Date: Thursday 26 September 2019  
Time: 9.30am  
Meeting Room: Reception Lounge  
Venue: Auckland Town Hall  
301-305 Queen Street  
Auckland

Tira Kāwana / Governing Body

OPEN ATTACHMENTS

ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS UNDER SEPARATE COVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Summary of Governing Body and Committee information memoranda and briefings - 26 September 2019 including the Governing Body Forward Work Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Written briefing in lieu of August 2019 Watercare Governing Body workshop</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. America’s Cup Update</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Quality Advice progress and achievements (May 2017 – August 2019)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Memo - Planning Committee: National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Memo - Planning Committee: National Policy Statement on Urban Development</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Status Report - Regulatory Committee: Appeals Report for September 2019</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Submission on Central Government’s Essential Freshwater package</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. Workshop - Planning Committee: 21/8/19 - Roads and Streets Framework Review</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Workshop - Planning Committee: 19/9/19 - Highly Productive Land, Urban Development and Freshwater</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The attachments contained within this document are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. Should Councillors require further information relating to any reports, please contact the relevant manager, Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson.
**Memorandum**

To: Mayor Phil Goff, Auckland Councillors  
From: Rob Fisher, Company Secretary, Watercare  
Subject: Written briefing in lieu of August 2019 Watercare Governing Body workshop  
Date: 10 September 2019

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

Below is a written briefing on the four agenda items Watercare was going to present on at the recently postponed Watercare/Governing Body workshop.

1. **Water Resources Update**

As reported by email on 6 September 2019, our water storage situation is improving as the region continues to receive regular rainfall. For the week ending Sunday, 8 September 2019, total storage was 81.2%. However, the normal rainfall we have been receiving in the Hūna Ranges in August was not enough to make up for the shortfall we accumulated over the first seven months of this year. As a result, our total water storage level is still a lot lower than normal for this time of year (historical average is around 90%).

The weather forecast to end of the year suggests a ‘normal’ pattern with a potentially dry first six months of 2020. In light of the above, we are continuing two broad pro-active measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preserving water storage &amp; optimising our sources</th>
<th>Managing and reducing demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✌️ We are maximising our use of the Waikato River and Onehunga underground aquifer to reduce demand on our southern dams</td>
<td>✋ We’re continuing our media campaign encouraging Aucklanders to be mindful of their water use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✌️ We are working to minimise losses across the water supply system, including via a targeted programme of leak detection and repair. This ensures we deploy crews to the areas with the highest need.</td>
<td>✋ We’re identifying unauthorised users, including standpipe use and construction sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✋ We’re working closely with major users to encourage greater efficiency (including Auckland Council and CCOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✋ We’re developing new analytics to detect water demand anomalies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will continue to brief the Mayor, Councillors and Local Board members and will let you know if there are any changes to the current situation.

2. **Central Interceptor update**

- Sites handed to Ghella Abergeldie Joint Venture on 1 May 2019 with a formal dawn blessing.  
- Construction is now getting underway at Māngere.
- Major focus has been on:
  - Recruitment
  - Stakeholder Engagement. Activity to date has included newsletters, planting days at Mount Albert Grammar School and involving mana whenua in the project.
  - The Management Plan has been approved by Auckland Council
  - We have also commenced Health, Safety & Wellness inductions
- We have sought consent for the Grey Lynn Tunnel extension
  - We received a low level of submissions
  - We have worked with the submitters to negate need for hearing

### 3. Water regulation updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four proposed changes</th>
<th>How this will affect Watercare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2019 came into force 1 August 2019.</strong></td>
<td>Watercare has no Priority 1 drinking water non-compliances. Some of our Priority 2 technical compliance issues will likely require some planned future work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister can make minor and urgent changes quickly (previously 3 year consultation and 2 year implementation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers must now comply with drinking water standards - previously “take all practicable steps” only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Water Services Bill (to be Introdiced by end of 2019 and enacted by mid-2020)</strong></td>
<td>Watercare will meet any of the anticipated changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of drinking water, source water and some aspects of wastewater and storm water</td>
<td>There will be some requirement to demonstrate a commitment to drinking water quality management by Executive/Board leadership in possibly a similar manner to H&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation over a 5-year period</td>
<td>Requirement for accreditation and licensing with increased compliance monitoring and reporting likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require water suppliers to: Develop and implement source water risk management plans; Adopt a multi-barrier approach to drinking water; Prepare/update water safety plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Introduction of a centrally located new Regulator</strong></td>
<td>Government has indicated that significant investment in expertise is required. This is likely to impact Watercare as a significant holder of expertise and the limited pool of expertise in NZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide range of functions including: sector leadership, standards setting, compliance, monitoring and enforcement, capability building, information, performance reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. New national environmental standard (NES) for wastewater discharges and overflows</strong></td>
<td>It is uncertain if a NES would impose any greater requirements than already imposed by the Auckland Regional Council. The NES will be a minimum standard with Regional Councils able to place increased requirements on dischargers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Attachment B*
4. Waikato District Council (WDC)

On 16 August 2019 we signed a contract with WDC to deliver water, wastewater and stormwater services to 16,000 homes and businesses in the district from 1 October 2019. Mobilisation of Watercare staff has commenced.

There are financial and non-financial benefits

- The contract has a strong focus on better environmental outcomes.
- It will generate revenues of $30 million per year (around 3% of Watercare’s revenue). This will assist Auckland Council’s debt to revenue ratio.
- It allows Auckland Council and Watercare to showcase Watercare’s leadership in the water industry.
- The relationship provides further development opportunities for Watercare staff.
- Builds closer ties with Tainui
- Three core principles underpin the agreement:
  - Watercare will make an acceptable return.
  - There will be no cross subsidy from Watercare’s Auckland customers.
  - Watercare will continue to operate its business in accordance with our obligations under s57 and s58 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The contract has two phases</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Month Transition</td>
<td>has the potential to run for 27 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 October 2019 - 30 June 2021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Watercare will complete the condition assessment of assets and write an asset management plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Watercare will be responsible for end-to-end services – operating assets, managing networks and engaging with customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WDC will continue to engage with their customers – billing them, logging faults and responding to enquiries.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The waters assets will remain in the ownership of WDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Watercare will undertake consultation in accordance with Section 137 of the Local Government Act, with our Auckland customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• WDC’s water customers will contract directly with Watercare (hence the need to consult during Phase 1 as noted above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Watercare will continue to keep Auckland Council informed of developments via our Quarterly Reports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment B
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Memorandum

To: All elected members and the Independent Māori Statutory Board
Subject: Update on the America’s Cup programme
From: Martin Shelton - Programme Director America’s Cup
Contact information: americascuppmo@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To provide a progress update on the America’s Cup programme.

Summary
- This memorandum provides an update on the infrastructure upgrades and event planning underway in preparation for the 2021 America’s Cup event.
- An America’s Cup activation framework has been developed to ensure Aucklanders, stakeholders and visitors feel engaged and experience a range of benefits through hosting the America’s Cup in 2021. ‘Activating Auckland around America’s Cup’ has been provided as a separate file (see Attachment A), should you wish to share it with any community or business contacts who may be interested in activation opportunities arising from the America’s Cup.
- Detailed event and city planning for the America’s Cup is underway, and the infrastructure build is on track for delivery by late 2020.
- Leverage and legacy plans, currently under development, will focus on adopting multi-partner initiatives that deliver to the programme outcomes of place, economic wellbeing, participation and storytelling via a collaborative approach.
- The America’s Cup Programme Management Office will continue to provide progress updates to elected members and the Independent Māori Statutory Board in the lead up to the America’s Cup event in 2021.
- If you have any queries relating to this memorandum or the America’s Cup programme, please contact the programme management office at americascuppmo@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Context
2. The America’s Cup programme and the Wynyard Edge Alliance, responsible for delivering the essential infrastructure, were established in 2018 to enable Tamaki Makaurau, Auckland and New Zealand to host the 36th defence of the America’s Cup in 2021.
3. Background information on the America’s Cup programme was provided to all elected members in a memorandum dated 28 March 2019. Further workshop updates were provided to Devonport-Takapuna, Ōrākei, and Waitakere Local Boards, and Auckland City Centre Advisory Board in July 2019.

Update on America’s Cup challengers
4. Four challengers are confirmed for the 2021: Luna Rossa (Challenger of Record, Italy), American Magic, INEOS Team UK and Stars and Stripes Team USA. Malta Altus Challenge and DutchSail AC36 (Netherlands), late challengers for the America’s Cup, have withdrawn from the event.
Discussion

America’s Cup event planning and city integration

5. Auckland Council and the Crown (represented by Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment) have entered into a Host Venue Agreement with Emirates Team New Zealand and America’s Cup Event Limited.

6. The agreement defines the rights and obligations of each of the parties and allows for the detailed event planning to continue in close collaboration with America’s Cup Event Limited. Emirates Team New Zealand established America’s Cup Event Limited to manage the delivery of the America’s Cup events in Auckland for both the on-water racing and the America’s Cup race village.

7. An inter-agency steering group is progressing with event planning in the city and has established working groups that include the relevant agencies and America’s Cup Event Limited. These groups will plan the operational detail to ensure the city continues to function effectively in the lead up to and during the event.

8. To provide accurate data for event crowd and traffic management planning and delivery, Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development has contracted a crowd modelling expert to develop an understanding of high-pressure areas in Wynyard Quarter, Quay Street and the Race Village (to name a few).

9. An America’s Cup activation framework has been developed by Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development to ensure Aucklanders, stakeholders and visitors feel engaged and experience a range of benefits through hosting the America’s Cup (see Attachment A). The parameters and scope of the framework are determined by aspects of the Host Venue Agreement and event partnership obligations between the Hosts and America’s Cup Event Limited. Feasibility, budget and operational components are also key drivers of the framework.

10. The dates for the Prada Cup challenger selection series and the Christmas race are due to be confirmed by the Challenger of Record in mid-2020 as defined in the Protocol of the 36th America’s Cup.

11. The Challenger of Record and Emirates Team New Zealand are discussing the possibility of holding an additional America’s Cup World Series regatta in Auckland in November 2020. This is due to be confirmed by the end of November 2019.

America’s Cup infrastructure

12. Construction of the America’s Cup infrastructure is on track for delivery within the required timeframes. A detailed list of construction milestones for 2019 is provided in Table 1 below (green cells have been completed).

Table 1. America’s Cup programme milestones for 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision on Hobson Wynyard resource consent amendment expected from</td>
<td>End of March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council and Independent Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Venue Agreement (including Superyacht Agreement, Master-base</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement and Viaduct Event Centre Lease) finalised and signed by parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New permanent link road from Brigham Street to Hamer Street completed</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredging of the outer Viaduct Harbour completed</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berths and water space by Halsey Wharf handed over to Emirates Team New</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zealand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. The Wynyard Edge Alliance achieved its first two milestones in May 2019 by handing over the floating infrastructure for Base A. Emirates Team New Zealand and the delivery of Breakwater 8 located on the western edge of Hobson Wharf to provide the environment required for the Emirates Team New Zealand to launch their boats safely.

14. The building platforms for Bases C and D were handed over in early August 2019. Construction of the Hobson Wharf extension is progressing well. Work has started on Wynyard Point.

15. In addition to the America’s Cup infrastructure, the relocation of the Sealink ferry terminal and extension of the Daldy Street stormwater outfall are progressing well. Both are part of the auxiliary works budgeted for within the council’s current long-term plan.

16. Auckland Seaplanes was relocated to its new site allowing Wynyard Edge Alliance to carry out repairs to Wynyard Wharf.

**America’s Cup leverage and legacy**

17. The leverage and legacy project seeks to identify, maximise the opportunities and evaluate the outcomes from hosting the America’s Cup in 2021. Through targeted leverage and legacy activity, Auckland and New Zealand’s reputation can be enhanced to deliver on key environmental, economic, social and cultural outcomes.

18. Leverage and legacy frameworks, endorsed by Joint Chief Executive Group on 24 June 2019, have focused on coordinating and delivering shared initiatives, which support the four America’s Cup programme outcomes of place, economic wellbeing, participation and storytelling.

19. The frameworks will guide the leverage and legacy plans, which are currently being developed and will be presented to the Joint Chief Executive Group in late September 2019. These plans will focus on multi-partner initiatives that deliver outcomes via a collaborative approach, recognising the spirit and importance of collective action as expressed in the America’s Cup whakataukī:

He waka eke noa
Kia eke panuku, kia eke tangaroa
We’re in this waka together
Through all our efforts, we will succeed.
20. The Mana Whenua Kaitaki Forum is contributing to the development of leverage and legacy plans in relation to the mana whenua outcomes that the forum is seeking to achieve from the America’s Cup event. Mana whenua is also represented in the Leverage and Legacy Project Steering Group and in each of the workstreams; leverage, legacy, and data and evaluation.

**Next steps**

21. Elected members, the Independent Maori Statutory Board, and the Auckland City Centre Advisory Board (or equivalent following the local government elections) will continue to receive progress updates in the lead up to the America’s Cup event.

22. If you have any queries relating to this memorandum or the America’s Cup programme, please contact the programme management office at americascupmo@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

**Attachments**

**Attachment A** – Activating Auckland around America’s Cup
16 September 2019

Tēnā koe

Activating Auckland around America’s Cup

By way of background, as part of co-hosting the 36th America’s Cup (AC36) presented by Prada, Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED) has been tasked with leading the City Planning and Integration Project. Within this project, the Auckland-focused Activation Framework has been developed to achieve the primary objective ‘To ensure Aucklanders, stakeholders, and visitors feel engaged and experience a range of benefits through hosting the 36th America’s Cup’.

This activation framework will provide opportunities for organisations, communities and businesses to undertake leverage activity to generate additional environmental, economic, social and cultural outcomes in the form of an Auckland-focused AC36 activations programme over the period January 2021 to March 2021 in locations outside of the race village.

Delivery of the AC36 Programme is a partnership between the Hosts (Crown and Auckland Council), Mana Whenua and America’s Cup Event Limited (ACE) led by the Joint Chief Executive Group (AC36 JCEG), the governing body for AC36 Programme. The principle role of AC36 JCEG is to provide strategic leadership, decision-making and integration across the AC36 Programme, ensuring the programme vision, outcomes and benefits are achieved.

The Auckland-focused AC36 Activation Framework has been endorsed by AC36 JCEG and we have begun engaging with key stakeholders to make them aware of the opportunities to get involved in this project. The guidance document went live on 4 September 2019.

The framework aligns with the overall AC36 Programme vision to ‘Ignite the passion - celebrate our voyages’ and whakatauki ‘He Waka Eke Noa, Kia Eke Panuku, Kia Eke Tangaroa. We’re in this waka together. Through all our efforts, we will succeed.’ This vision was agreed by the Mana Whenua Kaiataki Forum.

There are two strands in the Activation Framework as a means of prioritising and allocating application support.

‘Strand One’ would be available to those events and communities within close proximity of the racing and race village, and are likely to be most impacted.

‘Strand Two’ would be available to those within the Auckland region who are not necessarily as close to the race courses or race village, but like ‘Strand One’ will seek to maximise opportunities due to the event being held in Auckland and will enhance the overall experience for local residents and visitors.

Resources will be prioritised to ‘Strand One’ as there is a need to manage public health and safety operational requirements and reputational expectations, ensuring a great experience for locals and visitors first and foremost, as well as meeting our Hosts’ obligations within the Host Venue Agreement. However, ‘Strand Two’ will play a large part in ensuring benefits and opportunities for Aucklanders are spread across the region.
To meet the criteria outlined within the Auckland-focused AC36 Activation Framework, applicants must align their plans to the Activation Outcomes which are encompassed under the Event Concept guiding principles: **Place, Economic Wellbeing, Participation and Storytelling,** which will result in achieving the primary objective: ‘To ensure Aucklanders, stakeholders, and visitors feel engaged and experience a range of benefits through hosting the 36th America’s Cup’.

In order to receive support for either Strand One or Two, there will be an application process outlined within the [guidance document](#) that has been developed and is available now.

Within Auckland, the focus must be from an operational delivery perspective to ensure the region is able to function during the delivery of the event (with health and safety being the primary factor), whilst also providing opportunities for those seeking to maximise benefits from hosting the 36th America’s Cup in Auckland.

A digital solution will be developed to deliver on the needs of the Auckland-focused AC36 Activation Framework under the umbrella of ATEED’s wider marketing strategy for the abundant event offering in Auckland 2021. The desired outcome is that the AC36 Activation digital solution will be integrated either within or alongside the event deliverer (ACE)’s official digital offering around key event information.

The Activation Framework is Auckland-focused due to the location of the event; however, it takes into consideration the Emirates Team New Zealand Fanzones (delivered by ACE) and acknowledges Crown as a host partner, reserving the right to be involved in leverage opportunities both within Auckland and across New Zealand.

If the Auckland-Focused Activation Framework interests you, your business or your partners, please contact AC36 Activations Lead Brad Pivac at [brad.pivac@aucklandnz.com](mailto:brad.pivac@aucklandnz.com) for further information.

Ngā mihi nui | Kind regards

Michael Goudie  
Relationship Manager 2021  
Major Events  
[michael.goudie@aucklandnz.com](mailto:michael.goudie@aucklandnz.com)
Memorandum
17 September 2019

To: Governing Body

Subject: 2016-2019 Sector Advisory Panel Evaluation

From: Carol Hayward, Principal Advisor Panels

Contact information: Carol.hayward@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To inform the Governing Body of the outcome of an internal evaluation of the sector advisory panels for the 2016-2019 term.

Summary
2. Sector panel members were surveyed to evaluate how well the 2016-2019 sector advisory panels have been working and inform recommendations and improvements.
3. This memorandum introduces the feedback received and next steps to provide recommendations to the incoming council.
4. Based on the evaluation, staff recommend that the Rural Advisory Panel and the Auckland City Centre Advisory Board be re-established in a similar format, but that the Heritage Advisory Panel purpose and remit be reviewed in the new term.

Context
5. During July and August, Democracy Services conducted a short online survey of sector advisory panels to inform the advice that will be provided to the Mayor and councillors in the 2019-22 term of council.
6. Feedback from these surveys was discussed at sector panel meetings in August to capture additional feedback and consider recommendations for the new term.
7. Questions covered the following topics:
   • what panel members felt were the biggest achievements during the term
   • whether the panel work was meeting the expectations of panel members
   • how the panels could support wider stakeholder engagement
   • what improvements could be made to the support that has been provided
   • what improvements could be made to the way other council departments engage with the panels
   • Other feedback about the way panel meetings were managed.
Discussion

8. Key findings of the evaluation are outlined below.

Rural Advisory Panel

9. Feedback on the panel’s key achievements covered the following key areas: freshwater planning – both within Auckland and the National Freshwater Policy Statement; the Auckland Plan refresh; ensuring the rural sector’s views are taken into account at the appropriate time in the process; the council’s response to the challenges of climate change; and to provide a forum for the exchange of information.

10. Members felt that the Rural Advisory Panel was generally working well and that this is a good mechanism to gain input from the rural sector into a range of policies, strategies and plans.

11. Members felt that the panel could focus more on where future aggregates and sand were going to come from; transport issues regarding rural roads; biosecurity and pest control; Auckland Plan implementation in rural areas; food security and elite soils; and ongoing involvement in water management, water quality and water supply.

12. Panel members felt that workshops with the wider environmental sector would be beneficial from time to time to consider topics of mutual interest.

13. Panel members feel well supported by staff but ideas for improvement included developing a forward programme of work and allowing more time to provide feedback on policy items where the members needed to consult their own organisations.

Auckland City Centre Advisory Board

14. Feedback on the Auckland City Centre Advisory Board’s (ACCAB’s) key achievements covered the following key areas: providing more robust, rigorous and focused advice; securing funding for Access for Everyone; completing Freyberg Square and O’Connell Street upgrades; improving outcomes on both Albert Street and Lower Queen Street; supporting the upgrade of James Liston Hotel; encouraging the council and CCOs to join up their thinking; work to improve the information and timing of that information to make better decisions; and review of the City Centre Targeted Rate (CCTR) criteria and programme.

15. Members felt that the strategic role of ACCAB was working well in the areas of; defining strategic focus and advice to council; level of impact the board has made to the council’s strategies and policies; and how well the CCTR investment portfolio responds to the board’s strategic focus.

16. ACCAB members feel that their focus is helping to drive positive change within the city centre, however, board members feel that the council could work more closely across different departments and the council family to ensure that discussions are joined up at an early stage and that improvements are implemented quicker.

17. In general, ACCAB members feel well-supported but would like more support to communicate the board’s work programme for circulation with the city centre stakeholder groups and networks.

Heritage Advisory Panel

18. Feedback on the Heritage Advisory Panel’s (HAP’s) key achievements included: support for the heritage team and providing advice on regional heritage matters to staff; supporting the ihumatao situation; providing an outside voice when reviewing council processes in the heritage field; providing a forum for public groups to present heritage matters; and “surviving”.

19. Panel members also voiced frustration that the panel had no direct conduit to council committees. They felt that the council had little interest in heritage matters and that the panel’s
views or recommendations were not being heard or considered during decision-making processes.

20. The HAP feel well supported by the heritage team but that the panel is being used as “window dressing” by other parts of the council who they feel misunderstand their role.

21. HAP members have suggested a number of options for improvement such as greater engagement with local boards, heritage forum meetings for a wider group of groups interested in heritage, increased focus on bi-cultural and Maori heritage, involvement of the development sector and re-establishing a direct conduit to a council committee.

Next steps

22. Based on this evaluation, staff recommend that the Rural Advisory Panel and the Auckland City Centre Advisory Board be re-established in a similar format. Minor tweaks to the terms of reference may be proposed to the incoming council based on the feedback received.

23. Staff recommend that the purpose and remit of the Heritage Advisory Panel be reviewed in the new term. For example, this may be better suited to be reconstituted as a Heritage Forum that meets 2-4 times a year rather than an advisory panel.

24. Following the election, Democracy Services will provide additional advice to the incoming Mayor and councillors on the establishment of sector advisory panels and the changes that might be made to meet recommendations from the evaluation process.

Attachments

Rural Advisory Panel Members Survey Report
Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Members Survey Report
Heritage Advisory Panel Members Survey Report
Rural Advisory Panel Members Survey Report

2 August 2019
What do you think has been the panel's biggest achievement this term (2016-2019)?

Summary of responses:

- Freshwater planning – both in Auckland and the National Freshwater Policy Statement
- The Auckland Plan refresh
- Ensuring the rural sectors views are taken into account at the appropriate time in the process
- Council's response to the challenges of climate change
- to provide the forum for exchange of information
What would you like to see more of (eg specific topics, workshops with other groups)?

Summary of responses:

- where Auckland's future aggregates and sand are going to come from
- transport issues regarding rural roads (not just the state of them) but use by agricultural machinery and the issues that arise from them
- biosecurity and pest control
- Auckland Unitary Plan implementation in rural areas
- successes/failures and state of the environment
- food security given elite growing soils in Auckland are being buried under tarmac, concrete and buildings
Summary of responses:

- Current mix of balance is good
- Less telling more asking by Council
- was only one issue where the entire by-law review was presented
- when only that applicable to rural area would have been appropriate
In general, do you think the discussions in your meetings are at the right level?
Why do you say that

• The best discussions involved matters that were topical at the time they were being discussed
• Discussions tend to be well considered and from a common perspective of having the best interests of Auckland’s rural productive sector at heart
• Council staff are open and thorough in their presentations
• Collaborative approach within the panel and between the panel and Auckland Council staff
• Panel are encouraged to be open and frank in their discussion
How could the panel assist the council to reach other stakeholders who would have an interest in its work?

- By circulating among its membership in the area
- I think the Panel is generally made up of key sector representatives and their respective communication/membership networks are probably the best reach mechanism
- Some panel members are involved with other groups, particularly environmental groups. They could feed back through those groups the work the Panel is doing, and thereby assist the Council involve those groups.
About meetings

Overall, how strongly do you agree or disagree that meetings

- i - Are frequent enough
- ii - Are well organised and prepared for
- iii - Are productive
- iv - Help me better understand the operations of the council
Your voice during meetings

During panel meetings do you feel your voice...

- 4 - Strongly agree
- 3 - Agree
- 2 - Disagree
- 1 - Strongly disagree

- ii - Is respected
- i - Is heard

Auckland Council
Do you have any comments about your ratings above?

- The meetings are chaired very efficiently and everyone gets a chance to ask questions and or be heard
- The Panel achieves its aims by working with the Council officials
- There is a great deal happening, frequency of meetings barely manages to keep up with all that is happening
- Still issue that while agendas are timely that not all presentation available until at meeting or after.
- The fact that I have been unable to answer some questions indicates opportunities to sharpen up.
About support staff

How much you agree or disagree with the following

- 4 - Strongly agree
- 3 - Agree
- 2 - Disagree
- 1 - Strongly disagree

- iii - Support staff are approachable and easy to work with
- ii - Support staff keep me well informed
- i - Support staff offer timely and useful advice
Staff presenting at panel meetings

Now we’d like to ask you about the staff who come to your meetings to seek advice and recommendations. How much you agree or disagree that these council staff...

- v - Attribute these recommendations to your panel in reports and plans
- iv - Clearly explain follow-up processes
- iii - Provide you with information in a timely fashion
- ii - Provide quality material e.g. PowerPoint presentations
- i - Clearly explain in papers / reports what advice they want from the panel
How can council staff seeking your advice and recommendations better work with you?

- Staff are more than welcome to follow up with a phone call or email to get clarification or advise
- I would prefer to be able to see presentations prior to the meeting
- Maybe if we had a schedule / programme of work at the beginning of the year of matters that Council want to discuss
- Many of us are representatives from larger organisations so may need considerable lead time to consult on policy issues
- Some matters have been referred to panel members, other than at RAP meetings which provided the opportunity to feed back into the Council on matters that are important, but which may not engender widespread interest.
Do you have any other comments about your sector panel including any concerns or areas for improvement?

- A key part of the success of this panel and enjoyment of participating in meetings is down to the involvement of Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore, who does an outstanding job chairing this panel.
- The Panel has been functioning for eight years and has as far as I can establish provided a rural perspective for the Council that would otherwise not have been available. Continuance of the Panel will become even more relevant as we face the climate change and associated issues that will confront the Council.
- The rural farming community is facing an environmental challenge like never seen before. It is top of their worry list and the messages that come from the council are taken very seriously. I guess the main issue is that they are treated fairly in terms of fixing these environmental problems.
Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Members Survey Report
28 August 2019
What do you think has been the board's biggest achievement this term (2016-2019)?

Summary of responses:

- Providing more robust, rigorous and focused advice
- Securing funding for Access for Everyone
- Completing Freyberg Square and O’Connell St upgrades
- Improving outcomes on both Albert St & Lower Queen St
- Decision to support upgrade of James Liston Hotel
- Encouraging Council and the CCOs to join up their thinking
- Work to improve the information and timing of that information to make better decisions
- Review of the CCTR criteria and programme
Strategic role of ACCAB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>How well this is working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining strategic focus and advice to council</td>
<td>88% very well, 13% well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact the board has made to the council’s strategies and policies</td>
<td>13% very well, 88% well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well the City Centre Targeted Rate Investment Portfolio responds to the board’s strategic focus</td>
<td>38% very well, 63% well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the council’s process for establishing the City Centre Targeted Rate Investment Portfolio</td>
<td>50% very clear and robust, 25% clear and robust, 25% not clear and robust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments on strategic role

Selection of responses:

- “The recent discussion and review to the CCTR was very welcome, with a general view in the board that the use of the CCTR had deviated from what was originally envisaged.”
- “The Board has made great strides this year in getting our strategic focus right”
- “The board is remarkably united. There is a clear desire for change in the city centre from the people we represent, specifically for faster change.”
- “Process still takes precedence over outcomes”
Are discussions in your meetings are at the right level?

13% completely agree and 88% agree that discussions in the meetings are at the right level:

- “Our discussions are usually on point and focused”
- “Some members can go off on side-tracks...[or]...re-litigate issues that have been decided.”
- “..CRL and AT need to front at the same time, and be more responsive”
- “Sometimes there is not time left for discussion once presentations have finished.”
How could the panel assist the council to reach other stakeholders who would have an interest in its work?

- “Not sure this is our role. We give a lot of our time and energy as it is”
- “By having a broad as possible membership”
- “More communications about the ACCAB and the work programme in a way that could be shared with our various organisations and industries.”
- “It has been important to raise the bar in terms of the investment programme rationale and the level of respect and trust between the board and council [which] will underpin the growth of new stakeholder relationships”
About meetings

Overall, how strongly do you agree or disagree that meetings

I. Are frequent enough
II. Are well-organised and prepared for
III. Are productive
IV. Help me better understand the operations of the council

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Your voice during meetings

During panel meetings do you feel your voice...

- I feel respected
- I feel heard

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Agree
4 - Strongly agree
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Do you have any comments about your ratings above?

- “Main concern is that the length of presentations is sometimes too long – especially at workshops…perhaps more details on the agenda paper, shorter presentations."
- “I would like to see a commitment to getting the board papers at least 5 working days prior to a meeting”
- “Agendas have and will continue to improve now the review work is complete”
- “There has been quite a bit of churn with administrative support but generally the staff are supportive and can pick up where others left off”
About support staff

How much you agree or disagree with the following

- iii. Support staff are approachable and easy to work with
- ii. Support staff keep me well informed
- i. Support staff offer timely and useful advice

1 - Strongly disagree  2 - Disagree  3 - Agree  4 - Strongly agree
Staff presenting at panel meetings

How much you agree or disagree that staff who come to your meetings to seek advice and recommendations...

v - Attribute these recommendations to your panel in reports and plans

iv - Clearly explain follow-up processes

iii - Provide you with information in a timely fashion

ii - Provide quality material e.g. PowerPoint presentations

i - Clearly explain in papers / reports what advice they want from the panel
How can council staff seek your advice and recommendations better work with you?

- “There’s always the suspicion of attempts to control boards through the selective supply of information (too much, too little, too early, too late, irrelevant etc.) but that’s true of every board!”
- “A big bugbear for me is low resolution visual material. Please, every map, plan, chart or slide must be legible.”
- “Some of the PPP use more time than is necessary when often the information required is already in the meeting papers.”
- “On the whole staff present as both honourable and conscientious... If we begin to suspect there is some preconceived outcome selected by higher up... this will likely only stimulate further interrogation and interest from the board.”
Do you have any other comments about your sector panel including any concerns or areas for improvement?

- “I think Viv Beck has done an excellent job to refocus the work that the Board does into a more strategic approach.”
- “I appreciate the hard work of the individuals, but there is room to improve the co-ordination, collaboration and communication between parts of Council.”
- “This is a critical time for cities everywhere... AKL is fortunate that significant strategic transport infrastructure is being delivered... but the streets are lagging behind... AKL lacks both quality open space (at all scales) and trees.”
Heritage Advisory Panel Members Survey Report

27 August 2019
What do you think has been the panel's biggest achievement this term (2016-2019)?

Summary of responses:

• “Surviving”
• Support for the heritage team and providing advice on regional heritage matters to staff
• Supporting the Ihumātao situation
• Providing an outside voice when reviewing council processes in the heritage field
• Providing a forum for public groups to present heritage matters
Frustrations

- “the council took very little if any notice of the panel viewpoints or recommendations”
- “it has been difficult for the panel to meet its aims of protecting heritage given the structural context that we operate within.”
- “the heritage advisory panel has not had a direct conduit to council committees..”
- “the council…has very little interest, especially in the built heritage or development of historic precincts area”
In general, do you think the discussions in your meetings are at the right level?
Why do you say that

- “Our discussions are at the right level but advice is not listened to”
- “The panel began with a good mix of heritage activists and professionals. Some have left and were not...replaced and more recently there has been a decline in attendance...”
- “There have been too many agenda items simply informing the panel about interesting matters that require no action nor raise any wider issues. That has not been the best use of the panel’s time.”
How could the panel assist the council to reach other stakeholders who would have an interest in its work?

- Promoting and educating stakeholders about the role and work of council...through networks – could be formal or informal
- The panel requires communication support in order to reach other stakeholders including hand-out material or information that is distilled to be able to be circulated
- Need more young representation, greater engagement with local boards and stronger Maori and Pacific input
About meetings

Overall, how strongly do you agree or disagree that meetings

i - Are frequent enough
ii - Are well organised and prepared for
iii - Are productive
iv - Help me better understand the operations of the council
Your voice during meetings

During panel meetings do you feel your voice...

i. Is heard

ii. Is respected

1 - Strongly disagree  2 - Disagree  3 - Agree  4 - Strongly agree
Do you have any comments about your ratings above?

- “Re meeting frequency, they’re not frequent enough to deal with the matters they potentially could”
- “...there should be some time during the meeting for free ranging discussion and that time should be scheduled early in the meeting, not at the end.”
- “I agree that our voices are heard and respected “in the meetings” however I strongly disagree that this is the case within the wider council”
- “Heritage Panel advice does not directly reach councilors or council committees”
About support staff

How much you agree or disagree with the following:

- Support staff are approachable and easy to work with
- Support staff keep me well informed
- Support staff offer timely and useful advice

![Bar Chart]

Legend:
- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Agree
- 4 - Strongly agree
How can support staff better support you?

- “Heritage unit staff are dedicated and easy to contact and deal with. The panel supports them in their work endeavours, but wishes they had a greater budget allocation, to achieve better heritage identification and protection.”
- “The panel is often not advised of the current state on heritage issues in the council, without asking for information.”
- “Support staff would be able to support the panel better if the previous structure was reinstated.”
- “We could be provided with access to information about current consents, through local boards and/or a liaison in the consents unit.”
Staff presenting at panel meetings

How much you agree or disagree that these council staff...

- i. Clearly explain papers/reports what advice they want from the panel
- ii. Provide quality material e.g. PowerPoint presentations
- iii. Provide you with information in a timely fashion
- iv. Clearly explain follow-up processes
- v. Attribute these recommendations to your panel in reports and plans

Legend:
- 1 - Strongly disagree %
- 2 - Disagree %
- 3 - Agree %
- 4 - Strongly agree %
How can council staff seeking your advice and recommendations better work with you?

• “Have a serious engagement and exchange of information and include the outcomes in their work and policy development. Be pro-active in considering heritage aspects impacting on their work area.”

• “When there is consultation, it seems to be window dressing most of the time.”

• “Giving the council control over its agenda would be a start, along with a more comprehensive set of minutes”

• “It would be helpful if the Panel was given continuously updated feedback on how Council was receiving and acting upon its advice.”
Do you have any other comments about your sector panel including any concerns or areas for improvement?

- “The panel is there to be critical thinkers and provide advice, not just be rubber-stampers.”
- “Meetings should return to 8 per year (still only 1 every 6 weeks) to better respond and advice on current heritage matters.”
- “Heritage Panel to be able to directly present to councilors and committees – ie have a standing slot with the appropriate committee to briefly present Panel advice, and present community concerns.”
- “There needs to be greater focus on the concerns and priorities raised by Panel members as distinct from those of the staff.”
Memorandum 1 September 2019

To: Political Advisory Group members

Subject: Quality advice progress and achievements (May 2017-August 2019)

From: Judith Webster- Manager Governance Capability

Contact information: judith.webster@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To summarise quality advice progress and achievements made during the term of the current Quality Advice Political Advisory Group.

Summary
2. In February 2017 the Finance and Performance Committee established a Quality Advice Political Advisory Group to provide direction to the quality advice programme.

3. The advisory group has provided a decision-maker perspective on a large number of quality advice initiatives including ones focused on measuring progress, priority areas to improve, training opportunities for advisors and guidance for staff.

4. In addition, the chair of the advisory group has led several communication activities with staff and elected members. These have been focused on setting advisory expectations and involving elected members in the quality advice improvement journey.

5. Quality advice highlights over the current term of council include: improved elected member satisfaction with the overall support and advice they receive as well as improved satisfaction with reports and verbal advice at meetings; the best NZIER rating of the quality of our reports received to date; and an independent evaluation by NZIER of the quality advice programme itself concluding that it is one of the best they have seen.

6. The annual review and refresh of the programme will be undertaken around November once the 2018 NZIER results are received.

Context
7. The quality advice programme is a key initiative under council’s organisational strategy. It focuses on improving the quality of advice and support provided to elected members.

8. In February 2017 the Finance and Performance Committee established a political advisory group to support the quality advice programme.

9. The advisory group consists of three Governing Body representatives, three local board representatives and one Independent Māori Statutory Board representative. It was established to provide guidance and a decision-maker perspective to the quality advice programme.
10. This memo outlines quality advice progress and achievements made during the term of the current political advisory group.

Discussion
Political advisory group membership

11. The original membership of the political advisory group was:
   - Daniel Newman - Manurewa-Papakura Ward Councillor
   - Desley Simpson - Orakei Ward Councillor
   - Falanaka Efeso Collins - Manukau Ward Councillor
   - David Collings - Chair Howick Local Board
   - Josephine Bartley - Chair Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board
   - Tracy Muiholland - Chair Whau Local Board
   - David Taipari - Independent Māori Statutory Board.

12. During the term, Councillor Fa’anana Efeso Collins and local board members Josephine Bartley and Tracy Muiholland stepped down from the advisory group. They have been replaced by:
   - Paul Young – Howick Ward Councillor
   - Colin Davis – Member Orakei Local Board
   - Peter Haynes -Chair Albert Eden Local Board.

13. At its first meeting, Councillor Desley Simpson was appointed chair of the advisory group for the current political term.

Achievement highlights

14. Good progress towards providing quality advice has been made over the term of the political advisory group.

15. Key highlights for the period 2017-2019 are summarised in the paragraphs below.

New Zealand Institute of Economic Research assessments show improvements in our reports

16. In 2018 the New Zealand Institute of Economic Research (NZIER) assessed council reports as the best they have been since council began having them assessed in 2012.

17. When benchmarked against other local government reports assessed by NZIER in 2018, Auckland Council reports came out on top.

18. In addition, when benchmarked against central government agencies, council moved up ten places from 16th to 6th out of 18.

NZIER assessed the quality advice programme as one of the best they’ve seen

19. An independent evaluation of council’s quality advice programme by NZIER in 2018, concluded that this is one of the best quality advice programmes they have seen. In particular they noted that the programme is well-planned, has created quality training and guidance for staff and has managed to actively engage the organisation in the task of driving quality advice improvements. Active governance, including from the political advisory group, was also identified as a strength.
The 2019 Elected Member Survey shows improvements in some areas of advice and support

20. Compared to the 2017 results, the 2019 Elected Member Survey results show:
- An increase in overall satisfaction with advice and support provided by council employees (from 53% to 60%).
- An increase in the quality of written advice at council meetings (from 55% to 64%).
- An increase in the quality of verbal advice at council meetings (from 62% to 68%).

21. Attachment A provides key results from the Elected Member Survey and the 2018 NZIER assessments.

Areas for improvement

22. Each year we review and refresh the quality advice programme and set priority areas for improvement for the next calendar year. The 2019 areas of focus are presented in Diagram 1 below.

23. The 2020 priorities will be set towards the end of this year.

Diagram 1. 2019 areas of focus for quality advice improvements
Areas of political advisory group involvement and influence

24. Over the current term the political advisory group has provided input and guidance across a broad range of quality advice programme initiatives and activities. Table 1 presents a summary of the key areas benefiting from political advisory group input.

Table 1. Political Advisory Group’s Inputs and outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative / activity</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Annual reviews of the quality advice programme to set priorities for calendar years 2018 and 2019. | These annual reviews ensure the quality advice programme is current and focuses on the needs of decision-makers.  
The reviews identify specific advisory areas for the organisation to improve each year. It draws on information from a range of sources including the NZIER results, elected member survey results, and input from staff and senior leaders.  
Progress against the priority areas are monitored and to date improvements have been shown in Māori impact statements, executive summaries, the crafting of recommendations and purpose statements. Examples of robust options identification and analysis are also emerging. |
| Development of a new political report template: 2017-2018 | A new political report template was introduced in late 2017 and amended slightly following a six-month implementation review.  
An interim quality advice survey of elected members was carried out about four months after the new template was introduced. Most of the areas of reports surveyed (those with new headings and/or new supporting guidance for staff) were thought to have improved by at least third of respondents, with most others neutral in their assessment.  
The most recent Elected Member Survey shows a lift in satisfaction with written advice at council meetings. It is likely that the new report template has contributed to this result. |
| Māori Impact Standards: 2017-2018 | A set of Māori Impact Standards were developed to help staff better reflect how their advice impacts Māori.  
The standards were tested through an initiative focused on the Planning Committee (see below) and found to be helpful.  
Following the committee initiative, the standards were reviewed, amended and published for staff.  
The annual NZIER results show an improvement in our Māori Impact Statements. The standards, together with learning opportunities and guidance will have contributed to this result.  
However, a deeper dive into how staff identify and report on impacts has shown a need to improve these impact statements by covering implications and opportunities for mataawaka as well as mana whenua. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative / activity</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Planning Committee initiative: 2017 | The purpose of this initiative was to lift the quality of reports to the Planning Committee generally and improve Māori impact content specifically. 

The initiative included monthly reviews of Planning Committee reports with feedback given to authors and managers to help lift the quality of reports. 

Report authors were supported to improve their analysis of Māori impacts through a support package consisting of training, guidance and standards. 

Using NZIER ratings, reports were assessed over a six-month period and moved from being considered borderline to being adequate\(^1\). |

| Independent review of the quality advice programme: 2018 | In 2018 NZIER evaluated the quality advice programme. 

NZIER concluded that the programme is one of the best they have seen and noted in particular: 

- that it is well thought out and well planned and includes a comprehensive culture change element to ensure it becomes embedded 
- that it has strong governance sponsors, steering group, political advisory group 
- that some components of the programme are already becoming embedded 
- that some development work remains to be done (e.g. focusing on verbal advice and segmenting the market more). |

| Development of impact assessment guidance for staff: 2017-2019 | Over 2017-2019 several tools and guidance documents to help staff do impact assessments were developed. 

These included general impact assessment guidance, as well as a focus on local, regional and sub-regional impacts, Māori impacts and economic impacts. 

Feedback from staff through surveys and through the NZIER assessment of the quality advice programme indicates that staff find these resources helpful. |

| Environment and Community Committee initiative: 2018-2019 | This is a joint quality advice/ diversity and inclusion initiative aimed at improving our analysis of and reporting on social and community impacts. It is focused on the Environment and Community Committee. 

Each quarter, a selection of reports has been independently assessed against a set of criteria. The first assessment covered the period from September to November 2018 and set the baseline against which to measure progress. 

Authors are advised of the results and improvement areas to focus on. They are also supported by learning and development opportunities and guidance. |

\(^1\) NZIER ratings are: 5 = poor; 6 = borderline; 7 = adequate; 8+ = good. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative / activity</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Environment and Community Committee initiative: 2018-2019 (cont.) | Quarterly assessments for the periods December 2018 to February 2019 and March to June 2019 have been completed. Improved performance has been noted in some key areas, including:  
  - 42 per cent of Q1 and Q2 reports identified a range of impact types, compared to 31 per cent of baseline sample  
  - 74 per cent of Q1 and Q2 reports identified multiple impacts compared to 38 per cent of baseline sample  
  - 90 per cent of Q1 and 2 reports identified 1+ social impact, compared to 48 per cent of baseline sample. |
| Quality advice measures and targets: 2018 -2019          | In 2018, with the political advisory group’s input, the quality advice programme developed and trialled distributional NZIER targets.  
  The 2018 trial targets and results were:  
  - No poor reports (less than a score of 6): target met  
  - 75% reports assessed as adequate (score of 7+): target exceeded with 84% achieving this score.  
  - 35% reports assessed as good (score of 8+): target not met with 28% achieving this target.  
  Following input from NZIER, the political advisory group and the steering group of senior managers, 2019 targets have now been set as follows:  
  - No poor reports (less than a score of 6)  
  - 80% reports assessed as adequate or better (7+)  
  - 30% reports assessed as good or better (8+).  
  The 2019 results are due around November 2019. Each year these targets will increase. |
| Interim quality advice elected member survey: 2018       | Auckland Council decision-makers were surveyed in May and June 2018 about their views on the quality of advice they receive from council staff.  
  The survey aimed to provide a snapshot, in between the major Elected Member Survey, of overall advisory performance and the effectiveness of quality advice programme initiatives.  
  The themes from the survey were also tested through discussion with the chairs of local boards and with chairs and deputies of governing body committees of the whole. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative / activity</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interim quality advice elected member survey: 2018 (cont.)</td>
<td>The key findings that also align to those of the most recent Elected Member Survey, included that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• most respondents were satisfied with the overall quality of advice, but not its timeliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• governing body respondents were more satisfied than local board respondents with the quality of advice they receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• areas of reports most likely to drive satisfaction were ’financial implications’ (53%) and ’consideration of options’ (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• local board member respondents observed a good deal of inconsistency in the advice they receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• satisfaction with recent verbal advice was high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• there was dissatisfaction with Auckland Transport’s engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These results informed the 2019 quality advice priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal advice training for staff: 2017-2019</td>
<td>Verbal advice training for staff has been developed through a series of pilots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A verbal advice toolkit is now available to managers to help them run sessions to introduce their teams to meeting protocols and expectations. The quality advice programme will also organise some sessions for staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work is now underway to develop practice-based sessions. Initially there will be a focus on local board workshops which have been identified as a particular area of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To date feedback from staff has been positive. And it is good to see elected members feeling more satisfied with the verbal advice they receive at council meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional and departmental quality advice action plans: 2017-2019</td>
<td>Quality advice action plans were introduced as a way of encouraging divisions and departments to drive their own quality advice improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To date six plans have been developed and one is in development. In many instances, quality advice actions are now included in the newly introduced Elected Member Survey Action Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality advice action plans seem to be having a positive effect. Reports in those areas with quality advice action plans tend to have NZIER results that are above the organisation’s average NZIER score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and elected member communications from the political advisory group: 2017-2019</td>
<td>Over the current term, the chair of the political advisory group has communicated regularly with both staff and elected members about quality advice expectations and progress. These communications have been well received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In summary these communications have included:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An article on the council staff intranet site (Kotahi) on quality advice and what elected members are looking for.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initiative / activity | Outcomes
---|---
Staff and elected member communications from the political advisory group: 2017-2019 (cont.) | • A Kotahi article providing Mayor Phil Goff and Councillor Desley Simpson’s thoughts on quality advice.
• A presentation to Auckland Council’s senior leaders providing a ‘customer view’ for advice.
• A series of update emails to elected and IMSB members on quality advice progress and activity, NZIER results, the interim elected member survey results.
• An introductory video on quality advice as part of the Elected Member Development programme.
• A presentation to the Local Board Chairs’ Forum and all councillors to encourage them to complete the 2019 Elected Member Survey.

Next steps

25. The results of the 2019 NZIER review are scheduled for November 2019.

26. The annual review and refresh of the quality advice programme is scheduled for November/December 2019. It will set priorities for the 2020 calendar year.

Attachments

• **Attachment A**: key quality advice performance graphs
Attachment A. Key quality advice performance graphs

NZIER Results 2012 - 2018

NZIER - Auckland Council benchmarked against central government results for 2018

Proportion of reports less than adequate compared to good or better
Elected Member Survey 2019 - overall satisfaction with advice and support

Overall satisfaction with advice and support provided by council employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elected Member Survey 2019 Quality advice results

Overall quality of written advice at council meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of verbal advice at council meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of written and verbal advice provided at workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeliness of formal advice and information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsiveness to general requests and queries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

30 August 2019

To: Planning Committee
From: Ryan Bradley, Principal Planner, North West and Islands, Plans and Places
Peter Vari, Team Leader Planning North West and Islands, Plans and Places

Subject: Proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land

Context

The Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) and the Ministry for the Environment have released a discussion document on national direction for protecting Highly Productive Land, including proposed wording for a National Policy Statement (NPS). The need for the national direction has arisen from concerns over the loss of New Zealand’s elite soils through urban encroachment and rural lifestyle development.

The proposed NPS will direct councils to protect Highly Productive Land from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and maintain their availability for primary production. Highly Productive Land will need to be defined by councils for their regions. In the interim, the NPS will use the Land Use Classification (LUC) system classes 1-3 as a ‘placeholder’ for Highly Productive Land. A map of the Auckland region showing the areas of ‘Elite’ and ‘Prime’ land as defined by the Unitary Plan (Land Use Capability classes 1-3) is shown in Attachment A.

The proposed wording of the NPS states that Highly Productive Land does not include existing urban areas or areas zoned Future Urban in a District Plan. This means that for Auckland, the next 30 years of planned urban expansion (into the Future Urban zone) is not impacted by this NPS. A summary of the Proposed NPS is contained in Attachment B.

Public submissions are open from 14 August to 10 October 2019. Auckland Council will make a submission that will be signed off by delegated councillors (resolution GB/2019/75).

Over the past year Auckland Council (along with other stakeholders) has been involved in early consultation on this matter through workshops, correspondence with MPI, and supplying information around development on highly productive land in Auckland.

Outside this Proposed National Policy Statement further work by central government is expected to progress in 2020 to address declining soil health as a result of past and present agricultural practices. This work is likely to focus on soil contamination, soil compaction, and erosion. The government will also be releasing related updated national direction on Urban Development and Freshwater which may have cross-overs with protecting Highly Productive Land.

The Planning Committee will have a workshop on the Proposed NPS (and other related national direction) on 19 September.
Possible themes for feedback
Some questions that Planning Committee members may wish to consider before the workshop are:

- Is there support in principle for national direction on highly productive land?
- Is a National Policy Statement the best tool?
- Should any National Policy Statement apply to existing urban zoned land / Future Urban zoned land / Countryside Living zoned land?
- Is there support for some scope for the council to enable urban and/or lifestyle development on highly productive land or do you prefer an absolute protection of it?
- Is there support for the process of Auckland Council identifying highly productive land for Auckland (based on criteria) or do you prefer the approach of using the interim LUC1-3 method being made permanent?
- What other areas outside LUC1-3 would you consider might be worthy of being covered by the National Policy Statement (i.e. what criteria would you use to define highly productive land)?
- What sort of buffers might be necessary around identified highly productive land?

Timetable
The table below sets out the key timeframes for the council submission on the proposed NPS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 September</td>
<td>Workshop with Planning Committee on council submissions on various national directions including the Proposed NPS on Highly Productive Land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September</td>
<td>Deadline for local board and IMSB formal feedback so it can be considered for the final Auckland Council submission and be appended to the end of the submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 October</td>
<td>Send final council submission to the delegated councillors for signoff and lodgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 October</td>
<td>Closing date for submissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 October</td>
<td>Copy of final council submission circulated to Governing Body members, local board members and the Independent Māori Statutory Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next steps
The Planning Committee will have a workshop on this NPS (and other national direction) on 19 September.

Key contacts
Any queries on the process or content of the Proposed NPS can be directed to Ryan Bradley, Principal Planner, Plans and Places (021 949 658 or ryan.bradley@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz).
Attachment B – Summary of the Proposed National Policy Statement (NPS) on Highly Productive Land

- The government has identified the loss of NZ’s elite soils through urban encroachment and rural lifestyle development as a matter of national importance. This is an issue in Auckland in a number of areas but most notably around Pukekohe where Highly Productive Land has been and is being urbanised.

- The purpose of the NPS is to protect Highly Productive Land from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and maintain their availability for primary production. Inappropriate development would include rural lifestyle development and urban development. However, urban development can be considered on Highly Productive Land where it can be demonstrated that there is a shortage of capacity and other options for growth have been examined but are not feasible.

- The tool of a National Policy Statement essentially directs councils to follow it. This can be a good thing where certainty of outcomes is wanted. This is relevant to Auckland where the Unitary Plan has some fairly strong objectives and policies to protect elite and prime soils, but resource consent decisions are undermining this resulting in ad-hoc development on elite and prime land (i.e. self-storage facilities, schools). The NPS could mean that rather than the council having to provide large amounts of evidence for resource consent or plan change hearings with regards to Highly Productive Land, the council can simply point to the fact that it must be consistent with the NPS.

- Highly Productive Land will need to be defined by councils for their regions. In the interim, the NPS will use the Land Use Classification (LUC) system classes 1-3 (which the Auckland Unitary Plan defines as elite and prime soil) as a ‘placeholder’ for Highly Productive Land. This would cover about 20% of Auckland’s land area. When Auckland Council undertakes the exercise to define Highly Productive Land (based on criteria in the NPS) it could mean some LUC 1-3 is taken out (i.e. already heavily fragmented/built upon) or some lower classes of land are added in (i.e. vineyard areas on LUC 4-5).

- The proposed wording of the NPS states that Highly Productive Land does not include existing urban areas or areas zoned Future Urban in a District Plan. This means that for Auckland, the next 30 years of planned urban expansion (into the Future Urban zone) is not impacted by this NPS (despite areas of Auckland’s Future Urban zone sitting on LUC 1-3 land). What will be impacted is any urban expansion beyond that onto Highly Productive Land, either long term by the council or short term via private plan change requests or resource consent applications.

- There have been some concerns raised in the media about the potential of the NPS to push up house prices by removing land from potential urbanisation and therefore making land more scarce. However, in the context of Auckland the above bullet point is very relevant. Auckland has already identified and zoned its long term urban expansion areas (which are unaffected by the NPS) so this NPS has not changed any of the identified urban capacity in Auckland. The council will continue to monitor the uptake of urban development through the NPS on Urban Development Capacity. In the future if a shortage is identified the council can look to either identify some urban areas for intensification or identify new greenfield areas for urban expansion (which must not be on Highly Productive Land). While further urban expansion of Auckland is limited by various constraints (including Highly Productive Land), it is not prevented in all areas and there are some potential long term (i.e. beyond 30 years) areas for greenfield expansion that would avoid the main constraints.
A discussion document on the Proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land can be found here:

Further information and summary documents on the Proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land can be found here:
Memorandum

28 August 2019

To: Planning committee members and Local Board members
Cc: Local Board Relationship Managers, Local Board Advisors and Senior Local Board Advisors, Independent Māori Statutory Board Secretariat
Subject: Discussion Document on the National Policy Statement for Urban Development
From: Amanda Harland, Lead Growth and Spatial Strategy Advisor; Growth, Transport and Spatial Strategy

Purpose

1. The purpose of this memo is to provide elected members, Local Boards and the Independent Māori Statutory Board information on the Proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development.

Summary


3. This will replace the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS UDC).

4. The NPS UD broadens the focus of the NPS UDC 2016 beyond urban development capacity, to include other matters that contribute to well-functioning urban environments. It will build on many of the existing requirements to provide greater development capacity, but will broaden its focus and add significant new content.

5. The NPS UD is part of a package that will work with other initiatives from central government including a National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS HPL).

6. The Planning Committee and Local Board chairs will be invited to attend a workshop on 19 September where all three draft documents will be considered together.

7. Submissions to the NPS UD discussion document close on Thursday, 10 October 2019.

8. Auckland Council will make a submission that will be signed off by delegated councillors.

9. Local Board feedback is due by Monday, 16 September 2019.

Context

10. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Development and the Ministry for the Environment have released a discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD). This will replace the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS UDC).

11. Public submissions are open from now through to 10 October 2019. Auckland Council will make a submission that will be signed off by delegated councillors (GB/2019/75).

12. When the policy statement is approved by cabinet, it will replace the current NPS UDC 2016 and will build on existing requirements for local authorities to provide greater development capacity for supply of housing to meet demand.
Summary of the discussion document

13. The NPS UD broadens the focus of the NPS UDC 2016 beyond urban development capacity, to include other matters that contribute to well-functioning urban environments. It will build on many of the existing requirements for greater development capacity, but will broaden its focus and add significant new content.

14. NPS UD is proposed to contain objectives and policies in four key areas:

**Future Development Strategy** — requires councils to carry out long-term planning to accommodate growth and ensure well-functioning cities.

**Making room for growth in RMA plans** — requires councils to allow for growth ‘up’ and ‘out’ in a way that contributes to a quality urban environment, and to ensure their rules do not unnecessarily constrain growth.

**Evidence for good decision-making** — requires councils to develop, monitor and maintain an evidence base about demand, supply and process for housing and land, to inform their planning decisions.

**Processes for engaging on planning** — ensures council planning is aligned and coordinated across urban areas, and issues of concern to Iwi and hapu are taken into account.

15. The NPS UD is part of a package that will work with other initiatives from central government including a National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS HPL). Submissions on this document also close on 10 October 2019. The National Policy Statement on Fresh Water is yet to be released. All three documents will be discussed at a Planning Committee workshop on 19 September 2019.

16. Local board feedback is due to Amanda Harland, Lead Growth and Spatial Strategy Advisor by 16 September 2019.

17. The discussion document on the Proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development can be found here:

https://www.mfe.govt.nz/consultations/nps-urbandevelopment

18. Information on the 2016 version of the National Policy Statement can be found here:


Likely themes for feedback

19. Some questions that the Local Boards may wish to consider are:

- Is there support in principle for national direction on urban development?
- Is a national policy statement the best tool to deliver quality urban environments and make room for growth or are there other tools under the RMA or other legislation or non-statutory tools that would be more effective?
- Is there support for the proposed approach to provide national level direction about the features of a quality urban environment?
- Are there alternative ways to address urban amenity through a national policy statement?
- Is there support for requiring zone descriptions in district plans will be useful in planning documents for articulating what outcomes communities can expect for their urban environment?
- Are prescriptive development requirements such as location and density controls necessary or appropriate at the National Policy Statement level?
- Is there support for inclusion of a policy to provide for plan changes for out-of-sequence greenfield development and/or greenfield development in locations not currently identified for development?
• Do you agree that local authorities should be limited in their ability to regulate car parking?
• Is there support for central government to have more directive intervention in Auckland Council’s plans?
• Is there support for inclusion of policies to improve how local government works with iwi, hapu and whenau to reflect their values and interests in urban planning?

Feedback timetable

20. The timeframes for making submissions are tight. The table below sets out the key timeframes for local board input into the discussion document:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 September</td>
<td>Deadline for local board formal feedback so it can be considered for the final Auckland Council submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 September</td>
<td>Workshop with Planning Committee and Local Board Chairs for council submissions on various national directions – the proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development, the proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land and Fresh Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 October</td>
<td>Closing date for Auckland Council submissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 October</td>
<td>Copy of the final Auckland Council submission circulated to the Governing Body members, local board members and the Independent Māori Statutory Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next steps

21. Due to tight timeframes and the overlapping nature of the national directions that are being consulted on, a draft submission will not be sent to local boards prior to lodgement.

22. As the Proposed NPS progresses we will come back to you when the NPS is finalised by the government (early 2020) to provide you with the final wording of the NPS.

Key contacts

23. Any queries on the process or content of the discussion document can be directed to Amanda Harland, Lead Growth and Spatial Strategy Advisor: amanda.harland@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.

24. Once local board feedback has been formalised (either by business meeting minutes, urgent decisions or delegated feedback), Local Board Services staff will email this feedback to Amanda Harland for incorporation into Auckland Council’s submission on the discussion document. Due to the short timeframes for this submission, local board feedback may be included verbatim at the end of the submission.
Resource Consent Appeals: Status Report 12 September 2019

File No.: 

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update of all current resource consent appeals lodged with the Environment Court.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report provides a summary of current resource consent appeals to which the Auckland Council is a party. It updates our report of 31 July 2019 to the Regulatory Committee.
3. If committee members have detailed questions concerning specific appeals, it would be helpful if they could raise them prior to the meeting with Robert Andrews (phone: 353-9254) or email: robert.andrews@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) in the first instance.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Regulatory Committee:


Horopaki
Context
4. As at 2 September 2019, there are 34 resource consent appeals to which Auckland Council is a party. These are grouped by Local Board Area geographically from north to south as set out in Attachment A. Changes since the last report and new appeals received are shown in bold italic text.

5. The principal specialist planners - resource consents, continue to resolve these appeals expeditiously. In the period since preparing the previous status report, there have been six new appeals and one appeal resolved.

6. Three new appeals relate to the grant of resource consents for the establishment of a 24-hour automated service station at 66 Vauxhall Road, Devonport. The Thomas appeal from an immediate neighbour, and the Vauxhall Neighbourhood Society appeal oppose the grant of consent or as an alternative, conditions that will reduce the scale of the operation. Gull New Zealand Limited opposes those conditions that limit the hours of operation at night, the need for on site management during fuel deliveries and vibration standards during construction.

7. The Green and Biles appeal is to the decision of Auckland Council to grant resource consent to construct a dwelling at 59 Piha Road, Piha. The applicants R Taylor and D Palmolungo seek to locate the dwelling within a building platform specified by Consent Notice. The appellants’ concerns relate to the objectives and policies for ridgeline protection and the effects of the dwelling on the visual quality of the natural ridgeline.
8. Albert Street Holdings Limited appeals the refusal of their application to construct an office building and associated carparking at 10 Albert Street, Pukekohe. The consent proceeded without notification being found that the environmental effects were not more than minor however it was then refused as being contrary to some of the objectives and policies for the Business - Mixed Use Zone.

9. The appeal Ross Holdings Limited is against a decision to refuse consent to construct a 268m², 119 seat café on the corner of Beach and Great South Roads, Takanini. The consent proceeded without notification being found that the environmental effects are not more than minor however it was then refused as being contrary to the objectives and policies for the Business – Light Industrial Zone. The decision expresses concerns as to the scale of the café (proposed as a Kream café) activity being contrary to those objectives and policies that seek to avoid activities that may compromise the efficiency and primary function of the light industrial zone.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

10. To receive the report as provided.

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

11. Not applicable.

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

12. Not applicable.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

13. The decision requested of the Regulatory Committee is to receive this progress report rather than to decide each appeal.

14. The Resource Management Act 1991 includes a number of matters under Part 2, which relate to the relationship of Tangata Whenua to the management of air, land and water resources. Māori values associated with the land, air and freshwater bodies of the Auckland Region are based on whakapapa and stem from the long social, economic and cultural associations and experiences with such taonga.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

15. Environment Court appeal hearings can generate significant costs in terms of commissioning legal counsel and expert witnesses and informal mediation and negotiation processes seek to limit these costs. Although it can have budget implications, it is important that Auckland Council, when necessary, ensure that resource consents maintain appropriate environmental outcomes and remain consistent with the statutory plan policy framework through the appeal process.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

16. Not applicable.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps
17. Not applicable.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Current Appeals as at 2 September 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Infocouncil will insert the name of the attachment as saved in HPRM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Robert Andrews – Principal Specialist Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Ian Smallburn – General Manager Resource Consents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RODNEY – Local Board Area (3 Appeals)

### Attachment H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Appellant

**Goatley Holding Limited**

**Received**

| 27 June 2019 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ENV-2019-AKL-000133

Council: BUN60328269, LUC60328290, DIS60328291, WAT60328292 and LUS60328463.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Auckland Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Land between State Highway 1 and Matakana Road at Warkworth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

An appeal to resource consents associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the Matakana Link Road – Tuhonhoro ki Tai (Pathway to the Sea), a new 1.35km road between State Highway 1 (SH1) and Matakana Road at Warkworth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iwi comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Iwi consultation undertaken and conditions of consents provide for cultural monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Yet to be timetabled.*

---

#### Appellant

**Stelian Trust**

**Goatley Holding Limited**

**Received**

| 4 June 2019 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ENV-2019-AKL-000099

ENV-2019-AKL-000097

Council: BUN60322627, LUC60322701, WAT60322704, DIS60322702, DIS60323625 and LUS60323625

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Multiple Properties Between Hudson Road and 102 State Highway 1, Warkworth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Appeals to resource consents (and a Notice of Requirement) associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of a widened State Highway One at Warkworth, being the intersection with the future Matakana Link Road. (There is a related confirmation of a Notice of Requirement for alteration of designation 6763) The appellant’s submission seeks a reduced extent of designation and provision for access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iwi comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Iwi consultation undertaken by applicant. The Requiring Authority is to prepare a Protocol for any accidental archaeological discoveries during Construction Works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Yet to be timetabled.*
### Hibiscus and Bays - Local Board Area (1 Appeal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Auckland Council (Community Facilities)</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>22 December 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>ENV-2017-AKL-00075 Council – SUB60069647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site address</td>
<td>Orewa Beach Esplanade Reserve, between Kohu Street and Marine View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parties</td>
<td>Four 274 parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Appeal by the applicant against council’s decision to refuse consent to the construction of a seawall, walkway and accessory access structures at the Orewa Beach Esplanade Reserve, between Kohu Street and Marine View.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi comments</td>
<td>Cultural values assessments were prepared by Ngati Manuhi and Ngai Tai Ki Tamaki that confirmed conditional support for the application. The environment is highly modified and accidental discovery protocols are sought. The application was publically notified and no submissions from Iwi were submitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Court heard from the parties, and by minute of 22 February 2018 set the appeal down for a pre-hearing on jurisdiction over the right to appeal and determined that an amicus curiae should be appointed. Affidavits prepared for the pre-hearing set for 9 April 2018 that proceeded as scheduled. The Court on 2 May 2018 released its decision confirming jurisdiction over the Council’s right to appeal. A pre-hearing of 31 July 2018 discussed timetabling, possible mediation dates and sought the appellant to clarify the appeal issues. Court assisted mediation took place on the 21st and 22nd of February 2019. The substantive issues have been addressed and agreed between the main parties, some s.274 parties have not agreed. The matter proceeded to Court hearing, for the full week of 6th May 2019. <strong>Waiting decision from the Court.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEVONPORT TAKAPUNA – Local Board Area (3 Appeals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellants</th>
<th>Gull New Zealand Limited Thomas Vauxhall Neighbourhood Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site address</td>
<td>66 Vauxhall Rd, Devonport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Demolish existing structures and establish a 24-hour automated service station. An appeal from the applicant to conditions of consent and two appeals from a neighbour and group of neighbours opposing the grant of consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi comments</td>
<td>The application did not trigger any requirement for a Cultural Impact Assessment or raise any Iwi or Treaty Issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>New appeals awaiting direction from the court.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Region-wide Appeals Register – 12 September 2019**
## WAITAKERE – Local Board Area (2 Appeals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Trustees of Forest Trust and Successors</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>19 July 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site address</strong></td>
<td>199 Anzac Valley Road, Waitakere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other parties</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Appeal against hearing decision to uphold in part and dismiss in part a section 357 objection to conditions and costs of a subdivision resource consent (SUB-2011-63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iwi comments</strong></td>
<td>The application did not trigger any requirement for a Cultural Impact Assessment or raise any iwi or Treaty issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>Appeal lodged on 26 July 2018. Environment Court decision to refuse appeal issued 18 December 2018. <strong>Appealed to the High Court however there is now a five year stay imposed by the Court against any current or new appeals lodged by P. Mawhinney of the Forest Trust.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Green and Biles</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>25 July 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
<td>ENV-2019-AKL-000151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site address</strong></td>
<td>59 Piha Rd, Piha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>R Taylor &amp; D Palmolungo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other parties</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Appeal to the grant of landuse consent to construct a dwelling. The appellants’ concerns relate to the objectives and policies for ridgeline protection and the effects on the visual quality of the natural ridgeline of the proposed dwelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iwi comments</strong></td>
<td>The application did not trigger any requirement for a Cultural Impact Assessment or raise any iwi or Treaty issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>New appeal. Mediation scheduled for 5 September 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALBERT-EDEN – Local Board Area (1 Appeal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Panuku Development Auckland Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>ENV-2017-AKL-000176 Council – LUC60303721 &amp; DIS60303722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site address</td>
<td>196-202 and 214-222 Dominion Road and 113-117 Valley Road, Mt Eden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Appeal against a hearing commissioner’s decision to refuse resource consent for a mixed use development comprising four new buildings with 102 residential units, nine retail units and 115 carparks. The commissioner’s grounds for refusal related to the bulk and scale of the proposal and the associated visual, shading and dominance effects, and the adverse effects on Special Character values from the loss of the Universal Building (a character-supporting building).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi comments</td>
<td>The application did not trigger any requirement for a Cultural Impact Assessment, attract submissions from iwi or raise Treaty issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Appeal regarding a development that has generated media, political and local interest. Council has met on a without prejudice basis with the appellant (18 and 24 September 2018). Court assisted mediation occurred on 31 October 2018, no agreement reached between the parties. Further informal discussion between the parties (December 2018). Second court-assisted mediated occurred on 16 January 2019. Mediation agreement reached – subject to various conditions being satisfied. Council to report back to the Court as to progress by 15 February 2019. A number of the s274 parties have requested further time to consider their positions. Council has filed a memorandum with the Court seeking a judicial conference on the first available date after 15 March 2019. Pre-hearing conference scheduled for 2 April 2019. The pre-hearing conference held on 2 April 2019 confirmed that the matter will proceed to a hearing on or after 15 July 2019. A timetable for evidence exchange has been issued. The Court has issued a notice of hearing confirming that the hearing will commence of 19 August 2019. Hearing commenced 20 August and was adjourned 27 August 2019. Closing submissions to be filed with the Court by 25 September 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WAHEKE – Local Board Area (1 Appeal)

Appellants | Cable Bay Wines Ltd v Auckland Council | Received | 2 February 2018
--- | --- | --- | ---
References | ENV-2017-AKL-000010 Council – LUC60127798 |
Site address | 12 Nick Johnston Drive, Waiheke Island |
Applicant | Cable Bay Wines Limited |
Other parties | Stephen & Suzanne Edwards, Julie Loranger & Lindsay Niemann, Michael & Christine Poland |
Description | Cable Bay appeal Council’s decision to refuse retrospective consent relating to the unlawful establishment and use of an additional dining area known as ‘The Verandah’. The principal issues in contention relate to the scale and intensity of the activity and the general amenity / noise effects associated with the use of the structure. |
Iwi comments | The application was limited-notified to neighbours. No iwi group indicated a need for a cultural impact assessment. The Hearing Commissioners considered the application in accordance with the requirements of the RMA 1991 and in particular Part 2 of the RMA. |
Status | The Environment Court directed court-assisted mediation after the expiry of the section 274 period on 15 March 2018. Three s274 parties have joined. Awaiting confirmation of Environment Court mediation date and to involve both the consent appeal and the enforcement order application. Mediation held on 2 July 2018. No agreements reached between the parties. Caucus between noise experts to on 5 July 2018 and a further mediation to be scheduled. No agreement reached at second mediation and matter to be set down for a hearing. The Court has confirmed a joint resource consent appeal and enforcement order hearing commencing on 7 November 2018. The appellant’s evidence is due by 7 September and the Council’s evidence is due by 21 September. Council to call Planning and Noise expert witnesses. Council’s evidence was filed with the Court on 21 September 2018. The hearing commenced on 7 November 2018 and an interim decision on the resource consent was issued on 21 November to convey the Court’s refusal of part of the application, particularly in relation to the use of the lawn for outdoor dining and drinking, and make further directions about the refinement of conditions of consent to aspects of the proposal which might attract consent. An interim decision on the application for enforcement order was issued on 28 November 2018 ordering Cable Bay to undertake various steps to limit their activities. The Court intends that the orders will substantially mirror the final resource consent conditions. Further monitoring and testing work order by the Court is ongoing. A second interim decision on the resource consent appeal was issued by the Court 22 February 2019 confirming the Court’s earlier decision to refuse consent in part. Further collaborative noise monitoring and assessment has been undertaken by the parties’ acoustic engineers and a report on this work is to be provided to the Court by 8 March 2019. This will assist the court in determining whether or not consent can be granted to a modified proposal for the restaurant, alfresco dining and outdoor functions. A judicial teleconference held on 28 March 2019. A further 1-2 day hearing will be scheduled, however that will not be held.
until July (as the Judge is away for May and June). An evidence exchange timetable will be set in due course. The Court has indicated that the hearing will resume for 2 days in the week of 26 August 2019. A timetable for evidence exchange has been issued. Evidence has been exchanged and the hearing will re-commence on 29th August 2019. The hearing was re-convened on 29 August and concluded 30 August.Awaiting the Court’s decision.

Waitemata (11 appeals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Lod's Family Trust v Auckland Council</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>2 July 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
<td>ENV-2019-AKL-000134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site address</strong></td>
<td>109 John Street, Ponsonby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Parties</strong></td>
<td>Section 274 Party - Emma Jane Munro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 274 Party - Jennifer Katherine Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Appeal against Council’s decision to refuse resource consent to remove the existing dwelling and associated structures on the site, carry out a two-lot subdivision, and construct two new two-storey dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iwi comments</strong></td>
<td>The application was publicly notified. There were no iwi issues raised in the application. The application was considered in accordance with the RMA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>New appeal. Reporting date of 2 August to the Environment Court regarding mediation. Environment Court mediation set down for 8 September 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellants</th>
<th>Society for the Protection of Western Springs Forest Incorporated 2736092 &amp; G Baldock v Auckland Council</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>11 June 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
<td>ENV-2019-AKL-000104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUC0321424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site address</strong></td>
<td>859 Great North Road, Grey Lynn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>Auckland Council Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other parties</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>To remove approximately 200 pine trees in Te Wai Orea – Western Springs Lakeside Park, including earthworks for an access track and restoration planting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iwi comments</strong></td>
<td>Initial engagement and responses received from Ngati Paoa, Ngati Whatua Orakei, Ngati Whatua Kaipara, Te Patukirikiri, Te Runanga o Ngati Whatua, Waikato Tainui, Waiohua Te Ahiwaru Makaurau and Te Kawerau a Maki. Generally supportive of the works. No mana whenua groups have appealed or joined as s274 parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>New appeal. A timetable for court-assisted mediation has not yet been set. First mediation was held on 26 July 2019. Arborists to conduct joint site visit with a view to identifying and agreeing upon ‘urgent’ removals. Second mediation scheduled for 19th August 2019. Second mediation re-scheduled for 9 September 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellants</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>15 May 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Reference

ENV 2019 AKL 000087
CST60323353

### Site Address

Wharf 11-99 Brigham Street Auckland Central

### Applicant

Panuku Development Auckland Limited

### Other parties

Various 274 parties in support of applicant Devonport Heritage in support of Urban Auckland

### Description

Appeal against council’s decision to grant consent to construct two ship mooring dolphins and wharf access structures from the end of Queens Wharf and undertake alterations to the existing Queens Wharf structure including strengthening, bollard replacement, new piles and modifying the sub-structure.

### Iwi comments

Submissions by various Mana whenua groups opposed or supported the application and were neutral by the end of the hearing.

### Status

*Appeals proceed to mediation on 6 August 2019 and evidence timetabling agreed.*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellants</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-North Eastern Investments Limited v Auckland Council -The Dark Horse Trust &amp; Others v Auckland Council -The St Mary’s Bay Association Inc. &amp; Herne Bay Residents Association Inc. -Henry v Auckland Council (now withdrawn)</td>
<td>30 November 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reference

ENV 2018 AKL 000358 (NEIL)
ENV 2018 AKL 000355 (Dark Horse)
ENV 2018 AKL 000357 (Associations)
ENV 2018 AKL 000359 (Henry)

### Site Address

St Mary’s Bay and Masefield Beach

### Applicant

Auckland Council (Healthy Waters)

### Other parties

Numerous

### Description

Appeal against council’s decision to grant resource consent for the St Mary’s Bay and Masefield Beach Water Quality Improvement Project.

### Iwi comments

Iwi submitted in support of the application and have joined the appeals as a section 274 party in support of the Council’s decision.

### Status

The Environment Court has set down mediation in weeks 18 and 25 February 2019. Environment Court mediations held on 18 and 25 February 2019 to clarify issues and discuss and amend conditions of consent. Parties are to file a joint memorandum by 1 March 2019 setting out a timetable for a hearing in June. Appeal by NEIL and its section 274 notices to the appeals listed above withdrawn on 25 February 2019. Late applications by Watercare and Mr. and Ms. Henry to join as a section 274 party granted by the judge at the judicial conference held on 29 March 2019. Mediations held on 18 and 25 February. Parties are still in discussions with a reporting date to be agreed and approved by the Court. Henry Appeal is now withdrawn. Parties have requested a
reporting date of 12 July 2019 with the court to allow Watercare and parties to seek independent review of proposed stormwater pipe. Further reporting date of 23 August 2019 requested by the applicant. After further discussions between parties, a further reporting date of 13 September 2019 proposed to the court.

| Appellants | Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki v Auckland Council
|            | Te Ākitai O Waiohua, Ngaati Whanaunga, Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Tamaterā, Te Pāuikirikiri, And Ngāti Maru v Auckland Council
|            | Ngāti Whātua Orakei Whaia Maia Limited v Auckland Council
| Received   | 30 January 2019
|            | 30 January 2019
|            | 31 January 2019

| References | ENV-2019-AKL-000014
|           | ENV-2019-AKL-000015
|           | ENV-2019-AKL-000016

| Site address | 31 Westhaven Drive, Auckland Central
| Other Parties | Ngāti Te Ata

| Description | Appeal against the decision of hearing commissioners to grant resource consents for the redevelopment of existing pile moorings within the Westhaven Marina, including land reclamation, installation of new pile berths, a new car park, and a new observation deck and public open space area

| Iwi comments | The applications were publicly notified. Submissions from appellant iwi were received, along with other iwi who have not lodged an appeal against these decisions.

| Status | ENV-2019-AKL-000014 and ENV-2019-AKL-000015 were withdrawn on 13 January 2019. Mediation scheduled with remaining appellant (Ngāti Whātua Orakei Whaia Maia Limited) and s274 parties on the 29 April 2019. Mediation for 29 April cancelled at the agreement of all parties, appeal will proceed to a hearing, to be held on or after 19 August. A s116 application was made to allow consents to commence while appeal is determined, this was approved by EC on the 27 March 2019. Following a judicial conference in late June it was determined that:
|          | - The Westhaven Marina appeal, and the related Mooring Dolphin appeal will be heard together;
|          | - A declaration will be filed by Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei that addresses the jurisdictional issue as to whether the Environment Court has the jurisdiction to determine primacy issues where relating to the wording of consent conditions. This will be determined prior to the appeal proceedings being heard.
|          | The current status is that the appeal is on hold.
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## ORAKEI (1 appeal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellants</th>
<th>Paramount Villages (St John) Limited v Auckland Council</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>10 August 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>ENV-2018-AKL-000160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site address</td>
<td>55-57 Ripon Crescent, Meadowbank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Paramount Villages (St John) Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parties</td>
<td>Andrew and Jeanette Hayes and others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>An appeal against a decision to refuse an application to construct and operate a retirement village consisting of 7 buildings with 344 residential units at 55-57 Ripon Cres, Meadowbank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi comments</td>
<td>The resource consent application was publicly notified and determined by commissioners in accordance with the RMA. Involved stormwater discharge and removal of SEA. CIA provided by Ngai Tai ki Tamaki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Council directed to report back to the Court by 24 September 2018 on progress regarding any negotiation/mediation. Awaiting further directions from the Court and confirmation of a mediation date. The appellant has requested further time to consider possible design revisions. The Court required the appellant to report back on 30th November 2018 to progress before scheduling mediation. Court-assisted mediation is scheduled for 27 February 2019. No settlement reached at mediation. The matter is to proceed to a hearing. The timetable for evidence exchange has not yet been set. The Court issued a Minute on 20 March 2019 confirming the timetable for evidence exchange. A 5 day fixture will be allocated after 5 August 2019. Council’s evidence in chief was filed with the Court on 4 June 2019. Expert conferencing scheduled for the week beginning 1 July. Hearing scheduled to commence on 9th September 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## HOWICK (1 appeal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>508 Chapel Road Partnership Trust</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>16 October 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>ENV-2018-AKL-000281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council – LUC02029090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site address</td>
<td>508 Chapel Road Flat Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>508 Chapel Road Partnership Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parties</td>
<td>W &amp; B Smith, C Yang, M Muthu and T Mahesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Appeal by applicant against a decision refusing consent to establish a childcare centre accommodating 60 children and eight full-time staff at 508 Chapel Road, Flat Bush, Auckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi comments</td>
<td>No iwi issues. The application was considered in accordance with the RMA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>The Court has asked parties to confirm a list of issues unresolved between the parties, witnesses, timetabling and whether they agree to Court assisted mediation by 30 November 2018. The application was declined in regard to adverse neighbourhood character and residential amenity effects arising from the traffic access arrangements. Proceeded to mediation on 15 February 2019. Discussion primarily around traffic matters and alternatives. No settlement reached. Caucusing and evidence exchange proceeding during April to June. Evidence from applicant received. Evidence by council witnesses prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PAPAKURA – Local Board Area (2 Appeals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Reference Details</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment H</strong></td>
<td><strong>Item 14</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 August 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV-2019-AKL 000153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUC60332808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site address</td>
<td>1 – 3 Beach Road Takanini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Ross Holdings Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parties</td>
<td>Non-notified application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

An appeal against a decision on an application to refuse consent to construct a 268m², 119 seat café. The consent proceeded without notification being found that the environmental effects are not more than minor however then refused as being contrary to the objectives and policies for the Business – Light Industrial Zone. The decision expresses concerns as to the scale of the café (proposed as a Kream café) activity being contrary those objectives and policies that seek to avoid activities that may compromise the efficiency and primary function of the light industrial zone.

**Iwi comments**

No iwi group indicated a need for a cultural impact assessment. The commissioner considered the application in accordance with the requirements of the RMA 1991 and Part 2 of the RMA.

**Status**

Recently lodged and likely to proceed to mediation in the coming month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Reference Details</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Wallace Group Limited, BJ Wallace Trust and SJ Wallace Trust</strong></td>
<td><strong>14 March 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV-2019-AKL 000043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council – LUC60311805, DIS60303201, DIS60303159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site address</td>
<td>3 Popes Road, Takanini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Alpha Dairy Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parties</td>
<td>Spark NZ Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

An appeal against a decision to grant consents for the construction, operation and maintenance of a new dairy processing facility for the production of infant formula on a Business-Light Industry Zone site with an area of 22,372m². The consent was publicly notified, with 4 submissions in opposition received.

**Iwi comments**

No iwi group indicated a need for a cultural impact assessment and no submissions were received from iwi. The commissioners considered the application in accordance with the requirements of the RMA 1991 and in particular Part 2 of the RMA.

**Status**

Mediation set down for 28 May has since been vacated. **High Court proceedings on related matters scheduled for October 2019.**
## Franklin - Local Board Area (5 Appeals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Item 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Applicant** | Albert Street Holdings Ltd |
**Received** | 31 July 2019 |
**References** | ENV-2019-AKL 00152 |
| | LUC60336338 |
**Site address** | 10 Albert Street, Pukekohe |
**Applicant** | Albert Street Holdings Ltd |
**Other parties** | Non-notified application |
**Description** | An appeal against a decision to refuse consent to construct an office building and associated carparking. The consent proceeded without notification being found that the environmental effects were not more than minor however it was then refused as being contrary to some of the objectives and policies for the Business - Mixed Use Zone. |
**Iwi comments** | No iwi group indicated a need for a cultural impact assessment. The application was considered in accordance with the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. |
**Status** | New appeal. The parties are meeting at the end of August to consider whether the appeal can be settled without a hearing. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Item 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Applicant** | Jacks Ridge Limited |
**Received** | 24 April 2019 |
**References** | ENV-2019-AKL 00067 |
| | LUC60322216 |
**Site address** | 76 Kimptons Road, Brookby |
**Applicant** | Jacks Ridge Limited |
**Other parties** | Non-notified application |
**Description** | An appeal against a decision on an application to refuse consent to construct four commercial storage buildings. The consent proceeded without notification being found that the environmental effects are not more than minor however then refused as being contrary to the objectives and policies for the Rural - Mixed Rural Zone. The decision expresses concerns as to the nature, purpose and scale of the non-residential activity and being not associated with rural production. |
**Iwi comments** | No iwi group indicated a need for a cultural impact assessment. The commissioner considered the application in accordance with the requirements of the RMA 1991 and Part 2 of the RMA. |
**Status** | Recently lodged and likely to proceed to mediation in the coming month. The matter proceeded to mediation on 4 June 2019. The parties have lodged consent order documents with the Court based around a revised proposal. |
### Attachment H

**Item 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Clevedon North Limited</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>22 February 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
<td>ENV-2019-AKL 000029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council – (BUN60303009) LUC60303381, SUB60303384, DIS60303387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site address</strong></td>
<td>52 North Road, Clevedon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>Clevedon North Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other parties</strong></td>
<td>Numerous 274 parties have joined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>An appeal against a decision on an application for subdivision and land use consents to subdivide a 9.04ha site into 88 residential lots. Associated earthworks, new roading and infrastructure. The consent was publically notified, with 43 submissions in opposition received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iwi comments</strong></td>
<td>No iwi group indicated a need for a cultural impact assessment and no submissions were received from iwi. The commissioners considered the application in accordance with the requirements of the RMA 1991 and in particular Part 2 of the RMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>The appeal proceeded to mediation on 30 May 2019. The parties remain open to exploring alternative designs that may be the subject of a second mediation. A revised design was the bases of a second mediation on 25 June and an agreement in principal was reached. The parties continue to work towards agreement on a finalised design and conditions of consent. <em>The Court has requested that the lodged agreement between the parties on the basis of the revised proposal be supported by affidavit evidence. Evidence currently being prepared.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Signature Building Ltd</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>22 January 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
<td>ENV-2019-AKL 000009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council – LUC60313362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site address</strong></td>
<td>17A Bell Road, Beachlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>Signature Building Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other parties</strong></td>
<td>Beachlands Neighbourhood Voice Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Appeal by the applicant against the Council decision to decline consent to establish a childcare facility for 105 children and 17 staff. The consent was publicly notified, with 83 submissions received (82 in opposition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iwi comments</strong></td>
<td>No iwi group indicated a need for a cultural impact assessment and no submissions were received from iwi. The commissioners considered the application in accordance with the requirements of the RMA 1991 and in particular Part 2 of the RMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>Mediation held 29 March. No agreement reached at mediation however parties have agreed to attend further mediation in May. A revised proposal was the subject of a second mediation on 15 May 2019. Agreement was not reached and the matter is to be timetabled for evidence exchange and hearing. <em>Hearing scheduled for December 2019, with caucusing and evidence exchange to occur within August to November.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Ahuareka Trustees (No. 2) Ltd</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>19 November 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000147</td>
<td>Council – 42081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site address</td>
<td>650-680 Whitford Maraetai Road, Whitford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parties</td>
<td>Whitford Residents and Ratepayers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Appeal against Council’s decision to refuse consent to establish a hamlet of 186 households and ancillary buildings, a country pub and restaurant, retail and commercial units and carpark in the Whitford Rural B zone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi comments</td>
<td>No iwi submissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Appeal reported to the Committee in December 2015. Mediation held 11 February 2016. Appeal reported to the Regulatory Committee on 1 December 2016. Evidence exchange occurred in February/March 2017. Judicial teleconference held 30 March. Court hearing proceeded within the week 3 July 2017, with the applicants reply to be filed in writing. Decision of the Court received 15 December 2017 – appeal declined. Significant policy-based decision supporting provisions of AUP (OP). Court costs being sought, otherwise appeal matters complete. The Environment Court decision since appealed by the appellant to the High Court on 26 January 2018. A case management conference is scheduled for 6 March. Council filed its submissions on 31 August and a hearing has been set for 9 October 2018. The appellant’s lawyer requested a deferral for health reasons, which was agreed to. The hearing will now not be held until early 2019. <strong>High Court hearing held 9 May 2019 and awaiting decision.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Regionwide – All Local Board Areas (3 Appeals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellants</th>
<th>Royal Forrest and Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc. v Auckland Council Housing New Zealand Corporation v Auckland Council Hiona Bay Residents Association Inc. &amp; The St Mary’s Bay Association Inc.</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>10 May 2019</th>
<th>15 May 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>ENV 2019 AKL 000082 ENV 2019 AKL 000081 ENV 2019 AKL 000086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site address</td>
<td>Regionwide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Auckland Council (Healthy Waters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parties</td>
<td>Numerous section 274 notices received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Appeals against council’s decision to grant resource consent for the discharges of stormwater from existing and future urban landuses that will enter Council’s stormwater network, and discharges of stormwater from the Council’s stormwater network to the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi comments</td>
<td>Mr. Tame Te Rangi made submissions on behalf of Te Mana Whenua Kaiaki Forum which has membership from each of the 19 mana whenua entities with interests in the Auckland Council area and supported the application. There were other submissions from iwi including submission lodged by Ngati Tamaaho initially opposed the application but supported it at the hearing based on conditions recommended by the applicant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>The section 274 party notice timeframe closed at end of May 2019. Waiting for the Environment Court directions on the appeals and a mediation date. Environment Court has advised of the mediation dates which are set down for 5 and 21 August 2019. Parties to report to the court by 13 September on the draft conditions and whether a further mediation time needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region-wide Appeals Register – 12 September 2019
Memorandum

To: Planning Committee and Local Board members
Cc: Environment and Community Committee members
Chief Executive, Independent Maori Statutory Board

Subject: Preparing Auckland Council’s submission on central government’s Essential Freshwater package

From: Dave Allen  Manager Natural Environment Strategy
Jess Gerry  Analyst Strategy, Natural Environment Strategy
Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research, Chief Planning Office

Contact information: dave.allen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
jessica.gerry@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To firstly overview central government’s proposals for improving water outcomes as part of the Essential Freshwater work programme, as contained in the just publicly released discussion document entitled Action for Healthy Waterways, and secondly to highlight Auckland Council group’s approach to submitting on these far-reaching and complex proposals.

Summary

2. Central government have publicly released their discussion document entitled Action for Healthy Waterways, which is a key outcome of the Essential Freshwater work programme.

3. The discussion document places significant emphasis on improving freshwater outcomes through regulatory and non-regulatory actions. The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management is the primary regulatory instrument being reviewed, with introduction of other measures through a new National Environmental Standard for Freshwater Management.

4. Proposals include greater emphasis on te mana o te wai, ecosystem health attributes, and reducing the effects of rural activities.

5. There is an interrelationship with wastewater and stormwater consenting and discharge management through the Three Waters Review. National Environmental Standards are being developed by central government to improve consistency, transparency and national oversight for human drinking water, as well as for wastewater discharges and overflow management.

6. Opportunities for input to the council group submission are tight, with the submission closing date being Thursday 17 October 2019. The council group submission will be considered and signed off by the Planning Committee Chair and either the Deputy Mayor or Mayor, with the proposed submission being provided to these decision makers by no later than Thursday 10 October 2019.

Context

7. The Essential Freshwater work programme was announced by central government on 8 October 2018 (see Ministry for the Environment’s website www.mfe.govt.nz ). The work programme sets out a clear expectation and commitment to act to improve freshwater outcomes. In particular, the objectives of the work programme aim to stop further degradation and loss, reverse past damage and bringing waterways and ecosystems to a healthy state within a generation, or much sooner for certain activities.
8. An overview of the October 2018 announcement was provided to members of the Planning, and Environment and Community Committees, in an information memo dated 29 October 2018. Central government's formal proposals were released on 5 September 2019, following inputs from a broad range of interests across the country. The reforms represent a significant step-change from the current regulatory environment, despite iterations to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) in 2011, 2014 and 2017. The main elements of the Essential Freshwater work programme included in the Action for Healthy Waterways consultation document are outlined in this information memo.

9. The consultation period extends from 5 September through to 17 October 2019 (six weeks). Council staff are assessing what the proposals mean for the Auckland Council group, such that a submission can be signed off through the Chair of the Planning Committee and the Deputy Mayor or Mayor prior to the tight submission deadline. The proposals are complex and intertwined.

10. The Essential Freshwater work programme acknowledges linkages to other central government initiatives including the Three Waters Review, and the opportunities through the current consultative process to provide high level feedback on specific compliance, monitoring and central government oversight of consenting functions as announced in early August 2019. Similarly, there are other important interdependencies which need greater consideration if water outcomes are to be significantly improved.

Discussion

11. The proposals in the Action for Healthy Waterways discussion document encompass the following elements:

Policy framing and ecosystem health measures

a) Te Mana o te Wai – greater emphasis to promote integrated and holistic health from mountains to sea, prior to human health needs, then other consumption and use

b) preferred use of a mahinga kai compulsory national value, to ensure that this is given effect alongside other compulsory values, and as potentially complemented by a broader range of tangata whenua values

c) increased guidance and/or specification as to how te mana o te wai is reflected in regional policy statements and other activities

d) noting the initiative to introduce a Resource Management Amendment Bill to facilitate an improved freshwater planning process using Government appointed freshwater commissioners, and tangata whenua-nominated representatives to consider council plans, hear submissions and make recommendations, with councils making final decisions

e) to exempt the six largest hydro-electric power schemes from NPS-FM provisions in recognising government’s priorities for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy generation

f) greater emphasis on ecosystem health attributes including the components of aquatic life, habitat, quality, quantity, and ecosystem processes, and applying an adaptive management approach in response to declining trends of these attributes

g) use of compulsory national value for threatened species

h) stronger provisions to address improvements in fish passage past barriers

i) tighter controls on activities that damage inland / coastal wetlands, and stronger policies to protect and restore such habitats

j) ensuring that habitat offsetting is only used after other possibilities have been ruled out; infilling of streams is to be avoided, and culverting and diversion of streams cannot result in net loss

k) potential or proposed introduction of new or refined attributes to assess ecosystem health outcomes, including nutrients (dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) and dissolved reactive phosphorus (DRP), following further impact analysis); refinement to periphyton attribute;
suspended sediment (turbidity); and a more stringent E. coli threshold when monitoring is required for freshwater sites, during summer, where people want to swim

l) enhanced consideration of water quantity outcomes, including how objectives for quantity management link to minimum flows and allocation limits; ensuring that all consents are aligned with allocation limits and flow regimes (following scheduled legislative amendment to the RMA in the next year)

m) further amend the Measurement and Reporting of Water Takes Regulations 2010 to mandate the compulsory use of telemetry (remote data collection and automatic transmission to monitoring devices), daily reporting and staged implementation

Three Waters

n) proposals to amend the National Environmental Standard for Human Drinking Water (Three Waters Review decision of July 2019) which:
   - provide councils with direction on setting source water risk management areas, and what activities should be identified as potential risks
   - require councils to place controls on use of land in source water risk management areas, and review existing activities to ensure that appropriate controls are in place
   - expand the application of regulations to registered water suppliers serving more than 25 people (for at least 60 days per calendar year)
   - provide an approach to manage specific contaminants in source waters

o) seeking high level feedback on the proposed introduction of a National Environmental Standard for wastewater discharges and overflows to address variability in consent conditioning; and provide assurance about achieving good outcomes and managing risk to communities and the environment

p) a requirement for stormwater network operators to prepare a risk management plan to encourage transparency and consistency

q) proposals to introduce an obligation for stormwater network operators to report on a set of nationally prescribed environmental performance measures

r) national guidance on how to apply best practice for Water Sensitive Design / green infrastructure

Improving farm practices

s) a rural package that seeks improvements including proposed regulatory measures through a new National Environmental Standard for Freshwater Management that:
   - introduces minimum thresholds on land intensification that trigger requirements for consenting purposes to manage certain discharges, and accompanying use of freshwater module in farm plan tool for commercial vegetable growing
   - provides a top-down regulatory (mandatory) or bottom-up (voluntary) approach to use farm environment planning, as independently prepared by suitably qualified farm environment planners
   - reduces nitrogen discharges in sub-catchments (with similar soil type and rainfall) where nitrate-nitrogen levels are in the highest 10 per cent (or alternative threshold) of monitored sites and where regional rules implementing the NPS-FM are not in place (eg, Waitangi and Whangamaire Stream, Franklin)
   - requires greater use of Overseer model (for calculating nitrogen discharges) in highly impacted catchments
   - introduces a fertiliser application cap (per hectare), as potential alternative to nitrogen discharge limits in highly impacted sub-catchments
   - introduces stock exclusion requirements on low slope land (within 3-5 years for waterways greater than 1 metre wide), and in steeper areas based on stock
density, and specification of setback distances; and for streams less than 1 metre width, farmers would be required to set out a plan for fencing and setbacks in the freshwater module of their farm plan.

- introduces consent requirements for intensive winter grazing and setbacks from water
- introduces consenting requirement for ‘feedlots’ and restrictions on placement near water or coastal marine areas
- considers stock holding areas and whether to manage effluent through consenting approach
- how government may support rural industries through farm systems and modelling initiatives

12. Central government are currently working on further developing a Regulatory Impact Statement to support proposals that are scheduled to be forwarded to Cabinet around April 2020. Central government recognise that costs will be significant for some interests, but impact testing is ongoing, and will be informed by submissions.

**Next steps**

13. The Auckland Plan Strategy and Research department is coordinating the preparation of the Auckland Council group submission. Key steps in preparation of the council group submission include:

a) information memos being forwarded to Local Board members, mana whenua and Rural Advisory Panel members following the 5 September 2019 public release of the consultation document, advising of the brief opportunity to provide succinct input into the council group submission process

b) forming virtual teams of specialist staff (eg, rural package) to review the proposals and bring together an initial council group view and start to populate a skeleton council group submission

c) present key themes and the approach to the council group’s response through a Planning Committee workshop on 19 September 2019

d) finalise a council group submission for consideration with delegated council representatives, being the Planning Committee Chair and either the Deputy Mayor or Mayor (most likely no later than Thursday 10 October 2019 given local body elections).

14. Considerable work is required internally to coordinate the council group’s input into Auckland Council’s submission. Experienced staff will not only be considering the technical and policy merits of the central government proposals, but also considering the nature of these against other central and local government obligations and current consultative exercises (eg, National Policy Statements (NPS) for Urban Development, NPS Highly Productive Land, NZ Biodiversity Strategy, Three Waters Review, Auckland Plan, Auckland Unitary Plan etc).

15. The Ministry for the Environment is undertaking a national roadshow on the Essential Freshwater work programme during the consultation period. An Auckland public meeting is scheduled for the evening of 25 September 2019.

16. Following the close of the consultation period, central government staff and an independent panel chaired by retired Environment Court Judge Sheppard will consider the submissions received. Advice is scheduled to be put to Cabinet for decision around April 2020.
Auckland Council
Animal Management

Annual Report
1 July 2018 – 30 June 2019
Mihi

MĀORI

Tokoto ake rā e koutou o te ngākau māhara, o te hinengaro māhaki, o te whakaaro nui, o te wairua atawhai.
Tukua hei a tātou ngā reo mō te wahanu me te piringa ā-mahue noa.
Koutou i huakina ai ngā tatau o kāinga-rua ki ngā mōkai a kāinga-tahi kua kawhakina ki tāhaki e whakaaro kore rāua ko manawa poto.
Ki a koutou, ā mātou mihi me ā mātou whakamānawa.

ENGLISH

Welcome to all of you of open heart, humble mind, kind thought and caring spirit.
Let us be voices for the voiceless and give shelter to the abandoned.
To you who gave a second home to pets of those who cared less the pets cast out by negligence and short-term affection.
To you, we express our thanks and gratitude.

Again, we reach out to you all, to act together and help us meet the challenge that is to increase education, so that our communities are safe from the dangers of wayward animals and to inform the people of their obligations to dog ownership.

The following is our report of the work that has been completed already and the work that is yet to be done. Greetings to you, one and all.

E hora ake nei ko tā mātou pūrongo mō ngā mahi i oti me ngā arohanga ki ngā mea hei kawe ake ā ngā ra e tū mai nei. Mauri ora ki a koutou katoa.
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Executive Summary

This is the Auckland Council Animal Management annual report on dog control activities during the period 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019, as required by section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996.

This year the Animal Management team continued their focus on reducing harm caused by dogs in our most vulnerable communities, as well as promoting responsible dog ownership and compliance with the obligations placed on dog owners by the Dog Control Act 1996 and the Auckland Council Dog Management Bylaw 2012.

During the year, Animal Management officers and shelter staff prioritised the enforcement of dog registration and compliance with menacing and dangerous dog classifications. This combined effort by the team achieved the best result ever for Auckland Council with dog registrations—a total of 96.1% of all known dogs registered. This is an increase of 2.5% on the previous year, which amounts to 957 more dogs registered.

The total number of known dogs in the Auckland region has increased to 110,969, which is an increase of 0.87% from the previous year.

The focus on getting compliance from owners with high-risk dogs, as well as the ongoing pro-active effort to reduce the number of roaming dogs, have resulted in 28 fewer attacks on people and 34 fewer attacks on other animals. Unfortunately, the highly successful Txt 2 Desex campaign has ended at the end of June this year, due to no further funding from Central Government.

Our field services officers responded to 27,677 requests for service during the year, which is 4.2% lower than the previous year. This lower demand for services could be attributed to an increased rate of compliance by dog owners, which allowed officers to be more pro-active in public areas and to be more involved in educational activities, which will further improve safety around dogs in our communities.

During the year, the team adjusted their key performance indicators in the drive to enforce compliance with menacing and dangerous dog classifications. Instead of an annual performance metric, the team set a tougher challenge for themselves by changing the target to a rolling 3-month metric, to obtain the highest possible rate of compliance in a shorter period. The overall compliance rate achieved was 96.5%, which is 6.5% above the service level agreement—an excellent result for the Field Services teams.

In July 2019, Auckland Council adopted a new policy on dogs and a new bylaw for 2019 after a lengthy review process. During the public consultation phase, more than 8,000 submissions were received from individuals and other stakeholders.

Animal Management staff assisted throughout the review process with advice and other information, which was a great collaborative effort by all involved—to keep dogs a positive part of the lives of all Aucklanders.

The safety of all staff is always a top priority for the team, and in 2018 all field staff were issued with load-bearing vests, in addition to the body-worn cameras that were issued earlier. This initiative further enhances the safety of the team throughout all the difficult interactions they have on a daily basis.
The animal shelters experienced a very busy year with 6,833 dogs impounded throughout the year. Of these dogs, 87.7% were returned to their owners, and a total of 536 dogs were adopted from the shelters. The number of dogs that were euthanised dropped by 21.6% — a fantastic result for the passionate and dedicated Shelter teams.

Animal Management further restructured during 2018 and formed a new Specialists team, which includes the specialist Bark Advisors.

These advisors continued with the unit’s strategy to mediate between dog owners and other parties affected by nuisance barking, which is still the highest volume service request, by providing advice, information and other assistance. The team adopted a new process to deal with barking complaints in December 2018, and initial indications show a definite decline in repeat complaints.

The advisors also continue to utilise new technology to provide dog owners with extra tools to reduce the nuisance barking and started introducing ‘bark boxes’ — a device that sends out ultrasonic sound waves which are inaudible to humans and safe for dogs. These devices help to distract dogs whenever they start barking, and in the process, it reduces the instances of nuisance barking. The team had excellent results and great feedback from dog owners in relation to these devices.

The Animal Management team is currently involved in several other initiatives and projects that will continue during this year, including:

- an opportunity to assist with the training of dog control officers in Vanuatu;
- working with the New Zealand Police to provide training to their frontline officers on dealing with aggression from dogs when entering premises;
- an ongoing project to improve and simplify all letters, documents, brochures and other information used and distributed by Animal Management staff;
- continuing the transition to paper-free digital alternatives by using new technology; and
- the review of a ‘memorandum of understanding’ between Auckland Council and SPCA New Zealand.

On 1 November 2019, the new Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2019 and the Dog Management Bylaw 2019 will come into effect. Animal Management staff will work together with all dog owners to understand the new rules and definitions which will be introduced.

Our strategy for the 2019/2020 financial year continues to be a high focus on prevention of harm caused by dogs, and to provide an excellent service to the residents and visitors of Auckland.
Part 1: Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the annual report

Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 (the Act) requires each territorial authority to report on its dog control policy and practices and to provide specific statistical information.

This report acts as a medium for this information and an update on the activities and performance of the Auckland Council Animal Management unit.

1.2 Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2012

The objective of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2012 (the Policy) is to keep dogs a positive part of the life of Aucklanders by maintaining opportunities for dog owners to take their dogs into public places while adopting measures to minimise the problems caused by dogs.

This report addresses the key focus areas named as Policy Statements in the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2012, to summarise the 2018/19 year.

New Policy & Bylaw 2019

In July 2019, the Governing Body of Auckland Council adopted the new Policy on Dogs 2019 and the new Dog Management Bylaw 2019, which will come into effect on 1 November 2019.

The review & consultation process

- In November 2018, the Regulatory Committee completed its statutory review of the Policy on Dogs 2012 and the Dog Management Bylaw 2012 and agreed that they should be amended.
- From 1 April through to 10 May 2019, Aucklanders were given the opportunity to have their say about the proposed changes.
- Over 8,000 submissions were received and public deliberation meetings were held in the Auckland Town Hall from 26 June to 3 July 2019.
- Animal Management staff assisted the Regulatory Committee as ‘subject matter experts’ during these deliberation meetings.
1.3 Arrangement of the report

The key focus area of the Policy Statements, around which this report is based, are:

- Responsible dog ownership
- Dog welfare
- Community education
- Dog safe access
- Registration
- Dog safe communities
- Bylaws
- Funding

Each policy statement is addressed with regards to the achievements and activities of the 2018/19 year. The structure of this report follows the similar arrangement of previous annual reports, to allow for ease of assessing the success of each of our Policy Statement aims.

1.4 Our services

Our main purpose is to ensure that dogs and other animals are sufficiently controlled to prevent harm and nuisance to the public.

This helps to fulfil the overall goal of the Licensing and Regulatory Compliance department of protecting the public of Auckland from nuisance and harm, as well as improving, protecting and promoting the health of the public of Auckland.

These goals are achieved via a number of services:

- Providing information and education to the public relating to dog control and other animal management issues
- Dog registration
- Dog access to public places
- Dog bite prevention (including the classification and monitoring of menacing and dangerous dogs)
- Complaint response (including aggression, roaming and barking nuisance complaints)
- Shelter services (including lost and found, adoption and micro-chipping)

1.5 Animal Management structure

1.5.1 Our teams

Since 1 November 2014, Auckland Council has been operating a single, regional Animal Management unit and currently has a total of 86 staff (including the Manager).

This in-house model provides regional field and shelter services, supported by a newly formed Specialists team, which includes a team of Bark Advisors and other dedicated specialists.

The field services staff are supported by a regional Dispatch team, as well as a Regulatory Support team.

These teams are responsible for assigning service requests to field staff and also for providing administrative support to Animal Management. A dedicated Dog Registration Hub also operates during the beginning of every new registration year.
### Animal Shelter teams

Animal Management operates five shelters: Henderson, Silverdale, Manukau, Waiheke Island and Great Barrier Island.

Each of these shelters is responsible for the care and management of impounded animals.

These animals may be the subject of legal prosecutions or were impounded for being found wandering at large, or they were surrendered by their owners.

Shelters promote the adoption of unclaimed, suitable dogs and work collaboratively with other welfare and rescue agencies to find the best possible outcome for these dogs.

### Field Services teams

There are four teams of Animal Management Officers (AMOs): North, West, Central and South.

The Hauraki Gulf Islands teams are currently managed by the West team.

These teams are responsible for the field services of the unit. This includes a reactive response and investigations into complaints about animals that are not under control or are causing a nuisance.

Other responsibilities include ensuring compliance with the Dog Control Act 1996, encouraging responsible dog ownership and registration of dogs.

This is mostly achieved through proactive campaigns, a presence in public areas and dog safety education at community events.

### Specialists team

Animal Management has four dedicated specialists in distinct roles, a Senior Intelligence Analyst and a newly formed team of specialist Bark Advisors.

The Bark Advisors deal with all nuisance barking complaints and they focus mainly on education, assistance and mediation between dog owners and complainants.

A Senior Bark Advisor oversees all communications and also deals with all escalated complaints.
1.5.2 Our processes

In 2018, the Specialists team started a new project to review, improve and simplify all Animal Management field and shelter processes and guidance documents.

Documentation

Several new guides were developed, and two new Operations Manuals have recently been completed. The team is currently reviewing all letters, brochures and pamphlets to ensure that Aucklanders receive clear and consistent communication in every interaction they have with our Animal Management staff.

Training

During the year, a new Training and Competency Framework has been developed for our operational staff.

All new staff must complete a comprehensive training programme and pass a competency assessment before they become fully operational.

Training is primarily focussed on:

- Safe working practices
- Customer service skills
- Tactical communication
- Dog handling & behaviour recognition
- Stock handling
- Resiliency in the workplace
- Interpretation of legislation

Team Leaders, senior officers and other specially trained staff from within the unit are responsible for conducting the competency assessments.

All operational staff must also complete a comprehensive First Aid course every two years.

Some specialised training, e.g. DNA evidence collection, firearms use, etc. are only provided to experienced or Senior officers.
Part 2: Policy Statements

2.1 Responsible dog ownership

“Proactively promote the responsible ownership of dogs, including care and control around people, protected wildlife, other animals, property and natural habitats.”

The council recognises and rewards responsible dog owners by issuing a Responsible Dog Ownership Licence (RDOL).

The Responsible Dog Ownership Licence programme creates an additional incentive for dog registrations and an educational opportunity for dog owners. Operationally, this is an opportunity to increase awareness of responsibilities and to encourage more people to become responsible dog owners.

There are currently 26,809 RDOL holders in Auckland. This is an increase of 181 (0.68%) from the previous year.

Interesting facts

- The majority of RDOL holders live in Papakura (1,089) and Pukekohe (1,017).
- Only 4.2% of RDOL holders are under the age of 30.

Eligibility criteria for the RDOL

Applicants who wish to apply for an RDOL must:

- Pass a written test on their knowledge about dog ownership.
- Have been a registered dog owner in New Zealand for 12 months or more before applying.
- Have always registered their dogs on time.
- Not have any substantiated abatements, seizures or infringements under the Dog Control Act 1996 for the previous 12 months.
- Not have their dog be the subject of a substantiated complaint or impoundment under the Dog Control Act 1996 for the previous 12 months.
- Have a licence to keep multiple dogs, if required (where applicable)

2.2 Dog welfare

“Proactively promote the welfare of dogs.”

This requires owners to ensure that the physical, behavioural and health needs of their dogs are met.

Welfare issues

Animal Management continues to work closely with the SPCA and other rescue organisations to ensure that the adequate care and attention is provided to all dogs in our region.

During the year, Animal Management responded to 53 requests to assist the SPCA with dog welfare-related incidents.
Animal shelters

In our shelters, 100% of all suitable\(^1\) dogs were re-homed again this year. A total of 536 dogs were adopted from the Auckland shelters.

Several projects were completed during the year at our shelter facilities, including a new TV enrichment room for puppies and a dog sand pit at Henderson Shelter.

Other long-term projects to improve the dog enrichment facilities are still ongoing. Future projects may include an education room for dog owners at the Henderson Shelter.

Shelter success stories

‘Argentina’ was found as a stray and no one claimed her. She is now working with the company, K9 Detection, and being trained to sniff out Argentine ants, one of the world’s worst invasive species — and she is apparently doing very well!

She was named by the Manukau Shelter staff and K9 Detection decided to keep the name, as it was so appropriate for what she was going to be trained on at the time.

‘Rajah’ was relinquished to the Manukau Shelter, as the owners had a change in circumstances. He is now working with the NZ USAR Search Dog Association.

He has a great drive and is extremely eager to please. He went out for a day’s trial first and passed with flying colours!

\(^1\) Dogs are assessed for suitability in line with Animal Management’s current adoption policy.
2.3 Community education

"Increase public awareness on how to be safe around dogs (target children, families and people working in the community)."

At-risk workers

Animal Management’s education programme has reached over 2,000 ‘at-risk’ adults again this year.

Our staff visited various agencies and organisations, including New Zealand Police, Housing New Zealand, New Zealand Post, Electrix, Just Water and Oranga Tamariki, to assist and educate people working in the community who are interacting with dogs on a daily basis while performing their duties.

Community events

Animal Management staff visited several community events during the year, including:
  • Auckland Pet Expo
  • Toddler’s Day Out
  • Stren’s & Sounds
  • Silo Park Dog Day
  • Bark in the Pool 2018 event
  • Big Swim events (Pt Erin Pool, Onehunga War Memorial Pool & Massey Park Pool)
  • Paw Justice event
  • Eukanuba™ Tails & Trails event

Other education & assistance

Staff also made visits to Papakura Marae to help with a number of homeless dog owners who are staying next to the Marae – help was given with blankets, dog food and dog registration.

Ongoing work

Animal Management staff plan to visit all major community events during the year to promote safety around dogs.

Shelter staff will also have a stall at the next Eukanuba™ event in November to continue to promote the adoption of dogs from our shelters.
2.4 Dog safe access

“Provide dog owners with reasonable access to public places and private ways in a way that is safe to everyone...”

Animal Management continues to promote and encourage the safe and responsible presence of dogs in public places.

Beaches

Between November 2018 and February 2019, Animal Management employed two interns to primarily conduct beach patrols in the North and Central areas.

As a result, fewer complaints were received about the council not doing enough about dogs on beaches, or that field officers were not visible enough to dog owners.

The intern working with the North team undertook at least 289 beach visits during her time with Animal Management.

This year our field officers started issuing written warnings for a first offence, and an infringement notice for a second offence (within a 24-month period), to reduce the number of repeat offenders on Auckland beaches.

Working with the community

Earlier this year, our North team worked with several other units, including Maori Responsiveness, Community Facilities and the Park Services team to help form a resolution to some issues the local iwi of Pakiri beach were experiencing.

Through consultation with iwi members, issues were identified and discussed, and a number of improvements have been made to address their concerns, as well as some of our own:

- Old and incorrect signage, indicating that dogs are allowed on leash, were removed
- Larger signs were erected along the access road to Pakiri beach to clearly reflect no dogs allowed
- The Auckland Council website was updated to reflect the changes

In addition to this, there was a portion of beach at Pakiri Regional Park, which was designated as a dogs off-leash area, but the only way to access it was by walking your dog along the privately
owned beach belonging to the iwi, or by going through the Regional Park where dogs are prohibited.

This has now been rectified to reflect that no dogs are allowed.

As a result, this stunning, privately owned beach is still open to the public to enjoy, native birds are less threatened by dogs occupying their nesting areas, and positive relationships were formed with the iwi.

Animal Management staff continue to work with other departments that participate in community projects and events around the region.

### 2.5 Registration

"Identify the owner of every dog.”

Section 5 of the Act requires all dog owners to ensure their dogs are registered every year, and the Act also requires every territorial authority to keep a register of all dogs.

Having dogs registered significantly increases the council’s ability to manage dog-related safety and nuisance issues.

The annual dog registration year runs from 1 July to 30 June the following year. Failure to register a dog can result in a $300 infringement notice, or a court may impose a fine of up to $3,000.

Animal Management had a significant focus on dog registrations during the 2018/19 year, which resulted in the best ever result for Auckland Council – 106,608 of the 110,969 known dogs in the Auckland region were registered for that registration year.

The registration drive included reminders sent by text message and email, as well as follow-up phone calls by Animal Management staff. Opportunities to register a dog were also provided at all educational and community events that staff attended.

A total of 2,026 infringement notices were issued to dog owners who failed to register their dogs as required by the Act.

### 2.6 Dog safe communities

"Through encouragement, compliance and enforcement to the fullest extent necessary to ensure public safety and comfort, to change the attitudes and behaviours of irresponsible dog owners, and where appropriate to penalise irresponsible dog owners.”

Animal Management continues to focus primarily on reducing harm caused by dogs. Specific ‘high-risk’ areas have been targeted as part of the intelligence-led approach taken by our field officers.
**Dog-related injuries**

For the 2018/19 financial year, the Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC) reported\(^2\) that 3,952 claims were lodged in Auckland for dog-related injuries, which amounts to 41.8% of all claims for dog-related injuries in New Zealand. The total cost amounted to $1,027,710 in paid claims.

**High-risk dogs**

During the year, Animal Management staff continued to focus on reducing harm by enforcing compliance from all dog owners with high-risk dogs which are classified as ‘menacing’ or ‘dangerous’.

As at 30 June 2018, a total of 653 dogs were classified as menacing due to observed or reported behaviour of the dogs (Section 33A).

All menacing dogs living in Auckland must be neutered, even if the classification by another territorial authority does not require it.

All dogs classified as dangerous are required by the Dog Control Act 1996 to be neutered.

The enforcement drive during the year resulted in a total of 4,282 menacing and dangerous dogs now neutered, which is 96.5% of all classified dogs.

With the funding received from Central Government for the Txt 2 Desex campaign, a total of 646 high-risk dogs have been neutered during the year, up to the completion of the campaign in June 2019.

**Enforcement activities**

AMOs have issued 2,456 infringement notices during the year to dog owners who failed to keep their dogs confined or under control. A total of 5,172 infringement notices were issued for all offences under the Act, which is a decrease of 11.1% from the previous year.

There were 6,833 dogs impounded in Auckland’s five animal shelters throughout the region.

A total of 220 people were prosecuted for offences under the Dog Control Act 1996 – the majority of these were related to incidents where dogs attacked people or other animals.

**DNA evidence**

In 2017, Auckland Council introduced DNA evidence collection and forensic analysis as a valuable tool in investigating serious attacks by dogs on people or other animals, and in particular, on livestock.

During the 2018/19 year, investigating officers collected and requested analysis of DNA samples to be used in evidence in seven prosecution cases. In four of these cases, the results of the DNA analysis were accepted by the court and led to four convictions under section 57(2) of the Act.

There are currently three of these prosecution cases still pending in court.

---

\(^2\) Information obtained from ACC via an Official Information Act request.
Barking complaints

In 2017, Animal Management established a new team of specialist Bark Advisors to deal with our highest volume service request – nuisance barking, of which there were 6,811 service requests in the 2018/19 year.

This team was initially formed out of experienced Field Services staff, who received additional training in dog behavioural aspects and mediation techniques.

Complaints about barking dogs were reduced by 4.7% by the end of June 2019, and the new structure also had a significant impact on other areas of the unit’s operational activities; mostly by freeing up field officers to focus more on the prevention of harm in some of our high-risk areas.

The success rate for resolving barking issues increased from 67% in July 2018, to 92% by June 2019 – a massive achievement by the Bark Advisors.

In July 2019, Auckland Council had its first successful prosecution of a dog owner who continuously failed to prevent their dog from causing a nuisance by barking.

The Specialists team is currently working on improving all processes, letters, brochures and other information which the Bark Advisors use to educate and assist dog owners (who have dogs that are barking persistently) and their unhappy neighbours to resolve the issues between them.

2.7 Bylaws

"Broaden owner obligations to minimise dog aggression and nuisance not already covered in legislation."

The Auckland Council Dog Management Bylaw 2012 (the Bylaw) will remain in force until 31 October 2019.

On 1 November 2019, the new Policy on Dogs 2019 and the Dog Management Bylaw 2019 will come into effect.

The new Policy and Bylaw will:
- provide a consistent approach to multiple dog ownership
- provide a consistent definition of the time and season rule that apply at beaches
- apply a standard lambing season rule in regional parks
- extend the council’s ability to protect our plant life
- amend dog access rules for the protection of wildlife in Glenfern Sanctuary, Muriwai Regional Park, Long Bay Regional Park and Whatipu, Waitakere Ranges Regional Park
- incentivise responsible dog ownership for owners of dogs that have been classified as menacing due to their behaviour (Section 33A)

2.8 Funding

"Ensure adequate funding to maintain acceptable levels of service to achieve this policy."

The Governing Body of Auckland Council determines the level of funding, registration fee structure and other dog management fees as part of the long-term plan and annual plan process.
Registrations fees
The majority of Animal Management functions and activities are performed with funding from dog registration fees.

This funding contributes to vital areas of animal management, including:
- a 24-hour response to dog incidents, such as attacks on people and other animals;
- beach and park patrols;
- animal shelters and adoptions;
- educating children and adults about dog safety;
- reuniting lost dogs with owners; and
- dog safety initiatives.

Dog registration and Animal Management fees have increased by 3.7% on average for the 2019/20 financial year.

Central Government funding
The Txt 2 Desex campaign, which was funded by Central Government, contributed significantly to achieving safer communities throughout Auckland.

A total of 4,435 dogs were classified as menacing or dangerous at the end of the last financial year, and the overall compliance with the classifications increased by 6.5%.

This funding was a major contributor to the success of the campaign, but unfortunately no further funding has been received from Central Government for the 2019/20 year.

Future initiatives
To follow up on the success of the previous campaign, a new campaign is currently being planned to promote and assist with the de-sexing of high-risk dogs, and to continue the effort to reduce harm in our communities.

Funding for this campaign is still pending.
Part 3: The Auckland Region – Our Dogs & Dog Owners

3.1 Dog owners in Auckland

As at 30 June 2019, the Auckland Region had a total of 91,542 known dog owners, which is an increase of 237 (0.26%) from the previous year.

The average age of all dog owners in the region is 49.1 years, and of these owners there are 26,809 (29.3%) who currently hold an RDOL.

The average age of RDOL holders is 52.8 years, and 74% of this group only owns one dog. The majority of these licence holders live in Papakura.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple dog ownership</th>
<th>RDOL holders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All dog owners</td>
<td>RDOL holders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of owners</td>
<td>No. of dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,977</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,788</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>3+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Dogs in Auckland

The total number of known dogs in the Auckland Region increased from 110,012 in 2017/18 to 110,969 in 2018/19 – an increase of 0.87%.

Male dogs in Auckland make up 52% of all dogs, compared to 48% female dogs. The average age for a dog in Auckland is 6.5 years.

The percentage of dogs that were registered for the 2018/19 registration year increased to 96.1% – this is the best result ever for Auckland Council.

3.2.1 Most preferred dog breeds in Auckland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Primary Breed</th>
<th>No. of dogs in the Auckland Region</th>
<th>Top Dog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Labrador</td>
<td>13,926</td>
<td>The Labrador Retriever is Auckland's most preferred breed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Staffordshire Bull Terrier</td>
<td>5,688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Border Collie</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shih Tzu</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jack Russell</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>German Shepherd</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Miniature Schnauzer</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bichon Frise</td>
<td>3,256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maltese</td>
<td>3,084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>American Pit Bull Terrier</td>
<td>2,978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2.2 Most popular

Our heat map overlays show that Papakura is the most popular suburb for dogs, with 3.4% of all dogs in Auckland living there.

The most popular name for a female dog is Bella, and for a male dog, Charlie.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Area / Suburb</th>
<th>No. of dogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>3,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pukekohe</td>
<td>3,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>2,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>2,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Remuera</td>
<td>2,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Waiuku</td>
<td>1,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Massey</td>
<td>1,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>1,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Titirangi</td>
<td>1,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Glen Eden</td>
<td>1,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Papatoetoe</td>
<td>1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Torbay</td>
<td>1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Drury</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Waiheke Island</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Stanmore Bay</td>
<td>1,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Onehunga</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mount Wellington</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Orewa</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mount Eden</td>
<td>1,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Te Atatu Peninsula</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.3 Menacing & dangerous dogs

As at 30 June 2018, the Auckland region had a total of 4,406 dogs that are classified as menacing, with 653 of these classifications issued under Section 33A (behaviour) and 3,753 issued under Section 33C (breed or type) of the Act.

A total of 29 dogs are classified as dangerous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Menacing</th>
<th>Dangerous</th>
<th>Neutered</th>
<th>% of owners compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>953</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,062</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.55%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>97.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>95.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>97.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,406</strong></td>
<td><strong>653</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,253</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.53%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Top classified breeds – menacing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary breed</th>
<th>No. of dogs</th>
<th>Primary breed</th>
<th>No. of dogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Bull Terrier</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>American Pit Bull Terrier</td>
<td>3,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador Retriever</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>American Staffordshire Terrier</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Shepherd</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Dogo Argentino</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberian Husky</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastiff</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Collie</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rottweiler</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shar Pei</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Bulldog</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntaway</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

It is standard practice for Animal Management not to place a menacing classification on a dog as a result of any observed or reported behaviour (S.33A), if the dog is already classified as menacing due to its breed or type (S.33C).

## Top classified breeds – dangerous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary breed</th>
<th>No. of dogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German Shepherd</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Pit Bull Terrier</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Bull Terrier</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberian Husky</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Staffordshire Terrier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 4: Dog Control Statistics – 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019

### 4.1 Registrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known dogs</td>
<td>110,969</td>
<td>110,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs registered</td>
<td>106,608</td>
<td>102,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Known dogs registered</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDOL holders</td>
<td>26,809</td>
<td>26,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dog owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary owners</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified owners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menacing dogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 33A (observed or reported behaviour)</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 33C (breed or type in Schedule 4)</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>3,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous dogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 31(1)(a) – owner conviction</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 31(1)(b) – sworn evidence</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 31(1)(c) – owner admitted in writing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Menacing &amp; Dangerous)</td>
<td>4,435</td>
<td>4,297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Menacing & Dangerous dogs neutered    | 4,282 | 3,848         |
- % of all Menacing & Dangerous dogs neutered | 96.5% | 90%           |
4.3 Requests for service (RFS)

4.3.1 Service response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 (high priority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># responded to within 1 hour</td>
<td>3,031</td>
<td>2,995</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>13,664</td>
<td>13,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% responded to within 1 hour</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 (non-priority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># responded to within 24 hours</td>
<td>4,985</td>
<td>5,752</td>
<td>5,242</td>
<td>5,365</td>
<td>21,344</td>
<td>20,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% responded to within 24 hours</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RFS (including pro-active)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,008</td>
<td>33,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 RFS – breakdown by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive behaviour to other animals</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive behaviour to people</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>6,811</td>
<td>7,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw breach</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification breach</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog attack on animals</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog attack on people</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog attack on stock</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog / stock on motorway</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (property visits, dog trap requests, service of notices, etc.)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick up - dog (contained)</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>6,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick up - stock (contained)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police / SPCA assistance</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property inspection</td>
<td>↓ 664</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relinquish dog</td>
<td>↓ 78</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roaming dog – general</td>
<td>↓ 4,090</td>
<td>5,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roaming dog – risk to public</td>
<td>↑ 4,022</td>
<td>3,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roaming stock</td>
<td>↓ 1,069</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>↓ 228</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>↓ 27,677</td>
<td>28,905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.3 Pro-active work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW1 – Patrolling public areas</td>
<td>↑ 1,202</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2 – Targeted compliance (monitoring classifications, serving notices, etc.)</td>
<td>↓ 772</td>
<td>1,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3 – Unregistered dogs</td>
<td>↑ 5,357</td>
<td>3,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>↑ 7,331</td>
<td>4,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 Compliance data

#### 4.4.1 Prosecutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prosecutions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of people prosecuted (there may be more than one charge in many of the prosecutions)</td>
<td>↓ 220</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.4.2 Infringement notices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infringement notices issued</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description of offence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wilful obstruction of dog control officer or ranger</td>
<td>↓ 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(2)</td>
<td>Failure or refusal to supply information or wilfully providing false particulars</td>
<td>↓ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A(2)</td>
<td>Failure to supply information or wilfully providing false particulars about dog</td>
<td>↓ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Attachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(5)</td>
<td>Failure to comply with any bylaw authorised by the section</td>
<td>↑ 1,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A(2)</td>
<td>Failure to undertake dog owner education programme or dog obedience course (or both)</td>
<td>↓ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Failure to comply with obligations of probationary owner</td>
<td>↓ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28(5)</td>
<td>Failure to comply with the effects of disqualification</td>
<td>↓ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32(2)</td>
<td>Failure to comply with the effects of classification of dog as dangerous dog</td>
<td>↓ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32(4)</td>
<td>Fraudulent sale or transfer of dangerous dog</td>
<td>↑ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33EC(1)</td>
<td>Failure to comply with effects of classification of dog as menacing dog</td>
<td>↑ 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33F(3)</td>
<td>Failure to advise person of muzzle and leasing requirements</td>
<td>↓ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36A(8)</td>
<td>Failure to implant microchip transponder in dog</td>
<td>↑ 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>False statement relating to dog registration</td>
<td>↑ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41A</td>
<td>Falsely notifying death of dog</td>
<td>↑ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Failure to register dog</td>
<td>↓ 2,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(4)</td>
<td>Fraudulent procurement or attempt to procure replacement dog registration label or disc</td>
<td>↓ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48(3)</td>
<td>Failure to advise change of dog ownership</td>
<td>↓ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49(4)</td>
<td>Failure to advise change of address</td>
<td>↓ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51(1)</td>
<td>Removal, swapping, or counterfeiting of registration label or disc</td>
<td>↓ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52A</td>
<td>Failure to keep dog controlled or confined</td>
<td>↓ 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53(1)</td>
<td>Failure to keep dog under control</td>
<td>↓ 1,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54(2)</td>
<td>Failure to provide proper care and attention, to supply proper and sufficient food, and to provide adequate exercise</td>
<td>↑ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54A</td>
<td>Failure to carry leash in public</td>
<td>↑ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55(7)</td>
<td>Failure to comply with barking dog abatement notice</td>
<td>↑ 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62(4)</td>
<td>Allowing dog known to be dangerous to be at large unmuzzled or unleashed</td>
<td>↑ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62(5)</td>
<td>Failure to advise of muzzle and leashing requirements</td>
<td>↓ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72(2)</td>
<td>Releasing a dog from custody</td>
<td>↓ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓ 5,172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.5 Shelter data

#### 4.5.1 Impounded dogs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% of all impounds</th>
<th>H. Gulf Islands</th>
<th>Manukau</th>
<th>Henderson</th>
<th>Silverdale</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogs impounded</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3,666</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>6,833</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned to owner</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthanized</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5.2 Euthanised dogs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for euthanasia</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not pass a Temperament Test</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menacing breed or type</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health issues</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of all dogs euthanized as American Pit Bull Terrier dogs</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↑ = up from the previous year  ↓ = down from the previous year  = unchanged from the previous year
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Planning Committee Workshop:
Roads and Streets Framework Review
MINUTES

Minutes of a workshop held in the Room 1, Level 26, 135 Albert Street on Wednesday 21 August 2019 at 10.03am.

PRESENT
Chairperson Cr Chris Darby
Cr Josephine Bartley
Cr Cathy Casey
Cr Linda Cooper
Cr Richard Hills
Cr Penny Hulse
Cr Paul Young

APOLOGETIES
Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore  On council business
Cr Ross Clow  On council business
Cr Efeso Collins  On council business
Cr Alf Filipaina  On council business
Mayor Phil Goff  On council business
IMSB Member Liane Ngamane  On council business
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Desley Simpson  On council business
Cr Sharon Stewart
Cr Wayne Walker
Cr John Watson

ABSENT
Cr Christine Fletcher
IMSB Member Tau Henare
Cr Mike Lee
Cr Daniel Newman
Cr John Walker
Note: No decisions or resolutions may be made by a workshop, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing it specifically instructs such action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of the workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To seek feedback from the committee on the revision of the Roads and Streets Framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declarations of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There were no declarations of interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Auckland Transport provided an update on the revision process undertaken and that changes that have been made to the existing Roads and Streets Framework (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A PowerPoint presentation was provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop closed at 11.20am.
Planning Committee Workshop:
Government Reform Programme – Highly
Productive Land, Urban Development and
Freshwater
MINUTES

Minutes of a workshop held in the Room 1, Level 26, 135 Albert Street on Thursday 19
September 2019 at 10.02am.

PRESENT
Chairperson Cr Chris Darby From 10.23am
Deputy Chairperson Cr Richard Hills
Cr Josephine Bartley From 10.05am
Cr Cathy Casey From 10.05am
Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore
Cr Efeso Collins From 10.09am, until 11.34am
Cr Linda Cooper
Cr Christine Fletcher From 10.32am, until 12.01pm
Mayor Phil Goff From 10.05am, until 10.52am
Cr Wayne Walker From 10.14am, until 12.03pm
Cr Paul Young

APOLOGIES
Cr Alf Filipaina
IMSB Member Tau Henare
Cr Penny Hulse
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Desley Simpson
Cr Sharon Stewart
Cr John Walker

ABSENT
Cr Ross Clow
Cr Mike Lee
Cr Daniel Newman
IMSB Member Liane Ngamane
Cr John Watson
ALSO PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angela Dalton</td>
<td>Manurewa Local Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Doig</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Fulljames</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Makoare</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Tava</td>
<td>Waitāmatā Local Board Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: No decisions or resolutions may be made by a workshop, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing it specifically instructs such action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of the workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To seek direction for Auckland Council submission on proposed Government reforms concerning Highly Productive land, Urban Development and Essential Freshwater.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declarations of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There were no declarations of interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Staff worked through council’s submission points for the proposed Government reforms concerning Highly Productive land, Urban Development and Essential Freshwater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A PowerPoint presentation was provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop closed at 12.07pm.