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Pippa Coom Councillor Report – Waitematā and Gulf Ward

General update
- This is my first Councillor report for 2020 prepared for the Waitematā, Waiheke and Actea Great Barrier Local Boards’ February business meeting agendas.
- It covers the period from 25 November 2019 until 31 January including the summer break.
- The purpose of my report is to share key information with the local boards including governing body activities, attendance at events, conferences and meetings, regional consultations, media activities and ward issues I have been following up on. I also declare all gifts in my report regardless of value.

Governing Body and Committee meetings*
Governing Body committee met on 26 November and 12 December (photo right of Councillors at the Aotea Square Christmas tree on our way to the final business meeting of the year at the Town Hall). Highlights include:
- agreed the terms of reference for the Council Controlled Organisations Review
- approved allocation of the Auckland Council governance remuneration pool
- approved terms of reference for the Joint Governance Working Party and Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Working Party
- adopted the GB meeting schedule from 2020-2022
- agreed process for appointing the next Auckland Council CEO (appointment to be made by end of 2020)
- Unanimous support for an extraordinary item regarding the bus drivers dispute (reported on below)

The first Environment and Climate Change committee met on 29 November
- approved the grant allocations for the 2019/2020 Regional Environment and Natural Heritage Grant programme funding round
- allocations for the 2019/2020 Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund, September 2019 funding were considered in confidential

The first Council Controlled Organisation Oversight Committee met on 12 December to receive the first quarter reports of the substantive council-controlled organisations and approve the proposed content for inclusion in their 2020/2021 letters of expectation.

A minute’s silence was observed at the beginning of our Finance and Performance Committee led by Cr Desley Simpson on 10 December to pay tribute to all those affected by the awful tragedy on Whakaari /White Island.
*Note: This is not intended to be a complete summary of all governing body and committee meetings. Refer [https://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/](https://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/) for full details

Events and other meetings

- A range of briefings have continued for the Environment and Climate Change Committee Chair and Deputy Chair
- In my role as committee Deputy Chair I attend a weekly chairs’ catch up with the Mayor and a fortnightly Mayor and Councillors catch up
- I have a fortnightly meeting for transport updates relating to ward issues
- On Friday 29 November I hosted my first Councillor “clinic” on Aotea Great Barrier with booked appointment times
- Meeting on 6 December with councillors Bartley and Casey and First Union to discuss the bus drivers dispute.
- MUNZ meeting on 9 December with the automation working group of the International Transport Workers Federation
- Cr Hills and I met with Milag San Jose-Ballesteros, Regional Director For Southeast Asia And Oceania, C40 to discuss climate change action on 21 January. C40 Cities is an organisation working with 96 City Councils across the world to work on positive opportunities to reduce carbon emissions and protect our communities.
- Meeting on 22 January convened by the Mayor regarding Fuller Ferry cancellations (reported on below)
- City Centre network meeting at the Ellen Melville Centre on 23 January
- Tour of Aotea Great Barrier (north part of island) with the local board on 27 January (photos right)
- Waiheke Local Board business meeting on 28 January
- Environment and Climate Change Committee: Political Working Group meetings to finalise Council’s submission on the Reducing waste: A more effective landfill levy paper

I also attended the following events:

- Vision Zero celebration at Auckland Transport on 25 November
- 100 years of Zonta International celebration dinner on 25 November hosted by the Zonta Club of Auckland at the Royal NZ Yacht Squadron. Zonta’s mission is empowering women through service and advocacy.
- Friends of Sustainable Coastlines celebration on 27 November (photo right: Sam Judd presenting on the successes of the last year)
• Tamaki Paenga Hira Auckland Museum 90th birthday celebrations on 27 November. (Photo right: with Board Chair Orchid Atimalala, Deputy Chair Tarun Kanji and Director Finance Jignasha Patel)

• Ceremony for the 40th anniversary of the Erebus accident at Government House hosted by the Governor General where the PM and the Chair of Air NZ gave a wholehearted apology to the families for the actions of the government and airline following the disaster that claimed 247 lives. I’m sure that nothing can fully heal the loss from the tragedy for the families and those impacted by Operation Overdue but this apology is long overdue. I hope now we can also move ahead on a fitting Erebus Memorial.

• NZI Sustainable Business Network Awards gala dinner on 28 November at the invitation of Waste Solutions. Auckland Council, TROW and Green Way won the Partnering for Good category for the demolition of the Masonic Lodge in Salisbury Reserve (a project initiated by the Waitāmatā Local Board)

• Met with the Inspirasi Indonesian Young Leaders delegation (photo right with Cr Hills and Laila Harre) and spoke on the topic of the Role of Local Government and how to engage communities to be sustainably resilient.

• Visited Great Barrier on 29 November to hold a Councillor clinic to meet locals, did an interview with Aotea FM (photo right with Toni and Tony from Aotea FM) and meet with local board members.

• Raise up Leadership grad dinner at Eden Park on 30 November at the invitation of YMCA.

• Hyundai World Championships powhiri and opening ceremony on 1 December.
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- Franklin Road lights opening on 1 December (photo right with local board member Graeme Gunthorpe)
- Grey Lynn Residents Association AGM at the Grey Lynn RSC
- Farewell for Marguerite Delbet as Council’s General Manager, Democracy Services after six plus years at the helm
- Auckland Art Gallery’s 2020 programme launch on 3 December
- Whakawātea for Luna Rossa / Prada bases, America’s Cup on 4 December (photo right)
- Women in Leadership afternoon tea hosted by the Mayor’s office
- LGNZ strategy day in Wellington on 5 December
- LGNZ National Council meeting on 6 December
- Citizenship ceremony at the Auckland Town hall on 9 December
  (The official party for the citizenship ceremony L-R Deputy Chair Waiheke Local Board Bob Upchurch, Kaumatua Bob Hawke, Kaumatua Alec Hawke, Richard Northey Chair Waitaketa Local Board, and new citizen Kiri McCutcheon who works at Auckland Council)
- Ports of Auckland community liaison group Christmas drinks on 10 December
- Morning blessing on 17 December led by Ngati Whātua Ōrakei - Whai Maia for the start of the St Mary’s Bay water project that will dramatically reduce contamination going into the Harbour (photo right).
  This significant project is funded from the water quality targeted rate and delivered by Watercare and Healthy Waters (Auckland Council) with Auckland Transport improvements included as well
- End of year afternoon tea hosted by the Mayor on 17 December
• Late Night Christmas event organised by Heart of the City on 19 December
• Community celebration lunch at Ellen Melville Centre on 20 December
• Waiheke Ostend Market zero waste stall volunteer on 21 December and 17 January (photo right)
• I took a Christmas break from 20 December until 13 January
• I joined the Mayor and Panuku on 15 January for a tour of Auckland’s Waterfront Precinct and Wymyard Quarter as well as a look at the new Willis Bond apartment development on Madden Street, the Park Hyatt Auckland site (photo right in hard hats) and a visit to Emirates Team New Zealand.
• Enjoyed a session at the ASB Classic tennis at the invitation of ATEED and a chance to meet the tournament director Karl Budge
• Urban Nerds AKL - special guest appearance by Greg Vann on 23 January
• Moira Lawler’s farewell as CEO of Lifewise held at Merge Café on 23 January
• Supported the Mayor at the SeePort festival opening on 25 January
• International Buskers Day Festival opening on 25 January at the invitation of Crackerjack productions
• On behalf of the Mayor addressed the United Nations International Holocaust Remembrance Day event hosted by the Holocaust Centre of NZ at the Mt Eden Memorial Hall (Photo right and speech Attachment 1)
• State of the Nation presentation with the PM and lunch on 30 January at Sky City Convention Centre at the invitation of Business NZ

Regional consultation topics
In December the Mayor’s proposal for the Annual Budget 2020/2021 was agreed to go out for consultation on 21 February. The proposal is about showing leadership on climate change as well as continuing to invest strongly in infrastructure and services, and...
Auckland for the international spotlight in 2021, when the city hosts the 36th America’s Cup, APEC, Te Matatini and a range of other events. I have reported on the main topics in my Ponsonby News column (Attachment 2).

Regional grants
The Regional Environment and Natural Heritage Grant Fund and Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund applications were agreed by the Environment and Climate Change committee on 29 November.

Significant issues and ward issues (as at 31 January)

New Network bus changes on Waiheke

Following the report that Hana Blackmore prepared for the local board highlighting deficiencies in Auckland Transport’s consultation and presentation of a petition, Auckland Transport agreed to put in place a temporary diversion for every second 50A bus service to loop through Ostend / Wharf Rd. The use of services on these roads will then be assessed around March when AT undertakes the review of the New Network.

AT also reported that the New Network has significantly grown compared to the old network over the first eight weeks of operation - in average by +5% and more recently by up to +30% for individual weeks. More people are using buses on Waiheke now than before. However, issues remain with a bus driver shortage. I am also aware of continued concerns regarding the location of bus stops.

Leys Institute Library Building

Just before Christmas an operational decision was made to close Leys Institute Library and Gymnasium until further notice. A recently completed seismic assessment has found structural issues that make the buildings unsafe to occupy in the unlikely event of an earthquake.

This caused a lot of concern raised directly with me about the future of the buildings and the continuation of library services. The local board has ensured that services will resume from March at 14 Jervois Road for at least the next three years and that the jobs of all library staff are safe. In the meantime, the mobile library has been parking outside Leys Institute until the end of January.

A report on the options for restoring the buildings will be going to the local board.

Bus drivers dispute

The bus driver dispute ended before Christmas following Auckland Council unanimously requesting Auckland Transport to work on finding a solution and signalled the need to find a long-term sustainable way forward to the poor pay and conditions. It was important to take a
stand together as Auckland needs professional bus drivers who are well trained and can earn a living. Here is the resolution in full from the 12 December Governing Body meeting:

a) note with concern the industrial dispute affecting bus services and its impact on commuters, bus drivers and their families and potentially undermining a shift to use of public transport

b) request Auckland Transport to work with NZ Bus and the relevant unions to find a solution to end the current dispute

c) request Auckland Transport and the Chief Executive of Auckland Council to work on sustainable long-term solutions

d) request the Mayor to write to the Ministry of Transport on behalf of Council seeking urgency to be accorded to the Public Transport Operating Model (PTOM) Review to ensure that problems of recruitment and retention of bus drivers are addressed and a fair and equitable resolution is reached around drivers’ wages and working condition

Waitematā Ferry cancellations

On 22 January Mayor Phil Goff convened a meeting of Fullers, the Harboumaster, Auckland Transport, the Ports of Auckland and elected representatives including Councillor Chris Darby, Chair of the Waitematā Local Board, Cath Handley and Auckland Central MP Nikki Kaye and myself. After the meeting the Mayor released the following statement.

“I made clear my expectations that recent ferry cancellations were unacceptable, and the causes had to be addressed collaboratively by the parties directly involved. The inconvenience caused to Aucklanders is not acceptable. I also made clear my expectations that I want to see this issue resolved as soon as possible,” Phil Goff said.

“The discussions were positive, and progress was made. I have asked for a working party to be convened urgently, chaired by the Harboumaster, and involving Fullers, Auckland Transport, Ports of Auckland and the cruise ship industry.

“I have asked the group to address the following issues relevant to the cancellations:

- whether the restrictions on cruise liner berthing currently from 7.30am to 9am can and should be extended
- what the appropriate safety parameters are for ferries when cruise liners are berthing
- the need for a better communication mechanism between the relevant parties.

“I have asked the working group to report back on these matters to elected representatives as soon as possible.”

Media

- My regular Ponsonby News column was published in the February edition (Attachment 2)
- I was quoted in an Our Auckland story regarding Sustainable summer holiday waste tips (Attachment 3), the launch of e-bikes at Long Bay for the use of park rangers (Attachment 4) and regarding the Vector Lights at anniversary weekend (Attachment 5)
- I was also quoted in sponsored NZ Herald content regarding city centre construction (Attachment 6)

Conferences and seminars

Te kāwana ngātahi i a Tamaki Makaurau ‘Governing Auckland together’ symposium was held for all elected members on 2 December. The programme included:
Deputy Mayor gave the opening address on behalf of the Mayor
Chief Executive, Stephen Town address
Strategic briefing – overview of key strategic issues for Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland
No point wasting a good crisis – an interactive future-focused session, looking at era scale change and connecting the future to actions in the present. This will be led by Dr Stephanie Pride
Closing remarks by board Chair Leumaunga Lydia Sosene

Disclosures
Since 25 November I have received the following gifts as well the invites noted above under events:

Out there SCAPE Public Art 1998 – 2018 a booked valued at $80 gifted by Warren Pringle

Recommendation
That this report be received.
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United Nations International Holocaust Remembrance Day 27 January 2020 speech

Tēnā koutou e ngā rau Rangatirā mā e huiai mai nei
E ngā mate, moe mai, moe mai
Ka hoki ki tēnei ao
E te Whare e tu nei,
E ngā Mana Whenua me ngā Matāwaka,
E ngā mana, e ngā reo, e ngā hau e whā
Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou
Ko te kaupapa o tenei rā
Ka mihi whānui ki a koutou katoa, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa

Shalom and Greetings to everyone. I would like to acknowledge:

- shoah Survivors and those of the Second Generation and their families who are here with us today;
- Rabi Friedler and the many faith leaders and representatives of associated communities who are in attendance;
- honorary consuls from around the world who are here to offer their support and prayers;
- Bob Narev and his wife Freda for decades of hard work for the good of all humanity,
- Deborah Hart and Chris Harris, Chair and CEO of the Holocaust Centre of New Zealand
- Our prime minister Jacinda Ardern, my fellow speakers, and fellow elected members

It is a great honour, although one of the most solemn kind, to be present here on United Nations International Holocaust Remembrance Day to speak on behalf of Mayor Phil Goff.

As we focus on the commemoration of the 6 million Jews murdered and others murdered and adversely affected by the Nazis we reflect on the continued importance, 75 years after the Holocaust, of collective action against antisemitism and to reassert our commitment to human rights of all people everywhere.

Deb Hart has spoken about the important work of the Holocaust centre of NZ in taking action, in fighting antisemitism, intolerance and hatred, primarily through education. Auckland Council joins in supporting the Centre in convening this significant civic event.

In local government we have an obligation to promote understanding and tolerance within communities so that the conditions of the holocaust can never arise again. The Auckland Plan 2050, the long-term plan for the city that contributes to Auckland’s social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being, has a strong commitment to Belonging and Participation and we adopted the principle of interculturalism in the plan. This means that all strategies and plans underneath the Auckland Plan will work to foster inclusion and building a shared future together across cultures.

I know that there is more that Council can do to respond to the Jewish community’s concerns about rising anti-semitism. The central city that I represent is home to important Jewish institutions now facing the burden of greater security. It is deeply troubling that a recent poll found a third of New Zealanders have little or no understanding of the Holocaust. Council can join in supporting holocaust observance and education that,
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particularly since the March 15 massacre at the Christchurch mosques, promotes well-being
in Aotearoa and protects all New Zealanders.

Today we commemorate 75 years since the liberation of the Auschwitz-Birkenau
Concentration Camp and other camps and the freeing of those in hiding. It was only then
that the true extent of the atrocities became widely known. As those who bore witness
sadly dwindle in number it is occasions like today that ensure their stories live on, to be
known and understood by each successive generation.

Ka maumahara tonu tātou ki a rātou. We will remember.
Pippa Coom: Councillor for Waitemata & Gulf

The year started with an ominous sky as Auckland and the upper North Island was blanketed with thick, orange haze as a result of the tragic Australian bushfires thousands of kilometres away.

In December, the Mayor’s proposal for the Annual Budget 2020/21 was agreed to go out for consultation on 21 February. The proposal is about showing leadership on climate change as well as continuing to invest strongly in infrastructure and services, and readying Auckland for the international spotlight in 2021, when the city hosts the 36th America’s Cup, APEC, Te Matatini and a range of other events. Key matters covered in the proposal include:

- a $2.7 billion investment in capital assets and operating expenditure of $4.4 billion
- 3.5% increase in average general rates and the Uniform Annual General Charge
- progressively extending the living wage to contracted cleaners over the next three years with expenditure of up to $1.3 million in 2020/2021
- continued support in the council’s coordination and facilitation role in tackling homelessness in Auckland at $500,000 per annum for the next three years
- $4.13 million per annum to increase the subsidy for child fares across public transport services

initial response to increased urgency of climate action ahead

of the next 10-year budget, including up to $6.3 million for decarbonising the council’s fleet over the next five years funded from existing budget; $9 million for phasing out gas boilers in council aquatic centres over the next five years, with $1.5 million in 2020/2021; $2.7 million for planting an
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additional half a million trees over the next three years, totalling a million and a half trees this term and $900,000 for foundation work for climate change interventions.

Following Auckland Council's climate emergency declaration in June last year, the Mayor's proposal takes further steps to cut our carbon emissions in this budget ahead of more substantive changes once Auckland's climate action framework is agreed later this year.

We still need to do much more and urgently. The stark reminder we've experienced of what climate change can bring has made it clear that only real action and political commitment is acceptable in 2020.

Feedback on the Annual Budget and Local Board priorities for 2020/2021 opens on 21 February. See the Auckland Council website for details. (PIPPA COOM)
Sustainable summer holiday waste tips

Our Auckland Published: 8 January 2020

Ask yourself: how was it made, how long will it last, how much power will it use, what will I do with it once I’m done?

The holiday season can be overwhelming, so let us make it easy for you to minimise waste. Whether you’re headed to the beach or bach, or having the family round to your place, use these simple tips to avoid excess waste over the holidays.

Councillor Richard Hills, Chair of the Environment and Climate Change Committee, offers his support for thinking sustainably this holiday season.

*Over summer and the Christmas period, many of us will be at the beach, in the bush or down at our local park appreciating our natural environment. The best gift we can give is a healthy environment for all generations to enjoy.

Last-minute zero-waste gift ideas

It can be so tempting to buy that new appliance or gadget, but it’s worth pausing a moment to question first whether you really need it, whether an existing item could do the job already, or whether second-hand is a better option.

Ask yourself: how was it made, how long will it last, how much power will it use, what will I do with it once I’m done? This is one of the easiest ways to save some serious money and prevent the waste of so many usable or fixable things you already have.
ATTACHMENT 3

Councillor Pippa Coom recommends the Grey Lynn car boot market for the best unique holiday gifts. It’s on the Sunday before Christmas and the last Sunday of every month. Everything is second-hand, so you shop without growing your carbon footprint.

If you do go shopping, remember to bring your reusable bags, just like you would for groceries. You’ll be much happier carrying them than trying to juggle single-use ones.

Visit a community recycling centre

These local centres divert waste from landfill and sell these quality items, so they can find a new life in your home and community. The inventory is always changing but it can be a great place to get outdoor and camping equipment, BBQs, bicycles, furniture, books, jewellery, and so many more one-of-a-kind treasures. Most people simply drop by to find a surprise gem; that’s half the fun! Look for one in your neighbourhood and check their opening hours.

Join a toy library

Rather than buy a toy once, why not give your child a membership to one of Auckland’s many toy libraries. Toy Libraries offer a range of quality toys, puzzles, games and learning activities for members to hire for a set period of time. Toy Libraries are registered charitable organisations that are run by a group of volunteers.

Give a tree

The Kaipatiki project will plant a native tree for you in a reserve for only $10. Your gift is helping the biodiversity of our local spaces and will continue to grow for many years to come. This way of gifting also eliminates any unnecessary wrapping, packaging and transportation. A win for you and our climate.

Give your time

Offer a night of free babysitting, some gardening, or another special service that helps reduce the summer stress. Or, offer an experience you can do together to create new memories and try something you might not otherwise have done.

Zero waste holiday parties

Ditch the balloons! Put a big ribbon with a bow on your mailbox instead. Unlike a balloon it won’t pop, and you can use it year after year.

Better party favours. Don’t waste time and money on goodie bags or extra stocking stuffers. Most of the “goodies” are plastic bits that end up in landfill. Instead, send your guests home with baked goods or leftovers. Or, if you need a party favour, consider giving everyone a tomato plant.
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Avoid themed decorations. A lot of festive merchandise is single use, adds up to more spend than you planned for, and ends up in a landfill. Not to mention the labour and resources in the whole process. If you want a party theme, focus on a colour scheme and use materials you already have or can use again easily.

For kids games, consider re-usable options like fabric and ribbon for pass the parcel, instead of single-use paper that will be in the recycling bin faster than the kids have finished their lollies. You can also think about a simple activity that uses recycled materials, like making your own fidget spinners.

Love your leftovers. Here are seven simple ways to get a quick new meal everyone will like, using your holiday leftovers. Sausages and steaks from the barbeque make great tacos, pizza toppings, fried rice, or salad rolls.

Waste-free beach trips

To keep our public spaces beautiful, Auckland Council is sharing these litter-busting tips to encourage everyone to put litter in its place while out and about.

"When you’re packing in, try to pack up your food and other items in reusable containers, wherever possible, and then remove any excess packaging before you leave the house. For the other items, take a couple of extra bags with you and make sure you take the sorted leftover waste home."

If you do spot an overflowing public place litter bin, while you’re out and about around Auckland this summer, please call the Council on 09 301 0101 to report it, and arrangements will be made for a contractor to clear the bin.

Be responsible for your waste

There are a number of things you can do to reduce the amount of rubbish your household produces.

Remember, it’s your responsibility to dispose of your household and inorganic waste safety and legally. Your collection date might be different during the holidays.

Dumping rubbish is illegal and may result in a fine or prosecution, which would really put a damper on the holiday cheer. If you see items left on the kerb or cul-de-sac, give us a call at 0800 NO DUMP (0800 663 867).
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Long Bay park rangers hit the trails on e-bikes

Our Auckland Published: 24 January 2020

Auckland Council park rangers are embracing the electric revolution to patrol one of our region’s most popular parks.

Staff at Long Bay Regional Park are donning helmets and taking to the trails on e-bikes.

Auckland Council Principal Ranger Scott De Silva says the e-bike trial in the park ranger team has been a success so far. “We’re really happy. The e-bikes work well at Long Bay and the staff are loving it”. The use of e-bikes is part of Auckland Council’s sustainability goals and reducing the carbon footprint around council activities.

“This is a great innovative solution from the parks team. Using the e-bikes means our rangers are less reliant on diesel and petrol vehicles,” says Cr Pippa Coom, deputy chairperson of Auckland Council’s Environment and Climate Change Committee.

“It is about being responsible and showing Aucklanders that the council cares about the environment and is keen to play our part”.

Senior Ranger De Silva agrees. “It also helps us keep fit and it is a real joy to ride along the paths in Long Bay”.

He says that the e-bikes are here to stay in Long Bay and that Auckland Council is looking at how the e-bikes can be used in other parks.
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Vector Lights adds glitz to Anniversary celebrations

Our Auckland Published: 24 January 2020

The Anniversary Weekend Light Show on the Harbour Bridge is ready to dazzle Aucklanders again with a show centred around sustainable energy.

“The Anniversary show visualises Auckland moving to a sustainable future”, says Auckland Councillor and Environment and Climate Change Committee deputy chairperson Pippa Coom. “Aucklanders will be able to celebrate the region’s birthday with another spectacular show knowing that the energy used is completely clean and sustainable”.

Vector’s Chief Public Policy & Regulatory Officer Mark Toner agrees.

“Vector Lights is a great way to share with Aucklanders how new and emerging energy technologies can play a huge role in shaping the future of our industry to make electricity networks more efficient, reduce carbon emissions, and ensure our infrastructure can keep pace with rapid Auckland growth”.

The six-minute show references Tama-Nui-te-Rā (the sun), Hikohiko (electrical energy), and Hei te Ao Mārama (the future world of light), and weaves visuals with original sound and music.

The Anniversary show is repeated every night over the long weekend, including Monday night.

The Vector Lights Anniversary show kicks off tonight at 9pm and will run every 15 minutes until midnight. It can be enjoyed from multiple locations around the Waitematā Harbour from Bastion Point in the east to Te Atatū peninsula in the west.

Photo credit Malay Nayak
New downtown "world-class"

13 Dec, 2019

Auckland's Downtown Public Space project will be constructed over the next 12 months, and create a paved area for the public. Picture / Supplied

Sponsored by [Auckland Council]

It’s road works and delays right now - but Auckland’s new downtown is starting to take shape.

Aucklanders will be able to enjoy a whole new relationship with their downtown when the current building, road works and disruption clears – revealing a world-class destination, according to Auckland councillor Pippa Coom.

She was commenting on the start of construction this week to extend the waterfront boundary by 1800 sq m for a $35 million public space on Quay St as Auckland also readies itself for the America’s Cup showcase in 2021.

"I believe that what we are putting together will be incredibly attractive, green, with great seating areas, an area which really hums and with pulling power – people will want to hang out there and enjoy the harbour in a way they can’t right now," says Coom, councillor for the Waitakere and Gulf ward of Auckland Council.

"The city will have a whole new relationship with Quay St and with the whole downtown area."
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That vision may not always be easy to see if you are one of the drivers caught up in the road works and subsequent delays but Coom says many Aucklanders are in for a big surprise when all the council and private investment in the downtown area begins to reveal itself.

Picture / Supplied
Some Aucklanders, she says, may not yet be able to look past the workmen and the road cones but 'I think eventually they are going to go, 'wow!' Once you join the dots from the City Rail Link, to the rebuild of Quay St and private developments like Commercial Bay, I think people will realise what a huge boon all this will be to Auckland – and to their enjoyment of the downtown area.'

Mayor Phil Goff agrees: "The unprecedented level of development in central Auckland—including projects such as the City Rail Link, Quay Street enhancement, Wynyard Common, Karangahape Road upgrade, High Street and more—will be transformational and will ensure our city develops as a vibrant destination.

"The legacy of these projects will be a world-class city centre that Aucklanders are proud of and that enables us to fulfil our role as New Zealand's internationally competitive city."

Certainly the numbers around the various developments add up to significant change.

The Downtown Public Space project is costing $35m, part of a $332m council package of six projects to enhance Quay St and transform the waterfront for the America's Cup. Add to that the $4 billion of funding from the council and government going to the City Rail Link and about $14bn of private investment going into Commercial Bay and
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other nearby projects, like the $300m Seascape 52-storey apartments and hotel complex.

Picture / Supplied
Construction of the Downtown Public Space project will take 12 months – but will boast an elevated tidal shelf jutting out into the Waitemata Harbour from Quay St, showcasing a paved public area in the ferry basin between Princes Wharf and Queens Wharf.

Part of the overall project involves strengthening the sea wall to protect Quay St seismically and the utilities running beneath it. Other elements include widening the footpaths to give a more boulevard-like feel, with one car lane and one dedicated bus lane on each side of the street. The Quay St enhancement will also see more trees, new street furniture, a downtown bus interchange will be created at lower Albert St and six new ferry berths on the west side of Queens wharf will be the beginning of a modern ferry terminal.

Coom says the overall regeneration will also link the waterfront and Quay Street with Wynyard Quarter, where preparations are well underway to host the America’s Cup in 2021.

Commercial Bay – the $1.5bn development of offices, retail and commercial space – will also change the way people look at downtown. About 10,000 people are expected to work in Commercial Bay, including the new 39-storey PwC tower, expected to be completed next year. A second stage, One Queen Street will be a $298m mix of offices, a luxury hotel, retail, bars and restaurants.

"I think downtown will be a very different place for the next generation of Aucklanders," Coom says, "perhaps almost unrecognisable to people today."
"What's happening on Quay St is just the latest example. What we'll see there in the end is an attractive area that will draw people in. At the moment in Quay St, you can't sit outside a bar or restaurant and enjoy the vista – and there are not many of those kind of places there anyway.

"It will have real bustle and movement – it will be a transport hub too for buses, trains and ferries – and there will be a buzz there, I believe.

"If you look at it now, I sometimes feel sorry for the people that arrive on the cruise ships and want to go up Queen St – they are greeted by this wall of traffic. What we're doing there will ease that and make the waterfront vista more available, encouraging places to spring up to enjoy that vista."

Coom says private developments like Commercial Bay, One Queen Street and Seascape apartments and hotel had been a catalyst in the council plans for downtown.

"Commercial Bay, when they presented to the council a few years ago, said they wanted there to be a much better environment in the area – and that an upgraded downtown area would provide not just economic benefits but more attractive features like extended footpaths, more dining space, more things to do and a vista for their tenants.

"They basically said they were putting in over a billion dollars into the bottom of Queen St and that there needed to be investment in the streetscape as well."

Keep up-to-date at ProgressAKL.co.nz
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PONSONBY PARK+
DESIGN OPTIONS REPORT
OPTION C

Item 13

- Retains approximately 60% of existing canopy structure.
- New building approximately 60% of existing building footprint. New Lighthouse structure located to street frontage.
- Park and plaza spaces larger than concept design.
A. THE LAWN, a larger lawn on the southern side of the site for passive recreation, programmed events and gatherings. Located towards the western side of the site and utilized on the afternoon sun. Enclosed by sculptural seating edges providing flexible seating opportunities.

B. PARK GARDENS, a lush, lawn bordered to the site that provides a filtered setting to adjacent residential activity whilst establishing a new productive economy for the site.

C. URBAN GARDENS, a themed sequence of garden spaces supporting urban agriculture, biodiversity and rainwater retention by connecting each element of the site to reduce the stormwater runoff volume, with the use of rainwater harvesting systems to manage the storm water. Includes seasonal displays of colour and texture.

D. THE PLAZA, an intimate space, providing additional outdoor room for recreational use with the necessary hard and soft infrastructure to support a community market and range of programming events. The Plaza is a gathering space at the heart of the Ponsonby Road and an engaging public space.

E. URBAN CANOPY (TREETOP), a highly adaptable outdoor room for recreational use with the necessary hard and soft infrastructure to support a community market and range of programming events. Supports the proposed retail and community function plan and connects to Ponsonby Road.

F. THE LANE, a paved urban surface that provides a logical entrance and organizes connecting spaces. Supports the proposed retail and community function plan and connects to Ponsonby Road. Reduces width from 7.5m to 3m - makes a more intimate lane experience.

G. THE BUILDING, the adaptive reuse of existing building footprint. New light filled structural located to street frontage.
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POISONBY PARK+
DESIGN OPTIONS REPORT
OPTION C VIEW A

New Lighthouse structure located to street frontage

Retain approximately 60% of existing canopy structure

New building approximately 60% of existing building footprint to facilitate community, commercial, toilet + storage facilities.

Note: Existing trees not shown for the purpose of drawing clarity.
New building approximately 60% of existing building footprint

Retain approximately 60% of existing canopy structure to accommodate an enhanced park space scope.

New robust and flat lawn (approx. 840m²) for passive recreation, programmed events and gathering.

New riparian garden edge to adjacent residential activity establishes a new productive ecology for the site.

Note: Existing house not shown for the purpose of drawing clarity.
PONSONBY PARK+
DESIGN OPTIONS REPORT
OPTION C - VIEW C

Note: Existing items not shown for the purpose
of drawing clarity.

Retain approximately 60% of existing canopy
structure.

New Lighthouse structure located to street
frontage.
Waitematā Local Board
One Local Initiative
Ponsonby Park Detailed Business Case summary
Key Milestones

2006
The site at 254 Ponsonby Road was purchased to address open space shortfall

2014
254 decoupled from the Draft Ponsonby Road Master Plan and managed through a separate submission process

2015
Community-led design initiative commences
Winning design submitted by LandLAB

2018
Project becomes the Local Board’s QLI
Whole site approved for development

2019
$5.5M allocated to project through sale of 200 Victoria Street West

2019
CLD Group community consultation 61% support Option 5
**Investment Proposal**

In 2018, the Waitematā Local Board resolved to advance the $11 million Ponsonby Park project as their key advocacy project to be delivered through the One Local Initiative 10 Year Programme.

The Finance and Performance Committee allocated $170 million in the 2018-2028 LTP budget to deliver local discretionary One Local Initiatives.

In 2019 a funding allocation of $5.5 million to be provided from the sale of 200 Victoria Street West.

---

**Project Stages**

**AUCKLAND COUNCIL INVESTMENT DELIVERY FRAMEWORK**

1. **Strategic Assessment**
   - Plan & Cost Business Case
2. **Initiate**
   - Prepare Business Case
3. **Plan**
   - Prelim Design & Resource Consent
   - Detailed Design & Building Consent
   - Physical Works Tender
4. **Deliver**
   - Construction
5. **Close**
   - Close

**Ponsonby Park project is here**

---

**Key Investment Objectives**

- **Well-being**
  - Open space provision gap
- **Belonging and Participation**
  - Safe places for people to meet, connect and enjoy civic life
- **Engage and enable communities**
- **High-quality built environment**
Strategic Case

The proposal is strategically aligned with the goals of the Auckland Plan, Local Board and Auckland Council strategies

Proposal

To redevelop the whole site at 254 Ponsonby Road (2326m²) as a civic open space

Create opportunities for people to meet, connect and enjoy
Showcase Auckland’s Māori identity
Provide sufficient public spaces to promote well-being
Implement green infrastructure that will deliver resilience and environmental outcomes

Auckland Council LTP
Support community-building initiatives to meet Auckland’s population growth challenges
Ponsonby Road Plan 2014-2044
To address the lack of spaces for pedestrians to relax and enjoy their surroundings
Parks and Open Space Strategic Action Plan 2013
To provide a network of parks and open spaces

Inclusive communities that are vibrant, healthy and connected
Public places that meet our communities’ needs.
The natural environment is valued, protected and enhanced.
A high-quality built environment that embraces our heritage.
Economic Case
The refined Ponsonby Park concept achieves value-for-money by:
- providing a high-quality civic space with below average operating costs
- providing a wide range of Environmental, Social and Cultural outcomes
- remaining within the $11 million budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current / Do Nothing</th>
<th>Ponsonby Park (preferred option)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>A liquor store</td>
<td>Grassed lawn and gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>Modern and open outdoor civic space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrentable space (ex-Nosh)</td>
<td>New building with public toilets, commercial space and a storage area for events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Provides high rental income</td>
<td>Commercial rental potential to off-set park operational costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not require significant investment</td>
<td>Promotes local business activity and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>No low-impact design or green infrastructure</td>
<td>Incorporates low-impact design principles and technologies into the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoids creating construction waste and using new building materials</td>
<td>Provides green space and gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Lack of amenity to local community</td>
<td>Provides amenity to the local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discouraging outcome for the community led initiative</td>
<td>Rewards community lead initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creates a community hub and event space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>No opportunity to include cultural elements</td>
<td>Opportunities to incorporate cultural elements and display art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The preferred option – Concept Option 5

- Option 5 - New Building (Smaller Footprint)
- Demolish and remove existing building
- Demolish and remove existing Lighthouse
- New building on site with smaller footprint
- Changed appearance
- Retain existing canopy structure
- Build park + plaza as per concept design
## The preferred option

### Concept Option 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QS Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Park</td>
<td>$1,744,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1410 m2, grassed area and gardens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pavilion</td>
<td>$1,408,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(outdoor sheltered paved area, 222 m2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plaza and Lane</td>
<td>$1,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(outdoor uncovered paved area, 807 m2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Neil Street Upgrade</td>
<td>$1,152,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(734 m2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New building</td>
<td>$1,456,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(190 m2 incl. 130m2 of commercial space)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public toilet block</td>
<td>$696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60 m2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lighthouse</td>
<td>$784,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1st storey structure, 120 m2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Contingency + Design</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated potential commercial revenue of $60,000 p.a.

Operational costs estimated $50,000 - $70,000 p.a.
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Next Steps

- February 2020: Report to local board business meeting
- May 2020: Report to Finance and Performance Committee
- June 2020: Preliminary Design Commences
- Late 2020: Procurement and possible site works
- 2021: Development
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### November 2019 - Traffic Control Committee Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Nature Of Restriction</th>
<th>Committee Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</td>
<td>Bus Lane / Ambulance Service Lane / Clearway / Loading Zone</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Khyber Pass Road</td>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</td>
<td>Bus Lane / Ambulance Service Lane</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Ireland Street</td>
<td>Freemans Bay</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</td>
<td>Angle Parking</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Jervois Road / Wallace Street</td>
<td>Herne Bay</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times / P60 Parking / P30 Parking / P10 Parking / Lane Arrow Marking / Traffic Island / Traffic Signal / Flush Median / Edge Line</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Margaret Street</td>
<td>Freemans Bay</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</td>
<td>Paid Parking Zone</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Wakefield Street</td>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking changes (Works)</td>
<td>Loading Zone / Bus Parking - AT Metro Only / No Stopping At All Times</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>West View Road / Great North Road / Old Mill Road / Surrey Crescent / Selbourne Street / Williamson Avenue / Tuarangi Road / Wenford Road / Ivanhoe Road / Cook Street / Mayoral Drive</td>
<td>Western Springs</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking changes (Event)</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking Controls</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Mahuhu Crescent / Tapora Street / Te Taou Crescent / Quay Street</td>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking changes (Event)</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking Controls</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Mahuhu Crescent / Tapora Street / Te Taou Crescent / Quay Street</td>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking changes (Event)</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking Controls</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
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### Item 15

#### Waitematā Local Board

18 February 2020

**Attachment A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Nature Of Restriction</th>
<th>Committee Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Grosvenor Crescent</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking Changes</td>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>Car Share Vehicle Parking / Lane Arrow Marking / No Right Turn / Stop Control / Traffic Island</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Grey Avenue</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking Changes</td>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times / Lane Arrow Marking / 15km/h / Parking / Road Hump / Pedestrian Crossing / Give-Way Control / Shoulder Marking / Surface Friction Treatment</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Madeline Street</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking Changes (Event)</td>
<td>Grey Lynn</td>
<td>Car Share Vehicle Parking</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking Changes (Event)</td>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times / Lane Arrow Marking / One Way Road / 15km/h / Parking / Road Hump / No Parking / Traffic Island / Give Way Control / Removal of Traffic Island</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Queen Street / Victoria Street</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic Changes</td>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
<td>Traffic Island</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Hope Street / Alfred Street / Wellslea Street East</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic Changes (Event)</td>
<td>Freemans Bay</td>
<td>No Parking / Traffic Island / Give Way Control</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Prince Street / Alfred Street / Wellslea Street East</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic Changes (Event)</td>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
<td>Traffic Island / Give Way Control</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Malibu Crescent / Tapoa Street / Te Taoa Crescent / Quay Street</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic Changes (Event)</td>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
<td>Traffic Island / Give Way Control</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Great North Road / Moelons Road / West View Road / Gold Street / Naylor Drive</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic Changes (Event)</td>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
<td>Traffic Island / Give Way Control</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>Type of Report</td>
<td>Nature Of Restriction</td>
<td>Committee Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitetā</td>
<td>Bourke Street / Eden Street</td>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times / Small Psv Stand / Loading Zone / Lane Arrow Marking / Stop Control / One-Way Road</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitetā</td>
<td>Cook Street / Vincent Street / Mayoral Drive / Wellesley Street West / Queen Street / Victoria Street West / Hobson Street / Victoria Street East / Pitt Street / Airedale Street / Lorne Street / Nelson Street / Greys Avenue / Wakefield Street / Federal Street / Albert Street / High Street / Hopetoun Street</td>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times / Bus Stop / Bus Shelter / Lanes / No Through Traffic / Bus Lane / Ambulance Service Lane / Loading Zone / Small Psv Stand / Traffic Island / Road Hump / Traffic Signal / Give-Way Control / Flush Median / Keep Clear / No Passing / Removal Of Flush Median</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitetā</td>
<td>Great North Road / Motions Road / Old Mill Road</td>
<td>Western Springs</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking changes (Event)</td>
<td>Temporary Traffic and Parking controls</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Facilities Auckland
Quarter 1 Performance Report
For the period ending 30 September 2019

This report outlines the key performance of Regional Facilities Auckland.
Regional Facilities Auckland Q1 summary

Highlights, issues & risks for the quarter

**Highlights:**
1. Auckland Stadiums: Mt Smart Stadium played host to the first ever stand-alone NRL Women’s Premiership (NRLW) fixture, Warriors v Dragons (crowd circa 3,000). Key Western Springs announcements for the summer concert season included massive headline acts for Friday Jams return, Festival X Rising and Fat Freddy’s Drop.
2. Auckland Convention: 113 events were delivered across our venues, attracting around 39,000 attendees. The biggest was New Zealand Fashion Week, which returned to Auckland Town Hall after 16 years and attracted over 24,000 people. North Harbour Stadium hosted 32 events and Aotea Centre hosted 27 (welcoming 29,000 people).
3. Auckland Live: School of Rock – The Musical rocked The Civic in September, with more than 28,000 tickets sold for the almost four-week season. Other successful key events included Mr Red Light, James Morrison, Ruel, The Children, Pic n Mix, Area 51, Rock Quest, We Will Rock You, Neil Young’s Live Rust, War Horse, Stan Walker, 7 Days Live, Ngā Puke. Partnership with ATEED transformed Aotea Square into the Elemental Yula in July – alongside the perennially popular Ice Rink.

**Issues/Risks:**
1. Auckland Stadiums: The two Metallica concerts were cancelled by the band for reasons of ill health.
2. Auckland Live: Queens Wharf closed to the public to enable repairs to the roof of The Cloud and doors and walls of Shed 10 following two mini-tornadoes in August.
4. Auckland Zoo: 71 rain days in Q1 had a significant impact at the Zoo, both on visitation and the complex South East Asia development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financials (million)</th>
<th>YTD actual</th>
<th>YTD budget</th>
<th>Actual vs Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital delivery</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct revenue</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct expenditure</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net direct expenditure</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Commentary:**

**Capital delivery:** The RFA capital programme for Q1 delivered $18.2m of works and is forecast to achieve total spend to budget for the year. The delivery is primarily in two major projects: the Aotea Centre refurbishment and the South East Asia Precinct.

**Net direct expenditure:** The $0.4m unfavourable variance relates in part to the grants paid by RFA.

**Forecast FY20:** Current indications are that RFA will miss the FY20 revenue target in particular as a result of the exceptionally wet weather in the first quarter and business interruption impacts of construction at the zoo through the remaining months of the year. Although an allowance was made in the budget for business interruption, the shortfalls being experienced are greater than previously estimated. Direct expenditure is also anticipated to exceed budget due to higher than expected staffing costs and professional fees.

**Key performance indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>FY20 Quarter 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience RFA’s arts, environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the viability and presence of Māori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic focus area – Stadia

Key commentary
For three months ended 30 September 2019, a total of $1.6m was spent towards stadia against a budget of $3.2m.

Highlights
1. North Harbour Stadium: works to reconfigure the main field to accommodate baseball have commenced and are on schedule for completion by November 2019. Planning for renewal of the main stand roof is underway, following a delay to the programme to enable the team to expand the project scope to include additional seismic strengthening.
2. Mt Smart Stadium: works are completed on the lower west stand and the upper south stand aside from minor outstanding detail work.
3. Western Springs upgrade works to the entry road commenced in July 2019. Stages 1 and 2 will be complete and operational for the start of the speedway season in November. Building consents for the four building renewal projects have been received.

Issues/Risks
1. Stand strengthening and renewals works at Mt Smart and North Harbour stadia: In early 2019, RFA received preliminary findings from seismic surveys of building structures at Mt Smart and North Harbour stadia, which prompted further detailed assessments. These were received in late FY19 and indicated low seismic ratings, albeit within tolerance. Further strengthening works, particularly at North Harbour Stadium were identified to improve the seismic ratings of these structures, and these works are now in the planning stage. For North Harbour Stadium, the RFP for a larger renewals project will be released shortly. This will encompass not only seismic strengthening, but also the general renewal of a roof approaching the end of its useful life.
2. Toilet, works facility and entry road renewals at Western Springs Stadium: $2.4m of works focussed on renewing road, toilet and works facilities at the existing stadium were re-phased into early FY20. These works are contracted and ongoing. The discovery of unknown services near the surface and unexpectedly rocky ground conditions have delayed progress on the project.

Strategic context
Much of Auckland’s network of stadia are ageing and do not respond to the evolving interests of Aucklanders, including the growth of interest in a wider range of sports.

RFA is working to improve the amenity and health and safety standards in the stadia under its stewardship, in order to improve their financial sustainability and provide better facilities for both community sports activities and professional sports teams and their fans. RFA also aims to provide venues to support Auckland’s emerging sports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Harbour Stadium – baseball</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Reconfiguration and construction to enable the hosting of the Auckland Tuatara home games for next season at North Harbour Stadium</td>
<td>This project is currently in the construction phase, with work on track for completion by November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconfiguration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Harbour Stadium – main stand roof</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>To construct access to the grandstand roof and undertake roof repairs (renewals)</td>
<td>The stand’s seismic assessment has been confirmed as 34NBS. The package of upgrade and renewal works for the stand is being progressed with works expected to be completed in FY21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Springs Stadium renewals</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>The replacement of two toilet blocks, gate entry building, maintenance shed, concourse and Stadium Road upgrade works</td>
<td>The road upgrade has commenced, and the four building replacements will commence shortly. The discovery of unidentified services and difficult ground conditions has delayed the project, with further delays now likely in working around the upcoming event season. The major elements of the project are expected to be delivered in FY20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Strategic focus area – Auckland Zoo development

Key commentary
For the three months ended 30 September 2019, a total of $7.6m was spent towards zoo development against a budget of $9.8m.

Highlights
1. Construction of the South East Asia Precinct and new café is well underway. The project is being managed in zones, with the first zone due for completion in December 2019. The overall programme is scheduled for completion by mid-2020.
2. A significant programme of general renewals and infrastructure upgrades is also progressing well.

Issues/Risks
1. The extent of the construction work currently underway at the Zoo (the South East Asia project is currently impacting on more than 20% of the site) is impacting the visitor experience and perception of value at the Zoo. A range of mitigation strategies is in place, the most significant of which is the implementation of an adjusted pricing strategy, reducing the cost of entry by as much as 30%. Although the new pricing strategy resulted in the Zoo achieving 718,027 visitors in FY19, the reduced price impacted on revenue. Visitor numbers are down in quarter one, with visitors less likely to commit to multiple visits until the South East Asia construction is completed.

Key programme of works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South East Asia Precinct development</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the central area within the Zoo to provide modern standards of housing and care for the Zoo's South East Asian species, and new catering facilities</td>
<td>Largest renewals project in the Zoo’s history. Tracking to budget and expected to be completed in the 2019/20 financial year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic context
RFA is continuing with development of a world-class zoo and wildlife conservation facility by addressing aging infrastructure at Auckland Zoo and long-term under-investment through a phased programme of works.

These works constitute essential renewals aimed at ensuring Auckland Zoo meets the modern standards of animal welfare, visitor amenity, wildlife exhibition and health and safety obligations.
Strategic focus area – Aotea precinct development

Key commentary
For the three months ended 30 September 2019, a total of $6.4m was spent towards the Aotea Centre development against a budget of $6.3m. This project remains substantially challenged by delays associated with the need for a comprehensive redesign to meet new standards.

Highlights
1. Refurbishment of the interior of the Aotea Centre (Centre) is drawing to a conclusion, with significantly upgrading facility as a result
2. Working with the Auckland Design Office, a draft Aotea Square precinct master plan has been incorporated into Council’s proposed refresh of the City Centre Master Plan, and a programme of consultation with key partners and stakeholders is underway.

Issues/Risks
1. New external cladding standards and associated Council consenting processes have caused significant delays to the Aotea Centre refurbishment project. To somewhat mitigate the impact on the operation of the Centre and the ongoing project risks, the original refurbishment project has been split into two projects – internal works and external works. Internal refurbishment works are scheduled for completion in November 2019. Re-design of the weather tightness project is ongoing.
2. A review of escalating project costs, following an assessment of on-going delays identified the need for an additional $14m to complete the project, funding which was been approved by Council in FY19. The project now has a total budget of $68.8 million allocated to dealing with the Centre’s underlying structural problems and refurbishing its interior spaces.
3. Delays to completion of the project will reduce revenue potential from the Centre for a longer period than previously anticipated.
4. The need to work around Centre bookings continues to compromise the delivery of the renewal project, further exacerbating time delays and budget pressures.
5. There will be some negative impact on the customer experience caused by ongoing construction works until completion.

Strategic context
The refurbishment and further proposed development and expansion of the Aotea Centre are aimed at creating a vibrant cultural and civic centre for Auckland focused on the Aotea Square precinct and as part of a wider Aotea Arts Quarter.

This will include a significantly upgraded and expanded Aotea Centre and integrated Aotea Square, providing a home for the development and presentation of performing arts in Auckland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aotea refurbishment</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>The first significant refurbishment of the 30-year-old Centre, aiming to upgrade foyer and functions spaces and address long standing weather tightness issues</td>
<td>NZ’s growing understanding of the safety implications of building façades and cladding standards has required substantial changes to this project mid-programme. Council has approved an additional $14m in funding for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Square master plan</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>A precinct planning approach to the development of the Square and its surrounds to ensure the precinct meets its potential as a key lively and active space for Aucklanders</td>
<td>A consultation draft of the masterplan has been completed and is being used to inform discussions with partners and stakeholders, and the design for the Aotea Studios project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Centre expansion (Aotea Studios)</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Developing concept plans for expanding the current Aotea Centre to provide a home for performing arts organisations and to foster the work of performing arts groups</td>
<td>This project is in its early stages – the concept, funding and potential timing of this proposed development will be discussed with Council in 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Statement of Intent focus areas

**Arts & Culture Strategy**
- In July, Auckland Live presented its first Relaxed Performances for Matangi for Tamaki and Room on the Broom. Auckland Live also hosted the NZ International Film Festival in July.
- NZ Maritime Museum hosted a sold-out event that brought a new and diverse audience to the Museum. While the Light Lotts, an interactive, late-night mystery-style game for 200+ visitors.
- Nearly 400 patrons came to Auckland Art Gallery’s popular and lively Art After Hours in July. Inspired by the exhibition Frances Hodgkins: European Journeys, the gallery transformed into a European courtyard, with a packed schedule including drawing classes, dance performances and demonstrations, a popular talk by Mary Kisler, live music and bespoke food and drink.
- In August, Auckland Art Gallery hosted the Pat Hanly Creativity Awards, recognising 36 exceptional Year 13 art students from 28 Auckland secondary schools. The awards, supported by AUT, acknowledge Pat Hanly’s contribution to New Zealand contemporary art and his passion for art education and supporting young artists.
- The new exhibition A Place to Paint: Colin McCahon in Auckland opened on 10 August at Auckland Art Gallery, and was officially launched a week later by Prime Minister the Rt Hon Jacinda Ardern.

**Sustainability and Climate Change**
- Reports have been received from the waste services provider for the Aotea Centre and Auckland Zoo refurbishment projects, demonstrating waste diversion rates of over 80% across both construction sites.
- The North Harbour Stadium Baseball project saw 800 stadium seats recycled, and a resurfacing of the project during the design stage prevented the use of 250 tonnes of concrete and 22 tonnes of reinforcing steel, equivalent to around 40 tonnes of CO2e.
- A new waste compound has been constructed at Mt Smart Stadium to enable enhanced management and sorting of waste streams, including a hand-sorting area and wash-down facilities.
- New water metering equipment has been installed at the Gallery to enable a more refined level of understanding of water usage within the building.
- A sustainability workshop was held with 25 staff members from across RFA’s business units to discuss opportunities for cross-collaboration on sustainability initiatives, knowledge sharing and staff engagement. In addition, Auckland Stadiums re-invigorated their Green Team, meeting to compile a list and initiate work on various sustainability initiatives across Stadiums’ sites.

**Contribution towards Māori Outcomes**

**Te Rito Māori**
- RFA in partnership with Auckland Council’s People and Performance Group have successfully received Te Toa Takitimu funding to resource capability and development training for staff, with foundational level training will start in November. This is a positive step towards achieving goals related to “An empowered Organisation”. This will also increase the ability of our staff to work effectively with Mana Whenua and Māori communities in the delivery of our business activities.

**Identity and Culture**

- New Zealand Maritime Museum:
  - The Talking Portrait project stage 1 has been completed with Te Toki Voyaging Trust. A young female sharing her story. Stage 2 is in progress where public can interact and ask questions and the portrait will respond from a diverse, Te Ao Māori perspective.
  - Building collections for the future was able to purchase three taonga from the Webber Collection and registered to purchase taonga of New Zealand.
  - Tūto Tūtū (unfurling) Exhibition opens in October. Working in collaboration with Local government, Ngāti Whāitu and artists. The wake from Tahu has left bound for Aotearoa.

- Auckland Zoo:
  - The leadership team undertook a marae visit to Ōrākei as part of a commitment and efforts to build stronger relationships with Ngāti Whāitu.

**Local Board Engagement**
- The Quarterly Performance Report for the period ending 30 June will not be distributed to the local boards until December, after the local government elections, as this is a year-end report requiring confidentiality until the financial results are released.
- After the new Council term begins on November 1, all local board members will be fully informed of RFA facilities and activities through the Auckland Council training programme, and through visits to the boards. These visits will include an overview presentation, as well as the fourth quarter 2018-19 and first quarter 2019-20 performance reports.
- A presentation of the ongoing work on the Aotea Precinct Master Plan was positively received by the Waitematā Local Board.
- Upper Harbour Local Board members enthusiastically endorsed the concept plans that aim to significantly increase the use of North Harbour Stadium.
## Direct operating performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>($ million)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>FY 19 Actual</th>
<th>FY 20 YTD Actual</th>
<th>FY 20 Budget</th>
<th>FY 20 Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net direct expenditure</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct revenue</strong></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; user charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating grants and subsidies</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct revenue</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, contributions &amp; sponsorship</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct expenditure</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other key operating lines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC operating funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC capital funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net interest revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Commentary

**A:** The $0.4m unfavourable variance reflects in part the grants paid by RFA, refer to Note D below.

**B:** Direct revenue unfavourable variance is due to $433k of Spark Arena rental revenue transferred to offset costs in other direct expenditure however the budget remains in revenue.

**C:** Employee Benefits contains $2.9m staff costs that are recharged against events. These recharges are budgeted under Cost of Goods Sold (COGS) within other direct expenses. Actual staff costs are favourable to budget due to recruitment for vacancies being put on hold for non-essential roles.

**D:** Grants, contributions and sponsorships: RFA converted the MOTAT loan to a capital grant recognising $280k in quarter one for the FY20 financial year. Other grants related to capital spend programmes.

**E:** Other direct expenditure contains COGS which includes salary recharges of $2.9m. The $2.9m recovery should be offset against employee benefits (where the budget is held). This has resulted in a misalignment between actuals and budget which will be corrected in the next LTP process.
### Regional Facilities Auckland Q1 performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key performance indicators</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>FY to Quarter 1</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YTD Actual</td>
<td>YTD Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The number of people who experience Regional Facilities Auckland’s arts, environment and sports venues and events | 3,363,323 | 778,688 | 925,000 | Not met | The original target for RFA visitors/patrons was set prior to Council’s decision to lease the Viaduct Events Centre to Team NZ. This removed a key venue from RFA’s events programme and will continue to impact on RFA’s expected visitor/patron numbers. In addition:  
  - Major construction programme and 71 rain days during the quarter have had a significant impact on visitation.  
  - The Gallery saw a continued reduction in international visitor numbers, possibly related to the international visitor levy.  
  - The Maritime Museum is also impacted by construction within the vicinity, and the loss of Ted Ashby for sailings for five weeks. |
| Auckland Zoo visitation    | 718,027 | 138,270 | 182,500 |        |
| Auckland Art Gallery visitation | 401,883 | 102,145 | 128,750 |        |
| NZ Maritime Museum visitation | 157,091 | 32,799 | 42,500 |        |
| The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants | 43 | 44 | 19 | Met |
| Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues | 57% | 54% | 60% | Not met | RFA did not achieve its revenue targets this quarter due to $433k Spark Arena rental revenue transferred against the rental expenses (budget remained in revenue) and tight controls over expenditure were offset by un-budgeted MOTAT grant-related expenses |
| Percentage of Auckland residents surveyed who value RFA venues and events | 69% | 74% | 69% | Met |
| Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Maori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau | 68 | 20 | 4 | Met |

Note: RFA has a total of 5 primary SOI measures (with the addition of a further breakdown of visitation measures, individual to each of the zoo, gallery and Maritime Museum). For the quarter to 30 September 2019, 3 of the primary measures have been met and 2 have not.
Regional Facilities Auckland Q1 non-financial performance

384,323 people experienced free or subsidised events

778,688 patrons/fans participated in 917 event days

2,104 people participated in RFA’s outreach programmes

17,225 school students participated in RFA’s curriculum-based learning programmes

Inspiring volunteers contributed 11,379 hours supporting RFA activities
Terms of Reference

Taskforce on Alcohol and Community Safety in the Central City
Background/Context

A Mayoral Taskforce on Alcohol and Community Safety in the Central City was initiated by Major Len Brown in 2012 to address alcohol and safety issues within Auckland’s central city. It was set up in response to NZ Police and public concern about the levels of alcohol issues and violence in the central city at night.

The Taskforce is made up of a cross section of stakeholders who discuss and initiate work to improve alcohol management and safety in the central city.

In 2013, the Taskforce was devolved to a Councillor and the ‘Mayoral’ title was removed.

In 2016, prior to the appointment of a new Major for Auckland, the members of the Taskforce indicated their desire to continue the Taskforce into the new term of Auckland Council.

Terms of Reference for the Taskforce on Alcohol and Community Safety in the Central City

1. Purpose

To improve real and perceived safety in the central city through providing a platform to:

1. To connect key stakeholders in the central city safety space – the Taskforce provides value in terms of being able to meet and interact with the people involved in the city centre, know the right people to talk to about safety issues, and build relationships

2. To bring up issues that need to be addressed and look for shared solutions and increased knowledge around these - the Taskforce provides value in terms of being able to grow greater understanding of what other groups are doing and facing around safety and being able to find shared solutions to safety issues in the central city

3. To recommends direction and some operational oversight of the Taskforce’s operational representatives – the Taskforce makes recommendations on central city locales to focus on and the most appropriate ways to address the community safety issues.
2. Membership

The Taskforce is made up of representatives from the following groups:

| Auckland Council Elected members | • Councilors (at least 2)  
                                      • Waitemata Local Board members (at least 2) |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Auckland Council/COO             | • Community Empowerment Unit  
                                      • Licensing and Compliance  
                                      • Waste Solutions  
                                      • Auckland Transport  
                                      • Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development  
                                      • Social Policy |
| Agencies                         | • Auckland City District Police  
                                      • Health Promotion Agency  
                                      • Accident Compensation Corporation  
                                      • City Mission  
                                      • Lifewise  
                                      • District Health Board Reps to support drugs and alcohol and mental health support needs |
| Business                         | • Hospitality NZ  
                                      • Restaurant NZ  
                                      • The Karangahape Road Business Association  
                                      • Heart of the City |
| Other                            | • City Centre Residents Group  
                                      • Local church and tertiary student leaders |

In addition to the above, other individuals and groups may be invited to specific meetings as needed.

3. Roles and functions of the Taskforce members

- attend regular meetings and actively participate in these meetings
- have a genuine interest in supporting community safety in the central city
- identify and share risks around central city safety
- share information and develop shared solutions to safety issues in the central city
- inform the Lead Officer if they are no longer able to attend and recommend a replacement representative from their organisation/department
- declare any conflicts of interest
- Identify specific hot-spot areas for complementary initiatives.
4. Roles and functions of the Taskforce Chair

The Taskforce Chair should be an elected member of Auckland Council who:
- holds accountability for the Taskforce
- feeds back to relevant Governing Body Committees on the Taskforce
- Chairs the Taskforce meetings, or delegates the Chairing responsibility to the Lead Officer

5. Roles and functions of the Taskforce Lead Officer

The Taskforce Lead Officer should be a council staff member identified to support the Taskforce who:
- schedules and arranges all meetings, including room bookings and calendar invitations
- prepares meeting agendas and minutes and circulates these to Taskforce members
- Chairs the Taskforce meetings if this is delegated from the elected member

6. General

6.1. Agenda items

The agenda, with attached relevant supporting documents, will be distributed one week, five working days, prior to the next scheduled meeting.

6.2. Minutes and meeting papers

The minutes of each Taskforce meeting, including an action register, will be taken and circulated within two weeks of each meeting.

6.3 Frequency of meetings

The Taskforce will meet Bi-Monthly.

6.4 Conflict of Interest

Taskforce members are required to disclose any conflict of interest that may arise. A conflict of interest includes any financial interest (such as having received koha or grants; membership, employment, consultancies), or non-financial interest (such as personal or professional relationships or affiliations).

6.5 Review

The Purpose and Terms of Reference for the Taskforce on Alcohol and Community Safety in the Central City will be reviewed every 24 months.
More Homes, Sooner
A New Infrastructure Funding Tool

New Zealand is growing fast, but housing and associated infrastructure are not keeping pace. While zoning changes mean more land is available for homes, efforts to develop that land are stymied by a lack of supporting infrastructure – typically water, roading and community infrastructure.

Councils are responsible for most of this infrastructure but those in high-growth areas – Auckland, Hamilton, Tauranga and Queenstown – face constraints in funding and financing new projects.

Most are at, or near, their maximum debt-to-revenue ratios. They also face other constraints on borrowing – higher debt can increase the cost of borrowing and most ratepayers have not been convinced to invest in growth, preferring instead to see rates kept down.

These constraints mean viable infrastructure investment is postponed, creating a burgeoning infrastructure deficit for future generations while also forcing up the price of urban land and housing in cities unable to expand in response to growth.

Looking beyond traditional tools

To keep up with growth New Zealand needs to look beyond traditional funding and financing tools.

Working closely with the high-growth councils, the Government has developed a new alternative funding and finance tool so private capital can be accessed to get infrastructure built sooner than would otherwise be the case, without putting pressure on council balance sheets.

It will also help make the cost of new infrastructure more transparent while spreading that cost so it falls primarily on the homeowners who benefit over time, including across generations.

Water and transport infrastructure (including cycleways, roads and public transport infrastructure) could be funded using the tool, as well as certain community facilities, and environmental resilience infrastructure, such as flood protection.

The tool will be an important addition to councils’ infrastructure provision toolkit, helping them start viable housing and urban development projects sooner. It will not replace existing council planning and decision-making processes.

While at Milldale (see over page) a similar funding and financing approach was negotiated with the sole landowner, the new tool will be enabled through legislation, so it can be used for a wider variety of projects.
How the tool works

Key to the tool’s success will be the ability to ring-fence infrastructure projects from the relevant council’s balance sheet.

A Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), a stand-alone entity, will be created for each project (or a bundle of projects). It would be enabled by legislation to raise finance for the infrastructure project, collect a multi-year levy to repay the finance, and contract for the delivery of the infrastructure.

The levy would be paid by those who are expected to benefit from the infrastructure project, for a period of up to 50 years. A government support package would be agreed by Cabinet to cover certain tail-end risks that can’t be managed by either the SPV or the council.

Who pays what?

Affordability is a key issue that both local and central government have to consider when deciding whether to apply the tool.

The levy amount and term, along with who pays for the infrastructure (the project beneficiaries) will be agreed by Cabinet based on the specifics of each project. The total amount to be collected will be capped.

When the homeowner sells, the requirement to pay the levy will shift to the new owners. That requirement ends altogether once the infrastructure is paid for.

Allocation of the levy between beneficiaries could be determined by a range of factors, including land area, value and use. In broad terms the homeowners will know in advance how much they will need to pay, based on what the project is expected to deliver.

The term could be for up to 50 years, reflecting the life of the infrastructure, and helping ensure the costs are spread across the generations that benefit from it.

Initially it is likely only new housing developments will be funded through the tool. Those looking to buy into one of these developments will be told about the levy so they can consider it when deciding whether to opt in, and the price implications.

When it is eventually used for projects involving existing homeowners, there is flexibility in the tool to address potential impacts and to tailor solutions to the specific project.

Where to from here?

Legislation enabling the tool is expected to be passed by mid-2020. Councils and developers will then need time to work through the usual planning and consenting issues involved with getting large and complex projects underway, with the first project funded through the new tool expected to start in late 2021. In the meantime, a pipeline of possible projects is under development.

The Government is also exploring other ways to give councils greater flexibility in funding and financing infrastructure, including exploring how development contributions and the targeted rate regime could be improved.

Options for further evolving the new tool to meet the needs of a wider range of councils will also be considered.

Have your say...

To have your say on the legislation, consider making a submission to Parliament’s Transport and Infrastructure Select Committee. Keep an eye on their webpage for the submission deadline and other updates.

Milldale – creating a community

The new tool has evolved from the model used at Milldale, north of Auckland, in 2018.

A Crown Infrastructure Partners Special Purpose Vehicle was used to raise finance to fund infrastructure there. Landowners pay an ‘infrastructure payment’ to repay this borrowing – $650 for an apartment or $1,000 for a home a year over 30 years. Auckland Council collects these payments through the rates system, on behalf of the SPV.

The resulting infrastructure will eventually support the creation of a community of 9000 new homes.
Summary of the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (December 2019)

The following provides a summary of directions proposed by the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. Refer to the discussion document and draft wording for the NPSIB for further detail.

1. **Objectives and policies**
   a. The primary objective of the NPSIB is to maintain indigenous biodiversity. This has been defined as at least no reduction in certain functions and properties of indigenous biodiversity.
   b. Other objectives include taking into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi in the management of indigenous biodiversity, restoring indigenous biodiversity and enhancing ecological integrity of ecosystems, and recognising the role of landowners, communities and tangata whenua as stewards and kaitiaki of indigenous biodiversity.
   c. Policies require councils to adopt a precautionary approach towards proposed activities and their effects on indigenous biodiversity and to recognise the contribution maintenance of indigenous biodiversity makes to social, economic and cultural wellbeing.
   d. Policies also require that councils promote resilience of indigenous biodiversity to climate change, including through considering effects of climate change when making decision on restoration and managing new biosecurity risks, promoting connectivity to enable migration of species.

2. **Recognising te ao Māori and principles of the Treaty of Waitangi**
   a. The objectives and policies require recognition of and provision for Hitia te Rito in implementing the NPSIB. Hitia te Rito recognises that the health and wellbeing of indigenous biodiversity in the terrestrial environment is also vital for the health and wellbeing of our freshwater, coastal marine area and all our communities. Hitia te Rito as a fundamental concept to achieve an integrated and holistic approach to maintaining indigenous biodiversity.
   b. Policies require that councils must recognise the role of tangata whenua as kaitiaki within their rohe and provide opportunities for tangata whenua involvement in the management of indigenous biodiversity.
   c. The NPSIB specifies how local authorities are to collaborate with tangata whenua when giving effect to the NPSIB. This includes requirements to take reasonable steps to provide opportunities to exercise kaitiakatanga over indigenous biodiversity, be involved in decision making relating to indigenous biodiversity and incorporate mātauranga Māori.

3. **Application of NPS**
   a. It applies to all land tenures and will mainly be used in relation to new land uses or activities.
   b. The NPSIB does not apply to indigenous biodiversity in the coastal marine area or in waterbodies and freshwater ecosystems, except for the requirements relating to regional biodiversity strategies which can take a broader view, and, wetland enhancement and restoration. Freshwater ecosystems, including effects on wetlands, are otherwise covered by the proposed NPS Freshwater Management 2019.

4. **Identifying important biodiversity and taonga**
   Identifying significant natural areas
Summary of the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (December 2019)

a. The NPSIB specifies the process councils must take to assess and identify significant natural areas (areas with significant vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna). The assessment criteria are identified in the NPSIB. The Auckland Unitary Plan currently identifies such areas as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) – although note that the criteria for identifying such areas proposed in the NPSIB are not identical to those used in the Unitary Plan.

b. Councils must undertake a district wide assessment to determine whether areas meet defined ecological significance criteria.

c. A set of principles and approaches must be followed by councils when assessing and classifying SNAs. Principles include partnership, access, consistency and transparency. In relation to access, where access is not voluntarily given then councils must undertake desktop assessments.

d. SNAs must also be classified as either high or medium value (based on the criteria specified in the NPSIB). This distinction is used to manage effects.

e. For councils that already have identified SNAs in their plans, such as Auckland Council’s SEAs, a qualified ecologist can provide an assessment to demonstrate whether the SEAs meet the NPSIB criteria.

f. Requires updating of SNA lists every 2 years to allow for additions of SNAs that arise through resource consent applications or designations. A full update is required every 10 years.

Identifying taonga and highly mobile fauna

g. Requires identification of taonga subject to working together with tangata whenua to determine if they wish to identify taonga and if what is the process and level of detail.

h. Where identified taonga must be managed to protect their values.

i. Requires surveying and recording of likely and known locations for highly mobile fauna outside of SNAs

5. Managing effects on biodiversity

Managing adverse effects on SNAs

a. Specifies, and defines, what adverse effects on SNAs are to be avoided and the use of the effects management hierarchy is to be applied to all other adverse effects. This is intended to clarify how SNAs should be protected.

b. For SNAs classified as medium value a more lenient management approach is proposed for specific activities which have locational constraints. This includes nationally significant infrastructure, mineral and aggregate extraction, and Māori land.

c. Exceptions are provided for adverse effects relating to protecting, restoring or enhancing an SNA, risks to public health and safety, kānuka or mānuka identified because of myrtle rust risk, and indigenous vegetation established for specific uses/purposes.

d. The effects management framework includes biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation. A framework of criteria is set out in the NPSIB for the use of biodiversity offsets based around widely accepted principles that must be met and those that should be met to qualify as a biodiversity offset.

e. Specific direction is given around the management of plantation forests to maintain biodiversity values

Existing activities in SNAs
Summary of the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (December 2019)

f. Plans must specify where, how and when to provide for existing activities in SNAs.

g. Need to ensure that continuation of the existing activity does not lead to loss or degradation of any SNA and adverse effects do not change character, intensity or scale as at date of NPS

h. Provides for recognition where pastoral farming is existing activity and indigenous vegetation may regenerate in areas previously cleared and converted to improved pasture.

Rules applying outside SNAs

i. Requires councils to take steps to maintain indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs through specifying controls on activities, when assessment is required, and apply effects management hierarchy to adverse effects.

6. **Restoration and enhancement**

   a. Councils must identify and promote restoration and enhancement (including through reconstruction) opportunities through plan provisions and other methods, including incentives.

   b. This applies to degraded wetlands and SNAs, areas providing important connectivity or buffering functions and former wetlands that could be reconstructed.

   c. Regional councils must assess percentage of urban and rural areas in region that have indigenous vegetation cover, and where less than 10% cover:

      ○ A target must be set to increase cover to at least 10% for urban areas;

      ○ A target must be set to increase cover for rural areas; and

      ○ For areas already with 10% or more cover targets may be set to increase cover.

      ○ Targets to be included in regional policy statements along with objectives, policies and methods to achieve it.

7. **Regional biodiversity strategies & monitoring**

   a. Requires regional councils to prepare a regional biodiversity strategy through a collaborative approach with stakeholders, which is specified in the NPSIB.

   b. Strategies are intended to promote landscape-scale restoration and enhancement vision for the region’s indigenous biodiversity. They must recognise various aspects of the NPSIB including spatially identifying SNAs, identified taonga, areas for restoration and enhancement and other areas for protection.

   c. Regional policy statements and plans must have regard to any regional biodiversity strategy in relation to restoration and enhancement.

   d. For councils with an existing strategy, this must be updated within six years of NPS commencement date.

   e. Regional councils must develop a monitoring plan for indigenous biodiversity, establishing methods and timeframes.
Key themes for the Auckland Council submission on He Kura Koiora i hokia - a discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity

This document outlines the draft key themes that will be used to draft the full council submission on the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB). Staff are still considering some aspects of the NPSIB and its implications on both the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) and council’s implementation of the NPSIB. This includes the criteria for identifying significant natural areas and the management of adverse effects in SNAs. Initial comments on such matters are provided but the implications will be expanded on in the draft submission.

The submission will be organised in response to the key parts, and related questions, of the discussion document for the proposed NPSIB.

Overall comments

- Auckland Council supports the need for a National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB) to strengthen requirements for protecting and maintaining indigenous biodiversity under the Resource Management Act (RMA). This includes providing direction and guidance to implement the RMA.
- The council supports the overall intent of the proposed NPSIB, however considers there are opportunities to improve clarity in the proposed provisions and certainty in aspects of its implementation.
- The council has concerns with the interaction and alignment of the NPSIB with other national directions, specifically the National Policy Statements on Urban Development and Freshwater Management and the lack of recognition of the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy. Alignment of national direction is necessary to achieve the outcomes sought in the NPSIB.
- The council considers that technical and financial support will be essential for successful implementation of the NPSIB. The council has identified several areas where guidance could be provided to support implementation, clarify expectations required by the NPSIB and ensure consistency. The council supports the provision of technical and financial support to councils who may not be as well-resourced as Auckland to implement the NPSIB. Iwi/Māori also need to be adequately resourced for implementation.
- The Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) identifies significant natural areas as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) covering all domains. The council has extensive programmes delivering protection, restoration and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity across the region along with supporting landowners and community groups with advice and funding. As a unitary authority Auckland Council has greater opportunity to achieve integrated management of indigenous biodiversity and in this regard is likely to have different implementation challenges compared with other councils.
Specific topics

Objectives and Policies of the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB Part 2)

- The council agrees that the NPSIB is necessary to strengthen protection of indigenous biodiversity under the Resource Management Act (RMA). It will provide the necessary guidance and direction on achieving the outcomes sought under the RMA, and to achieve a more consistent approach across New Zealand. To date such national guidance has been absent. Throughout the submission the council has identified various opportunities to improve clarity in the NPSIB provisions to ensure it can be implemented effectively.
- The council recognises that the NPSIB applies to terrestrial indigenous biodiversity while the NPS for Freshwater Management and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement will manage indigenous biodiversity in their respective domains. While management can be undertaken through different documents the council emphasises the importance of ensuring alignment between documents to enable clear and effective implementation by councils, and certainty for landowners.
- The council generally agrees with the objectives and policies proposed in the NPSIB. However, the council questions whether they have been over simplified removing important detail from the objectives and prioritise restoration and enhancement over protection of significant indigenous biodiversity. As currently proposed, some objectives and policies do not add any further direction than the RMA.
- The council supports the inclusion of restoration and enhancement within the objectives and the implementation of the NPSIB. The council considers there is a need to do more than just maintain indigenous biodiversity, recognising the reference to ‘at least no reduction’ currently proposed in the NPSIB (clause 1.7). There needs to be a positive gain for nature to build resilience to impacts of climate change and enable nature-based solutions.

Section A: Recognising te ao Māori and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi

a. Providing for the concept of Hutia te Rito (Objective 3, Policy 1, clause 3.2 & 3.3)

- The council supports the use of the underlying concept of Hutia te Rito within the NPSIB, recognising the important connections between the health of nature and of people.

b. Providing for the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and engaging with tangata whenua (Objective 2 & 6, Policy 1 & 12, clause 3.3)

- The discussion document (p25) indicates that the NPSIB proposes a broader participation to allow councils to involve iwi/Māori, as opposed to only iwi authorities. For Auckland (and elsewhere), with a significant mataawaka presence, engagement with all Māori is important.
The council supports the direction to involve tangata whenua at all stages of implementation of the NPSIB, and the incorporation of mātauranga Māori and tikanga Māori in decision-making and biodiversity management. The council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi/ the Treaty of Waitangi and supports the additional direction that the NPSIB provides. The council is concerned around resourcing iwi/Māori for the implementation of the NPSIB.

Section B: Identifying important biodiversity and taonga

a. Identification and mapping of Significant Natural Areas (Policy 6, clause 3.8)

- The council supports having a national approach to identifying areas of significant indigenous biodiversity as Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). The Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) already identifies its SNAs as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), with over 3000 identified across terrestrial, freshwater and marine domains.
- The council supports the inclusion of principles and approaches in the NPSIB that must be used when undertaking assessment and classification of SNAs, which reflects the council’s approach.
- It is noted that the NPSIB criteria do not cover wetlands and streams (which are covered by the AUP SEA overlay), and this may have implications for the AUP.
- An initial assessment of the criteria used to identify SNAs/SEAs in the AUP suggests that there are generally high levels of congruence with the NPSIB significance criteria (which NPSIB clause 3.8(4) provides for). However, the council considers that the language used in the NPSIB Appendix 1 significance criteria is often general and vague such that they may not be useful to identify SNAs or allow for meaningful comparison throughout New Zealand and may lead to increased contention and litigation about their application. All regional councils have committed to the use of the terrestrial ecosystems identified in Singers & Rogers (2014)\(^1\). In Auckland, this ecosystem classification is used to identify and assess representativeness and other matters covered by the significance criteria in the AUP and provides an objective basis to assess important ecological characteristics. The NPSIB may be out of date in its approach to ecosystem identification, and a more consistent and robust basis is required than currently proposed in the NPSIB. Use of a standardised classification system provides the opportunity for consistent assessment of the current and future state of biodiversity across the country, and in a way that can be aggregated to the national scale.
- The council would like to see greater consideration of climate resilience in the proposed NPSIB significance criteria, or the ability to apply them to manage climate change impacts. Climate resilience and representativeness are linked and will become more important in future.
- The NPSIB proposes to manage adverse effects on SNAs differently depending on whether an SNA is classified as High or Medium (using criteria in Appendix 2 of the

---

NPSIB). The council has concerns with the implications of having to classify SNAs as High or Medium, which may become contentious and be subject to litigation. The NPSIB does not provide any detail around how landowners need to be advised or involved in this process.

- The council is also concerned with using the High Medium classification to manage effects on SNAs. Potentially it may result in greater loss of Medium SNAs and it is still a subjective assessment process.
- The council generally supports regional councils being responsible for identifying, mapping and scheduling SNAs and notes that the approach adopted in other parts of the country where regional councils identify SNAs that are then included in the district plans of the region allows for some efficiency of scale, and more consistent approaches. The success of any approach relies on adequate resourcing, and a standardised approach may not be always provide for the best outcome. As a unitary authority this will have less impact on Auckland Council than other councils.
- The council would like to highlight the impact that RMA section 76(4A)\(^2\) has on where the mapping and schedule of SNAs sits for urban areas. In Auckland, where there are significant areas of SNA/SEA on land that meets the definition in RMA s76(4C), and for which satisfying the requirements in 76(4A) –(4D) would be impossible, regional rules are required to enable SNA/SEA protection. If the NPSIB is to specify the inclusion of SNAs and associated provisions in district plans, consideration needs to be given to the interaction with RMA section 76(4A) – (4D) and the potential to repeal these provisions to enable effective protection of urban SNAs.

b. Recognising and protecting taonga species and ecosystems (Policy 12, clause 3.14)

- The council supports the identification and management of taonga species and ecosystems, and the recognition that tangata whenua have the right to choose not to identify taonga and the level of detail at which these may be described.

c. Surveying for and managing ‘highly mobile fauna’ (Policy 13, clause 3.15)

- The council supports recognition of highly mobile fauna within the NPSIB but suggests that these will be difficult to identify. The council considers that further guidance is required on the appropriate responses to managing the habitats of threatened species, including which regulatory responses might be appropriate.
- The council questions whether the relationship between the requirements for councils to identify and manage highly mobile fauna in the NPSIB and the Department of Conservation’s functions have been adequately clarified.

\(^2\) RMA section 76(4A-4D) refers to district rules for tree protection
Section C: Managing adverse effects on biodiversity from activities

a. Managing adverse effects and providing for specific new activities within SNAs (Policy 8 & 9, clause 3.9-3.12)
   - The council generally supports the use of the effects management hierarchy to manage effects on indigenous biodiversity proposed in the NPSIB. This generally aligns with the approach in the AUP, including the emphasis on avoidance of adverse effects as the first and sometimes only option.
   - However, there are concerns that the application of the effects management hierarchy in the proposed NPSIB, including in relation to the ‘Medium’ and ‘High’ classifications required, could undermine protection of ‘Medium’ value sites. Conversely, the ‘High’ classification may imply the need to apply prohibited activity status which may be overly restrictive in some SNAs. (Staff are still considering the implications of this)
   - The relationship between subdivision and subsequent land use could be more clearly addressed in the proposed NPSIB.
   - The council supports the proposed NPSIB including more emphasis on pest management – including integration with other tools such as Regional Pest Management Plans where appropriate.
   - The council questions whether the NPSIB contains enough emphasis on positive outcomes for indigenous biodiversity versus managing effects on SNAs.

b. Providing for existing activities (Policy 10, clause 3.12)
   - The proposed NPSIB approach to managing existing activities within SNAs (clause 3.12) generally aligns with the AUP approach. However, the approach to existing farming activities and ‘improved pasture’ proposed may be more enabling than the approach in the AUP and may lead to re-litigating of some rural SEAs. The NPSIB may potentially go further than the existing use rights set out in RMA s10 and s20A (notwithstanding the NPSIB recognising these RMA sections ‘apply according to their terms’).

c. Managing adverse effects outside significant natural areas (Policy 7, clause 3.13 & 3.15)
   - The council supports the inclusion of managing adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs in the proposed NPSIB. However, the council would like to see greater recognition of the impacts of pests and pathogens on indigenous biodiversity and consideration given to the potential of sites to improve, through active management, such that they meet SNA status.
   - The council requests greater direction be provided as to the appropriate response to the management of the habitat of highly mobile fauna, including outside of SNAs.

d. Use and development of Māori land (clause 3.7, 3.9, 3.13 & 3.16)
The council supports the proposed NPSIB recognition of the constraints on use and development of Māori land, and the relationship with indigenous biodiversity areas. The proposed approach in the NPSIB is generally consistent with approach to Māori land in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP).

e. Consideration of climate change (Policy 3, clause 3.5)

- The council supports the requirement to promote the resilience of indigenous biodiversity to climate change through the regional policy statement, plans and regional biodiversity strategy. The council suggests that it will be necessary to undertake more than just promote resilience to climate change. The council would support central government providing additional guidance on what is expected of councils when implementing the clause 3.5 climate resilience requirements.

- In relation to climate change, the council suggests that consideration be given as to the need for significance criteria related to ‘refugia’ for climate resilience. As habitats and distributions change some areas will become important refuges for flora and fauna providing relief from the stress of climate change and enable adaptation. The council recognises that regional biodiversity strategies will play an important role in this regard through the inclusion of such a criteria or lens in development of a long-term vision for restoration and enhancement.

- Overall, the council considers the climate change responses in the NPSIB could be developed and elaborated further.

f. Applying a precautionary principle to managing indigenous biodiversity (Policy 2, clause 3.6)

- The council supports the inclusion of the precautionary approach in the proposed NPSIB, noting that such an approach is also part of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.

g. Biodiversity offsetting and compensation (clause 1.8, Appendix 3 & 4)

- The effects management framework in the proposed NPSIB includes biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation. The council supports the framework of criteria as set out in the NPSIB (Appendix 3) for the use of biodiversity offsets which is based around widely accepted principles to qualify as a biodiversity offset. The council also supports the provision in the NPSIB for environmental compensation when biodiversity offsets are not possible or effective. However, the council considers biodiversity offsets should still be preferred for any significant effect on indigenous biodiversity where they are achievable.
Section D: Restoration and enhancement of biodiversity

a. Restoration and enhancement of degraded SNAs, connections, buffers and wetlands (Policy 11, clause 3.16)
   - The council supports the inclusion of clear direction for restoration and enhancement policies and requirements in the NPSIB.
   - With respect to requirements around restoration of wetlands and former wetlands in proposed NPSIB clause 3.16, the council reinforces the need for alignment with the proposed NPS for Freshwater Management so there is no overlap or gap between the two NPS directions that will prevent the restoration of wetlands as desired in the NPSIB.

b. Restoring indigenous vegetation cover in depleted areas (Policy 11, clause 3.17)
   - The council supports directions and requirements to increase indigenous vegetation cover in urban and rural areas with depleted cover. However, there is some uncertainty in terms of how the 10% target/assessment is to be applied. The council suggests that there should be criteria around unequal distribution of indigenous vegetation cover such as is included in Auckland’s Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy.
   - The discussion document indicates the benefits of increasing vegetative cover in urban and peri-urban areas (p72). The council reinforces the importance of aligning the NPS on Urban Development with the NPSIB. Bringing nature into cities is an important part of environmental quality in urban development and for responding to the impacts of climate change.

c. Regional biodiversity strategies (Policy 14, clause 3.18, Appendix 5)
   - The council supports the direction to require regional biodiversity strategies in the proposed NPSIB. With a focus on a collaborative approach to development of a regional vision for restoration and enhancement across all domains, regional biodiversity strategies will be important tools providing strategic vision and direction to implement the NPSIB.
   - Their inclusion in the NPSIB, rather than in the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy, enables better linkages with RMA plans. The council considers there needs to be strong linkages to the NZBS to ensure regional approaches are consistent with the national approach.
   - The council considers that there may need to be stronger direction in clause 3.18(2) whereby regional policy statements and plans ‘must have regard to’ the regional biodiversity strategy, particularly given the expectation of a collaborative strategy process and engagement with community.
   - The council considers that Appendix 5, which details how regional biodiversity strategies will be developed, contains detailed requirements that go beyond what a strategy includes such as the requirement for a comprehensive record of all actions being undertaken. Such a record is generally anticipated in an action plan or
implementation plan. For a large region such as Auckland creating such a record would be an immense task that may detract from development and engagement on a vision. Consideration should be given to greater flexibility around such detailed records being required in a strategy.

- As a regional vision for restoration and enhancement, the council supports regional biodiversity strategies promoting other outcomes such as predator control and prevention of spread of pests and pathogens. The strategy provides the opportunity to provide an integrated approach connecting all aspects of managing, protecting and restoring indigenous biodiversity.

Section E: Monitoring and Implementation

- The council supports greater guidance and direction on monitoring of indigenous biodiversity as proposed in clause 3.20 of the NPSIB, including the direction around using mātauranga Māori and tikanga Māori monitoring methods equally with scientific monitoring, where tangata whenua agree.

- The council supports SNAs being identified on public conservation land, although acknowledges the costs. The AUP currently identifies SNAs on public conservation land and public land. The council considers that protecting and maintaining indigenous biodiversity needs to be tenure neutral and that local and central government play an important leadership role.

- The council generally supports the proposed timeframes to implement the NPSIB and considers it is likely that these timeframes can be met. The council recognises that it may be in a different position to other councils in that it currently identifies and manages SNAs within the AUP, has programmes to support communities and landowners managing and restoring indigenous biodiversity, and is well resourced.
Memorandum

31 January 2020

To: Planning Committee

Cc: All Waitematā Local Board members

Jenny Fuller, Acting Manager Planning – Auckland Wide, Plans & Places
Ruth Andrews, Team Leader – Planning, Plans & Places
Debbie Hogan, Principal Analyst – Strategy, Natural Environment Strategy Unit

Subject: Waitematā Local Board feedback to the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity

From: The Waitematā Local Board

Purpose

1. To provide Waitematā Local Board’s feedback to the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.

Context/Background


4. Local Board feedback to contribute to the Auckland Council submission is due by 5pm 4 February 2020.

5. Auckland Council will finalise its submission before the Government deadline of 14 March 2020, with a draft submission proposed to be considered by the Planning Committee on 5 March 2020.
Waitematā Local Board feedback

Summary
The Waitematā Local Board:
- strongly supports the need for a national policy statement
- strongly supports more emphasis on pest management
- supports trialling areas of natural regeneration
- supports managing exotics in a role that can foster native biodiversity
- supports the return of default blanket protections for mature trees
- supports interventions that re-establish the keystone indigenous species
- endorses establishing more areas that are protected such as land and marine reserves
- recommends that local boards to be consulted on how tangata whenua will be involved in the management of indigenous biodiversity going forward

6. The Waitematā Local Board strongly agree with the need for a national policy statement and generally agree with the overall intent of the proposed statement.

7. The Waitematā Local Board Plan adopted in 2017 states:

“Our valued natural ecosystems and biodiversity are under threat from pest plants and animals. To address this challenge we will maintain our ecological restoration programmes and grow community capacity around managing weeds and getting rid of pests. We want the council to eliminate agrichemical spraying and embrace its commitment to minimise agrichemical use. You have told us to support alternative weed management techniques, such as the use of hot water and mechanical edging in parks. As a local board we support the target to make New Zealand predator free by 2050.”

8. The Waitematā Local Board Plan 2017 also includes the following biodiversity objectives and key initiatives:

Objective: Increase the urban forest and enhance biodiversity.
Key initiatives:
- Deliver local initiatives to increase tree planting, such as on St Marys Road, and additional pollinator paths in parks and the road corridor.
- Develop a local strategy to increase the urban forest in line with a regional urban tree strategy.
- Encourage Auckland Transport to provide planting, including canopy trees, in every streetscape improvement.

Objective: Regenerate our natural areas to enhance biodiversity.
Key initiatives:
- Deliver a local ecological restoration programme.
- Increase community capacity around weed management and pest eradication.
- Support initiatives which minimise the use of agrichemicals for weed control.

9. The Waitematā Local Board strongly supports the proposed national policy statement to include more emphasis on pest management. The board notes that the residents in Waitematā Local Board area were strongly supportive of the council introducing a targeted rate for managing pests and was the highest positive response overall for Auckland.
10. It is recommended that more areas are considered for trialling natural regeneration which may be more efficient at increasing biodiversity. The local board also supports no mow areas in urban zones to encourage soil health and increase insect habitats.

11. Management of exotics should be based on scientific evidence around their role in fostering native biodiversity, playing a useful role in eco-systems and mitigating climate change.

12. The Waitematā Local Board supports the return of default blanket protections for mature trees. Both native and exotics can have a beneficial effect of creating more habitat for native biodiversity and sequestering carbon.

13. The local board also recommends that more areas are protected such as land and marine reserves.

14. We support interventions that re-establish the keystone indigenous species when habitat conditions are so degraded that it can’t re-establish itself without intervention.

15. It is recommended that local boards be consulted on how tangata whenua will be involved in the management of indigenous biodiversity going forward.
SUBMISSION OF THE AUCKLAND COUNCIL TO THE JUSTICE COMMITTEE INQUIRY INTO THE 2019 LOCAL ELECTIONS AND LIQUOR LICENSING TRUST ELECTIONS, AND RECENT ENERGY TRUST ELECTIONS.

Introduction

1.1 This is the Auckland Council submission to the Justice Committee’s Inquiry into the 2019 Local Elections and Liquor Licensing Trust Elections, and Recent Energy Trust Elections. Auckland Council welcomes the opportunity to provide comments for consideration by the Committee.

1.2 The address for service is Auckland Council, Private Bag 92300, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142.

1.3 Please direct any enquiries to Warwick McNaughton, Principal Advisor and Deputy Electoral Officer, Democracy Services, phone 021 191 1009 or email: warwick.mcnaughton@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.

1.4 Auckland Council wishes to appear before the Justice Select Committee to discuss this submission.

1.5 Auckland Council local boards have provided feedback into this submission and their comments are appended.

2 Background

2.1 Auckland Council is responsible for local government elections in its area, which comprises a total of 1,065,383 electors. The 2019 elections for Auckland Council involved 170 elected member positions:

- one mayor
- 20 governing body members, elected on a ward basis
- 149 local board members for 21 local boards
2.2 Elections for three district health boards and four licensing trusts were held at the same time.

2.3 The Council’s submission sets out recommendations in respect of:

(i) matters raised in the Committee’s terms of reference regarding the 2019 elections:
   - low voter turnout
   - liquor licensing trusts
   - the role of council staff
   - disclosure of candidates or members with serious criminal convictions
   - irregularities

(ii) matters raised in the Committee’s terms of reference regarding its recommendations arising from its report on the 2016 local elections:
   - Electoral Commission to be responsible for local elections
   - Same electoral system in all elections
   - Foreign interference

(iii) additional matters for consideration by the Committee:
   - disclosure of interests
   - probity
   - Māori wards
   - Review of representation arrangements
   - Timing of polls for creation of a Māori ward or change of electoral system

3 **Low voter turnout**

3.1 Auckland Council has undertaken research into voter awareness in conjunction with the 2013, 2016 and 2019 elections. The following are highlights from the survey results that might be of assistance to the Committee in its investigation into low voter turnout.

3.2 After the 2019 elections a random sample of 1,871 Aucklanders were surveyed online. The survey tested respondents’ awareness of advertising and included questions relating to whether they voted or not. Of those who did not vote (643), the top four reasons given for not voting were:
   - “I didn’t know anything about the candidates” 11%
   - “I forgot to vote” 11%
   - “I did not know when voting finished, missed the deadline” 10%
3.3 Of those who did not vote, 25% had filled in all or part of their voting documents but did not cast their vote. The top four reasons given were:

- “I didn’t send it off in time / ran out of time” 29%
- “I forgot to send / complete it” 21%
- “I had other commitments during that time” 17%
- “I didn’t know anything about the candidates” 8%

3.4 Non-voters were asked “What could Auckland Council do to encourage you to vote?”. The top four (unprompted) replies were:

- “Have online voting” 19%
- “It was my own fault” 8%
- “More advertising” 7%
- “Send reminders and notifications by post / email / txt” 7%

3.5 All respondents were asked whether they preferred online voting or postal voting if they had the choice. 66% preferred online voting and 26% preferred postal voting.

3.6 Of non-voters, 28% said they would have been more likely to vote if it had been booth voting.

3.7 Research was also undertaken into the impact of different messaging on voter behaviour. The most effective message was a social norm message “74% of Aucklanders are planning to vote. Join them and vote this election!”. As compared with other messages such as a message of concern about low voter turnout, this had a more positive effect. This indicates election administrators should be cautious about negative messaging such as highlighting low voter turnout.

3.8 Survey results are being written up for publishing onto the council’s website knowledgeauckland.govt.nz

3.9 Auckland Council held 50 one-stop shop events which provided people the ability to enrol (the Electoral Commission attended) and to cast special votes. Our experience of these could be described as “social voting”. A lot of people made use of them, enrolled then sat down to complete their voting documents. Typically, venues where the one-stop shops were held were packed with people wanting to vote.

3.10 Another project was “Vote Friday” through which business organisations gave staff time to fill out voting documents at work. 60 organisations, representing 55,000 employees, took part.

3.11 One of the answers to lifting turnout might include a multi-modal approach which does not seek to identify just one way for voting but develops options for voters. For example:

- Postal voting
• Booth voting
• Advance voting
• One-stop shops
• Vote Friday
• Marae-based
• Ballot boxes at convenient locations such as supermarkets
• Online voting (once considered secure)

Recommendations:

3.12 Note the research conducted by Auckland Council which is available on knowledge.auckland.govt.nz.

3.13 Note the successful initiatives undertaken by Auckland Council including: Vote Friday and One-stop Shops.

3.14 Consider that the response to low voter turnout may best be through a multi-modal approach which provides voters with options.

4 Liquor licensing trusts

4.1 Licensing trusts are established under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (or the earlier Sale of Liquor Act 1989 and continued under the 2012 Act). The Law Commission, when it reviewed alcohol legislation prior to the 2012 Act, noted that licensing trusts were well supported by their communities and there was the ability for the community to petition for those trusts with monopoly powers to become competitive. It recommended no change to the law around licensing trusts.

4.2 Of the licensing trusts in the Auckland area, only the Portage and Waitakere Licensing Trusts have the sole right to establish and operate on-licences in hotels and taverns, and off-licences in their districts. The other licensing trusts are the Birkenhead, Mt Wellington and Wiri Licensing Trusts.

4.3 The aspect of licensing trusts that impinges on election administration the most relates to trust areas. Because these are not aligned with local government areas there are 26 more permutations of voting packs required in the Auckland Council area.

4.4 An example is the Birkenhead Licensing Trust. This was constituted in 1967 with its area being the whole of the then borough of Birkenhead. The area has not changed since then.

4.5 Any change to the western trust boundaries would have implications in terms of existing licences. However it may be possible to align the boundaries of the other three trusts, say with local board boundaries. Auckland Council has not considered this in detail.
4.6 Apart from the issues around trust areas, the election of trust members adds complexity to the voting documents used for council elections.

Recommendations

4.7 Note that with the passage of time trust boundaries no longer align with local government boundaries in the Auckland area and this creates complexity in terms of the number of different combinations of voting documents that are required.

5 The role of council staff

5.1 The Committee’s terms of reference include the role of council staff during election periods around decisions to release or not release information or any public statements that may be construed to affect the election outcome.

5.2 Auckland Council staff were involved in three types of scenarios regarding requests for information:

(i) Ordinary requests for information from the public which are dealt with under the procedures in the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA), which clearly states that decisions on requests are made by the chief executive. There was no change to normal procedures.

(ii) Requests for information from candidates. Staff noted that researching information for use by a candidate could be perceived as council resources being used for benefit of an election candidate. Given that LGOIMA still applied in such situations and requests for information had to be met, responses to requests for information from candidates were published to the website so the information would be available to all candidates. Staff also considered it was useful for candidates and the electorate to have factual information rather than be misinformed.

(iii) Proactive media statements of fact. If a candidate continues to make public statements that are factually incorrect, there may be the need to correct that through the media, particularly if there are incorrect allegations about council operations. However such statements should be the exception - staff should not be involved in political debate.

5.3 Auckland Council considers there is no need for legislative change.

6 Disclosure of candidates or members with serious criminal convictions

6.1 Under the Local Government Act 2002, an elected member will lose their position if convicted of an offence punishable by a term of imprisonment of two years or more. However, there is no requirement to disclose such offences if standing for election – there is no criminal check undertaken.

6.2 One argument is that all candidates are subject to the ballot box and a candidate who has committed serious crime in the past is unlikely to be elected.
6.3 An alternative approach is to amend the Local Electoral Act 2001 to apply to candidates the provisions in the Local Government Act 2002 for sitting members. So that not only is a sitting member disqualified but a person is prevented from standing if they have had a criminal conviction of the same type of offence (unless their record has been wiped by the clean slate provisions). If this alternative approach is taken then a candidate would need to declare on their nomination form that they are not prevented from standing by this requirement.

Recommendation

6.4 Amend the Local Electoral Act 2001 to align with the Local Government Act 2002, schedule 7, clause 1, with the effect that a person is not eligible for election if they have been previously convicted of an offence punishable by a term of imprisonment of 2 years or more (unless their record has been wiped by the clean slate provisions).

7 Irregularities

7.1 The Committee’s terms of reference include irregularities that could have compromised the fairness of the elections.

7.2 Auckland Council is not aware of any irregularities in the Auckland Council elections.

8 Inquiry into 2016 local elections

8.1 The Auckland Council made a number of requests of the Committee in its submission to the inquiry into the 2016 local elections and notes that the Committee’s recommendations in its report support many of the council’s recommendations.

8.2 The following comments address the feedback the Committee has requested in terms of its key recommendations arising from the 2016 inquiry.

9 Electoral Commission to be responsible for local elections

9.1 The options for the Electoral Commission ("Commission") being responsible for local elections range along a spectrum from the Commission being responsible for a few key aspects working collaboratively with local authorities, to the Commission being totally responsible. The Committee’s recommendation is that the Commission should be responsible for running all aspects of local elections.

Centralisation vs decentralisation

9.2 Parliament devolves responsibilities to local government when it is more important for local communities to decide matters than it is to have national consistency. The notions of subsidiarity and localism are important to local government.
9.3 However, these considerations do not apply to the same extent to decision-making about elections. Local political decision-making around the running of elections should be minimised. Local politicians should not be too involved in making decisions about elections because they themselves may be candidates. It is considered best practice for local politicians to be at arms-length from the running of elections.

9.4 However, it is important that local community characteristics are reflected in the administration of local elections (for example translation into languages that are appropriate for a local community). A “one size fits all” needs careful consideration.

Efficiencies

9.5 There are efficiency benefits from centralising election administration:

9.6 Reduce or eliminate duplication among councils. For example, rather than each council’s web team developing web pages for candidates and voters there might be only one central web-based information portal for the whole country (as for parliamentary elections). Likewise, there might be just one branding for the whole country.

9.7 Provide a permanent team focussed on elections. Currently each council has to budget for local elections happening on a three-yearly cycle. For Auckland Council this has also meant engaging temporary additional staff for the elections who develop expertise in running elections then who leave after the election is over. Although the Commission also has to engage additional staff for each triennial election, it has a core team which is permanent.

9.8 Those who are responsible for the electoral roll would also be responsible for running local elections. Currently, local elections are run by councils who must use the electoral roll which is administered by the Commission. For the 2019 elections there was excellent collaboration between the council and the Commission. However, collaboration needs to be a conscious effort and making the Commission responsible for both the electoral roll and the local elections could create synergies. The Electoral Commission, as part of its responsibility for the electoral roll, undertakes awareness raising in the community to ensure people enrol and update their details. If the commission already has community engagement processes in place, it could use these to raise awareness for local elections as well.

9.9 Consistent development of legislation. Currently legislation for central and local elections is comprised in two separate statutes and regulations. This is not a problem in itself, but developments of the legislation in order to bring about improvements happens as the result of separate organisations making submissions regarding separate legislation. There have been occasions in the past where the Commission has achieved improvements in its legislation, but these do not flow through to local electoral legislation (one example being the ability to vote from overseas).

Issues
9.10 An issue related to local elections is the review of representation arrangements. For Parliamentary elections a Representation Commission undertakes a review of boundaries. It would be a significant undertaking for the Representation Commission to undertake the review for all local authorities. Even though incumbent members might be seen as having an interest in electoral boundaries, local councils are best placed to propose changes to boundaries due to their knowledge of communities of interest in their area. The representation review is a process where representation is decided by a council in conjunction with its community, and if the community appeals, the final determination is made by the Local Government Commission. The review should be retained as a community-based process led by the community’s council. The discretion around establishing Māori wards should become part of the representation review (it should be a local consideration rather than decided centrally by a Representation Commission).

9.11 Another issue is the candidate nomination process. Currently candidates bring in their nominations physically to a council office for processing. For Parliamentary elections, individual nominations are lodged with electorate returning officers who are employed on a short-term basis for each Parliamentary election and who establish an electorate office for the election. (Alternatively party secretaries send nominations to the Commission in Wellington for processing.) Following an election the electorate office is closed. Whether the Commission retains returning officers to also cover local elections or appoints a council employee or an election service provider as returning officers just for local elections may be options. Another alternative is legislative change to allow nominations to be submitted electronically. This is noted as a matter of operational detail.

9.12 One feature of local elections is the candidate profile booklet. While some voters say this does not tell them much about candidates, it is better than nothing. Surveys show clearly that lack of information about candidates is a key deterrent for voters – voters do not have meaningful information with which to make voting decisions. Any move to centralise elections and amalgamate the legislation should retain candidate profile statements.

9.13 There are two providers of election services who have developed considerable expertise and resources for conducting local elections. Those resources and expertise should be recognised. The Commission may choose to use their services for any local elections for which it is responsible. A move to centralising the administration of local elections does not necessarily mean the services of these providers will no longer be required. This is noted as a matter of operational detail.

9.14 The Commission is funded out of Vote Justice (the current estimate is $46 million). This is expressed as services purchased by the Minister of Justice. If the Commission provides additional services to the Minister for conducting local government elections there is a question of whether these additional services result in some form of levy on local government and, if so, how it is calculated. The fairest form of any levy might be one based on providing minimal core services so that those councils who do not require more value-added services are not charged for something they do not need. If the Commission provides only core services, some
councils might wish to supplement what the Commission provides with additional services (for example, council websites providing local information, additional participation campaigns).

9.15 Any centralised arrangement must recognise differences at the local level, particularly in terms of demographics. Branding, collateral, images and translations must be relevant to the local communities. The Commission should collaborate with local council staff over appropriateness.

Effect on the voter experience

9.16 A decision on centralising local elections should consider its effect on voters and voter turnout.

9.17 There is anecdotal evidence that some voters find the current system confusing. For example, the Commission receives calls from voters who did not know they should be contacting the council’s local electoral officer.

9.18 A voter who changes residence and forgets to update the electoral roll through the Commission, will blame the council when they do not receive their voting documents. Voters sometimes do not understand that the electoral roll is not maintained by the council.

9.19 Candidates currently lodge their nominations with the council electoral officer. However, if there is a problem with the eligibility of nominees then that must be taken up instead with the Commission if the problem relates to the electoral roll.

9.20 Participation campaigns are currently conducted by the Commission and councils separately. The Commission conducts a campaign to ensure people are enrolled to vote. Councils conduct campaigns to encourage people to vote. The commission could use its campaigning for enrolment to also encourage people to vote in local elections.

9.21 It is intuitive that a simplification of the process from the voter’s perspective might facilitate greater turnout, though there is no guarantee. There are no obvious aspects of moving to the commission that would be likely to work the other way – that is, that might lead to lower turnout.

Recommendation

9.22 Further investigate the Committee’s recommendation for the Electoral Commission to conduct local elections.

10 Same electoral system (FPP or STV) in all elections

10.1 In its submission into the inquiry into the 2016 local elections the council noted the complexity created by holding the District Health Board elections in conjunction with the council elections.

10.2 The council advocated moving these elections to a different year, but the Committee, in its report, noted there are efficiencies in holding these elections
together. Instead, the Committee has recommended requiring all elections to use the same electoral system as a response to this complexity.

10.3 The council also notes that additional complexity is created by the council, district health boards and licensing trusts making different decisions about order of names on voting documents. This should also be standardised.

Recommenations

10.4 Amend legislation to the effect that all elections run in conjunction with the elections of a territorial authority use the same electoral system and the same order of names on voting documents.

11 Foreign interference

11.1 The council has noted the Committee’s recommendations and supports them.

12 Disclosure of interests

12.1 The Committee’s report notes inconsistencies between the requirements for Parliamentarians and for local authority members in terms of declaring interests and makes recommendations that Government should introduce legislation setting out requirements for local authority members.

12.2 The existing legislation that applies to local authority members is the Local Authorities (Members Interests) Act 1965. This has been noted for some years as needing a complete review. In particular, section 3 provides for a person to be ineligible to be an elected member if they have an interest in a contract with the local authority of over $25,000 per annum. Most contracts of that amount are let by staff under delegated authority and members do not participate in those decisions yet their eligibility for office might be affected.

12.3 The Committee’s report also notes that maintaining a register of interests is ad hoc – some councils include this in their code of conduct and others do not.

Recommendations

12.4 Review the Local Authorities (Members Interests) Act 1965.

12.5 Provide a consistent framework across all local authorities for registers of interests.

13 Probit

13.1 The Council notes that the Auditor-General is responsible for monitoring the use of public funds and public property and had published guidelines about communications and the use of council resources during the pre-election period but withdrew these guidelines during the 2019 pre-election period. There is now a lack of guidelines for providing consistent action by councils during this period.

Recommendation
13.2 Auditor-General to republish guidelines on the use of council resources during the pre-election period.

14 Māori wards

14.1 The Council notes the consideration of the Committee given to the petition of Andrew Judd and records its current resolved position in regard to Māori wards:

That the Governing Body:

a) ... reiterate to government the position adopted by Council in 2015 supporting the need for legislative change to allow Auckland to determine the number of members on the Governing Body and subject to that, agree in principle to establish a Māori ward and request for a consistent policy regarding Māori representation in line with legislation governing the composition of Parliament.

15 Review of representation arrangements

15.1 As part of the election process, councils are required to conduct a review of representation arrangements at least every six years.

15.2 Every other council can review the number of its councillors but the number of councillors on the Auckland Council governing body is set at 20 in the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009.

15.3 Problems relating to this came to light in the review of representation arrangements for the 2019 elections. A workable option to address the under-representation in the Waitemata and Gulf ward would have been to increase the number of councillors but this option was not available.

15.4 As noted above, this restriction also affects decisions around the creation of Māori wards.

Recommendation

15.5 Amend the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 to remove the specification that Auckland Council's governing body will comprise 20 members in addition to the mayor so that Auckland Council has the same discretion as any other council to review its membership.

16 Timing of polls for creation of a Māori ward or change of electoral system

16.1 The current provisions in the Local Electoral Act 2001 for the council to resolve to change the electoral system (for example from FPP to STV) or to establish a Māori ward, allow for a petition for a poll of the community to be conducted. The Local Electoral Act requires the chief executive to advise the electoral officer as soon as practicable once a valid petition is received. If notice is received by 21 February in
the year prior to the election, the electoral officer must conduct the poll within 89
days of receiving notice from the chief executive.

16.2 In the case of Auckland Council, conducting a standalone poll of over 1 million
electors costs over $1 million.

16.3 By contrast, the council has the discretion to initiate its own poll and may choose to
hold a poll in conjunction with an election, which would lower the cost.

Recommendation

16.4 Amend the Local Electoral Act 2001 so that if a petition for a poll in respect of a
resolution relating to Maori wards or change of electoral system is received by 21
February in the year prior to an election, a council has the discretion to conduct a
poll in conjunction with the next triennial elections.

17 Conclusion

17.1 The Council looks forward to appearing before the committee to speak to its
recommendations.

17.2 Some of the Auckland Council local boards asked for their comments to be
forwarded in to the committee and these are attached.
Memorandum

22 January 2020

To: Local board members

Subject: Preparing Auckland Council’s submissions on central government’s Taumata Arowai – Water Services Regulator Bill and Water Services Bill

From: Ellie McNaë, Principal Analyst, Natural Environment Strategy
Rebecca Forgesson, Analyst - Strategy, Natural Environment Strategy
Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research, Chief Planning Office

Contact information: ellie.mcnae@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
rebecca forgesson@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To provide elected members with information on council’s upcoming submission on Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulator Bill.

Summary

2. Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulator Bill (Taumata Arowai) was introduced to Parliament on 17 December 2019. It is expected this will be followed by introduction of the Water Services Bill in the coming months. These bills build on the government’s work to date on the Three Waters review. Submissions on Taumata Arowai close on 4 March 2020; the submission period for the Water Services Bill has not yet been announced.

3. Taumata Arowai will establish a stand-alone regulatory body with responsibilities relating to drinking water safety and administration of the drinking water regulatory system, along with improving the environmental performance and transparency of stormwater and wastewater networks.

4. While Auckland Council’s role in the delivery of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater services will not be significantly affected by the establishment of the regulator, the details within the Water Services Bill are expected to have implications for how we deliver these services, and how our planning and regulatory functions are carried out. Further detail and analysis of the implications of the Water Services Bill for Auckland Council will be provided following its release.

5. Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research staff will coordinate the Auckland Council group submissions to both bills, working with staff from across the council group.

6. Staff propose bringing the draft submission on Taumata Arowai to Environment and Climate Change Committee members for consideration at their meeting on 12 March 2020. While the official submission period closes on 4 March, the Health Select Committee Secretariat have permitted an extension for Auckland Council until 17 March 2020.

7. Local boards are invited to provide input into the draft submission on Taumata Arowai prior to 24 February 2020.

Background

8. In mid-2017 the government launched the Three Waters Review, in parallel to the latter stages of the Havelock North Inquiry into drinking water safety. The review focussed on improving regulation and service delivery arrangements of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater.
9. In July 2019, Cabinet agreed to a suite of system-wide reforms to the regulation of drinking water, including the establishment of a centrally located regulator to oversee a new drinking water regulatory system. Cabinet also agreed to targeted reforms to improve the regulation and performance of wastewater and stormwater systems, including some new regulatory functions that would be undertaken by a central regulatory body.

10. The Three Waters Review is a separate but related work programme to the Ministry for the Environment's Essential Freshwater programme. The government released the Action for Healthy Waterways Discussion Document in September 2018, which outlined the proposals of the Essential Freshwater programme. The discussion document covered some proposals related to the Three Waters Review, such as the government's intent to amend the National Environmental Standards for Human Drinking Water and the proposed approach to improving management of stormwater and wastewater systems, including a proposed National Environmental Standard for Wastewater Discharges and Overflows. The discussion document did not include any information about the structure or function of the proposed central regulator.

11. Auckland Council’s submission on the Action for Healthy Waterways Discussion Document noted its support, in principle, for the initiatives relating to the three waters, and offered to work with central government on the development of detail around these proposals. A memorandum outlining Auckland Council’s submission to the discussion document was provided to Planning Committee members, local board members and the Independent Māori Statutory Board on 25 November 2019.

12. Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulator Bill was introduced to the House on 17 December 2019, and submissions on this bill are due on 4 March 2020. Auckland Council has received an extension for submission until 17 March 2020 to enable consideration at the 12 March Environment and Climate Change Committee meeting. The separate Water Services Bill is expected to be released in the coming months.


14. The Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research department is coordinating the preparation of the Auckland Council group submissions to these bills.

Summary of Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulator Bill

15. Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulator Bill and the yet-to-be released Water Services Bill are complementary, with Taumata Arowai focusing on the establishment of the regulatory body that will implement the regulatory framework which is expected to be outlined in the Water Services Bill.

A new regulator and a new regulatory framework

16. Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulator Bill proposes the establishment of a new regulator, which will be a standalone crown agent, with the objectives of:

   a) protecting and promoting drinking water safety and public health outcomes
   b) effectively administering the drinking water regulatory system
   c) building and maintaining capability among drinking water suppliers and across the wider industry
   d) giving effect to Te Mana o te Wai, to the extent that Te Mana o te Wai applies to functions and duties of Taumata Arowai
   e) providing oversight of, and advice on, the regulation, management, and environmental performance of wastewater and stormwater networks
   f) promoting public understanding of the environmental performance of wastewater and stormwater networks.

17. While the regulator’s primary focus is drinking water, its functions include providing national-level oversight, leadership, communication, coordination, guidance, advice and information in relation
to statutory requirements for and environmental performance of wastewater and stormwater networks and network operators.

18. Regional councils will remain the primary regulators of discharges from wastewater and stormwater networks.

19. The regulator will be governed by a board appointed by the responsible Minister. A separate Māori advisory group, also appointed by the responsible Minister, will support the drinking water regulator on how to uphold Te Mana o Te Wai, and how to enable mātauranga, tikanga Māori and kaitiakitanga to be exercised.

20. Responsibility for policy and system stewardship, including investment decisions about fundamental matters relating to water service delivery, infrastructure and funding arrangements, will remain with the relevant ministers and their departments.

21. The establishment of the regulator is anticipated to take around 18 months. An establishment unit, formed in the Department of Internal Affairs in October 2019 to lead this work, will be governed by a transition board that will be appointed in early 2020. Tauamata Arawai – the Water Services Regulator is due to be operational by 1 July 2021 at the latest. The intent is for the regulator to have both a central, national presence, and a strong regional presence, reflecting the nature of the issues it is tasked with addressing.

Impact on Auckland Council’s role

22. While Auckland Council’s role in the delivery of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater services will not be significantly affected by the establishment of the regulator, the details within the yet-to-be released Water Services Bill will have implications for how we deliver these services, through both the council parent and its council-controlled organisation functions. Further analysis of these impacts will be provided following the release of that proposed legislation.

Feedback timetable

23. The table below sets out the key timeframes for input into council’s submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 February 2020</td>
<td>Deadline for local board input so it can be incorporated into the final Auckland Council submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 March 2020</td>
<td>Draft Auckland Council submission presented to the Environment and Climate Change Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 March 2020</td>
<td>Auckland Council submission to Health Select Committee (note extension received from 4 March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March 2020</td>
<td>Copy of final council submission circulated to all elected members, the IMSB and manawhenua representatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next steps

24. Input from local boards must be received by Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research staff no later than 24 February 2020, to enable this feedback to be considered for incorporation into council’s draft submission.

25. The final draft submission on Tauamata Arawai – the Water Services Regulator Bill will be presented to the Environment and Climate Change Committee meeting of 12 March 2020, with the final Auckland Council submission on this bill due to be received by the Health Select Committee by the permitted extension date of 17 March 2020.

26. Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research staff will keep elected members and the IMSB informed on the release and submission period for the Water Services Bill, which is expected to be in the coming months, as this information becomes available.
URGENT DECISION OF THE
Waitematā Local Board

Approve Temporary Premises for Leys Institute Library

AUTHORITY TO EXECUTE THIS URGENT DECISION

Urgent Decision Process WTM/2019/259

a) That the Waitematā Local Board:
   i) adopt the urgent decision-making process for matters that require a decision where it
      is not practical to call the full board together and meet the requirements of a quorum
   b) delegate authority to the chair and deputy chair, or any person acting in these roles, to
      make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board
   c) agree that the relationship manager, chair and deputy chair (or any person/s acting in
      these roles) will authorise the urgent decision-making process by signing off an
      authorisation memo
   d) note that all urgent decisions will be reported to the next ordinary meeting of the local
      board
   e) agree that every effort will be made to ascertain the views of all board members prior
      to approving an urgent decision.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. A recent assessment of the Leys Institute Library and Gymnasium has identified that there
   is a significant health and safety risk to staff and the public.
2. The Executive Leadership Team have made an operational decision to cease services at
   Leys Institute Library from 5pm Friday 20 December following a recommendation from the
   Council’s Chief Engineer.
3. Options for a temporary library premises in the near vicinity to provide library services for
   the affected community has been explored.
4. Several options were considered including the use of the mobile library on a limited number
   of days, a container type pop up solution, other council buildings and provision of a semi-
   permanent pop up library.
5. It is recommended that a semi-permanent library in a retail space within reasonable
   proximity to Leys Institute would provide the best level of service.
6. Seven sites have been considered and it is recommended that council enters a lease for the
   premises at 14 Jervois Road for a three-year lease.
7. Approximately 60% of the rear Leys Institute car park will remain available for use by visitors
   to the new premises. Staff are investigating the best options for the provision of mobility
   parks in the near vicinity.
8. A budget of [redacted] will be added to the Waitematā Local Board budget to cover the new leasing costs.

9. Initial discussions with the landlord of the premises has indicated that the council can tenant the site from February 1, 2020.

10. An exclusive period to agree the terms of the lease has been agreed with the landlord up to the 6 January.

11. Existing staff at Leys Institute library will remain employed under their current terms and conditions.

12. An urgent decision is being sought from the local board to enable staff to proceed with securing the premises before 6 January. There is a risk that if the identified premise is not secured this would extend the time before a substitute community library service could be provided in the area or a more inferior site will need to be considered.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) approve the lease of a retail space at 14 Jervois Road, Ponsonby for a period of 3 years to provide temporary library services while a plan for the restoration for Leys Institute is being developed.

REASON FOR URGENCY

13. The case for an urgent decision is made due to local board approval being required by the 6 January 2020 to secure the premises for commencement of library services beginning of February 2020.

14. The Waitematā Local Board’s next business meeting is not scheduled until the 18 February 2020 meaning the local board cannot wait until then to resolve.

15. The urgent decision will be reported to the local board at their 18 February 2020 meeting.

GENERAL

16. The recommendation contained in this report falls within the local board's delegated authority.
DECISION

AUTHORISED FOR RELEASE

Trina Thompson
Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor, Waitematā Local Board

[Signature]

SIGNATORIES

[Signature]

Richard Northey
Chair, Waitematā Local Board

[Signature]

Kerrin Leoni
Deputy Chair, Waitematā Local Board

DATE: 20 December 2019
Confidential Memorandum

To: Waitematā Local Board Chair and members

Subject: Temporary library premises for Leys Institute

From: Darryl Soljan, Head of Community Libraries (North & West)

Contact information: darryl.soljan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To: Approve the lease of a retail space at 14 Jervois Rd, Ponsonby, for a period of 3 years to provide temporary library services while a plan for the restoration for Leys Institute is developed.

Summary

2. Following a further recent assessment it has become clear that the Leys Institute Library and Gymnasium presents a significant health and safety risk to staff and the public. Council’s Chief Engineer recommended the closure of this building to the Executive Leadership Team which is supported by the General Managers of Libraries & Information and Arts, Culture & Events. The operational decision has been made to cease services at midday Friday 20 December (or earlier if necessary).

Libraries have been urgently exploring options for an alternative service for the affected community, particularly around the provision of a ‘pop up’ library.

We wish to keep the time that the community is without a library service to an absolute minimum.

We have investigated seven sites.

There is a ‘stand out’ site that we wish to enter terms with via Panuku.

Suitable options in the Three Lamps area are limited.

Initial discussions with the landlord indicate we could tenant the site from February 1, 2020.

We have an exclusive period to agree terms. After Monday 6th January, the owner can negotiate with new parties with a risk that we lose this option.

We appreciate the inconvenient timing and the time of year, however we seek an urgent Local Board approval to enter a lease arrangement that will provide what we believe to be the best interim outcome for the community.

Options considered

3. We do not believe ‘do nothing’ is an option.

4. Mobile library. This could provide some service on a limited number of days a week but the vehicles carry a small collection and have little ‘space’ on board. We do not believe this is a suitable ongoing option.

5. ‘Container-type’ pop up solution/s (or similar). Examples of this were seen in Christchurch following the earthquakes. These are generally quite small. We could also not readily identify where we could locate them.
6. Other Council buildings. Other than the Ponsonby Community Centre, we do not believe there are other suitable sites. A pop up could work at the PCC however it is some distance from Leys and would affect current PCC users.

7. In the end we felt that a ‘semi-permanent pop up library’ in a retail space within reasonable proximity to the Leys Institute would be the best alternative.

8. Of seven sites considered, four were quite some distance from the Leys Institute. We felt it was important to try and find a solution closer to the current library.

   One of the three sites close to Three Lamps was a warehouse site which was poorly situated and uninsulated. The two remaining sites were excellent, high profile retail sites within 200m of Leys Institute. One was only 90m2. Our preferred option at 14 Jervois Rd is 114m2 with wide frontages on both Jervois Road and Redmond Street, large windows and dual entry points. It is a high foot traffic area with two underground car parks which we will need for book deliveries and possibly as an additional disabled car park. It may be possible to utilize some customer parking at Leys Institute if it is safe.

**What services would we provide from a ‘pop up library’**

9. The ‘pop up library’ space will be significantly smaller than the current space. However this also gives us the opportunity to think of new ways of engaging and serving customers. We have a lot of insight into what parts of the collection are most used at each library so it is likely for example that the focus will be on a smaller but very high-quality fiction selection and very focused non-fiction that is frequently refreshed. We will maintain a high-quality children’s collection.

10. Programming space will be limited. It is likely we will need to partner with the likes of the Ponsonby Community Centre or other partners to deliver our larger programs like ‘Wriggle and Rhymes’. However, this could also give us the opportunity to reach new young families and connect with the nearby kindergarten and schools. We expect that a ‘creative’ use of space would allow us to conduct author talks and book clubs from the new boutique site.

11. We still expect to provide public printing and free wi-fi. It is likely we will need to reduce the number of public computers.

**Financial considerations**

12. We have discussed the financial implications with Taryn Crewe, Commercial Manager for the Customer and Community Directorate. It is likely that the Libraries and Information Department will pay for lease costs out of its own budget until June 30, 2020. The Commercial Manager will arrange for an additional circa $100,000 p.a. to be added to the Waitemata Local Board budget in future years specifically to cover the new leasing cost (as the leasing cost will need to come from the Local Board budget). Essentially then, there is no additional cost to the Waitemata Local Board over the three-year lease.

**Next steps**

13. We can proceed with securing these premises when we have a decision from the Local Board.
Waitematā Local Board submission on the Urban Development Bill

The Board are supportive of the Government looking for new or adapted tools to increase the supply of housing in a strategic approach to remove barriers to coherent development and construction and the provision of affordable housing, given the significant housing supply issue across Tamaki Makaurau.

In relation to the Bill, we acknowledge the critical housing shortage in Tamaki Makaurau. However, the proposed bill is blunt, loses too much of the opportunity for good sustainable design and community participation and for the wider Local Government voice to be heard.

Local Government NZ has been working to ensure localism is a focus of the Government and, wherever possible, decisions are made locally, and that appropriate Central Government roles are devolved to, or retained with, the local. This new Act will undermine the local, in the planning and development of a city.

Issues that should not be progressed in the Bill:

Kāinga Ora and the Independent Hearing Panel should not be able to set the rules for development. At least for Auckland the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) should be adhered to, in setting the rules for all Specified Development Projects (SDP). The AUP already sets the rules to ensure economic and housing needs are met. The process included a comprehensive decision-making process after very many submitter were heard. Another body should not be able to set the planning rules for Auckland without full and proper process.

An individual Government Minister or two should not be able to make the decision whether to accept the recommendations of the Independent Hearing Panel (IHP).

Local authorities should retain the consent monitoring and enforcement functions for the development.

Kāinga Ora should not be empowered with the ability to process, and veto, all other consent applications within their area, and especially when it is not related to the development. A landowner may be at risk of being vetoed from constructing a garage or undertaking house modifications, that has no relevance to the development.

Kāinga Ora is proposed to have powers similar to the Public Works Act. Land should only ever be taken under the PWA for significant local or central government infrastructure projects. It is appropriate that substantial housing or urban re-development projects could legitimately be considered as meeting the infrastructure development test in some circumstances. This PWA type power could apply to privately owned housing for new housing and urban development projects but only after carefully defined criteria are applied, including robust public consultation and where a small proportion of landowners would otherwise veto a project of major public benefit.

Property taken under the PWA should be offered to original owners should it not be used. The Bill proposes that is not required. Land that is taken under the PWA cannot be transferred or on-sold to other parties, including private developers.

Kāinga Ora or their developer should not have the ability to set, change or suspend bylaws in their area. For example, a suburb with its own specific speed limit, alcohol ban or rules regarding animal welfare is inappropriate. A city should be able to set regionally applicable rules so all residents understand the bylaws in place. Another issue that comes out of this, is who will enforce the bylaws. Will Kāinga Ora or future owners employ its own compliance teams to enforce the bylaws?
Kāinga Ora should not be able unilaterally to revoke, reclassify and reconfigure reserves, although it could seek appropriate land swaps with local authorities to provide reserves that appropriately enhance a development.

Kāinga Ora should not be able to determine the overall level of open space. This is a role for local authorities in determining the provision and service level required in its areas. The Bill proposes that Kāinga Ora be able to determine that there are adequate reserves in the area or that provision is impractical. They may then use a development contribution for reserves for other purposes. We disagree.

Amendments that should be made to the Bill:

Extend the 10-day timeframe for feedback from the Local Authority in the initial proposal phase. Those most knowledgeable about local areas and challenges are local boards and 10 days is insufficient time for feedback to be provided. In Auckland, local boards should be part of that engagement given their significant powers and their local focus.

Greater emphasis should be given specifically to good sustainable urban design. Low carbon, energy efficient designs are required close to public transport networks with accessible active transport and with quality social infrastructure.

Provisions for the inclusion of infrastructure, such as new stormwater connections, must consider the impact on the wider infrastructure network and any network upgrades required as a result.

Local Boards hold landowner status for the majority of parks and reserves in Auckland. Local Boards must be consulted to ensure approval will be forthcoming, should any new connection or infrastructure impact on Local Board-governed public open space.

If Kāinga Ora do retain the power to revoke, reclassify and reconfigure reserves, that should only be undertaken once the approval of the body that maintains and governs reserves in the local area is secured. In Auckland, reserves managed by Local Boards must have Local Board approval to be changed.

Categories of reserves that should be “absolutely protected” should be extended to include historic and scientific reserves.

Land that has been gifted to local authorities should be protected to the extent currently applying to ensure the gift that was intended to be a legacy is enduring for future generations.

In Auckland, Local Boards must be able to submit on the SDP.

With regard to roading, the design standards of the local authority must be applied to the design and construction of footpath and roads.

The creation of cycleways, pedestrian ways or shared-access ways should not be considered ‘betterment’ but as part of the transport network and should not attract betterment revenue.

At least two representatives from the Local authority should sit on the Governance Team for the SDP.

The Independent Hearing Panel (IHP) is only required to give 10 days’ notice for the hearing. This should be extended to 20 working days to enable submitters to be able to organise themselves to attend and participate.

New matters for inclusion in the bill:

Iwi Management Plans should be given weight in the consenting process.

Existing Integrated Area Plans or Spatial Plans should be planning tools that have weight in the consenting process.

All applications should have a timeframe at least as long as that which applies to Resource Consents. However, given the extent of planning required for a SDPs, a longer timeframe before the consent
expires should sit at 5 years. This is requested as communities and environments change with time especially in rapidly expanding urban environments.

END
URGENT DECISION OF THE
Waitematā Local Board

Approve feedback on the Urban Development Bill

AUTHORITY TO EXECUTE THIS URGENT DECISION

Urgent Decision Process WTM/2019/259

a) That the Waitematā Local Board:
   i) adopt the urgent decision-making process for matters that require a decision where it
      is not practical to call the full board together and meet the requirements of a quorum
   b) delegate authority to the chair and deputy chair, or any person acting in these roles, to
      make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board
   c) agree that the relationship manager, chair and deputy chair (or any person's acting in
      these roles) will authorise the urgent decision-making process by signing off an
      authorisation memo
   d) note that all urgent decisions will be reported to the next ordinary meeting of the local
      board
   e) agree that every effort will be made to ascertain the views of all board members prior
      to approving an urgent decision.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Urban Development Bill is the second piece of legislation for Kāinga Ora –
   Homes and Communities. The Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill established
   it as a new Crown entity on 1 October 2019. The entity has two key functions, being a
   public landlord and leading and coordinating urban development.

2. The Urban Development Bill provides details about the establishment of ‘specified
   development projects’ and powers that will include the ability to:
   - override, add to, or suspend provisions in Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
     plans or policy statements in the development plan that applies to an area
   - act as a consent authority (city/district level) and requiring authority under the RMA
   - use funding and financing tools for infrastructure and development activities
   - build and change infrastructure
   - reconfigure and change reserves.

3. Local boards have the opportunity to provide input into Auckland Council submissions
   on other agencies documents.

4. The bill was released on 13 December 2019 and submissions are due on 14 February
   2020.
RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) approve the feedback, as contained in Attachment A, on the ‘Urban Development Bill’.

REASON FOR URGENCY

5. Submissions are due on 14 February 2020. The Waitematā Local Board’s next business meeting is not scheduled until the 18 February 2020 meaning the local board cannot wait until then to resolve.

6. The urgent decision will be reported to the local board at their 18 February 2020 meeting.

GENERAL

7. The recommendation contained in this report falls within the local board’s delegated authority.

Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process

Signed by Trina Thompson
Relationship Manager, Waitematā Local Board Date 07 /02 / 2020

Approval to use the urgent decision-making process

Richard Northey
Chairperson, Waitematā Local Board Date 07 /02 / 2020
Waitematā Local board Resolution/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) approve the feedback, as contained in Attachment A, on ‘the ‘Urban Development Bill’.

b) note that the Waitematā Local Board feedback will be attached verbatim to the Auckland Council submissions on the ‘Urban Development Bill’.

Richard Northey
Chairperson, Waitematā Local Board  Date 07 /02 / 2020

Kerrin Leoni
Deputy Chairperson, Waitematā Local Board  Date 07 /02 / 2020
URGENT DECISION OF THE

Waitematā Local Board

Approve feedback on the Resource Management Review Panel’s Issues and Options paper

AUTHORITY TO EXECUTE THIS URGENT DECISION

Urgent Decision Process WTM/2019/259

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) adopt the urgent decision-making process for matters that require a decision where it is not practical to call the full board together and meet the requirements of a quorum

b) delegate authority to the chair and deputy chair, or any person acting in these roles, to make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board

c) agree that the relationship manager, chair and deputy chair (or any person/s acting in these roles) will authorise the urgent decision-making process by signing off an authorisation memo

d) note that all urgent decisions will be reported to the next ordinary meeting of the local board

e) agree that every effort will be made to ascertain the views of all board members prior to approving an urgent decision.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The government is undertaking a comprehensive review of the resource management system with a primary focus on the Resource Management Act 1991.

2. The review is being led by the Resource Management Review Panel. The panel has just released an issues and options paper that starts a conversation about issues to be considered and addressed by the review and sets out some initial thoughts on possible options.

3. The review’s aim is to improve environmental outcomes and better enable urban and other development within environmental limits.

4. Local boards can provide formal feedback on the Issues and Options paper by 24 January 2020, which will be included verbatim as part of council’s submission before submissions close on 3 February 2020.

5. The memo to highlight the release of the Resource Management Review Panel’s release of its issues and options paper was circulated, and views were sought from all board members to develop the board feedback.

6. An urgent decision is being sought from the local board to agree the board’s feedback to be included in council’s submission.
RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) approve the Waitematā Local Board feedback on the Resource Management Review Panel's Issues and Options paper

REASON FOR URGENCY

7. Local boards must provide formal feedback by Friday 24 January 2020 to be included in council's draft submission before submissions close 3 February 2020.

8. The Waitematā Local Board’s next business meeting is not scheduled until the 18 February 2020 meaning the local board cannot wait until then to resolve.

9. The urgent decision will be reported to the local board at their 18 February 2020 meeting.

GENERAL

10. The recommendation contained in this report falls within the local board’s delegated authority.

DECISION

AUTHORISED FOR RELEASE

Carlos Rahman
Acting Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor, Waitematā Local Board

SIGNATORIES

Richard Norhney
Chair, Waitematā Local Board

Kerrin Leoni
Deputy Chair, Waitematā Local Board

DATE: 24 January 2020
Memorandum

22 January 2020

To: Planning Committee

Cc: All Waitematā Local Board members

Subject: Resource Management Review Panel’s Issues and Options paper

From: Waitematā Local Board

Purpose

1. To provide Waitematā Local Board’s feedback on the Resource Management Review Panel’s Issues and Options paper.

Context/Background

2. The government is undertaking a comprehensive review of the resource management system with a primary focus on the Resource Management Act 1991.

3. The review is being led by the Resource Management Review Panel. The panel has just released an issues and options paper that starts a conversation about issues to be considered and addressed by the review and sets out some initial thoughts on possible options.

4. The review’s aim is to improve environmental outcomes and better enable urban and other development within environmental limits.

5. Local boards can provide formal feedback on the Issues and Options paper by 24 January 2020, which will be included verbatim as part of council’s submission before submissions close on 3 February 2020.

6. Council will have a further opportunity to provide a submission on the next phase when the Ministry releases its proposals for reform, expected in mid-2020. This second submission will look at the more detailed attributes of the proposed reforms.
Waitematā Local Board Feedback

Issue 1: Legislative Framework

1. The Waitematā Local Board strongly oppose any concepts that would separate urban development laws from the Resource Management Act, and the same requirement of net environmental enhancement should apply to both urban and rural areas.

Issue 2: Purpose

2. The Waitematā Local Board recommends that the purpose of the Resource Management Act should aim to improve the environment as well as mitigation with a focus on net positive outcomes. The board further specifies there should be a requirement for every development to have a net positive effect on the environment.

Issue 3: Recognising Te Tiriti o Waitangi

3. The Waitematā Local Board supports entwining the principles of Te Ao Māori through the act and supports Māori involvement in spatial planning and significant resource development and extraction.

Issue 4: Strategic Integration

4. Strategic integrated planning will be better achieved through spatial planning that is led and managed at a regional level in consultation with local stakeholders, other regions, and central government.

5. The scope of spatial plans should be expanded beyond housing and growth to include environmental protection and restoration, land and sea management, and climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Issue 5: Addressing Climate Change

6. The Waitematā Local Board supports the RMA to be used as a tool to address climate change by allowing regional authorities to protect its natural resources that serve a carbon sequestration and biodiversity function, and to reduce carbon intensive transport requirements through good spatial planning.

7. The RMA should incorporate the principles of the Climate Change Response Act 2002 or be secondary to it. Clear direction should be given within the RMA that councils must consider climate emergency response in decision-making.

Issue 6: National Direction

8. The Waitematā Local Board supports the establishment of clear high environmental standards through regulation that strengthen environmental protections and requirements. National direction may play a role in guiding local authorities and facilitating good planning and decision-making. The establishment of National Planning standards is welcome.
Issue 7: Policy and Planning Framework

9. The Waitematā Local Board supports spatial planning at a regional level and the facilitation of coordination and collaboration across the regions to share ideas and best practice.

10. Good spatial planning should communicate a vision that facilitate positive development and provide for an outcomes-based approach that requires developments to have a net positive outcome and that these documents should be legally binding.

Issue 8: Consents/Approval

11. The Waitematā Local Board supports a simple consent framework with a focus on positive outcomes and suggests a single stage plan making process.

12. There needs to be better transparency in the consenting process that provides opportunities for public involvement where the effects of the activity are more than minor to the community or the environment.

Issue 9: Economic Instruments

13. The Waitematā Local Board supports the use and development of economic instruments, as described in 118d, to incentivise the use of resources more efficiently, and revenue from economic instruments ringfenced to improve environmental quality, fund environmental remediation, fund the setting aside of public land, and the transition to a low carbon/low waste economy. Within an urban context this could also encompass improving amenity within a more compact urban form.

Issue 10: Allocation

14. The Waitematā Local Board supports the idea that principles guide local decision-making, which would be subject to judicial review, that prioritises the current and future needs of the mauri of the land and waterways and the community. The board proposes that climate change, the environment and its ecosystems and the current and future needs of NZ residents be considered in the allocation and renewal of consents. Further the board proposes that the duration of consents be reduced and the power to the consent authority to vary or cancel a consent be increased to allow them to act in special circumstances. The principles would apply to resource extraction, discharge into resources and the right to occupy public space.

Issue 11: System Monitoring and Oversight

15. The Waitematā Local Board supports that institutional oversight of all monitoring functions should be the responsibility of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, and functions should include data collection of environmental and urban outcomes. Further it supports local and central government to provide policies in response to outcomes identified by environmental reporting.
Issue 12: Compliance, monitoring and enforcement

16. The Waitematā Local Board supports consistent, firm and effective enforcement of resource consents by local government under the oversight of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment.

17. Further the board proposes that a portion of the revenue collected through enforcement should be ringfenced for environmental remediation and a portion used to offset the administrative costs for enforcement.

Issue 13: Institutional Roles and Responsibilities

18. It is the view of the Waitematā Local Board that good regional planning is at the heart of the RMA and this is a core service of local government so proposes that decision-making and enforcement powers should be at a local level.

Issue 14: Reducing Complexity across the System

19. The Waitematā Local Board supports the clarification of priorities in the RMA to align with the LGA, LTMA and Climate Change Response Act to reduce complexity and facilitate ambitious future-focused strategic planning that provides more protections for the environment, more effective planning of homes, provision of infrastructure and social infrastructure like schools, parks, libraries, cafes and more certainty and less risk for development.
URGENT DECISION OF THE
Waitematā Local Board

Approve feedback on Reducing waste: a more effective landfill levy

AUTHORITY TO EXECUTE THIS URGENT DECISION

Urgent Decision Process WTM/2019/259

a) That the Waitematā Local Board:
   i) adopt the urgent decision-making process for matters that require a decision where it is not practical to call the full board together and meet the requirements of a quorum
   b) delegate authority to the chair and deputy chair, or any person acting in these roles, to make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board
   c) agree that the relationship manager, chair and deputy chair (or any person's acting in these roles) will authorise the urgent decision-making process by signing off an authorisation memo
   d) note that all urgent decisions will be reported to the next ordinary meeting of the local board
   e) agree that every effort will be made to ascertain the views of all board members prior to approving an urgent decision.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Ministry for the Environment is consulting on proposed changes to the landfill levy and waste data collection methodologies.
2. The waste levy, applied under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008, is intended to raise revenue for waste minimisation and diversion opportunities while increasing the cost of waste disposal to recognise the costs of disposal on the environment, society and economy.
3. The consultation document proposes progressively increasing the landfill levy to higher rates, expanding the levy to apply to more types of landfills and making improvements to waste data collections.
4. Local boards can provide formal feedback on Council’s draft submission. To be considered by the political working group before the submission is finalised this formal feedback needs to be received by Wednesday 22 January 2020 before the final submission is submitted by 3 February 2020.
5. The consultation memo was circulated, and views were sought from all board members to develop the board feedback.
6. An urgent decision is being sought from the local board to agree the board’s feedback to the working party and Environment and Climate Change Committee to be included in Council’s submission.
RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) approve the Waitematā Local Board feedback on Reducing waste: a more effective landfill levy.

REASON FOR URGENCY

7. Local boards must provide formal feedback by Wednesday 22 January 2020 to be considered by the working party included in the Council’s draft submission before the final submission is submitted by 3 February 2020.

8. The Waitematā Local Board’s next business meeting is not scheduled until the 18 February 2020 meaning the local board cannot wait until then to resolve.

9. The urgent decision will be reported to the local board at their 18 February 2020 meeting.

GENERAL

10. The recommendation contained in this report falls within the local board’s delegated authority.

DECISION

AUTHORISED FOR RELEASE

[Signature]

Trina Thompson
Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor, Waitematā Local Board

SIGNATORIES

[Signature]

Richard Northey
Chair, Waitematā Local Board

[Signature]

Kerrin Leoni
Deputy Chair, Waitematā Local Board

DATE: 20 January 2020
Memorandum

15 January 2020

To: Political Working Group
   Environment and Climate Change Committee

Cc: All Waitetā Local Board members
    Parul Sood, General Manager Waste Solutions
    Barry Potter, Director Infrastructure and Environmental Services

Subject: Waitetā Local Board feedback on Reducing waste: a more effective landfill levy

From: Waitetā Local Board

Purpose

1. To provide Waitetā Local Board’s feedback to the government’s ‘Reducing waste: a more effective landfill levy – consultation’

Context/Background

2. The Ministry for the Environment is consulting on proposed changes to the landfill levy and waste data collection methodologies.
3. The waste levy, applied under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008, is intended to raise revenue for waste minimisation and diversion opportunities while increasing the cost of waste disposal to recognise the costs of disposal on the environment, society and economy.
4. The consultation document proposes progressively increasing the landfill levy to higher rates, expanding the levy to apply to more types of landfills and making improvements to waste data collections.
5. Local boards can provide formal feedback on the draft submission. To be considered by the political working group before the submission is finalised this formal feedback needs to be received by Wednesday 22 January 2020 before the final submission is submitted by 3 February 2020.

Summary

The Waitetā Local Board:
- supports the Auckland Council’s draft submission to the government’s ‘Reducing waste: a more effective landfill levy – consultation’.
- supports progressively increasing the landfill levy to $140 per tonne
- supports utilising the landfill levy to educate the community on waste minimisation and a proportion of the levy to be used to support low income households
- recommend utilising the landfill levy towards programmes that activate a circular waste economy
- supports improvements to waste data collection and reporting
Waitematā Local Board feedback

6. In May 2018, the Waitematā Local Board provided feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 (Resolution number WTM/2018/42). There are three points within that feedback that apply to the consultation on the landfill levy:
   - confirm its commitment to the vision of Zero Waste Auckland by 2040, taking care of people and the environment, and turning waste into resources.
   - supports advocating to central government to increase the waste levy to $140 per tonne.
   - utilising the waste minimisation levy (and potential increase in funding if the waste levy increases) for an increased emphasis on waste education focussing on waste minimisation.

7. The Waitematā Local Board Agreement 2019/2020 also confirms the board’s position to advocate for an increase in the landfill levy to $140 per tonne.

8. The Waitematā Local Board strongly supports Council’s feedback point to increase the landfill levy to a higher amount than the ministry’s proposed amount ($10 per tonne to $50 per tonne). However, the board specifies that the landfill levy should be steadily and progressively increased to $140 per tonne in line with the 2017 Eunomia report concludes that this amount would provide greater benefits.

9. The Waitematā Local Board recommend utilising the landfill levy towards an increased provision of waste education that focuses on waste minimisation, as previously stated in their feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 (Resolution number WTM/2018/42). Programmes should focus on minimising business as well as household waste and encourage compostable or repurposed items as the cheapest and easiest choice of purchase.

10. The Waitematā Local Board also recommend utilising the landfill levy towards programmes that activate a circular waste economy, so that it is convenient and cheaper to repurpose and recycle than to send waste to landfill.

11. The Waitematā Local Board recognises that the potential landfill levy increase may cause financial hardship in low income households, hence the board recommend that a proportion of the levy funds raised are targeted to supporting low income households.

12. The Waitematā Local Board supports improvements to waste data collection and reporting, and that this data should include creative and effective measures utilized by community groups, NGOs and Councils to minimise and reuse waste and these measures publicised nationwide.
URGENT DECISION OF THE
Waitematā Local Board

Approve feedback to LGNZ – Reinvigorating local democracy: The case for localising power and decision-making to councils and communities

AUTHORITY TO EXECUTE THIS URGENT DECISION

Urgent Decision Process WTM/2019/259

a) That the Waitematā Local Board:

i) adopt the urgent decision-making process for matters that require a decision where it is not practical to call the full board together and meet the requirements of a quorum

b) delegate authority to the chair and deputy chair, or any person acting in these roles, to make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board

c) agree that the relationship manager, chair and deputy chair (or any person/s acting in these roles) will authorise the urgent decision-making process by signing off an authorisation memo

d) note that all urgent decisions will be reported to the next ordinary meeting of the local board

e) agree that every effort will be made to ascertain the views of all board members prior to approving an urgent decision.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. In 2019, LGNZ released its discussion paper “Reinvigorating local democracy: The case for localizing power and decision-making to councils and communities”.

2. The discussion paper seeks to refine LGNZ’s advocacy position on ‘localism’ and calls for an active programme of devolution and decentralization of services. The paper argues that decentralization will be more efficient and effective in meeting community needs, be more relevant and able to respond to growing diversity, increase voter interest and participation and spur innovation.

3. There is no official Auckland Council position on this proposal and local boards interested in giving their views on the discussion have been encouraged to submit directly to LGNZ.

4. LGNZ is seeking feedback from individuals and organisations and have extended the deadline to the end of January 2020.

5. An urgent decision is being sought from the local board to agree the board’s feedback to be included in council’s submission.
RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) approve the Waitematā Local Board feedback to LGNZ – Reinvigorating local democracy: The case for localising power and decision-making to councils and communities.

REASON FOR URGENCY

6. Local boards who are interested in giving their views on this discussion can submit directly to LGNZ by the end of January 2020.

7. The Waitematā Local Board’s next business meeting is not scheduled until the 18 February 2020 meaning the local board cannot wait until then to resolve.

8. The urgent decision will be reported to the local board at their 18 February 2020 meeting.

GENERAL

9. The recommendation contained in this report falls within the local board’s delegated authority.

DECISION

AUTHORISED FOR RELEASE

Trina Thompson
Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor, Waitematā Local Board

SIGNATORIES

Richard Northey
Chair, Waitematā Local Board

Kerrin Leoni
Deputy Chair, Waitematā Local Board

DATE: 29 January 2020
Memorandum

To: Dr Mike Reid, Principle Policy Advisor, Local Government New Zealand

Cc: All Waitematā Local Board members

Subject: LGNZ – Reinvigorating local democracy: The case for localising power and decision-making to councils and communities

From: The Waitematā Local Board

Purpose

1. To provide Waitematā Local Board’s feedback to LGNZ on the discussion paper “Reinvigorating local democracy: The case for localising power and decision-making to councils and communities.”

Context

2. In 2019, LGNZ released its discussion paper “Reinvigorating local democracy: The case for localizing power and decision-making to councils and communities”.
3. The discussion paper seeks to refine LGNZ’s advocacy position on ‘localism’ and calls for an active programme of devolution and decentralization of services. The paper argues that decentralization will be more efficient and effective in meeting community needs, be more relevant and able to respond to growing diversity, increase voter interest and participation and spur innovation.
4. There is no official Auckland Council position on this proposal and local boards interested in giving their views on the discussion have been encouraged to submit directly to LGNZ.
5. LGNZ is seeking feedback from individuals and organisations and have extended the deadline to the end of January 2020.

Waitematā Local Board Feedback

6. Waitematā Local Board supports the ideas, analysis and proposals in LGNZ’s Localism Paper, which are important constitutionally and in terms of the wellbeing of New Zealand, its Districts, Communities and Whanau.

7. Having important decisions made locally:
   - empowers people, families, communities, districts and cities.
- enables decisions that are more appropriate to the needs, aspirations and views of distinctive local communities
- means decisions are more likely enhance actual and perceived wellbeing across the four wellbeings
- enables and supports local innovation and creativity by Councils, community organisations, iwi, whanau and individuals
- encourages greater and more effective participation in consultation, petitioning, voting and other participatory democratic processes
- enhance achievements in terms of the four wellbeings nationwide, including economic wellbeing in comparison with other countries.

**Waitematā Local Board specific feedback:**

8. **Do you agree with the three recommendations in this section, devolution, negotiated devolution, and removing constraints?**
   
   Yes

9. **If not, what would you change?**
   
   Only some changes in emphasis, particularly regarding funding and resourcing, set out in this submission.

10. **What, if any, functions currently provided by central government should be devolved to councils and other local organisations like iwi / Māori and other organisations?**

    In terms of policies, funding, services, projects and facilities, cultural wellbeing is the most appropriate area for extensive devolution. This is because culture is about creativity, innovation and distinctiveness. It needs to reflect the distinctive ethos of aspects of different districts, geographical and interest group communities within them, ethnic groups, different iwi and families if it is to communicate, inspire and challenge appropriately.

    Social wellbeing would be the second highest priority for devolved local action. While retaining central government’s role of providing most direct financial support to individuals and families, councils and their communities should be enabled and encouraged to develop and implement policies, funding, services, projects and facilities in the social policy area. This is particularly needed in the area of housing where both central and local government have pulled back from their traditional roles and responsibilities and done very little to enable the not for profit sector and iwi to respond to the extent of the need that they face.

    Other areas, as included in the LGNZ paper, include locally appropriate and innovative support for youth, older adults, disabled communities, ethnic groups, manawhenua and maatawaka. Some environmental programmes and activities are most effective when carried out locally, particularly where volunteers play an important role. Pest management, beach and stream cleanups, resource recovery centres, tree planting and maintenance, community composting and pest management are obvious examples.

    The pursuit of economic wellbeing might prove the most difficult, partly because national and regional businesses prefer consistency in terms of regulation and financial incentives.
Nevertheless, the opportunity to assist businesses that are startups, that ought to develop into sunrise industries, are environmentally sustainable, or that employ or are owned by disadvantaged groups are among the areas where councils and subsidiary organisations should make a major contribution to economic wellbeing.

Much of this support and innovation should be devolved further to effective community groups and Māori organisations as even our councils are large, bureaucratic and remote by the standards of most successful European countries.

The section of the Paper which deals with this under Devolving local services on Page 20 refers only to community boards. It is recommended that the Paper also refers to local boards.

11. What, if any, central government responsibilities would be more effective if your council, or other local organisation, applied to take them over under the negotiated devolution approach? This has essentially been answered in our answer to the previous question.

12. Can you identify legislative and regulatory constraints on councils and other local authorities that limit their ability to be responsive to local needs? Yes. One clear example is transport. Government insists regional councils and Auckland Transport must use the Public Transport Operating Model, which has forced them to contract out public transport services to operators that are less than ideal in providing reliable services to meet local needs, nor the needs of their staff. Regional Councils should have a much freer hand in selecting operators, including the ability to deliver the service itself.

Another example is having inappropriate requirements to respond to the emergence of e-scooters and other micro-mobility devices. Councils should be able to provide for them to use cycle lanes and cycleways and other more appropriate ways of operating. Other examples are in some RMA and District Plan requirements. Another is sources of funding, see below.

13. What additional forms of funding or tax should councils have access to in order to meet community expectations and address future challenges? Given that Councils are obliged to thoroughly consult on any revenue raising or taxing proposals and are ultimately responsible to the verdict of the voters on whether those measures are fair and appropriate they should be given much flexibility to implement income generating proposals that meet the principles set out in the financial provisions of the Local Government Act. These are: ability to pay, a rate on property proportional to the fair value of that property user pays where private benefit is gained, charging throughout the life of an asset (intergenerational equity) and exacerbator (including polluters) pays.

Local authorities should be prepared to levy reasonable rates, given that it is the only tax on assets, property and capital applied by the public sector in New Zealand. They should also be prepared to make more use of borrowing, with payments being made by all generations that
benefit, given many local authorities have a lazy balance sheet compared to most businesses and households. The call in the Paper for access to a buoyant tax is reasonable given that income and company tax operates that way. Perhaps Councils should do what central government does and utilize an assumption that the same rate in the dollar of property value should apply in order for rising property values to help pay for the infrastructure that is a major source of rises in property values.

Local government should have access to a range of possible taxes to appropriately apply the users pays and exacerbarator pays principles. These should include:

- A fair share of the GST raised in that district from spending by the visitors who have generated increased infrastructure costs
- Short term accommodation provider charges (bed taxes) for the same reason
- A benefit uplift charge on property owners who have made substantial gains in the value of their property simply from planning rezoning or the provision of major infrastructure by their local authority.
- Regional fuel taxes and/or congestion charges to help pay for the costs of providing and maintaining roads and other transport
- Greater opportunities to apply new and higher exacerbarator and polluter pays charges, e.g. for spills of polluting materials, polluting discharges; littering, parking offences and the like, including applying substantial spot fines.
- Government grants to help pay for growth areas and those impacted by the climate emergency.

The case for making these new funding sources available to local government is set out in the Waitematā Local Board’s submission on the Productivity Commission’s inquiry on local government funding and finance (submission attached).

The Paper needs to acknowledge that many of these devolved local government functions will need to be funded in large part from the above local government sources rather than central government. This means that some local authorities will choose not to take up some of these roles in any case and those that do will need to seek support or at least general acceptance of them.

9. **What process should councils go through in order to implement a new levy or tax?**
   As now, they should be required to use the Special Consultative Procedure as set out in the Local Government Act, with specific emphasis on seeking and formally considering the views of those who would be impacted by the new levy or tax.

10. **What else could be done to protect the constitutional status of local government?**
    The New Zealand Constitution Act needs to be specifically amended to provide new sections on local government setting out its purpose, its minimum roles, its right raise funds from property taxes, the costs of services and infrastructure, and its right to act and raise resources on behalf of its communities to enhance the wellbeing of its communities.
Waitemata Local Board Chair Richard Northey’s Report to the February 18th 2020 Waitemata Local Board Meeting

The Waitemata Local Board has continued careful work on its proposed Annual Budget for the 2020/21 Financial year and on our Local Board Plan for the next three years. We are commencing getting ideas from the community on these important local issues at Uptown Sounds on 15 February, the Myers Park Medley on 16 February, a youth hui called Seeding our Future on 20 February, the Central City Network on 27 February, Beating the Bounds on 29 February, a Climate Change Workshop on 11 March, Pasifika on 14 March, together with formal hearings with groups on 3 March at the Board Office and, as usual, seeking written or digital communication from anyone for a month from mid-February. I want the Board to provide increased support for local practical projects that further our Board’s declaration of a climate heating emergency and look forward to proposals from the community on what we could support. We are also keen to hear what more we can contribute on homelessness issues, parks development, environmental enhancement and to implement the recently completed Parnell Plan. We are also actively seeking out the views of people and groups that don’t normally participate in such consultations.

In terms of the Local Board Plan our initial thinking is to give specific recognition and priority to Maori identity and culture in our outcomes and objectives. We also propose to infuse the need for action on the climate heating emergency not merely in our environmental objectives but throughout our Board Plan.

I am delighted that all Board members are proving to be committed and hardworking and that they are taking up the challenges and opportunities in the new portfolios we allocated at our Board meeting on December 3 with enthusiasm and determination.

I was privileged to be able to break my holiday and return to Auckland and attend the celebration of the life of the late Gerry Hill.

The 27 Jan St Jerome’s Laneway Annual Music Festival in Albert Park once again proved to be a great event with fine music for those who attended. However there were repeated concerns about noise levels from local residents and the Central City Residents Group. This annual event still needs careful consideration to minimise noise levels and the time up to which PA and packing in and out noise is permitted, given complaints from residents. Previous concerns about the Diwali Festival appear to have
effectively been mitigated by events organisers working closely with local residents, so this ought to be possible in future with the Laneway Festival.

There are important wider questions about noise levels, particularly at night, both with events and with construction activity in the Central City that will need to be addressed over time.

The Central City has been busy with construction activities in its streets over this period. Although this is disruptive now for travellers, it is worth it to achieve the major improvements for all forms of transport users that will result.

The sudden closure of the Leys Institute Library and Gymnasium late in December was a major shock for me and the other Board members. It was the result of a decision by expert Council staff.

We quickly passed an emergency resolution to provide a public library service as soon as practicable in Three Lamps at 14 Jervois Road and understand this will be available from 16 March. It should operate from there for at least the next three years and will have the same opening hours as the Leys Institute Library had. I asked for, and received assurances, that all Leys institute staff have retained jobs with the Council. Also, the previous users of the gymnasium have all been found reasonable places to operate from, particularly in the Freeman’s Bay Community Centre. All Board Members have agreed with me that they are keen that the Leys Institute buildings will be fully restored for public use, but it will take quite a while to determine if and when that is practicable.

I have liaised with Bob Tait of Friends of the Earth, who is opposed to the closure, on Dec 13, Jan 17 and at Gerry Hill’s funeral on 11 Jan. I have also done so with Tania Donniani of Gym kids, the major user of the Leys Institute Gymnasium, on Jan 7 about utilising alternative venues including the Freeman’s Bay and Ponsonby Community Centres. I have also communicated with John Hill of the St Mary’s Bay Association on January 13 and David Abbott and Dirk Hudig from the local residents’ associations on 31 Jan and 4 February to find out their concerns and to share our knowledge and aspirations about the state and future use of the Leys’ Institute.

During this period when Board Members would normally be on holiday I worked with the relevant Portfolio Holders on the board to draft and approve detailed submissions and feedback on quite a range of government bills and discussion papers that affected the Waitemata Local Board area and also on Local Government New Zealand’s Discussion Paper on Localism and Democracy.
Community Portfolio Activities

At the first Board Meeting I have been appointed the portfolio holder for community development and community facilities. Some activities under this heading have been.

25, 26, 28 November, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10 and 11 Dec Express Fit, Fitness Programme and Pilates sessions at the YMCA.

25 Nov Meeting with Hamish Keith and other community members and Jennifer Ward-Lealand to organise launch of the Franklin Road lights; Ponsonby Community Centre Annual Meeting.

27 Nov Auckland Museum Function to celebrate the 90th Anniversary of its opening.

28 Nov I contributed to the meeting of the Central City Network.

1 Dec Participated in the ceremony to turn on the Franklin Road Christmas Lights by introducing celebrity actor Jennifer Ward-Lealand. These introductory remarks are attached.

2 Dec Meeting of City Centre Residents’ Group.

4 Dec Housing Call to Action meeting of housing workers and providers. Annual General Meeting of the University of Auckland Society which re-elected me as Deputy-Chair and David Abbott to the Executive.

5 Dec Karangahape Road Business Association’s wonderful First Thursdays event including the performance by the Auckland Street Choir.

7 Dec Ponsonby Business Association Market Day; Functions for Labour’s Auckland Isthmus Hub and of the Auckland Central Electorate Committee.

9 Dec Re-elected as Chair of the Auckland Community Housing Trust as its Annual General Meeting.

11 Dec Farewell function for Professor Elsie Ho, the retiring chair of Asian Family Services, followed by the Annual General Meeting of Asian Family Services where I was reappointed to its board.

11 Dec Tenants’ Protection Association function. Opening of exhibitions at Studio One: by Dana Dadi, Marcia Soanes, Linda Cook, and by Marjorie McLean’s students.

23 Jan Discussion with Viv Beck about Heart of the City issues.
Parks, Sports and Recreation Activities and Liquor Licence Application

25 Nov Guided tour with staff of the area of Western Springs Park that contains the pine trees.

13 Dec Opposed proposed new off licence application for Fresh Value Supermarket at 127 Hobson Street.

13 Dec Discussions about Ngati Awa’s relationship with Western Springs Park.

17 Dec Responses to residents about dog policy in Basque Park.

18 Dec Response to Graeme Atmore about delays in the completion of the new changing rooms in Grey Lynn Park.

20 Dec response to complaints about the temporary closure of the Sentinel Road toilets.

6 Jan Approval of landowner consent in Albert Park for the temporary installation of the Queer Pavilion in March.

15 Jan Submission opposing an off-licence application for a supermarket opposite the Auckland City Mission; submission on an application to compress the timetable for when concerts at Western Springs may occur.

21 Jan Correspondence re the consent conditions for the Laneway Festival in Albert Park.

22 Jan Landowner consent for water and wastewater works in Alberon Park

**Waitematā Local Board General Activities**

During this period the Waitemata Local Board activities I have taken part in have included:

25 Nov Meeting with Nicki Kaye MP; meeting with Waitemata Board staff re current issues; and meeting with Councillor Pippa Coom.

26 Nov Waitemata Local Board Induction session followed by Board workshop.

29 Nov Waitemata Board Chair’s Profile Article written and submitted to The Hobson (Attached)

2 Dec Chair and Deputy-chair’s weekly meeting with Waitemata Board staff.

3 Dec I chaired a practice meeting and then the first full meeting of the Waitemata Local Board. We made grants to 15 local organisations, appointed all Board members to lead portfolio topic areas and to represent the board on, or liaise with, a range of business and community organisations, and decided on our local content to consult
on our annual budget for next year. My message from the chair in this consultation material is attached.

4 Dec Meeting with Martin Leach, editor of the Ponsonby News.

5 Dec Meeting regarding the Ponsonby Park project. Interviewed by CABAC Manager Kate Anderson for the Auckland CAB Survey Project. Discussion with Graeme Roberts of the Gibraltar Crescent Owners’ Association about their efforts to protect four mature oak trees on the neighbouring Summerset Property.

6 Dec With Alex Bonham had meetings with Dirk Hudig and Don Matheson of the Herne Bay Residents’ Association and then with David Abbott of the St Mary’s Bay Residents’ Association.

9 Dec With Kerrin Leoni met with Waitemata Board staff to plan for the week ahead.

10 Dec Waitemata Local Board induction, then workshop followed by the annual Board Chair’s shout.

20 Dec Approved and signed off, with Kerrin Leoni, an Emergency Resolution to lease premises at 14 Jervois Road to continue the provision of public library services in Three Lamps consequent on the Council staff experts’ decision to close the Leys Institute on safety grounds because it is at risk of collapse in the event of an earthquake. Raised several issues and questions with staff, many of which were responded to in the report concerned.

20 Dec Drafted Board feedback on the Ports of Auckland application to dredge and dump material in the Hauraki Gulf area.

23 Dec Drafted monthly article for the Ponsonby News. Final form tweaked and sent on 19th January. This is attached. Contributed to the Board submission on the government’s review of the Resource Management Act.

28 Dec Interviewed by Xindong a PhD candidate in Urban Planning at Auckland University for his thesis on Neighbourhood Character and Urban Intensification in Freeman’s Bay.

9 Jan Attended the funeral of John Wigglesworth, who was on the Auckland City Art Gallery Board with me, at St Mary’s Church on Parnell Road.

11 Jan Attended a celebration of Gerry Hill’s life at the Grey Lynn RSC, with celebratory bubbles.

21 Jan Approved an urgent decision on our Board’s Submission on the government discussion document, Reducing Waste: A More Effective Landfill Levy to which I and several other Board members provided content.

22 Jan I drafted a proposed Board submission on LGNZ’s Localism Discussion Paper.
23 Jan I attended a meeting of the Karangahape Road Business Association with the CRL Alliance and Auckland Transport on progress with their developments in the area. Corresponded on the McKelvie Street Festival.

24 Jan Signed off the urgent decision by the board on its feedback on the government’s discussion paper: Resource Management Review Panels Issues and options.

28 Jan Waitemata Local Board Workshop. This included discussions on a Board response to LGNZ’s Localism Paper, consideration of our appointments to community liaison groups, work on the content of, and engagement on, our local board plan, progress on the 254 Ponsonby Road project, options and parameters for the use of the Myers Park cottage once repaired, issues related to the Western Springs pines Project, and an innovation in the form of a series of conversations with the local board with important local community organisations.

29 Jan Signed off the urgent decision on our submission on Local Government NZ’s Localism Discussion Paper; updated my declaration of interests; met Council policy development staff about the forthcoming review of Council’s Gambling Venues Policy; and met Panuku staff to discuss waterfront development issues including planning for Wynyard Point and its future park and forthcoming celebrations of the opening of the three open spaces we recently named: Amy Daldy Park, Urunga Plaza and Freda Barnes Park.

31 Jan Drafted a proposed Board submission on the Urban Development Bill

3 Feb Worked on the draft Outcomes and Objectives for the Local Board Plan

4 Feb Waitemata Local Board Workshop. This workshop discussed the issues in the Urban Development Bill and the Infrastructure Funding and Finance Bill. We did further work on the proposed Outcomes and Objectives in our next local Board Plan. We were briefed, and asked questions, about the closure of the Leys institute and Gymnasium and on the research about to be undertaken on other Council buildings that appear not to meet earthquake standards. We discussed opportunities for engagement with people on developing the Local Board Plan, ideas for the development of Basque Park and of Heard Park, and issues with commuter parking at Point Erin Reserve and Victoria Park and were briefed by Auckland Transport and also by the NZTA, the agency responsible for the proposed Northern Pathway across the Harbour Bridge.

5 Feb provided material for The Hobson.

7 Feb Extraordinary Meeting of the Board which adopted the Board’s Feedback on the Urban Development Bill, feedback which I had drafted after Board members discussion.
Auckland Council and National Activities

In this period the meetings and events I took part in included:

27 Nov Finance and Performance Committee Workshop re the proposed 2020/21 Budget.

2 Dec Auckland Council Elected Members Symposium.

4 Dec Further Finance and Performance Committee Budget Workshop.

9 Dec Chaired the Peace Foundation’s International Affairs and Disarmament Committee Teleconference Call.

9 Dec Meeting of Auckland Local Board Chairs. They elected me as their representative on the National Council of Local Government New Zealand.

9 Dec Officiated at a Citizenship Ceremony at the Auckland Town Hall where 517 delighted Aucklanders were granted New Zealand citizenship.

11 Dec Council’s Planning Committee Workshop on the Resource Management Act Review.

12 Dec Chaired the Annual Meeting and Board Meeting of the Problem Gambling Foundation Group, where I was re-elected Chair.

29 Jan Chaired an Executive Meeting of the PGF Group.
ATTACHMENT 1

Richard Northeys introduction of Jennifer Ward-Lealand for the Franklin Road Christmas Lights

Thank you very much Eric. I know Eric well because we undertake the Express Fit programme at the Pitt St YMCA every Tuesday and Thursday morning.

Hello to Councillor Pippa Coom, my fellow Waitemata Board Members Graeme Gunthorp and Adriana Christie, MP Nicki Kaye, Santa and founder Roscoe.

This event is a wonderful donation by the residents of Franklin Road to provide this joyous experience for the children and families of Auckland. This is its 26th successive occasion, starting with one resident setting up a nativity scene. The Waitemata Local Board is very proud to be continuing to sponsor these Franklin Road Christmas Lights.

I am privileged to be given the opportunity of introducing Jennifer Ward-Lealand, a local actor who I very much admire, who will formally turn on the Christmas Lights.
ATTACHMENT 2

Richard Northey Waitemata Local Board Chair Profile Piece Set questions for The Hobson

What neighbourhood do you live in? How long have you lived there?
I live in an apartment in Hereford Street off Karangahape Road in Newton. I have lived there for two and a half years. I moved there from Onehunga and have previously lived in Churton Street in Parnell.

What is your working background?
I have been a City Councillor and an MP. I run a consultancy for public and community sector organisations. I have worked for the Arts Council as Local Authority Liaison Officer; for the Internal Affairs Department as Community, Recreation and Youth Adviser; for Auckland University as Lecturer first in Political Studies and then in Planning, and as a Builders Labourer.

Why did you stand for this role?
Because I believe I have the skills, knowledge, experience and outlook to develop and implement good decisions for the city centre and the inner suburbs. Because I want to help make Auckland a better, safer and more enjoyable place for all its residents, visitors and businesses to live, work and play in.

What board portfolios are you responsible for?
Community Development and Parks, Sport and Recreation.

What do you consider to be the top two projects you will initiate and complete in your role to directly benefit the community?
The redevelopment and activation of Heard Park to be a great space for people who live in or visit Parnell.
Developing and progressively implementing the Laneways Plan in Newmarket.

Tell us something about yourself that will surprise your community.
When I was 14, I won the Auckland Astronomical Society Prize for my research project on The Moons of the Solar System.
ATTACHMENT 2

If you were prime minister what would you do to improve Auckland?
Give the Auckland Council and Auckland residents the power together to decide their own
future rather than having transport and other big issues decided instead by CCOs.

What is your favourite escape in Auckland?
The Central City Library.

Tell us a little about your family.
My wife Robyn has worked in health all her working life from being a dental nurse to being
Manager of Aged Care and Disability Services until she retired this month after serving 9
years on the Auckland District Health Board. Son Andrew lives in Leys Crescent and runs a
software development business. Daughter Fiona lives in Singapore and teaches primary
school. Youngest daughter Miranda lives in Melbourne and is a radiographer. We have eight
grandchildren.
Message from the chair

I am pleased to present our proposed priorities for the Waitematā Local Board Agreement. This document sets out what we plan to deliver and advocate for in the 2020/2021 financial year based on the clear direction set by the previous local board and, more recently, from what we heard in the lead up to the local body elections.

We want to take practical action in response to Auckland Council’s declaration of a climate change emergency. We intend to continue waterway restoration programmes and we have adopted an Urban Ngāhere (Forest) Strategy. Your practical ideas for retaining and extending our vital tree cover are welcomed and we also propose expanding the Eastern Bays Songbird Project into Parnell and Newmarket.

We are committed to turning the community’s vision of 254 Ponsonby Road becoming a neighbourhood park into a reality. This project remains as our major capital project.

We will continue to support local economic development initiatives and propose to investigate the feasibility of a targeted rate for Newmarket to help fund projects from the Newmarket Laneways Plan. This would be subject to further consultation if the targeted rate proposal proceeds.

The recently completed Open Space Network Plan, Waitematā Play Network Analysis, and park development plans including the Meda Reef Reserve Te Tokoaroa and Western Springs Lakeside Te Wai Ōrea Park, will help prioritise investment and activation of our parks. We will continue funding agrichemical-free maintenance of our major parks and want to hear your views on expanding this programme.

Participating in events, arts and recreation helps to create a vibrant, healthy and connected community. Arts funding for TAPAC will continue and we will assess the success of a newly-funded arts space coordinator role. Our popular events, such as the Parnell Festival of Roses and Myers Park Medley, will continue along with support for other local events and community arts programmes. We will continue funding increased opening hours at Grey Lynn Library and the Central City Library. We propose supporting practical actions to address homelessness in our area.

We welcome your views on the above, your feedback is appreciated and directly influences the projects and initiatives we invest in for this wonderful area.

Richard Northev ONZM
Chair, Waitematā Local Board
ATTACHMENT 3

Article for February Ponsonby News

The new Waitematā Local Board, including its five energetic new members, has got down to positive work. At our December Business Meeting we approved our discussion material for next year’s budget and projects, for public consultation from 21 February to 22 March. We welcome your ideas, particularly on practical actions we should take on the climate emergency and homelessness. This consultation will also seek your views on the Review of the Council Controlled Organisations.

At that meeting we also delegated important roles to all the Board members, who you are welcome to contact in their areas of responsibility.

Alex Bonham leads the Planning and Heritage Portfolio and has Arts, Culture and Events as her co-portfolio. She is on the Karangahape Road Business Association and our link to the Herne Bay Residents’ Association.

Adriana Avendano Christie holds the Parks, Sport and Recreation portfolio and is co-holder of Local Economic Development. She is Board rep on the Ponsonby Business Association, the Grey Lynn Community Centre and Deputy for the Ponsonby Park Project Group. She liaises with the St Mary’s Bay Residents’ Association.

Graeme Gunthorpe is our Transport lead and co-portfolio holder for Planning and Heritage. He represents the Board on the Newmarket Business Association and on the Ponsonby Park Steering group and is our liaison person with the Freemans Bay Residents’ Association.

Deputy-Chair Kerrin Leoni holds the Arts, Culture and Events Portfolio with a co-portfolio of Environment and Infrastructure. She is our rep on the Uptown Business Association and liaison person with the Grafton Residents Association.

Julie Sandilands holds the Environment and Infrastructure Portfolio and co-portfolio holder for Transport. She is on the Grey Lynn Business Association and liaison person with the Grey Lynn Residents’ Association.

Sarah Trotman has the Local Economic Development Portfolio and is co-holder of the Community Development Portfolio. She represents us on the Parnell Business Association and liaises with Parnell organisations.

I now hold the Community Development Portfolio and am co-holder of Parks, Sport and Recreation. I was appointed to the Heart of the City Board, the Ponsonby Community Centre and am on the Auckland City Centre Advisory Board and the National Council of Local Government New Zealand. I liaise with the Citizens’ Advice Bureaux and the City Centre Residents’ Association.

On the afternoon of Sunday 16 February, from noon to 4pm, the Waitematā Local Board hosts the Myers Park Medley, a major public event for us. Myers Park will have exciting music groups, community group and food stalls, and a range of participatory activities for children and families. This annual event is great fun for Waitematā Local Board residents of all ages, abilities and interests. Come along on the 16th of February.
ATTACHMENT 3

The community organised and Waitemata Board sponsored Franklin Road lights were as spectacular as ever. I was privileged to help Jennifer Ward-Lealand turn them on on December 1.

I was as surprised and saddened as you were to hear of the closure of the Leys Institute because experts have decided it is no longer safe for the public or staff for even a week longer. The iconic Leys Institute has served Ponsonby and Herne Bay wonderfully for a century. I am pleased that the Board has acted to pass an emergency resolution to ensure library services will, from March, be provided at 14 Jervois Road for at least the next three years and that the jobs of all library staff are safe. We will work with you on how best to provide quality library and other services located in this area long-term and to restore Leys Institute for public use.
Graeme Gunthorp – Board Member Report

Roles assigned by the local board

- Transport Portfolio – Lead
  - 20 Dec NZTA briefing – central Auckland projects
- Planning & Heritage – Alternate
  - 31 Jan Urban Development Bill & Infrastructure Finance and Funding
  - Bill workshop
- Newmarket Business Association – Lead
  - 5 Dec CEO meeting – Newmarket priority projects
- Heart of the City – Alternate
  - Meeting scheduled for February
- Freemans Bay Residents Association – Lead
  - Meeting scheduled for February
- Ponsonby Park – Lead
  - 23 Jan Business case briefing

Meetings / events attended

- 1 Dec Bike Auckland – Donation Ride to Auckland City Mission
- 1 Dec Franklin Road Lights opening
- 5 Dec Rainbow Youth breakfast
- 13 Dec Auckland Zoo tour
- 23 Jan UrbaNerds
- 5 Feb Tamaki Drive cycleway karakia
- 5 Feb Parnell Business Association – CEO meeting & tour of priority projects
- 5 Feb Grafton Cricket Club – Chair meeting re: car parking in Victoria Park
Upcoming events

- 14 Feb  Newmarket tour
- 24 Feb  Festival Italiano – planning
- 28 Feb  Wynyard Quarter Transport Management Association – board meeting
- 27 Feb  Newmarket Business Association – board meeting
- 29 Feb  Beating the Bounds
- 3 Mar   Local Board Plan – public hearings

Conferences / member development

Upcoming events

- 14 Feb  Training: Standing Orders
- 28 Feb  Training: Treaty of Waitangi

Disclosures

- None

Recommendation

- That this report be received
### Governance Forward Work Calendar February 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Auckland Climate Action Framework</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific decisions</td>
<td>Service Provision for West Waitematā</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Auckland Waters Strategy</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific decisions</td>
<td>Western Springs Development Plan</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March/April 2020</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Signage Bylaw 2015 (March-April)</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Water supply and wastewater bylaw review</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Open Space Management Framework (2020 tbc, no date set)</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>Draft Local Board Plan</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>Annual planning (LBA) agree feedback and advocacy</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waitematā Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Waitematā Local Board held in the Waitematā Local Board Office, 52 Swanson Street, Auckland Central on **Tuesday, 10 December 2019** commencing at 9.42am.

**PRESENT**

Chair: Richard Northey  
Deputy Chair: Kerrin Leoni  
Members: Adriana Avendaño Christie (until 1pm)  
Graeme Gunthorp  
Julie Sandilands  
Apologies: Alexandra Bonham  
Sarah Trotman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Auckland Transport –  
Great North Road Project  
City Gateway Treatments | Oversight and monitoring | To provide an update about the Great North Road (Ponsonby to Crummer Road) project. To request feedback on the project and input into the community engagement design.  
To provide an update about the Speed Limits Bylaw, the plans for the City “gateway” treatments |
| Community Facilities –  
Ponsonby Park at 254 Ponsonby Road | Setting direction, priorities and budgets | To update the progress of the OLI and provide background on the project.  
To update on the outcomes of the Community-led Development Group (CLD) consultation. |
| Legal and Risk –  
Health, Safety and Wellbeing responsibilities | Keeping informed | To present the responsibilities of Auckland Council governors around Public Safety and Health, Safety and Wellbeing. |
<p>| Local Board Services – Local Board Plan | Setting direction, priorities and budgets | To present the proposed engagement for local board plan. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Design Office – City Centre Masterplan</td>
<td>Input into regional decision-making, policies, plans and strategies</td>
<td>To provide an opportunity to scrutinise the proposed refresh to the Auckland City Centre Masterplan (CCMP) and provide formal feedback to be included in the report for the 4 March 2020 Planning Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED) – CCO introduction</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>To provide an overview of Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waitematā Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Waitematā Local Board held in the Waitematā Local Board Office, 52 Swanson Street, Auckland Central on **Tuesday, 17 December 2019** commencing at 9.35am.

**PRESENT**

**Acting Chair:** Kerrin Leoni  
**Members:**  
Alexandra Bonham  
Graeme Gunthorpe  
Julie Sandilands  
Sarah Trotman  

**Apologies:**  
Richard Northey (Chair)  
Adriana Avendaño Christie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service, Strategy and Integration</strong> – West Waitematā, Parnell and Central Libraries</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To outline preliminary findings from our investigation into Parnell Library and community centre services to inform a discussion on options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure and Environmental Services</strong> – Healthy Waters</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific decisions</td>
<td>To introduce regional infrastructure projects, seek feedback on these and discuss opportunities to leverage off these regional works to achieve positive local outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board Services</strong> – Local Board Plan</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To finalise outcomes sought from the Local Board Plan engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waitematā Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Waitematā Local Board held in the Waitematā Local Board Office, 52 Swanson Street, Auckland Central on **Tuesday, 28 January 2020** commencing at 9.37 am.

**PRESENT**
- **Chair:** Richard Northey
- **Deputy Chair:** Karrin Leoni
- **Members:** Adriana Avendaño Christie, Alexandra Bonham, Julie Sandilands, Sarah Trotman
- **Apologies:** Graeme Gunthorp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide an overview of the process to develop the local board plan including timeline and steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Local Board Plan</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To agree on draft plan outcomes and objectives that will further be enhanced with the community in phase 1 of the engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities – 254 Ponsonby Road</strong></td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific decisions</td>
<td>To present the final draft detailed business case for Ponsonby Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities – Leases</strong></td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific decisions</td>
<td>To seek direction regarding the community lease to Auckland Playcentres Association Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide an update on informal expressions of interests received for the use of Myers Park cottage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks, Sport and Recreation – Western Springs Pines</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To provide an update about Western Springs Pines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conversations with the local board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Groups that had previously requested to meet the local board have each been offered 15 minutes for a conversation with the local board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Brigitte Sistig</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grey Lynn 2030 climate action projects 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rob Thomas and Andrea Reid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pollinator Paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gael Ballock</td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Springs Lakeside Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Daniel Tohill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grey Lynn Park Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Audrey van Ryn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communities feeding the homeless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waitematā Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Waitematā Local Board held in the Waitematā Local Board Office, 52 Swanson Street, Auckland Central on **Tuesday, 04 February 2020** commencing at 10.30am.

**PRESENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair:</th>
<th>Richard Northey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair:</td>
<td>Karrin Leoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members:</td>
<td>Adriana Avendaño Christie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandra Bonham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graeme Gunthorp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Sandilands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Trotman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities, Libraries and Arts, Community and Events – Leys Institute Library</strong></td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>To provide an update on withdrawal of services from Leys Institute Library and Gymnasium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks, Sport and Recreation – Parking at Point Erin Park</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To seek direction from the board on options for parking restrictions at Point Erin Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities – Basque Park</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To seek feedback regarding proposed ideas to be incorporated in the concept plan and agreement on the proposed timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities – 192 Parnell, Heard Park</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To seek feedback on the concept design for the planned scope of works for 192 Parnell Road, Heard Park prior to the commencement of physical works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport</strong> — various updates</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>To provide updates on the City Centre Transport initiatives and Nelson Street Phase 3 project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2.2.30pm – City Centre Transport Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2.30-3pm – Nelson Street Phase 3 update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) – Northern Pathway</strong></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>To provide an update on the Northern Pathway project (previously referred to as the Auckland Harbour Bridge Shared Path, and Skypath).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waitematā Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Waitematā Local Board held in the Waitematā Local Board Office, 52 Swanson Street, Auckland Central on **Tuesday, 11 February 2020** commencing at 9.35am.

**PRESENT**
- **Chair:** Richard Northey
- **Deputy Chair:** Kerrin Leoni (apology for lateness)
- **Members:**
  - Adriana Avendaño Christie (apology for lateness)
  - Alexandra Bonham
  - Graeme Gunthorpe
  - Julie Sandilands
  - Sarah Trotman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panuku – Wynyard Point Feasibility and Plan Change Project</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>To present the process and next steps and to consider opportunities for working together and community input</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Arts, Culture and Events –**  <br>1. Albert Park Cottage  <br>2. Ellen Melville Centre  <br>3. Homelessness | Setting direction, priorities and budgets | To provide an update on activation of the Albert Park Caretaker’s Cottage and to discuss funding options for the ongoing activation of the facility.  
To provide an update on the findings and recommendations of the draft Ellen Melville Centre Strategic Review and seek feedback.  
To provide an update on homelessness initiatives and seek feedback on the 2020/2021 work programme. |
| **Development Programme Office – introduction to team and current projects** | Local initiatives and specific decisions | To introduce the Development Programme Office.  
To provide an update on current projects in the city centre. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket Business Association – annual report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The provide an annual report from Newmarket Business Association. To discuss a targeted rate for the completion of the Newmarket Laneways project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnell Business Association – annual report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The provide an annual report from Parnell Business Association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>