampled each year to scan for developing areas as well as regular monitoring of core sites to establish trends. Collaborative project on monitoring and research for emerging contaminants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use, upgrade and install stormwater devices to trap contaminants (new and retrofitted to key areas) to reduce heavy metal contaminants in urban areas as part of infrastructure delivery</td>
<td>GCO1 includes technical guidance for stormwater management devices, including identifying which devices provide the best heavy metal (and other contaminant) removal. Project to retrofit stormwater devices in Glen Innes (partner funding arrangement with HLC). Stormwater devices include in several new urban areas (e.g. Hobsonville, Long Bay).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially WQTR, partially 10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emptying of stormwater catchpits and ongoing maintenance of treatment devices</td>
<td>Ongoing maintenance work to ensure catchpits and devices function correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Pollution Prevention Programmes being run by several local boards</td>
<td>The industrial pollution prevention programme involves inspecting and discussing potential pollution issues with business owners in industrial areas and educating them on waste minimisation techniques. If changes are recommended, a report is provided to the business, and re-visits are undertaken to assess whether recommendations have been adopted. This programme has been undertaken by: - Howick Local Board (East Tamaki area) - Henderson-Massey/Waiuku/Whau Local Boards (through EcoMatters) - Kaiapoi Local Board (Birkirkera, Beach Haven and Wairau Valley areas) - Manurewa-Otahuhu Local Board (Papakura area) - Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board (Parnell and Mt Wellington areas) - Upper Harbour Local Board (Rosevale area) The programme has delivered good results e.g. for Kaiapoi Local Board. In 2018/19FY, 162 sites were visited. 44 sites had recommendations made to mitigate risks of contaminated stormwater. Follow-up visits showed 50% of recommendations were adopted within 3 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking Whau water quality investigation to determine sources of heavy metals</td>
<td>Investigation to identify the sources of pollution causing water quality issues in the Whau catchment, involving investigating pollution from a range of land uses including industrial areas, wastewater overflows and closed landfills. The 3-stage project should be completed by 2020 and help identify where Auckland Council should focus its attention on improving water quality in the Whau River.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of integrated watersheds plans to determine loads of heavy metals based on land use</td>
<td>See update under Theme 9 (Sediment): Integrated Watershed Management Plans will contribute to reduced heavy metal loads entering receiving environments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SeaChange Theme</th>
<th>Indicative work programme</th>
<th>Work programmes commenced or augmented</th>
<th>Committed funding and source</th>
<th>Information/decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 12: Microbial pathogens</strong></td>
<td>Undertaking various Local Board and community initiatives for monitoring and education of onsite wastewater management.</td>
<td>Education programme for Great Barrier residents (swimmability and septic tanks) approved; Feasibility study for integrated approach with Project Little Oneroa (expansion of existing targeted compliance and monitoring project)</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of risk assessment model for onsite wastewater devices throughout Auckland</td>
<td>GO06 – Onsite Wastewater Management in the Auckland Region produced September 2018. This includes a risk assessment framework for onsite wastewater devices, including consideration of potential effects on water quality, public health, and cultural or natural heritage, and mitigation of risks.</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completing review of onsite wastewater treatment management in the Auckland region</td>
<td>Review has been completed and informed the regional compliance scheme funded through the WQTR (see proactive compliance regime for onsite wastewater update below)</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme, additional funding through WQTR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertaking monitoring of closed waterways and other waterways graded as having poor water quality to identify source and then associated works to reduce contribution. This work may include despair works, cross connection works, etc.</td>
<td>See ‘Safe Networks Programme’ update below</td>
<td>WQTR (portion of $5.6m, $0.5m in 2018/19 for Safe Networks Programme)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertaking infiltration and ingress works to improve network performance. Current works include Takapuna, Motions Bay.</td>
<td>Council’s existing safe networks programme scaled up to conduct sampling at stormwater outlets and streams at SafeWise sites where elevated health risks for contact recreation have been identified.</td>
<td>WQTR (portion of $5.5m, $0.5m in 2018/19 for Safe Networks Programme)</td>
<td>WQTR Update to E&amp;C Committee (Feb 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded to ‘Safe Networks Programme’, investigating and eliminating any sources of faecal contamination in the stormwater system which cause increased public health risk of the region’s SafeWise sites.</td>
<td>Network investigations underway and significant progress made during winter 2018, around the areas of Glen Innes, Takapuna, Red Beach and Meadowbank.</td>
<td>WQTR Update to E&amp;C Committee (Feb 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigation of proactive compliance regime for onsite wastewater systems for Auckland</td>
<td>Sepic tanks and onsite wastewater systems programme – develop a compliance programme to ensure private onsite wastewater systems are regularly inspected and maintained to reduce the amount of wastewater entering waterways. - Interim database developed, of 40,000 properties with onsite wastewater systems, business case for permanent database approved. - Targeted education materials for property owners have been developed, sent to these living in coastal areas in early 2019. - Pilot compliance and monitoring programme trialed for 123 properties (in Pinha area) in 2018, monitoring to measure results to be completed mid 2019. - Another targeted compliance initiative in Little Oneroa (Waikoke Island) begun in Feb 2019, learning from Pinha experiences. - Online checklist app being developed for contractors making onsite wastewater inspectors independent review on the effectiveness of several financial incentive schemes completed Dec 2018, focusing on homeowners in the Little Oneroa lagoon area; reviewing found incentives had low take-up for range of reasons, recommendation for future incentives to comprise more substantial grants in targeted, high-impact areas.</td>
<td>WQTR (portion of $9m, $0m in 2018/19 for Septic tanks and onsite wastewater systems)</td>
<td>WQTR Update to E&amp;C Committee (Feb 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Industrial practice group for onsite wastewater devices</td>
<td>GO06 – Onsite Wastewater Management in the Auckland Region produced September 2018. Industry professionals contributed to the development of the document.</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion of catchment assessment for high risk catchments identified in the onsite waste risk assessment as variant.</td>
<td>Pinha and Little Oneroa identified as high risk catchments, among others – pilot compliance initiatives to improve onsite wastewater performance trialled in Pinha and Little Oneroa catchments.</td>
<td>WQTR (portion of $9m, $0m in 2018/19 for Septic tanks and onsite wastewater systems)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roll out of region wide on-site stormwater bylaw or other proactive compliance scheme</td>
<td>Auckland Council’s Stormwater Bylaw (2015) requires private (as well as public) stormwater systems to be managed and maintained to a consistency high standard. The AUP is also being reviewed to see if test should be changed to enable council to require landowners to send in maintenance records for onsite stormwater management devices on request. Compliance monitoring initiatives for onsite stormwater are planned to be rolled out to include onsite stormwater within the next few years.</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westernleigh Water Quality Improvement Program - Constructing new stormwater enhancements, including separation of existing combined networks and construction of strategic consolidated outfalls.</td>
<td>Progressive catchment by catchment, including: - St Mary’s Bay and Masfield Beach water quality improvement project consent granted in Nov 2018, with appeals addressed through mediation in Feb 2019, construction to begin mid-2019, the completed late 2020 - Dally Street outfall upgrade (to improve water quality in the Freemans Bay, Maidstone Harbour and Wynyard Wharf areas) onsite works to commence mid-2019 - Picton Street stormwater extension (separation of combined network) consent lodged and tenders for construction Nov 2018, construction to commence mid-2019 - Waterway separation works (extend and upgrade stormwater network) concept design phase, private drainage investigations completed and surveys underway.</td>
<td>WQTR ($361m AC, $421m Watercare - $10.5m in 2018/19)</td>
<td>WQTR Update to E&amp;C Committee (Feb 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unitary Plan requirements in place to limit the discharge from vessels</td>
<td>Limits on discharges from vessels (including sewage, bilge water, litter, waste oils, residues, spills, etc.) are included in Chapter F2 – General coastal marine zone.</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Interceptor Tunnel, Link Sewers</strong></td>
<td>Contractor selected late 2018. Construction to begin August 2019 at the Mount Roskill and Mangere wastewater treatment plant sites, full construction to be complete 2025.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Funding ($1.2b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Interceptor - Hobsonville to Rosedale</strong></td>
<td>Phase 1 (Hobsonville to Rosedale) - design began 2017, construction began Jan 2019, to be complete late 2020. Future phases planned for 2020-2035.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Funding ($135m phase 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fred Thomas Drive wastewater pumping station and storage</strong></td>
<td>Construction completed Dec 2017. Reduction in wet-weather overflows demonstrated since operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Funding ($30m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wynyard Quarter wastewater pumping station and storage</strong></td>
<td>Construction completed June 2018, reduction in wet-weather overflows demonstrated since operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Funding ($23m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glendowie Brouch Sewer upgrade</strong></td>
<td>Project began June 2018, construction due to be completed mid-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Funding ($30m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waiarau wastewater pumping station and rising main</strong></td>
<td>Rising main completed mid-2018. Pumping station currently in execution phase, completion expected mid-2021.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Funding ($44m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Coast Bays link sewer upgrade</strong></td>
<td>Currently in execution phase, completion expected early 2021.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Funding (approx $26.5m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Army Bay treatment Plant Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>Outfall upgrade completed May 2019, wastewater treatment plant upgrade due to begin planning phase in 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Funding (approx $30.68m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warkworth/Whitianga Water Pipeline</strong></td>
<td>Warkworth Wastewater Treatment Plant upgrade completed late 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Funding ($193m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Watershed Plans take a risk based approach, including the identification of risks and its assessment</strong></td>
<td>The Freshwater Management Tool will assist in understanding the source, behaviour and subsequent delivery to the coastal environment (via streamer river network) of six key contaminants (sediment, nitrogen, phosphorus, zinc, copper, and E. coli). From this, opportunities to optimally reduce ongoing and future contaminant effects will increasingly be identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Council has the pollution response team which responds to spills. Harbour Master has responsibility for coordinating ber 1/2 spills and works closely with Maritime NZ for larger scale spill preparedness and response</strong></td>
<td>Work of the pollution response team is ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westhaven Marina runs education programmes with local schools to teach them about the Blue Flag and Clean Marina programs and gets involved in clean-ups. Also run work programmes and cadetships.</strong></td>
<td>In order to qualify for and maintain Blue Flag status, Westhaven Marina must continue to meet stringent environmental, educational, safety and accessibility criteria. The importance of a clean marine environment, as a Clean Marina has required the marina to promote sustainable environmental initiatives and encourage environmental best practice in marine operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Visitor Plan 2021. Auckland has an opportunity to repurpose the Watemata Harbour and Gulf Islands as a world class marina park offering a range of distinctive attractions and experiences that are easily accessible</strong></td>
<td>The Destination AKL 2025 Plan has superseded the Auckland Visitor Plan 2021. Specific actions in the Plan that are relevant to the Hauraki Gulf:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Omaha Regional Park runs education programs on marine environments such as the See Shore Safari</strong></td>
<td>Regional Environmental Education Centres located at Long Bay, Omaha and Tawharanui regional parks. Programmes at Long Bay include Coastal Biodiversity Detectives (P2-8), Healthy Waterways, Healthy People (P4-8), and Seaside Sensational Senses (P0-2). Programmes at Omaha include Sea Shore Safari (P1-8). Regional Park Rangers run all of these programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaChange Theme</td>
<td>Indicative work programme</td>
<td>Work programmes commenced or augmented</td>
<td>Committed funding and source</td>
<td>More information/decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks water quality and shore health studies</td>
<td>Monitoring of sea and shore birds nesting at coastal Regional Parks has continued, informing pest control to protect the birds.</td>
<td>- Monitoring of water quality is included in the Regional Park Management Plan and has continued, informing where many of the 140,000 trees have been planted across Eastern Regional Parks over the past year – with a focus on reducing erosion and sediment input into waterways in the coast.</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motukoreea / Browns Island management and community volunteering days</td>
<td>Management activities at Motukoreea (Browns Island) have included: - Rangers and volunteers have undertaken control of priority pest plant species (thinnam, woylie grass, moth plant) - Ongoing animal pest surveillance has continued to maintain pest-free status - Volunteers have carried out regular beach clean-ups - Monitoring of sea birds and shore birds nesting on the island, including several threatened species (Little Penguin, eclectus parrots, Northern NZ dotted and shore gull)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana Whenua engagement - Parks, Sport and Recreation run monthly hui to discuss upcoming projects and provide updates on existing projects.</td>
<td>The Maramatāka – Mana whenua council meetings calendar is used to schedule the mana hui with mana whenua and council/GOs. Regular hui include: - Mana Whenua Kaiakari Forum - Panuku Mana Whenua Governance Forum - America’s Cup Kaiakari Engagement Plan (ACKEP) Forum - Watercare Mana Whenua Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbormaster supports Coastguard at Safe Boating Week</td>
<td>Work of the Harbormaster is ongoing, continued involvement in Safe Boating Week</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme 15: Providing access to the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park**

- **Te ara mana – Sea Kayak Trail, with campgrounds provided at regional parks along the South East coast, stretches from Howick to Kaiaua**
  - Provision and maintenance of wharves, jetty, parks, esplanades and beach reserves is ongoing. One example is the proposed Hōnau Trail, a 1.2km walking and cycling trail linking Cledonian to Kaiaua on the Firth of Thames via the Hōnau Range.
  - Mana Whenua developed a set of goals for the waterfront and these were adopted by the Panuku Mana Whenua Governance Forum in 2017 – Mana Whenua envision the waterfront as a holistic interface between land and sea, where Mana Whenua are recognised and empowered to fulfill their kaitiaki obligations. The mana and mara of Te Waiwaiwhata is respected and upheld.
  - The Waterfront Plan 2012 is being refreshed as part of the City Centre Masterplan Refresh (July 2019).

- **Te Ara Hura Trail, Waiheke – a collection of walks to explore Waiheke Island and discover its natural beauty. The walking track network allows exploration of the coastline, native bush and historical sites.**
  - The Tourism Boat Hub is a proposal for the Eastern Viaduct as a charter and tourism boating hub (supported by ATED, as consistent with Destination 2020). Lack of funding and a focus on ACC works has put this project on hold. It is at scoping stage and included in a list of uncommitted projects for consideration in the next LT funding round.

- **Recreational access to the Hauraki Gulf is provided through a wide range of wharves and jetties, accessible from parks and reserves, as well as number of esplanade and beach reserves.**

- The regular Panuku Mana Whenua Forum enables a place-based approach to city centre waterfront planning and development. Mana Whenua have adopted goals for this area. Panuku plays a lead role in this location.

- The refresh of waterfront planning in the central wharves area (being led by Panuku) aims to enable growth in charter and tourism related boating which will support visitor access to the Gulf.

- **Auckland Transport is currently preparing a revised Ferry Strategy that will look at service and bartering requirements, frequency and associated infrastructure needs. The Strategy is scheduled for completion in mid-2018.**

- **Auckland Transport Walking and Cycling Strategy**
  - Footpaths and cycleways are included in the Integrated Transport Plan (2012) and Regional Land Transport Plan (2018).

- Cyclists' pedestrian path works that improve access to the Hauraki Gulf include:

**Attachment A**

Item 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SeeChange Theme</th>
<th>Indicative work programme</th>
<th>Work programmes commenced or augmented</th>
<th>Indicative work programme periods</th>
<th>Committed funding and source</th>
<th>More information/decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilise Māori design advice available from within the Urban Design Strategy team of the ADO and application of Māori design principles (Te Arārea principles).</strong> Used by all of Auckland Council, including CCOs&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Māori design advice is included in the Auckland Design Manual, including Te Arārea principles. One example of Māori design used on the coast is Te Takapuna Reserve, on the Orewa foreshore. In line with Te Arārea principles, the reserve was named by mana whenua, it reflects the wider landscape and local narratives, incorporates work by local Māori artists, and is intended to contribute to mana of the receiving Manukau Harbour. Similar projects have been undertaken at locations on the Hauraki Gulf.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Improvements underway include upgrading the space below the Harbour Bridge, improving the cycle path along Curran Street, and upgrading water supply and sewer infrastructure. Works on lifting the seawall in this area are to begin soon.</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td>Skypath enabling works to be completed 2019. <a href="#">Westhaven Project Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 16: Designing coastal infrastructure</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Currently discussing with mana whenua the opportunity of and options around co-governance in relation to a proposed expansion of the Westhaven Marina&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Panuku is working with mana whenua on the public realm projects, a kātakura fund, and co-governance opportunities as part of the Westhaven Marine pile moorings project. Council has granted a resource consent for the pile mooring project and Panuku is engaging with several mana whenua partners through this process.</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribute to the development of blue design principles and include these in the Auckland Design Manual</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;A section on blue design principles has not been included in the Auckland Design Manual, but it does include various blue design principles throughout. Coastal developments are given careful consideration to ensure coastal values are maintained and enhanced, and water-sensitive design guidance is provided. A case study is the Browns Bay Beachfront Reserve, which prioritised providing coastal access for everyone and maintaining a coastal sense of place (e.g. nautical-themed playground).&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Auckland Transport Ferry Strategy proposed to include design and operation of land based assets&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Provide advice on the establishment of a HGMIP Design Panel using the existing urban design panels body of knowledge</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport Ferry Strategy proposed to include design and operation of land based assets</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Phase One of the Ferry Strategy has focused on adding capacity to existing services and improving their operation. There are some terminal and land-based upgrades included in the Regional Public Transport Plan ferry service strategies. Phase Two of the Ferry Strategy will focus more on enabling infrastructure&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;A Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Design Panel has not been established. The Auckland Urban Design Panel provides advice on projects that interface with and impact the Hauraki Gulf, along with other projects around the region. The current panel includes members with expertise in waterfront design, Māori design principles, and environmental management.</td>
<td>Funded at time of developing work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Arārea Māori design principles used by Auckland Council and CCOs</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;See update in Theme 15 – Māori design advice is included in the Auckland Design Manual, including Te Arārea principles, and these have been used to inform many Auckland Council and CCO projects situated on and impacting the Hauraki Gulf. For example, the Downtown Programme (ferry terminal redevelopment) has been developed with designers working pokotāhi pokotāhi (shoulder to shoulder) with mana whenua as a collective.</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater Quality improvements as appropriate during transport projects (Auckland Transport)</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Ongoing work to implement water sensitive devices during transport projects while managing operation/maintenance costs, traffic management, vegetation, etc.</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group

Terms of Reference

FINAL (September 2019)

Purpose

1. To provide oversight and guidance to, and encourage integration of, Auckland Council group\(^1\) activities and initiatives that advance Hauraki Gulf outcomes.

2. To, where possible, integrate the activities of the Auckland Council group with those of other agencies in the Hauraki Gulf and the Hauraki Gulf Forum.

Background

The SeaChange – Tai Timu Tai Pari Marine Spatial Plan was completed by an independent working group of stakeholders in December 2016. The Sea Change plan’s broad vision is to ensure that the mauri of the Hauraki Gulf is strong, and it is vibrant with life, productive, and supports healthy and prosperous communities.

The Planning Committee acknowledged the shared vision and intent of the Sea Change plan and Auckland Council’s goals in May 2017. At the direction of the Planning Committee, the Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group was established, with a preparatory meeting in August 2017.

A work programme of council group activities to progress shared objectives with the Sea Change plan was approved by the Environment and Community Committee in September 2017. At the same time, the purpose of the Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group was approved, being to provide oversight and guidance to council departments and council-controlled organisations in delivering this agreed work programme, and to integrate with other agencies in the Hauraki Gulf and the Hauraki Gulf Forum where possible.

The Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group has made the following observations since its formation:

a) Hauraki Gulf aspirations are being progressed through various initiatives, and the Sea Change plan is one reference point amongst a broad range of strategies, plans and activities.

---

\(^{1}\) The Auckland Council group includes Auckland Council and its council controlled organisations, particularly Watercare, Auckland Transport, Punuku Development Auckland, and Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development.
b) Some council group activities with a significant impact on Hauraki Gulf aspirations have not been considered to date, as they were not directly referenced in the Sea Change plan.

c) Since the Sea Change plan was released in December 2016, and the council group work programme was agreed in September 2017, various substantial strategies, plans, activities and programmes have been initiated or completed that have a significant impact on Hauraki Gulf outcomes. Examples include the America’s Cup 36 programme, the Auckland Plan 2050, and the Auckland Unitary Plan.

d) There is the potential to enable greater synergies and collective buy-in through embracing a wider range of strategies, plans, activities and initiatives.

e) There is the potential to effect greater system change, and therefore more holistic approaches to Hauraki Gulf outcomes, through integrating a wider range of council group functions in the oversight role of the political reference group.

For these reasons, the purpose and membership of the political reference group has been broadened, resulting in this updated (September 2019) Terms of Reference and membership below.

Membership

The Chair of the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group is the Chair of the Environment and Community Committee (or the Deputy Chair in their absence).

Membership, outlined in Table 1 below, reflects the desire to include inter-related responsibilities and membership from the Environment and Community, Planning, Finance and Performance, and Regulatory Committees. Additionally, membership includes Local Board representatives – one from the Hauraki Gulf Islands and three from the adjoining mainland (geographic distributed preference to representatives from Franklin, Hibiscus and Bays, and Rodney local boards). Independent Maori Statutory Board representation is also included.

Members may be replaced as required, while retaining the relative mix of representatives from differing backgrounds and interests. The Environment and Community Committee have agreed to delegate to the Chair of that committee the ability to agree to any such changes, particularly following the outcome of the September 2019 local body elections.
Table 1: Membership on the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Environment and Community Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair, Environment and Community Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or Deputy Chair, Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or Deputy Chair, Finance and Performance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or Deputy Chair, Regulatory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Mayor or Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands local board member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland local board members (3) adjoining Hauraki Gulf coast (Franklin, Rodney, Hibiscus &amp; Bays)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Maori Statutory Board member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings and sharing of information

Meetings are proposed to be called as required, with an expectation of at least two meetings to be held in the 2020 calendar year. Members will be provided information for their consideration prior to any such meeting.

Quorum

Four members, with at least one being the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Environment and Community Committee shall form a quorum.

Tenure

The scope, currency and need for the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group should be reviewed by the Environment and Community Committee prior to December 2020.
Dedication of Road Reserve - Maraetai

File No.: CP2019/16537

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve the dedication as a legal road of a road reserve located at 46R Carlton Crescent Maraetai under Section 111 of the Reserves Act 1977.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Road reserves held under the Reserves Act are often situated on the city fringe or the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) as it is known under the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part). This preserves the route for a future road to connect future development through an existing development’s road network when the RUB is extended.

3. Under the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP), the RUB was extended to rezone land at 1 Maraetai Coast Rd, Maraetai that was previously rural.

4. The owner of the land is currently applying for a resource consent to subdivide the land into residential lots.

5. Physical and legal road access to the land can only be achieved via a local purpose road reserve at 46R Carlton Crescent, Maraetai.

6. The road reserve was originally vested in the Crown by a private owner on subdivision of the larger block in 1926 and then transferred to Manukau City Council in 1977.

7. It is proposed to dedicate the road reserve as a legal road so that the subdivision of the property at 1 Maraetai Coast Rd may proceed.

8. A Licence to Occupy 46R Carlton Crescent will need to be granted to the developer before the reserve has been dedicated as a road to enable its construction to Auckland Transport (AT) standards. The Licence to Occupy may be approved under officer/staff delegation.

9. The developer has agreed to place signage on the road reserve once the resource consent has been granted and as far ahead of construction as possible to let neighbours know what will be happening on the site.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the dedication as legal road pursuant to Section 111 of the Reserves Act 1977, the road reserve situated at 46R Carlton Crescent being Lot 2 Deposited Plan 19097 upon approval being granted by Auckland Transport to accept the road into the Transport Network.

b) note that prior to the dedication as a legal road, an occupation licence will be granted to the developer of the adjoining property (to the east) for the purpose of undertaking earthworks and construction of the road.
Horopaki

Context

10. The Reserves Act 1977 provides for land to be reserved and preserved for certain purposes. One of those purposes is for future road development.

11. Road reserves held under the Reserves Act are often situated on the city fringe or the RUB as it is known under the AUP. This preserves the route for a future road to connect future development through an existing development’s road network when the RUB is extended.

12. The property at 46R Carlton Crescent was one of several reserves created on early subdivision of land at Maraetai in 1926 for road purposes. Legally described as Lot 2 DP 19097, it was originally vested in the Crown. The road reserve is shown circled red on the deposited plan in the figure below.

13. In 1977, the land was vested in the former Manukau City Council pursuant to the provisions of Section 44 of the Counties Amendment Act 1961 for road reserve, subject to the Reserves and Domains Act 1953.

14. Pursuant to section 38 of the Municipal Corporations Amendment Act 1971, the council resolved to request a new title. Record of Title NA35D/1312 was issued on 22 March 1977.
15. The title states that the land is subject to the Reserves and Domains Act 1953, but that statute was replaced by the Reserves Act 1977 under which such reserves were automatically classified for their intended purpose.

16. In 2017, a consent was granted for the subdivision of the rural property at 3 Maraetai Coast Road to create a super lot (Lot 1) which became known as 1 Maraetai Coast Rd, (as shown outlined blue on the plan below). The new title created for 1 Maraetai Coast Rd was subsequently sold to a developer for residential development. The subdivision plan is appended to this report as Attachment A.

17. The developer is currently in the process of preparing an application for a subdivision consent on 1 Maraetai Coast Rd, that will require access via 46R Charlton Crescent, being the only point where physical and legal access may be gained to the site. The terrain on the boundary adjoining Maraetai Coast Rd is too steep to form a road, and the current legal access to the property (from Colson Lane) is not wide enough to support traffic from the proposed level of development. A preliminary subdivision plan of housing lots is appended to this report as Attachment B.
18. Through the consenting process, AT may grant approval for the road reserve to be included into the Transport Network provisional upon the developer constructing the road to the appropriate standards.

19. A Licence to Occupy 46R Carlton Crescent will need to be granted to the developer before the reserve has been dedicated as a road to enable its construction to AT standards. The Licence to Occupy may be approved under officer/staff delegation.

20. The developer has agreed to place signage on the road reserve once the resource consent has been granted and as far ahead of construction as possible to let neighbours know what will be happening on the site.

21. Section 111 of the Reserves Act provides for land that was vested in the council for the purposes of a road reserve to be dedicated as a road by council resolution:

111 Road reserve may be dedicated as a road

(1) Where any land is vested in the Crown or in any local authority for the purposes of a road reserve and the land is required for the purposes of a road, the land may be dedicated as a road by notice under the hand of the Minister or, as the case may be, by resolution of the local authority, and lodged with the District Land Registrar.

(2) For the purposes of this section the term road includes any road, street, access way, or service lane; and the expression road reserve has a corresponding meaning.

22. Also, it is worth noting that three other road reserves (shown below) are at the final stages of being dedicated at neighbouring Beachlands – 20R, 52R and 92R Karaka Rd – permitting considerable development to the South.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
23. The dedication of the road reserve will enable the subdivision of 83 lots to proceed, providing additional housing.
24. The dedication will not proceed immediately but only after the developer has completed its obligations under the subdivision consent.
25. The decision sought is in keeping with the AUP.
26. The dedication as a legal road is in accordance with the classification of the reserve.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
27. Auckland Transport will have to be satisfied with the standard of construction of the road before it will accept it into the roading network. This will be dealt with through the consenting process. Dedication will only proceed following approval of the construction of the road.
28. No other groups are impacted by the decision sought.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
29. The Franklin Local Board was sent a memo advising the members of this report concerning a road reserve in its area, and the proposed change to the roading network because of the development at 1 Maraetai Coast Rd.
30. Feedback received will be tabled at the committee meeting.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
31. In May 2018, consultants acting for the owner/developer consulted with both the Makaurau Marae Maori Trust and Ngati-Te-Ata who did not raise any cultural concerns and deferred their interest to Ngai-Tai-ki-Tamaki.
32. In June 2018, Ngai-Tai-ki-Tamaki were consulted regarding the overall development proposal due to the relative proximity of the marae to the residential land. No concerns were expressed about the residential development.
33. An archaeological assessment report prepared for the property in August 2018 did not note anything of cultural significance on the property.
34. While the consultation was not specific to the proposed dedication of road reserve (the subject of this report) it was included in the preliminary plans for the overall development.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
35. All costs in relation to the subdivision and construction of the road (on the road reserve) will be met by the developer, including surveying of the road if it is required.
36. Auckland Transport will be responsible for future maintenance of the road once formed.
37. The former Manukau City Council policy - for use of road reserves by developers - required developers to pay consideration for the land when it was to be formed as road serving their subdivision. This provision was challenged by a developer of a subdivision and that council waived the requirement in certain circumstances following a review. It was determined that when land is vested as a road reserve and is held for a future public road - then the council could not demand compensation (when it is dedicated as a public road). Consideration is only payable if the land is sold, after revocation of the reserve status, upon a road reserve having been deemed no longer required for a future road.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

38. No risks have been identified.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

39. Upon a positive resolution being passed to declare the land road, and a resource consent is granted (to the developer), council will issue a ‘licence to occupy’ to the owner of 1 Maraetai Rd. This will allow for construction of the road on the road reserve.

40. At the completion of the subdivision, council’s engineer will inspect all aspects of the subdivision including the construction of the road. On construction being found satisfactory, the appointed engineer may accept the road on behalf of AT.

41. Council’s Legal Services will then apply to Land Information NZ to publish a notice in the NZ Gazette declaring the land as road. This also involves ministerial consent from the Department of Conservation.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subdivision Plan Super lot</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Subdivision Plan Housing lots</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Allan Walton - Principal Property Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dedication of Road Reserve - Maraetai

Lot 1
17.1255ha

Lot 2
197.3338ha

Lots 1 and 2 Being a Boundary Adjustment of Lot 1 DP 195270 and Lot 2 DP 186245
Comprised in NA116C/828 and NA121C/827
Item 15

Attachment B
Submission to the Department of Conservation on Te Koiroa o te Koiora - proposals for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand

File No.: CP2019/16801

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To request input into the Auckland Council submission on the Department of Conservation’s Te Koiroa o te Koiora discussion document on proposals for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand.
2. To delegate approval of the submission to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Environment and Community Committee, and an Independent Statutory Māori Board member from that committee.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. The Minister for Conservation has released *Te Koiroa o te Koiora Our shared vision for living with nature*, a discussion document for proposals for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand ([link](#)), seeking submissions by 22 September 2019.
4. A new national biodiversity strategy will be non-statutory and replace the 2000 strategy entitled *Our chance to turn the tide*. The new strategy will provide direction and guidance for New Zealand’s biodiversity system, covering all ecological domains extending to the outer edges of the Exclusive Economic Zone.
5. Auckland Council plays an important role in the biodiversity system out to its jurisdiction of the 12-nautical mile limit.
6. Auckland Council staff are preparing a submission to the Department of Conservation. Staff are supportive of the need for a new biodiversity strategy along with the vision, values and principles. However, staff have identified several missed opportunities and areas for improvement in response to the discussion document.
7. Staff invite elected members to provide input to the submission by 13 September 2019. The Auckland Council submission will be developed incorporating feedback from elected members, local board members and Mana Whenua.
8. As the submission is still being developed and the closing date is prior to the next committee meeting, delegation is sought for the Chair, Deputy Chair and an Independent Statutory Māori Board member to approve the final submission.

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

a) delegate approval of the Auckland Council submission on the Department of Conservation’s Te Koiroa o te Koiora discussion document on proposals for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Environment and Community Committee, and an Independent Statutory Māori Board member from that committee.
Horopaki

Context

9. In August 2019, the Minister for Conservation has released *Te Koiroa o te Koiora Our shared vision for living with nature*, a discussion document for proposals for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand (link), seeking submissions by 22 September 2019.

10. The new biodiversity strategy will replace the current strategy, *Our chance to turn the tide* from 2000. The new strategy will be non-statutory and will provide direction and guidance for New Zealand’s biodiversity system and contribute towards the global response to declining biodiversity.

11. The Department of Conservation (DOC) are seeking views and feedback on:
   - a new 2070 matapopore/vision for biodiversity;
   - a set of long-term outcomes and principles founded on mātāpono/values from Te Ao Māori supported by Mātauranga Māori and science;
   - a series of goals to 2025, 2030 and 2050 to measure success; and
   - five system shifts to implement the biodiversity strategy in its first five years, including proposed initial actions.

12. The strategy will cover all ecological domains including freshwater, land and the marine environment extending to the outer edges of the Exclusive Economic Zone. Auckland Council’s jurisdiction only extends out to the 12-nautical mile limit.

13. Following consideration of feedback, DOC will develop the new biodiversity strategy for the Minister of Conservation. Cabinet will approve the final strategy, so it can be in place for 2020.


Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

15. Auckland Council staff have considered the *Te Koiroa o te Koiora* discussion document and identified the following key themes to form the basis of the Auckland Council submission:

   a) support the overall intent, vision, values and principles of the proposals for the national biodiversity strategy, however the discussion document lacks logic to understand how the different parts of the framework are linked to achieve the vision. This needs to be clarified.

   b) the document does not link well with other government initiatives such as urban development, freshwater, resource management system review and biosecurity 2025. Auckland Council staff consider this is a missed opportunity.

   c) missed opportunities include the need for stronger links with climate change impacts on biodiversity, picking up on the urgency expressed through recent public support for change, and urban biodiversity opportunities.

   d) the proposed five key system shifts for implementation are not considered to be sufficiently transformative to achieve the vision.

16. Attachment A expands on these key themes.

17. Elected members are invited to provide feedback on the key themes identified, or other aspects of the discussion document, to staff by 13 September 2019.
18. The submission will incorporate feedback from elected members, local board members and Mana Whenua. Due to time constraints this report requests delegation to sign-off the final Auckland Council submission.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

19. Auckland Council staff with roles in biodiversity management are contributing to development of the submission. Watercare staff have indicated an interest in contributing to the draft submission.

20. As this is still a discussion document the future impacts of a new national biodiversity strategy are yet to be determined. However, it is likely to have resource implications.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

21. The reporting timeline is insufficient to enable local boards to provide formal feedback to inform this report. Local boards were notified of the proposed submission opportunity with a memo on 13 August 2019 and provided with key themes for the submission on 30 August 2019. Informal feedback from local boards to staff was requested by 9 September 2019.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

22. The discussion document proposes that the new national biodiversity strategy is founded on mātāpono/values from Te Ao Māori supported by Mātauranga Māori and science. These values are highlighted throughout the discussion document with specific long-term outcomes and goals identified for Māori.

23. Mana whenua representatives were notified of the proposed submission opportunity with a memo on 15 August 2019 and invited to provide feedback by 9 September 2019.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

24. There are no financial implications arising from approving a draft submission. The implications of a future national biodiversity strategy are yet to be determined.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

25. If Council does not make a submission, the Minister of Conservation will not be apprised of Auckland Council’s position on the proposals for the national biodiversity strategy.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

26. The final draft submission will be circulated on 17 September 2019 to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Environment and Community Committee, and an Independent Statutory Maori Board member from that committee for review and approval.

27. The Auckland Council submission will be submitted to DOC on 20 September 2019 (the closing date is Sunday 22 September 2019).

28. DOC will develop a new biodiversity strategy, taking account of submissions and feedback from regional workshops, for the Minister of Conservation. Cabinet will approve the final biodiversity strategy.

29. In 2020, DOC will commence discussions on implementation of the strategy.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Key themes for Auckland Council submission response on Te Koiroa o te Koiora</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Debbie Hogan - Principal Analyst - Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jacques Victor – General Manager Auckland Plan Strategy and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Council Submission on Te Koiroa o te Kolora – our shared vision for living with nature. A discussion document on proposals for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand

Key themes for submission
Auckland Council has organised its submission in response to the key elements, and questions, of the discussion document proposals for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand.

Overall comments
- Auckland Council supports the proposed vision, values and principles and need for a new biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand. However, the discussion document and proposed strategy framework lacks logic in how all the various parts of the framework fit.
- Auckland Council considers there are several missed opportunities in the discussion document proposals including:
  - the need to express urgency for restoring nature and support priorities and actions that will implement this urgency.
  - the failure of the discussion document to link well with other government initiatives such as urban development, freshwater, resource management system review and biosecurity 2025. All these initiatives have impacts on biodiversity.
  - stronger links with climate change impacts on biodiversity, picking up on the urgency expressed through recent public support for change, and urban biodiversity opportunities;
  - the five proposed key system shifts are not considered to be transformative. They rely on existing DOC work programmes or are already being undertaken across New Zealand, including by Auckland Council.
- Auckland Council as a unitary authority plays a key role in the biodiversity system for the Auckland region.

Part 1 of Strategy
How well does Part 1 of the discussion document set out the problem and consider the challenges and opportunities facing nature now and in the future?

- Auckland Council support the focus on ‘nature’, and the use of the term, in the discussion document proposals. Nature is a broader term that more people can connect with and respond to.
- Auckland Council does not consider that the key drivers and pressures related to biodiversity loss have been fully articulated, or the challenges in addressing these existing pressures particularly when combined with future pressures from climate change. Greater consideration should be given to the key pressures of agriculture,
urban development, legislation and regulatory barriers like the Resource Management Act on biodiversity loss.

- Auckland Council suggests that some reflection on the current biodiversity strategy, *Our chance to turn the tide*, would be useful particularly a discussion around aspects of the current strategy that worked well and what areas needed improvement.
- Auckland Council as a unitary authority plays a key role in the biodiversity system for the Auckland region. The discussion document does not fully recognise the full range of responsibilities that regional councils and unitary authorities have.

**Poutama strategy framework**

*What do you think of the proposed strategy framework? Does it provide a useful way of linking the elements of the strategy together?*

- Auckland Council support the overall framework and consider it is useful from a visual perspective. However, the framework is confusing as to how the values, tools and principles link together, and how it links with other parts of the discussion document such as the key system shifts and goals. Auckland Council suggest that the strategy framework, and wider discussion document, would benefit from a logic framework that clearly shows the direct links between different parts of the framework necessary to achieve the vision.

**Vision, values and principles**

*What do you think about the proposed values and principles?*

- Auckland Council supports the proposed matapopore/vision, values and principles outlined. The proposed values could be strengthened to ensure collaboration is a key value, as currently it is not mentioned while it is mentioned across the discussion document.
- Auckland Council is supportive of the 2070 timeframe for the new strategy. It is recognised that a lot can change over 50 years. A set of measurable goals that are regularly monitored and reviewed can ensure this timeframe is manageable.
- Auckland Council is generally supportive of the principles identified and particularly support the ‘Knowledge’ principles which support evidence-based decision making, along with the ‘courage’ to take innovative approaches to restoring nature and to not delay action due to a lack of complete information. Such a principle is necessary given the urgency of the nature crisis.
- Auckland Council supports the *in-situ* management principle on the basis that it is easier to conserve ecosystems and ecological processes in-situ, compared to other means.

**Long-term outcomes**

*What do you think about the proposed long-term outcomes?*

- Auckland Council are largely supportive of the eight long term outcomes identified in the strategy. It is suggested that some wording could be strengthened or clarified for
some of the outcomes. For example, the global outcome should be more aspirational such that New Zealand is seen as a global leader in biodiversity conservation and management, rather than making a meaningful contribution.

- Auckland Council support the focus on restoration in the long-term outcomes (i.e. Tiaki) and throughout the discussion document proposals. This recognises the growing interest in restoration and the need to continue to scale this up into the future.

- Auckland Council supports the outcome acknowledging the role that non-indigenous species and ecosystems play in biodiversity management, and the benefits they offer in providing suitable habitat to indigenous species. This reflects the interconnected and complex interactions of nature, particularly for a large urban area like Auckland.

*Is there anything you would add or change?*

- Auckland Council suggests a need to provide clearer direction on how a new biodiversity strategy intends to achieve these long-term outcomes. The discussion document does not provide clear linkages between the goals, targets, principles, actions, key-shifts, and how they will move towards the long-term outcomes. Clarity could be provided through a logic framework demonstrating how all these parts of any new strategy are connected.

**Goals**

*What do you think of the proposed set of goals?*

- Auckland Council support having goals in the new biodiversity strategy that are realistic, targeted and measurable. The goals proposed in the discussion document do not all meet these criteria and require further clarification. It is unclear in some proposed goals as to what the baseline will be measured from, and who will determine details such as ‘ten key freshwater pest species’.

- Auckland Council supports identifying goals for different timeframes but suggest that there needs to be additional goals between 2030 and 2050, and potentially between 2050 and 2070. Otherwise there is potential that the goals and vision may not be achieved if there are no opportunities to measure progress at regular intervals.

- As commented earlier, it is unclear how the goals fit into the poutama strategy framework. It is suggested that this be clarified in any strategy document. It would also be useful to map any goals to the long-term outcome areas, if possible.

**Implementation**

*What do you think about the proposed plan for implementation planning? What do you think are the requirements for a governance structure to oversee implementation planning and delivery?*

- Auckland Council considers that the discussion document lacks detail and discussion around funding and resourcing, including being innovative in how restoration of nature can be funded. It is important that any discussion on funding recognises that
regional councils across New Zealand are a critical part of the biodiversity system but vary in terms of how well they are resourced.

- Auckland Council suggest that any governance structure for the new biodiversity strategy should have representation across the biodiversity system, especially from regional and unitary councils given their role in the biodiversity system.
- Clarity needs to be provided as to how any governance structures for the new biodiversity strategy will link with other governance structures (i.e. Predator Free 2050). Auckland Council suggest that these structures need to speak to each other and not operate in isolation, as many of the actions are interconnected and overlapping.
- Auckland Council acknowledge the intention to develop a detailed implementation plan once the new biodiversity strategy is in place.

*What do you think about the proposal for progress reporting and review of the strategy? How do you think this reporting should take place to ensure it is useful, transparent, inclusive, and drives accountability?*

- Auckland Council support the five-yearly reporting and review process of the new strategy as this will promote accountability and enable an adaptive strategy.
- Auckland Council suggest that any review process for the new strategy is conducted independently, potentially by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, to ensure an honest and transparent appraisal of the progress and implementation of the strategy.

**Key shifts and Priority Actions**

*What do you think about the five system shifts? Are they the right areas to focus on in the near term? Are there other areas that should be included?*

- Auckland Council suggest that the five system shifts are good initiatives on their own and should be encouraged. However, Auckland Council does not consider the proposed shifts are transformational enough to significantly tackle and alleviate the current and future, pressures facing nature. It is suggested that they are not ‘shifts’ but rather ‘improvements’ to the current biodiversity system, some of which are already underway.
- Auckland Council support key Shift 1: Getting the System Right and suggest that this should be a key focus of the new strategy as parts of the system are a significant road-block to achieving effective outcomes for nature. It is encouraged that a greater focus on tackling legislative barriers and development pressures is included as part of this shift.
- Auckland Council supports Shift 4: Connecting ecosystems from the mountain tops to the ocean depths, which highlights the importance of landscape-scale restoration activities which is essential to restoring nature. This shift is embedded in the landscape scale approaches to Predator Free 2050 programmes.
- Auckland Council suggest that another shift could be based around better embedding restoration of nature into urban development, economic development and planning
considerations. These are some of the key drivers of biodiversity loss and changing how these pressures consider and value nature would lead to a fundamental shift in behaviour and outcomes. Such a shift would also highlight the interconnections between social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing.

*Do you agree with the proposed first steps? What other actions should be included?*

- Auckland Council generally support the proposed first steps and actions to be undertaken. However, short-term actions should indicate responsibilities, and whether they are funded or would require additional funding. This would improve transparency and delivery of the actions.
- Auckland Council note that many of the proposed actions in the discussion document are already captured in existing strategies, programmes and national directions. It is suggested that if these are carried through to the new strategy that new actions, and those already underway, are clearly identified along with how the actions connect with other strategies or programmes.

*General Comments / Improvements*

- There should be a mention of NZ’s international obligations to the Global Strategy for Plant conservation, and how this strategy supports them.
- A greater emphasis on threatened species and legislation to support them should be considered. For instance, there is currently no legal protection for threatened plants in New Zealand, along with incomplete knowledge of all the threatened species, and their distribution.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To note progress on the forward work programme (Attachment A)
2. To provide a public record of memos, workshop or briefing papers that have been distributed for the Committee’s information since 13 August 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
3. This is regular information-only report which aims to provide public visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo or other means, where no decisions are required.
4. The following papers/memos were circulated to members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/08/2019</td>
<td>Auckland Council staff feedback on proposals for an updated threat management plan for protecting Hector’s and Māui Dolphins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/08/2019</td>
<td>Memorandum extension to consultation dates for Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/08/2019</td>
<td>Memorandum product stewardship – waiting confirmation if the draft priority consultation submission needs to be added to this memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/08/2019</td>
<td>Memorandum SafeSwim 2018/2019 end of season update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/08/2019</td>
<td>Memorandum Project Hunua 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/08/2019</td>
<td>Memorandum International Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The following workshops/briefings have taken place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/08/2019</td>
<td>Haumaru Housing Workshop - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2019</td>
<td>Kaipara Moana Remediation workshop - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.

7. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: [http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/](http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/)
   - at the top of the page, select meeting “Environment and Community Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled ‘Extra Attachments’.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:
a) receive the summary of the Environment and Community Committee information report – 10 September 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Forward Work Programme</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Memorandum Auckland Council staff feedback on proposals for an updated threat management plan for protecting Hector’s and Māui Dolphins <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Memorandum extension to consultation dates for Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Memorandum product stewardship <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Memorandum SafeSwim 18_19 season update <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Memorandum Project Hunua 2018 <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Memorandum Draft Submission <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Suad Allie - Governance Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Priorities:
1. Clearly demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
2. Enable green growth with a focus on improved water quality, pest eradication and ecological restoration
3. Strengthen communities and enable Aucklanders to be active and connected
4. Make measurable progress towards the social and community aspects of housing all Aucklanders in secure, healthy homes they can afford
5. Grow skills and a local workforce to support economic growth in Auckland

The work of the committee will:
- Deliver on the outcomes in the Auckland Plan
- Be focused on initiatives that have a high impact
- Meet the Council’s statutory obligations, including funding allocation decisions
- Increase the public’s trust and confidence in the organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-Jun 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic approach to Climate Change**

To demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce emissions.

**Next steps**
- Develop draft plan March – May 2019
- Draft plan to committee for input and adoption June 2019
- Public consultation of draft plan July-August 2019

**Strategic direction** will be provided in the coming months.

**Progress to date**
- A summary of activities to prepare for climate change was given in the presentation on 8/8/17 meeting.
- Report was considered on 20/2/18, resolution ENV/2018/11
- Dec 18 – approval for consultation
- Feb – Mar 19 - targeted public engagement
- Apr 19 – feedback presented to elected members

**Progress to date** report was considered December 2018 meeting. Res ENV/2018/170
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019 9 April 14 May 11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019 9 July 13 Aug 10 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop scheduled 23 May 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report on Auckland’s Climate Action Framework Consultation draft and approach was considered on 6/11/2018, resolution ENV/2019/71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic direction and endorse programmes as part of the Low Carbon Auckland Plan implementation.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec 18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group (IAG) was approved. Chairs Planning and Env &amp; Community Ctees, an IMSB member and the Mayor’s office to decide on the membership of the IAG.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To deliver on Low Carbon Auckland Plan commitments by the design and implementation of awareness raising and incentives programmes to reduce household, community, business and schools carbon emissions by approximately 50% of current levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four-yearly review of strategic action plan due in 2018; increased engagement with and commitments via C40 Cities membership; development of proactive policy agenda to central government emerging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Forest Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Strategic approach to delivering on the wider social, economic and environmental benefits of a growing urban forest in the context of rapid population growth and intensification.</td>
<td>Decision on strategic direction and endorsement of strategy.</td>
<td>Q3  Q4  Q1 (Aug 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A workshop was held on 14/06/17. Report was considered on 12/09/17. ENV/2017/116 a full draft of the strategy was considered 20/02/18, res ENV/2018/12 with a report back on the results of the LIDAR and an implementation plan on costs and benefits in Aug 2018. An update was included in the 14 Apr agenda regarding several workstreams covered by the 18 high level implementation actions. A report on full progress on implementing the strategy TBC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund</strong></td>
<td>Decision making over medium and large funds from the Waste Minimisation and Innovation fund in line with the fund’s adopted policy. Funds to contribute towards council’s aspirational goal of zero waste to landfill by 2040.</td>
<td>Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year. Decide: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar) Q4 Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report was considered on 4/12/18 to note allocations for the 2018/2019 small to med September funding round, res ENV/2018/176, Item C1 approval of medium to large grants September 2018 round</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2019 - email to committee: small grants round opening 1 April to 30 April. A copy of the memo is attachment C of the Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information – updates, memos and briefings – 9 April 2019 report. – April agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland’s water strategy</strong></td>
<td>The health of Auckland’s waters is a critical issue. Both freshwater and marine environments in Auckland are under pressure from historic under-investment, climate change and rapid growth. The draft Auckland Plan 2050 identifies the need to proactively adapt to a changing water future and develop long-term solutions.</td>
<td>Decision and strategic direction and priorities as part of the Auckland Plan. Consider the development of an Auckland’s waters strategy to be adopted for consultation December 2018.</td>
<td>Q4 (June 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A report was considered on 12/06/18 to approve the proposed scope, timeframe and budget for the development of the strategy. Res ENV/2018/78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key milestones:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• June 2018 – develop a strategic summary of water related outcomes, identify integrated water outcomes,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019 FY19/20 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb 9 April 12 March 14 May 9 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 June 13 Aug 10 Sept Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Nov 2019 – high level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes – consultation with mana whenua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key timeframes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public consultation on discussion document 17 Feb – 17 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public engagement feedback to committee, April 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draft options for the finalisation of Auckland’s water strategy, and associated work programmes to be present to committee in June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop – April water discussion document, and to foreshadow and seek the councillors’ input on the contents of the report that will be coming to them in June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report</strong> was considered June 2019 – adopt the Our Water Future ō Tātou Wai Ahu Ake Nei framework Res ENV/2019/75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Pest Management Plan review</td>
<td>Statutory obligations under the Biosecurity Act to control weeds and animal pests. To ensure that the plan is consistent with the national policy direction and up to date.</td>
<td>Decision and strategic direction on weed and plants that will be subject to statutory controls. Consider submissions received on the draft plan in mid-2018 and adopt the final plan by December 2018. Decision: Agreed to the inconsistencies in ACT at the 14 Feb 2017 ENV/2017/7 Item 12 Workshops held on 4/04/17, 3/05/17 and 27/09/17 Draft plan was approved for consultation in Nov 2017 Funding for implementation of the proposed RPMP through LTP. A memo was distributed and is attached to the July agenda. Key milestones: • workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018 • workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar) Q4 Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Area of work: Inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan

**To ensure the plan is consistent with Auckland Council’s:**
- proposed Regional Pest Management Plan
- current and future marine biosecurity programmes
- response to SeaChange – Tai Timu Tai Pari Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan.

**Next steps:**
- Memo to local boards and mana whenua with the final discussion document and plans for informal public consultation February – March 2019
- Informal public and key stakeholder consultation March – May 2019
- Feedback and recommended next steps reported back to participating councils, including Environment and Community Committee and the Upper North Island Strategic Alliance July 2019

**Decision on the development of the discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan for public consultation.**

A memo was distributed on 31/05/18 advising the committee on the Auckland Council’s participation in the development of a discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan, through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity partnership.

**Progress to date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
<th>Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan</td>
<td>To ensure the plan is consistent with Auckland Council’s: proposed Regional Pest Management Plan current and future marine biosecurity programmes response to SeaChange – Tai Timu Tai Pari Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan.</td>
<td><strong>Next steps:</strong> Memo to local boards and mana whenua with the final discussion document and plans for informal public consultation February – March 2019 Informal public and key stakeholder consultation March – May 2019 Feedback and recommended next steps reported back to participating councils, including Environment and Community Committee and the Upper North Island Strategic Alliance July 2019</td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> 12 February 2019 report. To approve the discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan, ahead of informal public consultation between March and May 2019. Res ENV/2019/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation of the Regional Natural Heritage Grant</td>
<td>Decision-making over regional environment fund as per the grants funding policy and fund guidelines</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date</strong></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Item 16 to December 2018 committee to approve grant recommendations for the 2018/2019 Regional Environment and Natural Heritage Grant programme funding round. Res ENV/2018/175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management</td>
<td>The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management is being implemented, with periodic reporting to council committee on progress, and responding to ongoing central government refinement of the framework for achieving water outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council submission was approved on Central Govt. Clean Water Consultation 2017 process: Minutes of 4 April ENV/2017/54 Item 12. Follow up is required for resolution b) – a workshop held on 14 June. A supplementary submission on the Clean Water Consultation package was made on 25 May 2017, Item 14 13/06/17</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A report was considered on 26/6/18 : Res ENV/2018/78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- June 2018: develop strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- July to Oct 2018 – High level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes in consultation with mana whenua, local boards and key stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dec 2018 - Draft Auckland's waters strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for approval for release for public consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Feb to Apr 2019 - Targeted public engagement on the draft Auckland's waters strategy in February to March 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Apr 2019 - Feedback analysed and presented to elected members in April 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Jun 2019 - Final strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for adoption ENV/2019/75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Community Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information</strong></td>
<td>- updates, memos and briefings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> Report <a href="#">Item 9 to December 2018</a></td>
<td>committee meeting - To approve the Auckland Water Strategy discussion document, ahead of public consultation from 17 February 2019 to 17 March 2019. Res ENV/2018/168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of work</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reason for work</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decision or direction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expected timeframes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Auckland Growing Greener | Statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act, Biosecurity Act and Local Government Act. Consideration of items to give effect to the adopted commitment of Auckland Council to grow greener. | **Strategic direction** and oversight into council’s role to improve the natural environment, and to endorse proposed incentives. This may include endorsing:  
  - a framework to ensure planning and growth decisions are underpinned by relevant environmental data  
  - proposed incentives for green growth  
  - recommendations arising from a current state statutory obligations review. | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 |
| Food Policy Alliance | To consider food policy alliance | **Decision** on food policy alliance | TBC |
| Hunua Aerial 1080 Operation | Provide information on outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation | To note outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation. | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 |
| Parks, Sports and Recreation |                                                                                  |                                                                                        |                                             |
| Sport and Rec Strategic Partnership Grant to Aktive Auck Sports Rec | Approval of $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auck & Sport to deliver on agreed priority initiatives.  
2019 reporting schedule:  
  - January 2019 - Interim report from 1 July – 31 December 2018  
  - June 2019 - confirm 2019/20 priorities, outcomes and measures  
  - July 2019 – Annual report from 1 January 2019 – 30 June 2019  
  - September 2019 - Audited Financial Statements from 1 July 2018 – 30 June 2019 | To approve the $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport & Recreation for 2017/2018 |                                             |
| **Progress to date:** Report [Resolution ENV/2017/186](#) | Interim report from 1 July – 31 December 2018 – report back against KPI every six months. | A report was considered on 10 July 2018 to approve the strategic partnership grant of $552,000 per annum for a three-year term (2018-2021). Res ENV/2018/90 |                                             |
| | A funding agreement will be prepared for Aktive that ensures clear accountability and KPIs for each of the four geographical areas (North, West, Central and Southern) for the investment. (TBA) | | |
| Te Motu a Hiaroa (Puketutu Island) | Status update on the Te Motu a Hiaroa Governance Trust | To note further update on progress of the governance trust. | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 |

Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information - updates, memos and briefings - 10 September 2019
## Attachment A

### Item 17

**Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status report on implementation plan</td>
<td>Direction on future options for sport and recreation.</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• public consultation February to March 2019</td>
<td>Q3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• final approval of plan will be sought June 2019</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (June 2019) Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation of the plan will occur in stages over the next three to five years, depending on council budgetary and planning processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sports Investment Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status report on implementation plan</td>
<td>Direction on issues papers</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• public consultation February to March 2019</td>
<td>Q3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• final approval of plan will be sought June 2019</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (June 2019) Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation of the plan will occur in stages over the next three to five years, depending on council budgetary and planning processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Golf Investment Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status report on implementation plan</td>
<td>Direction on issues papers</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• public consultation February to March 2019</td>
<td>Q3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• final approval of plan will be sought June 2019</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (June 2019) Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation of the plan will occur in stages over the next three to five years, depending on council budgetary and planning processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indoor Courts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status report on implementation plan</td>
<td>Direction on issues papers</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• public consultation February to March 2019</td>
<td>Q3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• final approval of plan will be sought June 2019</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (June 2019) Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation of the plan will occur in stages over the next three to five years, depending on council budgetary and planning processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Western Springs Community School Partnership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status report on implementation plan</td>
<td>Direction on issues papers</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• public consultation February to March 2019</td>
<td>Q3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• final approval of plan will be sought June 2019</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (June 2019) Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation of the plan will occur in stages over the next three to five years, depending on council budgetary and planning processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb 12 March 9 April 14 May 11 June 9 July 13 Aug 10 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Programme</td>
<td>Update on proposed growth funding allocation for 2018-2020</td>
<td>Decision on growth funding allocation</td>
<td>FY19/20 Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012: TOR</td>
<td>The review will assess the efficacy of the guidelines in for the council to deliver the best possible outcomes for Auckland through community leases</td>
<td>Decision on the terms of reference for the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012</td>
<td>Progress to date: The TOR was approved for the review to commence and will report back in July 2018 subject to TLP. An update memo was circulated in August 2017 in response to feedback from the July 2017 meeting. Joint workshop with local board chairs held 20/6/18. Report was considered November 2018 and resolved ENV/2018/150.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation Investment and Visitor Experience</td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcome, priorities and investment for active walking, cycling, waterways and visitor experience on open space, parks and regional parks</td>
<td>Decision on scope and phasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Environment and Community Committee

10 September 2019

### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Takaro – Investing in Play discussion document</strong></td>
<td>Development of a play investment plan</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on approval for public release</td>
<td><strong>FY18/19</strong>&lt;br&gt;Q3&lt;br&gt;Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Approved on 16/05/17 for public release the <em>discussion document</em> and will report to E&amp;C for approval in late 2017&lt;br&gt;<em>Takaro</em> was <em>reported</em> to committee approved for release on 20 Feb 2018&lt;br&gt;A report back by August 2018 for approval to initiate public consultation</td>
<td><strong>FY19/20</strong>&lt;br&gt;Q1&lt;br&gt;(Oct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Parks Management Plan 2010 – variation to incorporate land at Piha into the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</strong></td>
<td>To approve variation to incorporate land purchased at Piha to be known as Taitomo Special Management Zone as part of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on approval to a variation</td>
<td><strong>FY18/19</strong>&lt;br&gt;Q3&lt;br&gt;(tbc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Approved on 20/2/2018 Res ENV/2018/15 report&lt;br&gt;Manager, Regional Parks, will prepare an integrated vegetation management and fire–risk reduction plan in consultation with the local community and report back on the resourcing needs for its effective implementation.</td>
<td><strong>FY19/20</strong>&lt;br&gt;Q1&lt;br&gt;(tbc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

#### The Southern Initiative (TSI)

- **Provide an update on the TSI approach, priorities and achievements.**
  - **Strategic direction** of the TSI approach to social and community innovation in south Auckland
  - **Progress to date:**
    - Monthly global engagement updates are published on each agenda
  - **Strategic direction** of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities
  - **Progress to date:**
    - Monthly global engagement updates are published on each agenda
  - **Progress to date:**
    - Monthly global engagement updates are published on each agenda
  - **Funded**

#### Global Engagement Strategy

- **Provide an update and direction of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities.** It has been three years since a new strategic direction was introduced, progress on this strategy will presented.
  - **Funded**

#### Options to expand revenue streams for sport facilities investment

- **Provide strategic direction to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft *Sports Facilities Investment Plan***
  - **Progress to date:**
    - A *report* was considered in Aug. Res ENV/2017/121
  - **Strategic direction** to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft *Sports Facilities Investment Plan***
  - **Progress to date:**
    - A *report* was considered in Aug. Res ENV/2017/121
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb 9 April 9 July 12 March 14 May 11 June 13 Aug 10 Sept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOCIAL, COMMUNITY, CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb 9 April 9 July 12 March 14 May 11 June 13 Aug 10 Sept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Community Facilities Network Plan
- **Update on progress and report back on strategic business case for central west.**
  - **Decision** on indicative business case for central west
  - **Progress to date:** A progress report was considered on 14 March. Resolution ENV/2017/36 Item 11 to report back on an indicative business case for investment in the central-west area.

#### Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan
- **Develop and endorse the Sports Facilities Investment Plan to enable Auckland Council to take a more co-ordinated approach to its sports facilities investment.**
  - **Decision** on the Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan.
  - **Decision** on sector’s investment priorities and investigate potential funding options.
  - **Progress to date:** The plan was endorsed on 12 Sept ENV/2017/118. Staff to report back on priorities and potential funding options.

#### Homelessness
- **Implementing Regional Policy and Strategy resolution to progress work around Council’s strategic position on addressing homelessness**
  - **Decision** on scope
  - **Decision** on role and direction addressing homelessness
  - **Progress to date:** Approved the scope policy 14 Feb Item 17
  - Auckland council’s position and role was considered at the August meeting report item 12. Staff to report back with an implementation plan. Resolution ENV/2017/118 of preferred position and role.

#### Facilities Partnerships Policy
- **Identify the range of current council approaches to facility partnerships, issues, opportunities and agree next steps**
  - **Next steps:**
    - January – March 2019 policy summary released
    - April – June 2019 implement initial operational guidance and systems
    - July 2019 detailed operational design and testing continues. Benefits realisation plan developed
  - **Decision** on facility partnership approach
  - **Decision** to adopt Facility Partnership Framework in December 2017
  - Update was given at 14 February meeting on Phase 1. Approval was given on the proposed timelines for Phase 2: Minutes 14 February Item 14 preferred option
  - A report seeking approval to engage on a draft facility partnerships policy on 12/06/18. Resolution ENV/2018/74
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decision on review results</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Report was considered at 20 Feb meeting. Decision: lies on the table. A supplementary report was considered on 10 April 2018, Res ENV/2018/46 and with changes for an updated funding model to be agreed by 1 April 2019 Report was considered at 14 May meeting, funding model decision Res ENV/2019/58</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Advice Bureaux Services</td>
<td>Review of the Citizens Advice Bureaux Services</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSP decision in April 2016 (REG/2016/22)</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong> (Feb)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Community</td>
<td>Strategic overview of social and community housing</td>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Strategy and initiatives</td>
<td>initiatives. Wider housing portfolio and spatial</td>
<td><strong>Q1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes of council's role in housing is led by the</td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Committee.</td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Intervention</td>
<td>Understanding NZ and international interventions to</td>
<td>Decision on future Auckland Council approaches to affordable housing interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>address affordable housing</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kauroa – Library Strategy</td>
<td>Libraries and Information is carrying out a change</td>
<td>Direction relating to priorities and to receive update on strategic direction and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme (Fit for the future) to accelerate the</td>
<td>implementation progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementation of this 2013-2023 strategy (approved</td>
<td><strong>Approve an expanded and improved regional mobile library service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the Governing Body)</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q1</strong> (Sep) <strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>workshop held on 7 March with local board chairs. Workshop notes were attached to the 10 April agenda</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central library strategic review</td>
<td>A strategic review of the Central Library has been</td>
<td>Decide direction and receive the strategic review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commissioned to understand how the current building</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can meet future need and demand for services, asses</td>
<td><strong>Q1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Central Library's current and potential future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>role in the region, and guide decision making about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future investment and development opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Work around the integration with customer services</td>
<td>Decision on matters relating to regional aspects of the proposed integration (local boards will decide on local outcomes)</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong> <strong>Q4</strong> <strong>Q1</strong> <strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Cities Network</td>
<td>Consideration of a proposal to join the Intercultural Cities Network to support implementation and monitoring of progress on ‘Inclusive Auckland’ actions.</td>
<td>Decide whether Auckland should be a member of the network</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong> <strong>Q4</strong> <strong>Q1</strong> <strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investing in Aucklanders (Age Friendly City)</strong></td>
<td>Identify issues and opportunities for an inclusive friendly city (Regional Policy and Strategy resolution REG/2016/92)</td>
<td>Strategic direction on the approach to a friendly, inclusive, diverse city.</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update reports were circulated on 18 April 2018 and 14 Dec 2017. Staff report findings and the proposed next phase in 2018.</td>
<td><strong>Q1 (Jul)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A report on the Findings was considered on 12/06/18 meeting. Resolution ENV/2018/75 approval for up to five inclusion pilots.</td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A report back on the advantages and any obstacles to Auckland becoming an Age Friendly City as part of the World Health Organisation’s Global Network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Enterprise approaches for youth and long term unemployed</strong></td>
<td>Improved understanding of social enterprise reach, impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on council’s approach to social enterprise.</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q1 (Jul)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth volunteer programmes</strong></td>
<td>Intervention assessment of youth volunteer programmes on long term education and employment – understanding impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on interventions approach</td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q1 (Jul)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Events Policy</strong></td>
<td>A review of what is working well and what isn’t</td>
<td><strong>Decision on interventions approach</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q1 (Sep)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Policy Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Audit of the application of the Grants Policy</td>
<td><strong>Decision on audit results</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toi Whitiki Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Targeted analysis of social return on investment on specific art and culture investment</td>
<td><strong>Decision on review results</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Art Policy</strong></td>
<td>Review of the Public Arts Policy; what’s working what’s not, Decisions relating to major public arts</td>
<td><strong>Decision on review results</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q4 (Apr)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Development Contribution revenue and expenditure – funding for open space purposes</strong></td>
<td>Highlight the new parks and open spaces for Aucklanders’ use and enjoyment</td>
<td>A report was considered on 14/08/178 on Open Space acquisition in 2017/18 financial year. resolution ENV/2018/104 to report back on DC revenue and expenditure by funding area for open space purposes based on current based on the current DC policy.</td>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation in North-west Community Provision</td>
<td>Investigation to identify any current gaps in services or facilities or in the future</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on the investigation findings</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019 Apr-Jun 2019 Jul-Sep 2019 Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A report will be considered at 13 August committee meeting</td>
<td>12 Feb 12 March 9 April 14 May 11 June 9 July 13 Aug 10 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Environmental Standards</td>
<td>Council response on the National Direction for aquaculture</td>
<td><strong>Direction</strong> Committee agreement to a council submission on the National Direction for Aquaculture</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expected following scheduled release of consultation document in April 2017. The National Direction is likely to address matters relating to re-consenting, bay-wide management, innovation and research, and biosecurity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic acquisition issues and opportunities</td>
<td>Understanding current acquisition issues and options.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition for stormwater purposes</td>
<td>Delegated responsibility of the committee. To acquire land for stormwater management and development purposes, to either support a structure plan or ad-hoc development.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> to acquire land. Reports will come to committee as required. Next report will be in Feb 2018 seeking authority to carry out compulsory acquisition of land in the Henderson area for a flood prevention project.</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb) Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Plan</td>
<td>Informing the development of the 2018-2028 Auckland Council Long-term Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic advisory panels' achievements in the 2016-19 term

File No.: CP2019/09103

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To note the achievements of the demographic advisory panels this term.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Demographic Advisory Panels have helped with council's engagement with Tāmaki Makaurau’s diverse peoples, as well as meet the challenges of our region’s super diversity, by:
   - Providing feedback on council's strategies, policies, plans, bylaws and projects
   - advising the council on ways to communicate and engage effectively with diverse communities
   - bringing to the attention of the council any matters that the panels consider to be of importance for, or concern to, their communities.
3. The Demographic Advisory Panels provided advice and advocacy through:
   - their open meetings and closed workshops
   - integrated panel meetings on topics of common interest
   - newly-established integrated panel meetings with the Governing Body and the Executive Leadership Team
   - a new initiative of co-hosting with the Community Development and Safety Committee on a theme of importance to each panel.
4. The panels also facilitated a range of community forums and open meetings and used social media and digital tools to support the council’s communications and engagement efforts with diverse communities.
5. This report provides an overview of the work of the demographic advisory panels over the term. Each panel has prepared its own end of term report, which provides more detail in the attachments (see Attachments A-F). A representative from each of the panels will attend the meeting to present their reports.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:
a) note the report on the demographic advisory panels for the 2016-2019 term.

Horopaki
Context
6. The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 S (9) specifies that one of the roles of the Mayor of Auckland is to ensure there is effective engagement between the Auckland Council and the people of Tāmaki Makaurau, including those too young to vote. The Mayor has the power to establish processes and mechanisms for the council to engage with the people of Tāmaki Makaurau, whether generally or particularly (for example, the people of a cultural, ethnic, geographic, or other community of interest).
7. The demographic advisory panels are one of the ways we comply with this legislative requirement, and they help us understand and meet the challenges of super diversity by:
   - reviewing and commenting on the content of council's strategies, policies, plans, bylaws and projects
   - advising council on ways to communicate and engage effectively with diverse communities
   - bringing to the attention of council any matters that the panels consider to be of importance for or concern to their communities.


9. The demographic advisory panels' terms of reference define the objectives and scope of the panels' work and are based on governing body resolutions.

10. The term of the six demographic advisory panels ends on 12 September 2019.

Meetings and work programmes

11. Panels hold monthly meetings which have been a combination of open meetings and closed workshops. The latter have allowed informal discussion between panels and council staff in early stages of policy and plan development.

12. Two or three integrated panel meetings have been held each year where all panel members were invited to come together to discuss key topics of common interest such as the Auckland Plan refresh, the Long-term Plan and Age Friendly Auckland.

13. From 2018, some of these integrated panel meetings have been held with the Governing Body and the Executive Leadership Team as a way of fostering more strategic connections between the panels and the council. Themes for the meetings have been identified in partnership with the panel chairs and have included transport and housing.

14. Panels have also nominated members to participate in cross-panel working groups on topics such as elections.

Panel priorities for the 2016-2019 term

15. In 2017 the panels developed their own work programmes with a focus on areas of importance to their respective communities. These work programmes were approved by the Environment and Community Committee and provided a framework for the panels in determining which council areas of work to get more actively involved with.

16. Priorities included housing, civic participation, environment, public transport, diversity and inclusion, accessibility and community safety.

Co-hosting the Community Development and Safety Committee

17. During 2019, a new approach was trialled, where each panel co-hosted with the Community Development and Safety Committee a meeting on a key theme of importance to their community. The goal was to include authentic voices of the community, possibly those not normally heard by the council, that would reinforce the issues and theme that the panel wished to present.

18. The topics covered in order of presentation were:
   - Seniors Advisory Panel on a smart age friendly Auckland
   - Pacific Peoples Panel on a Pacific friendly Auckland
   - Disability Advisory Panel on accessible housing
   - Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel on an inclusive future for Auckland
   - Youth Advisory Panel on transport accessibility, affordability and safety
   - Rainbow Communities Advisory Panel on belonging and participation.
Communication and engagement

19. The panels have been encouraged to support the council in its communication and engagement with diverse communities and to engage with their communities by organising community forums or by inviting the public to attend open meetings. These were intended to better inform the council of current community voices and to facilitate discussion between the council and diverse communities on council issues.

20. The panels organised a range of different types of events such as:

- The Disability Advisory Panel held fully accessible disability hui to support and encourage disabled people who may not normally be able to participate in council processes to engage through round table discussions.
- The Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel held open meetings around the region, inviting their communities to attend and to participate in round table discussions. Also, the panel created and launched a microsite to share stories from the community about the future of Tāmaki Makaurau.
- The Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel supported the Health and Hygiene Bylaw review process by facilitating a ‘Tatou Talanoa’ fono (meeting) to discuss council’s approach to tatou and a Youth Fono to discuss employment pathways to council.
- The Rainbow Communities Advisory Panel commissioned a piece of engagement research to understand the rainbow communities’ priorities and inform the panel’s work programme.
- The Seniors Advisory Panel hosted a community forum to gain input into the council’s Auckland Plan and Long-term Plan consultations and co-hosted a series of events to support work on the council’s work to become an Age-Friendly Auckland.
- The Youth Advisory Panel organised a range of events and activities including a pub quiz, supporting the elections team with engagement at university events as well as encouraging a range of youth groups to present at open meetings.

21. Advisory Panels have also been proactive in using social and ethnic media, as well as their networks to share council news and to communicate with their communities.

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

22. While the panels have been set up to advise on regional strategies, plans and policies, several of the panels have involved local boards in community-based open meetings and community forums.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

23. Each panel, except the Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel and Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel, has at least one member with lived experience in Te Ao Māori and knowledge of the contemporary issues facing Māori communities.

24. Advisory panels’ work programmes are aligned with the Auckland Plan that focuses on enabling Māori aspirations through recognition of Te Tiriti O Waitangi.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

25. Demographic advisory panels’ term ends on 12 September 2019, one month prior to the 2019 local government elections. A report to the September Governing Body meeting will outline the findings of a panel review to inform the incoming mayor and governing body on a future form of council’s engagement with diverse communities for the 2019-2022 term of council.
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