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Pt Chevalier Cycleway

Auckland Transport have got the Pt Chevalier Cycleway location WRONG.

The original location of the cycleways were decided by transport bloggers ‘Greater Auckland’ to be on the main arterial roads. This is flawed thinking. And it was never consulted on.

The best place to

Here are my responses to the ‘have your say’ https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/point-chevalier-improvements/

PT CHEVALIER ROAD
What has AT got RIGHT: Not a lot Keeping the street pohutakawa is the only thing you’ve got right

What could AT IMPROVE: Everything
1. STOP the removal of removes 90 car parks from Pt Chevalier Road….this will destroy businesses and make it difficult for residents
2. A wigging cycleway on both sides of the road is unnecessary
3. The cycleway interferes with the character of the area by taking away cafe space for dinning 4.
4 pedestrian crossings with raised tables is complete over kill and unnecessary
5. Raised table pedestrian crossings at each side road and narrowing of entry is completely unnecessary as this is a commute road with little traffic going into side roads in comparison with those going to the motorway.
6. Lights at Meola Rd / Pt Chev Rd intersection will only slow traffic. Isn’t the ‘Vision Zero’ rule that roundabouts are better than lights?
7. The narrowing of the intersection of vehicles turning into Meola from Pt Chev Rd when some on these vehicles are buses is silly and dangerous….again AT is not thinking about emergency vehicles including firetrucks

MEOLA ROAD
What has AT got RIGHT: Not a lot
1. The pedestrian crossing by the bus stop but it shouldn’t be with a raised table
2. Meola Road is a very busy commute road so this is the silliest place to put a cycleway at all BUT at least it’s only on one side of the road
3. Meola Road is a very busy commute road so removing parking COULD be a good idea…..if parking was provided for the users. I see that some parking is being provided for soccer players with MOTAT visitor BUT nothing for dog walkers

What could AT IMPROVE: Everything
1. Not moving of Meola Road over in the portion from the dog walking park to Pt Chev Road NOT KILLING 20 MATURE TREES in a Climate Change Emergency. These trees cool the area, provide shelter and habitat. Their amenity value of a tree lined vista down the length of the road is enormous…..esp once the power lines are underground and they can grow more evenly
2. Underground power lines
3. Parking for dog walkers
4. Parking for soccer provided by MOTAT before any of this starts in a multilevel building. A Park and Ride for commuters would be even better
5. Parking in the area by the start of the walkway before the soccer fields 6. Support Meola Monarchs Butterfly Sanctuary as an Interactive Art Park to enhance the amenity value of Meola Road, to tie in with the Meola Reef Enhancement Project
GARNET ROAD
What has AT got RIGHT: Nothing What could AT IMPROVE: Everything
1. AT have already consulted and been rejected on the Garnet Rd cycleway and are using this as an attempt to roll out the ‘blood sandwich cycleway again’
2. It is evident in the small portion that goes into Garnet Road from the roundabout that the intention is to ignore the rejection to the ‘blood sandwich’ and endanger lives by putting the cycleway between the kerb and parked cars along a residential road with people turning into driveways and backing out into moving vehicles where many, many car parks are lost in a street that is wide enough to function without separated cycleways. These people have NOT been consulted.
3. The flow of commuter traffic is blocked with raised table pedestrian crossings on all 4 roads of roundabout. These are completely unnecessary and dangerous for turning vehicles
4. The removal the lane for south bound up Garnet Road being separate from right turning commuter vehicles will only cause more congestion
5. The cycleway design falls just short of the West End Shopping Village in an attempt to avoid consultation with the Village while planning a roll out as the next step
6. On this projectary the West End Road Shopping Village will be devoured by the cycleway. Just like the debacle at West Lynn, this village relies heavily on the best butcher in town as a destination shop (just like Harvest in West Lynn)....let’s face it these vegan cyclist don’t need access to this butcher 7. What in this design is there to continue the bus access to West End Rd shopping village as currently the bus turns around the round about and does not provide a bus route through the village?

OVERALL
1. Why are the designers thinking like cars and choosing the busiest commute roads instead of quiet roads and through parks.
2. The design hasn’t taken into account the school catchment areas.
3. The cycleway....if it had to be on Meola Road at all....could branch off onto a boardwalk through the mangroves after the dog walking park and go up a side street to go to the school eg Newel. Equally so, it could go along Walford and Kiwi and Tui with sharrow in these side roads and only a cycleway controlled by lights on Meola during school commute....which of course avoids evening traffic commute I have a map of a better parking map as well
4. AT could support Meola Monarchs Butterfly Sanctuary on Meola Road to further enhance the amenity value of the area
5. This consultation period was badly planned over the Christmas period with minimal signage for commuters, users of the dog park and soccer field. Low community involvement and a lack of mail drop to affected residents. I asked for further information from AT on some specific but was told that people were not available to answer my questions.
It was also over the election time as was the debacle in West Lynn that resulted in a dangerous cycleway rejected by community, this is similar. This also crosses the boundary of 2 local boards. Members have also not been able to get answers.

The whole of Meola Road would be safer without parking during rush period to have no parking. Outside these hours he road is calm and safe with parking.

Parking for Dog Walkers The dog walking area requires extra parking.
Double the current parking by moving current parks one car length west and there were also carparks on the eastern side. Add more parking in area shown below
Bus Stops – busy stop for school children by MOTAT needs to stay recessed not inline
There are many other aspects of this design that are flawed. 1. Removal of 97 car parks on Pt Chevalier Road that are need for residents and businesses. @. Restricting the area that cafes can rent off Auckland Council for outdoor seating that give the area much loved character. 3. Adding 2 extra pedestrian crossings in the area from Great North Road to Meola Road, making a total of 4. 4. Changing the drop off zone and bus stop area by the library that currently works, especially for elderly and mobility impaired.
Roundabout - article from Ponsonby News

AUCKLAND TRANSPORT STRIKES AGAIN!
This time it’s the main commute route – West End Road, Garnet Road, Meola Road, Pt Chevalier Road to the Western Motorway. Just like the debacle caused by Christmas consultation on West Lynn, the consultation closed on 10 December 2019.

The plan removes car parking from residents, dog walkers and Pt Chevalier Road patrons. It moves Meola Road over to the south from the dog walking park to Pt Chevalier Road where new lights will be installed. In doing so, it removes 20 mature trees, but that’s okay according to AT because “they’re Australian” (no koalas will be harmed).

Worst of all, they’re messing with the Meola Road roundabout by removing the straight ahead lane from Garnet Road and having raised table pedestrian crossings at each road. How will the buses that no longer service West End Road shopping village be able to turn around in this new constricted configuration? The design finishes just short of West End shopping village to avoid their consultation.

The plan shows how it will link in with the ‘blood sandwich (my description) / ‘aspirational plans’ (AT’s description) / rejected consultation of the Garnet Road cycleway from last year! Happy New Year.

Gael Baldoch, Westmere
Item 9.2

Attachment A
**Alternative route - servicing schools in the area - safer and better breathing for cyclists**

Instead of commuters avoiding the main road and using the side road, send the cyclists down the side roads that directly connect to the schools eg. Kiwi Road.

**Consultation – AT wouldn’t answer questions in preChristmas consultation until AELB member intervened**
Hi Lee,

The consultation opened on 22 November and a number of steps have been taken to notify the community of the opportunity to provide feedback, including:

- More than 5,700 brochures/feedback forms delivered to local properties
- Hand delivered letters to local businesses including follow up meetings with a number of them
- On-street signage
- Media release picked up by Stuff and Our Auckland (articles published on 22 November)
- Adverts in the Central Leader – 28 November and 5 December
- Social media posts and geo-targeted advertising
- Held three public drop-in sessions (which were also advertised in the Central Leader)
- Set up a project webpage and an online feedback form on our website

Feedback closes on 20 December. The consultation will not be extended.

Having experienced a debacle of Grey Lynn occurring over election time and preChristmas, it is only logical to extend the consultation period. Signage needs to be prominent in the commuting route and the dog walking park.
From: *Projects (AT)*<projects@at.govt.nz>
Date: 20 December 2019 at 7:25:51 PM NZDT
To: Gaiel Baldock <gaielb@xtra.co.nz>
Subject: RE: Pt Chevalier Cycleway consultation

Dear Gaiel,

We have been asked to provide responses to you regarding the questions you raised with Lee Corrick the Deputy Chair of the Albert-Eden Local Board.

We have provided answers to these questions below:

1. Does the design move the Western end of Meola Road from the dog walking park to Pt Chevalier Road to the south removing 20 large, mature trees in the process?

   We have tried to find ways to minimise tree removal and collaborated closely with arborists on the designs. We focused on retaining and planting even more native trees. The Pohutukawa trees will be retained on Point Chevalier Road. Arborists have told us that many of the trees on Meola Road were introduced from Australia and are not in a healthy state at the moment. We received recommendation to remove some of those trees on Meola Road and replace them with native trees that are appropriate for the space and area available. This will also benefit our native birds which prefer native trees. It will also help to create the safest possible outcome for the community by enabling us to provide better road widths for motorists and a more consistent cycleway width for people on bikes. Some trees will also need to be pruned for the safety of large vehicles. The trees are currently heavily compromised with the current power lines going through them. Yes, the road carriageway along the western residential section of Meola Road is shifting south. The trees would require heavy vehicle clearance as a part of maintenance anyways. This will require about 30-40 % of the tree that will need trimming, hence the tree will not survive that and will have structural issues in the future. All works concerning trees will be undertaken with arborist support.

2. Why isn’t the northern footpath widened and changed to a cycleway and the southern footpath kept for pedestrians?

   The footpath on both sides collects people walking from both sides of the road and the neighbourhood without having to cross the road multiple times to use it. Also the widening of the existing footpath on the north side would have then warranted for a removal of non-compromised, healthier trees on the that side of Meola Road.

3. Are the powerlines going underground during the cycleway or is the road getting dug up again?

   The project team is currently in conversation with Vector to achieve that outcome.

4. Why is the well flowing Gatel / Meola Road roundabout having lanes reduced and raised tables with pedestrian crossings on all four roads to block a main commute road to and from the Western motorway? And why would designers of cycleways want to think like commuting cars????

   The design is taking a safe system approach which means that safety needs to be considered for all types of users across the full cross section of the road corridor. It is considered safe by providing crossing facilities that would create safer infrastructure for vulnerable active road users such as those walking, riding a bike etc.

Kind Regards

Sandy Welsh
Project Interface Business Support Specialist
Portfolio Delivery, Projects
Integrated Networks
Private Bag 10290, Auckland 1142
Ph: 99 443 8571
www.at.govt.nz | forests@at.govt.nz

---

**Attachment A**

**Item 9.2**
The activist: Pania Newton

Pania Newton, co-leader of Soul (Save our Unique Landscape group), looks back at four years of protest against the Fletcher housing development at Ihumātao.

"From the beginning, we were never asked whether the development should go ahead," she says. "We were only ever asked what it should look like."

The activist lawyer, whose leadership of the South Auckland protest propelled her into the spotlight, picks apart the "consultation" process.

"What we can confidently say is that looking at the history of consultation with Māori, it’s that agencies and corporations look for the consenting individuals, or consenting groups to consult with, and disregard those in opposition because they’re regarded as too difficult," she says.

At Ihumātao, the robustness of the consultation process with local Māori about the land and planned housing development has been a significant sticking point. While landowner and NZX listed company Fletcher insist adequate consultation took place, mana whenua groups like Soul say otherwise. Disagreement among those groups eventually led to the involvement of the Māori King, King Tūheitia, in August. Significantly, after weeks of discussions and more than a month of mass occupation at Ihumātao, a consensus was reached that the 33ha piece of land should be returned to Māori.

Newton puts it in perspective.

“When you think about what’s happened, had they appropriately and correctly consulted with the right groups, we probably wouldn’t be in the position we’re in right now.”

The “they” refers to the Crown.

other Pākehā organisations like Auckland Council and Heritage New Zealand, as well as Fletcher. They chose not to listen to those who disagreed with their plans, she says.

“On the one hand they’re saying they’ve got deadlines to meet and limited resources, but look at the resources they’ve spent here at Ihumātao.” Reports indicate the police presence cost tens of thousands of dollars each day at the height of the protest when more than 100 officers were deployed.

“And that’s just the cost of police,” Newton says. “Then there’s the Ministers’ costs, negotiation costs, and the cost of buying back the land now, rather than what it cost back then [2015]. It’s a lot more.”

Owning up to serious flaws in previous and existing practices of consultation with Māori is the first step, Newton says carefully.

“My hope for the next 10 years is that this [Ihumātao] would set an example to governments, councils and agencies of how they should not engage with Māori.

They need to be more aware about consulting with the correct groups, and ensure those groups or individuals who claim they have mandate actually have the mandate to say that. It can’t just be about talking to the groups or individuals that say what suits them and is the easiest option at the time.”

Doing that is how we live out consultation and partnership as it was intended in Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Newton says.
NZTA Overbridge – no consultation

The plan – 2 right turning lanes onto the motorway and one straight ahead lane to St Lukes Road – GREAT THINKING 99

RE: St Lukes NZTA Information URGENT please read
30 January 2020 at 12:04 PM
☑️ Found in xtra.co.nz Inbox

Hi Gaol

The AELB board wasn’t consulted on this. It all happened over the election time. We were notified of the work being progressed in late 2019, by email. Concerns on this process were expressed to NZTA.

Kind regards
Lee

Lee Cormick | Deputy Chair
Albert-Eden Local Board
Mobile 021 387 4488
Auckland Council, 135 Dominion Road, Mt Eden Auckland 1024
Visit our website: aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Now extend that great thinking to make the extra wide emergency lane to be an extra lane to exit at Waterview
Albert-Eden Local Board feedback on proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB)

This feedback starts with general comments from the Albert-Eden Local Board (the Board) and continues with responses to some of the questions for consultation in MFE’s discussion document *He Kura Koiro i hokia* (G.5, p 95-99).

1. General comments from the Board

1.1. We acknowledge that Aotearoa New Zealand’s biodiversity is unique, has been declining and needs processes in place to provide protection to prevent further loss.

1.2. We note the need for adequate resourcing to enable implementation of the proposed policies and we support resourcing iwi/Māori for the implementation of NPSIB, including the involvement of both mana whenua and mataawaka.

1.3. We ask Auckland Council to commit to using its role as unitary authority to create integrated management plans for the protection of indigenous biodiversity within its existing protection, restoration and enhancement programmes.

1.4. We believe there needs to be an increased emphasis on consideration of climate change and climate resilience throughout the NPSIB, beyond Part 3.5.

2. Responses to MFE’s questions

2.1 Question 1: Do you agree a NPSIB is needed to strengthen requirements for protecting our native plants, animals and ecosystems under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)? Why/why not?

Yes. The Board supports the creation of a nationally applicable NPSIB given its significant role as kaitiaki and holder of landowner status for 102 parks, coastal environments, several Significant Ecological Areas and two streams. A NPSIB is required to strengthen our role in commenting on RMA matters when responding to development and infrastructure projects.

Our reasons for wanting to move in this direction include the significance of irreversibility of loss of indigenous biodiversity to the environment of New Zealand (s 45 (2)(g) RMA) and a desire to work towards meeting obligations to Māori.

Albert-Eden Board has for many years actively supported protection of indigenous biodiversity, for example, through its financial support for restoration of waterways in shared infrastructure projects in the area. However, there are some circumstances where policy direction would extend the potential range of protective activity.

Further, the Board suggests the Resource Management Act (RMA) itself needs increased requirements to actively protect and maintain indigenous biodiversity.

2.2 Question 2: The scope of the proposed NPSIB focuses on the terrestrial environment and the restoration and enhancement of wetlands. Do you think there is a role for the NPSIB within coastal marine and freshwater environments? Why/why not?

Yes. Despite separate NPS’s for coastal and freshwater management, we think there should be an NPS that has an over-arching function and specifically focusses on indigenous biodiversity across habitats. To make this work, it will of course be necessary to align the mechanics of the NPSIB and all other NPS’s (including the proposed NPS on highly productive land) and instruments of national direction (including the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy). Clause 1.6 may therefore need amendment.
2.3 Question 3: Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed NPSIB? (see Part 2.1 of the proposed NPSIB) Why/why not?
Yes. However, we would also like to see an increase in the clarity of provisions relating to assessing output of the proposed NPSIB. We support Part 4 ‘Effectiveness Review’, but suggest that this may need to include more detailed provisions about methodology that will prove useful.

Objective 1 is ‘to maintain indigenous biodiversity’. However, we believe that there needs to be a positive gain in indigenous biodiversity given the significant reduction in biodiversity in our area. (As noted in our paragraph 2.5 below, we also note that, for consistency, clause 1.7 (3) should go further than ‘at least no reduction’).

2.4 Question 4: Hutia te Rito recognises that the health and well-being of nature is vital to our own health and wellbeing. This will be the underlying concept of the proposed NPSIB. Do you agree? Why/why not?
Yes. It is important that it is explained, as in the draft, that it will benefit all communities’ wellbeing in addition to kaitiaki obligations to provide for the health of indigenous biodiversity, species and ecosystems that are taonga.

2.5 Question 5: Does the proposed NPSIB provide enough information on Hutia te Rito and how it should be implemented? Is there anything else that should be added to reflect te ao Māori in managing indigenous biodiversity?
Clause 1.7 (3) should go further than ‘at least no reduction’ (see paragraph 2.3 above).

2.6 Question 6: Do you think the proposed NPSIB appropriately takes into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi? Why/why not?
We believe that restoration is important for Treaty obligation reasons, and that therefore the benchmark of requiring ‘at least no reduction’ is too weak.

2.7 Question 7: What opportunities and challenges do you see for the way in which councils would be required to work with tangata whenua when managing indigenous biodiversity? What information and resources would support the enhanced role of tangata whenua in indigenous biodiversity management? Please explain

As in our general comment 1.2 above, we note again here the need for adequate resourcing to enable implementation of the proposed policies. We support resourcing iwi/Māori for the implementation of NPSIB, including the involvement of both mana whenua and mataawaka.

Iwi Management Plans should have status when RMA matters are considered.

Further, we believe there is a very widespread deficit in understanding of ecological principles about protection and restoration of indigenous biodiversity. This creates challenges when community engagement and consultation are required. National level support for formal and informal education and resources to address this deficit is required since it is unreasonable to rely on local government and iwi to fill the gap on an ad hoc basis.

2.9 Question 9: What specific information, support or resources would help to implement the provisions in this section?

Section A
See answer to question 7 in paragraph 2.7 above.

Section B: Identifying important biodiversity and taonga (pgs 32 - 41)
The Board supports the general principles in Appendix 1 because they seem to provide a desirable level of flexibility, for example, to include areas within the wider ecological context that support indigenous biodiversity.

The Board believes that section 76(4A) of the RMA needs to be reviewed and brought into line with the proposed NPSIB.

2.10 Question 10: Territorial authorities will need to identify, map and schedule Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) in partnership with tangata whenua, landowners and communities. What logistical issues do you see with mapping SNAs, and what has been limiting this mapping from happening?

This is a significant undertaking and needs adequate resourcing to ensure community consultation and personnel to do the work. This has been completed in the Auckland region.

2.11 Question 11: Of the following three options, who do you think should be responsible for identifying, mapping and scheduling SNAs? Why?

Auckland Council is a Unitary Authority and should remain responsible.

2.12 Question 12: Do you consider the ecological significance criteria in Appendix 1 of the proposed NPSIB appropriate for identifying SNAs? Why/why not?

Yes, for reasons in paragraph 2.9 section B above.

2.13 Question 13: The NPSIB proposes SNAs are scheduled in a district plan. Which of the following council plans should include SNA schedules? Why?

Not applicable - Auckland has a Unitary Plan.

2.14 Question 14: Do you agree with the proposed approach to the identification and management of taonga species and ecosystems? (see Part 3.14 of the proposed NPSIB) Why/why not?

Yes.

2.15 Question 15: Part 3.15 of the proposed NPSIB requires regional councils and territorial authorities to work together to identify and manage highly mobile fauna outside of SNAs. Do you agree with this approach? Why/why not?

Yes. Highly mobile fauna need protection across their ecosystems.

2.16 Question 21: Are there any other adverse effects that should be added to Part 1.7(4), to be considered within and outside SNAs? Please explain.

Increased risk of other biosecurity threats and detrimental environmental factors.

2.17 Question 22: Do you agree with the distinction between high- and medium-value SNAs as the way to ensure SNAs are protected while providing for new activities? If no, do you have an alternative suggestion? Please explain

We do not support a more lenient approach to facilitate mineral or aggregate extraction except where required for domestic, as opposed to export, supply.

2.18 Question 27: Does the proposed NPSIB provide the appropriate level of protection for indigenous biodiversity outside SNAs, with enough flexibility to allow other community outcomes to be met? Why/why not?

It is not sufficient or reasonable to rely on SNA’s alone.
2.29 Question 29: Do you think the proposed NPSIB adequately provides for the development of Māori land? Why/why not?

We support provision for development of Māori land to redress historic disadvantage and consequently some leniency. However, in the case of the most vulnerable species, in principle Māori should be compensated for the costs of resulting development limitations. This may require more resources than are available to local government, and as a matter of national significance should be funded at a national level. (We acknowledge this may be beyond the scope of this NPSIB).

2.30 Question 30: Part 3.5 of the proposed NPSIB requires territorial authorities and regional councils to promote the resilience of indigenous biodiversity to climate change. Do you agree with this provision? Why/why not?

Yes, because it is one of the relevant factors.

2.31 Question 31: Do you think the inclusion of the precautionary approach in the proposed NPSIB is appropriate? (see Part 3.6 of the proposed NPSIB) Why/why not?

Yes, this is the best approach adopting a risk management approach: the consequences of ‘getting it wrong’ in the ecological context can be irreversible.

2.36 Question 36: What level of residual adverse effect do you think biodiversity offsets and biodiversity compensation should apply to?

Compensation should apply to all residual adverse effects where associated with business activity. Business should not be permitted to externalise any ‘costs’ to the environment that are adverse impacts, whether less or greater than ‘minor’. On the other hand, effects which are less than minor associated with construction of a single residential dwelling may be outside the system. As a proviso, this exception should only apply to the extent that proposed construction will result in a dwelling with a value that is equal to or less than the median value of a dwelling at the time in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Section D: Restoration and enhancement of biodiversity (pgs 68 - 76)

2.38 Question 38: The proposed NPSIB promotes the restoration and enhancement of three priority areas: degraded SNA; areas that provide important connectivity or buffering functions; and wetlands. (See Part 3.16 of the proposed NPSIB). Do you agree with these priorities? Why/why not?

Yes. Because they cover all the important areas.

2.40 Question 40: Part 3.17 of the proposed NPSIB requires regional councils to establish a 10 per cent target for urban indigenous vegetation cover and separate indigenous vegetation targets for non-urban areas. Do you agree with this approach? Why/why not?

For urban areas, we believe that overall a percentage target may well have some limited use as a baseline for a jurisdictional area, such as a local board area. However, we also believe that other measurements connected with the objectives of the NPSIB and lived experience of residents may be more meaningful for smaller areas within a jurisdictional area.

To explain further: we are concerned that the effect of averaging out across too broad a geographic area could be yet another way in which deprived areas are disadvantaged. For example, smaller areas in which social and lower cost residential development is set to be intensified within the Albert-Eden local board area will hopefully all gain the benefits of an
assured level of indigenous vegetation cover. It would be a poor outcome if these ‘sub-areas’ were to miss out because other areas well beyond the scope of residents’ walking range include double the amount targeted.

Also, the creation of wildlife corridors depends on different aspects of distribution of cover as well as the total cover that can be counted.

2.41 Question 41: Do you think regional biodiversity strategies should be required under the proposed NPSIB or promoted under the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy? Please explain

There seems to be a number of options for how to organise the inter-workings of these national documents. For example, perhaps the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy should become an NPS and incorporate the NPSIB?

From our perspective, the most important outcome is that the national guidance is clear, easy to follow, and kept up to date as knowledge grows.

2.42 Question 42: Do you agree with the proposed principles for regional biodiversity strategies set out in Appendix 5 of the proposed NPSIB? Why/why not?

Yes because of the potential benefits in Table 5.

2.43 Question 43: Do you think the proposed regional biodiversity strategy has a role in promoting other outcomes (eg, predator control or preventing the spread of pests and pathogens)? Please explain

Yes. These ecological outcomes are only achievable when applied over a landscape approach.

2.48 Question 48: Do you agree with the proposed additional information requirements within Assessments of Environmental Effects (AEES) for activities that impact on indigenous biodiversity? (see Part 3.19 of the proposed NPSIB) Why/why not?

Yes.
Albert-Eden Local Board feedback to the Justice Committee inquiry into the 2019 local elections.

The Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) Notes with concern the low turnout in local body elections. Some stated reasons (from the Auckland Council draft submission) such as ‘I didn’t know anything about the candidates’ are difficult to address, but ‘I forgot’ and ‘I was away from home’ are more amenable to solutions. The Board recommends:
   - That Auckland Council continue to explore the most effective means of reminding voters throughout the election period to return their ballots, by targeted as well as broad messages.
   - That the election period be timed to avoid school and university holidays.
   - That the Local Electoral Regulations 2001 be amended to allow for electronic transmission of voting documents to and from voters overseas in similar fashion to clause 45A in the Electoral Regulations 1996.
   - That the Local Electoral Act 2001 be amended to allow enrolment until the close of voting.

b) Recommends that work be undertaken to achieve a consistent voting method for all types of local elections (health boards, local boards, council, licensing trusts).

c) Notes that, according to the Electoral Commission, all NZ residents who are not required to leave the country by a certain date are eligible to vote. This includes several categories of residence visa other than the Permanent Resident visa. Electoral Commission and other materials use the term ‘permanent resident’, which is likely to cause confusion among residents who hold visas which allow them to remain in New Zealand indefinitely (and who are thus eligible to vote), but do not hold Permanent Resident visas. The Board recommends that publicity materials be revised to eliminate this confusion and communicate to all eligible residents that they are eligible to vote.

d) Notes the success of the Auckland Council initiatives Vote Friday and One-Stop Shops. The One-Stop Shops were especially well attended, with reports of some locations running out of voting papers for some wards and local board areas. There was also no regular One-Stop Shop in the Albert-Eden area (and only one pop-up location, at the Auckland Deaf Society in Balmoral, which was primarily promoted to the Deaf community.) The Board recommends:
   - That Auckland Council continue to support the Vote Friday initiative.
   - That Auckland Council expand the One-Stop Shop service to more times and locations, and formalise these sites as voting booths with enrolment.
   - That Council sites (libraries, service centres and community centres) be used for One-Stop Shops/voting booths, as security can more easily be set up there.
   - That One-Stop Shops/voting booths be managed similarly to voting booths at general elections, with campaigning and party colours not allowed within 50 metres.
   - That Auckland Council ensure that ample voting papers are available at One-Stop Shops/voting booths, and implement procedures to enable quick delivery of more papers if they are needed.

e) Recommends that further investigation be undertaken into giving responsibility for local elections to the Electoral Commission.

f) Notes that security issues around online voting are at present insurmountable, and opposes online voting (with the exception of electronic transmission of voting documents to and from voters overseas, similarly to the practice in general elections).

g) Recommends that local electoral advertising rules be aligned with general election advertising rules, including:
- aligning the definition of electoral advertising in the Local Electoral Act with that in the
  Electoral Act so that it covers all advertising that attempts to persuade people to vote
  or not to vote in a particular way.
- regulating third party spending, registration and declarations similarly to the framework
  in the Electoral Act.
- aligning local election provisions on anonymous, overseas and corporate donations with
  general election provisions.

h) Notes that in many instances, a provision requiring vacancies arising within six months of an
  election to be filled by the next highest polling candidate is likely to cause substantial changes
  in the make-up of local boards or the Governing Body. The Albert-Eden Local Board
  recommends against such a provision for local elections, including for local boards, the
  Governing Body or the mayor.

i) Recommends that the Local Electoral Regulations be amended to allow nominations and the
   associated profile statements to be submitted electronically.
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RFA Snapshot

- 3.5 million visitors annually
- 2800+ events a year
- 13 landmark venues
- Seven divisions
- 57% of revenue externally generated

573 FTES

$1.4 BILLION TOTAL ASSETS

$54.8 MILLION EXTERNAL REVENUE

$36.5 MILLION COUNCIL OPERATIONAL FUNDING
RFA Snapshot

OUR PORTFOLIO
- Auckland Art Gallery Toi o Tāmaki
- Auckland Conventions
- Auckland Live
- Auckland Stadiums
- Auckland Zoo
- NZ Maritime Museum
- RFA Corporate

OUR VENUES
- Viaduct Events Centre
- Aotea Centre & Square
- Auckland Art Gallery Toi o Tāmaki
- Auckland Town Hall
- Auckland Zoo
- Bruce Mason Centre
- Mt Smart Stadium
- NZ Maritime Museum
- North Harbour Stadium
- Queens Wharf
- The Civic
- Western Springs Stadium
Our Operating Model

- Delivers public good outcomes from a predominantly commercial basis

- Complex
  - Six unique businesses, all customer facing
  - Thirteen venues geographically spread across the region
  - Balance between commercial and public good outcomes

- Track record of turning struggling organisations into successful operations
  - Economies of scale
  - Leverage RFA-wide expertise, systems and resources

- Proven record of securing top international acts, commercial entertainment, conventions and exhibitions that deliver significant social and economic benefits for Auckland
  - Over the past six years, RFA’s stadium concerts and international musicals have generated more than $172 million in visitor spend and over 171,000 visitor nights
Auckland Art Gallery
Toi o Tāmaki

- Award-winning and internationally recognised visual arts museum
- Holds New Zealand’s largest collection of national and international art, including Māori art of international significance
- **450,000 visitors** a year, **90%** satisfaction
- Innovative public access, education and outreach programmes
- Aims to:
  - Preserve and make the visual arts accessible to the community
  - Provide learning opportunities to build appreciation of the visual arts
  - Act as a catalyst for creativity

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ “Excellent gallery, absolutely world class and one of the highlights of my trip to Auckland.”
- TRIPADVISOR REVIEW
Auckland Conventions

- New Zealand’s largest conventions business
- Secures and delivers more than 750 events every year
- Multi-venue programming: Aotea Centre, Auckland Art Gallery, Auckland Town Hall, Auckland Zoo, Bruce Mason Centre, Mt Smart Stadium, North Harbour Stadium, Queens Wharf, The Civic
- More than 360,000 attendees per annum
- Grows Auckland’s reputation as a viable market and secures international conventions for the city

"Thank you so much for pulling out all the stops to help make our Diversity Forum a success! The feedback we’re receiving is very positive. My sincere thanks to the team at Auckland Conventions."

- KARINIA LEE, NEW ZEALAND WOMEN LEADERS
Auckland Live

- New Zealand’s largest performing arts and entertainment organisation
- Secures, produces and delivers more than 1,260 shows/concerts a year
- Multi-venue programming: Aotea Centre, Aotea Square, Auckland Town Hall, Bruce Mason Centre, The Civic
- More than 1 million visitors a year
- Annual ticket sales of $58 million
- 280 free events and performances a year
- Negotiates and secures the big shows/musicals for the city

“We can’t thank Auckland Live enough for the incredible Royal New Zealand Ballet performance and workshop at today’s Pick & Mix event. My three little girls were mesmerised from start to finish. To be able to give a child that kind of experience is priceless, and for that we can’t thank you enough.”
Auckland Stadiums

- Secures and stages more than 1,200 sports events, concerts and music festivals across Mt Smart, North Harbour and Western Springs stadiums every year, attracting more than 640,000 people

- Supports high-performance sports organisations through the provision of training and administration facilities across all three stadiums

- Supports a significant community sports programme for schools, and local and regional clubs – more than 192,000 participants a year

“Travelled all the way from Brisbane to see the Broncos play the Warriors. I really enjoyed myself, loved the atmosphere and the stadium itself. was amazed at how close you could get to the field. Thanks again New Zealand for your hospitality. We will be back again next year.”
Auckland Zoo

Leading centre for wildlife conservation with New Zealand’s largest collection of native and exotic species. The Zoo is in a unique position to bring people together to keep wildlife safe from extinction.

Auckland Zoo:
- Provides exemplary care for wildlife
- Connects people with nature and inspires them to care about wildlife
- Provides unique learning opportunities to build understanding of wildlife
- Supports research to improve the science of wildlife management
- Helps conserve wildlife in wild places and encourages the community to care for and protect wildlife through their own actions

“An awesome zoo guys! I’ve been to zoos around the globe and would have to say this has been the best.... A big tick from this Aussie tourist. Keep up the great job!”
- TRIPADVISOR REVIEW
NZ Maritime Museum

- Celebrates Aotearoa New Zealand’s bond with the sea and our unique stories of discovery, exploration, immigration and sailing
- Largest maritime collection in New Zealand
- More than **160,000** visitors a year engage in NZMM’s galleries, programmes, shop and function centre
- Passionate volunteers contribute more than **40,000** hours every year
- More than **19,800** children and students participate in education and learning programmes annually
- Over **16,500** people experience a heritage sailing on the Waitematā Harbour every year

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ “Fantastic Museum! Excellent exhibits and beautifully displayed. A delight for all ages.”
- TRIPADVISOR REVIEW
Our Regional Role

- Advises Auckland Council on levy setting and governance for MOTAT and Auckland War Memorial Museum.
- Provides operational and/or capital funding for:
  - Trusts Arena
  - Vodafone Events Centre
  - North Shore Events Centre
  - Stardome Observatory and Planetarium
Financial Snapshot – FY18/19

TOTAL REVENUE
- 29% Council Operational Funding: $36.5M
- 50% Council Capital Funding: $92.5M
- 1% Philanthropic Revenue: $1.9M
- 20% Commercially Generated Revenue: $52.8M

OPERATING COSTS MET THROUGH EXTERNAL REVENUE
- 43% External Revenue
- 57% Council Operational Funding
Engaging our Community

In 2018/19, RFA attracted over 3.5 million patrons and visitors to a rich and engaging programme of exhibitions, performances and events including:

- Internationally renowned & Auckland-exclusive shows, sport and exhibitions including:
  - Aladdin the Musical
  - Taylor Swift
  - War Horse
  - Gordon Walters: New Vision
  - Tonga v Kangaroos

- A summer stadium concert programme that delivered $20 million in visitor spend and 95,000 visitor nights

- 21 new exhibitions at Auckland Art Gallery, NZ Maritime Museum and Auckland Zoo

- Education and learning programmes for more than 114,000 Auckland children and families

- Auckland volunteers contributed more than 64,000 hours in support of RFA’s activities
Reaching Our Community

In 2018/19, RFA’s accessible and diverse programme included:

- Delivering **free or subsidised events/programmes** including:
  - Auckland Zoo’s free Zoofari programme for low decile school students
  - Auckland Lives free family Pick & Mix performing arts programme (North Shore, central, Mangere)
  - Auckland Art Gallery’s free Creative Learning Centre

- **Providing 1.7 million free** or subsidised entries to Auckland Zoo, Auckland Art Gallery and NZ Maritime Museum

- **Free and subsidised community use** of venues

- **Free and subsidised** curriculum-based learning programmes for more than **76,000** students

- Broadcasting **free access to RFA content** through the innovative digital stage on Aotea Square

- Delivering outreach programmes to more than **20,000** participants in conservation science, visual arts, performing arts and maritime experience
Providing for Future Generations

In 2018/19, RFA delivered a $93.9m capital investment programme to ensure fit-for-purpose RFA venues for the future.

- **Auckland Zoo**
  - South East Asia Precinct – the largest renewals project ($60m) in the Zoo’s history – is well underway

- **Aotea Precinct**
  - Interior refurbishment of the Aotea Centre was sufficiently completed to host the Auckland Arts Festival in March
  - Planned Aotea Centre weather-tightening works design to be revisited in light of post-Grenfell changes to cladding standards
  - Development of an Aotea Square precinct master plan advanced, with partner consultation underway

- **Stadiums**
  - Renewal works on several Mt Smart stands completed
  - Reconfiguration North Harbour Stadium main field for baseball commenced
  - Amenity renewals works at Western Springs Stadium underway
Focus Areas

Contribution towards Māori Outcomes

Four values underpin our contribution to Māori outcomes:

- Mahi Tahī – Collaboration
  - Kaitiakitanga – Stewards of Auckland’s Regional Facilities
  - RFA businesses work together to achieve shared outcomes

- Whanaungatanga – Relationships and Engagement
  - Te Reo Māori and tikanga Māori are an integral part of our business culture

- Manaakitanga – Enhance Customer Experiences
  - Develop and sustain our relationships with Māori to enhance innovation and culture

- Whakatauki: Providing excellent service where customers, visitors and fans of our venues experience dimensions of Māori culture
Focus Areas

Contribution towards Māori Outcomes (cont.)

• All areas of the business with direct customer service responsibilities have implemented te reo Māori, waiata and tikanga Māori staff training

• Auckland Art Gallery Toi o Tāmaki has implemented bilingual naming, signage and announcements

• Auckland Zoo has adopted a bilingual signage policy for the its wayfinding system which is currently being developed

• Foundation Te Ao Māori employee learning programme that includes Treaty of Waitangi and te reo courses is in development

• Internationally renowned artist Lisa Reihana has been commissioned to create a unique world-class Māori digital media work for Aotea Centre celebrating Te Ao Māori
Focus Areas

Contribution towards Māori Outcomes (cont.)

- Aotea Centre’s new tri-lingual (English, Māori & Braille) wayfinding a finalist in the 2019 Best Design Awards

- New Zealand Maritime Museum continues to develop educational programmes tailored to kura kaupapa Māori (primary school) in partnership with Te Toki Voyaging Trust

- Auckland Art Gallery Toi o Tāmaki public programmes for FY 2018/19 included:
  - Tour of Gordon Walters with Chris Heaphy (Ngai Tahu) and Julia Waite
  - Public Programme: Professor Deidre Brown (Ngāpuhi, Ngāti Kahu) on Gordon Walters and his influence on design in Aotearoa NZ
  - New exhibition: Ralph Hotere: Godwit/Kuaka exhibition opened
  - Ruth Buchanan (Te Atiawa), Winner 2018 Walters Prize in conversation with Natasha Conland
Focus Areas

Sustainability and Climate Change

COMMITMENT TO ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY
RFA is revising operational practices, aiming to achieve by 2022:
- CarboNZero certification across all operations
- Green Building certification for major new building projects
- 75% diversion of waste from landfill
- Elimination of single-use plastics from food & beverage packaging

CARBON EMISSIONS
- As an RFA pilot, Auckland Zoo achieved certified carbon neutral status in 2017/18
- A baseline emissions measurement regime has now been established across all RFA venues
- In 2020, work will commence on cross-RFA emissions reduction plans

WASTE
- Several initiatives to reduce use of single use plastics are being trialled
- Hand sorting recycling is being trialled at the Zoo to reduce recycling being rejected (sent to landfill)

WATER
- Water conservation efforts trialled at the Zoo resulted in savings of 42,300m³ over the past year
Huge Summer Line-up for Auckland

- **A Place to Paint: Colin McCahon in Auckland**, Auckland Art Gallery | UNTIL 27 JANUARY
- **Takiri: An Unfurling**, New Zealand Maritime Museum | UNTIL 7 JUNE 2020
- **Taste of Auckland**, Queens Wharf | 31 OCT – 2 NOVEMBER
- **Les Misérables**, The Civic | 7 – 30 NOVEMBER
- **U2 – The Joshua Tree Tour**, Mt Smart Stadium | 8 & 9 NOVEMBER
- **SX Open**, Mt Smart Stadium | 16 NOVEMBER
- **Friday Jams**, Western Springs Stadium | 17 NOVEMBER
- **A Gala Concert in the Presence of Dame Kiri Te Kanawa**, Aotea Centre | 20 NOVEMBER
- **Tuatara Baseball season**, North Harbour Stadium | 21 NOVEMBER – 26 JANUARY
- **Festival X Rising**, Western Springs Stadium | 28 NOVEMBER
- **RNZ Ballet: Hansel & Gretel**, Bruce Mason Centre | 13 & 14 DECEMBER
- **Fat Freddy’s Drop**, Western Springs Stadium | 18 JANUARY
- **Queen + Adam Lambert**, Mt Smart Stadium | 7 FEBRUARY
- **Elton John – Farewell Yellow Brick Road Tour**, Mt Smart Stadium | 16, 18, 20 FEBRUARY
- **SIX60**, Western Springs Stadium | 22 FEBRUARY
- **The Book of Mormon**, The Civic | 6 – 22 MARCH
- **Auckland Arts Festival**, various venues | 11 – 29 MARCH