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1 Welcome

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

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

4 Leave of Absence
At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

5 Acknowledgements
At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting."

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

"Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting."

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

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

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

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."
Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

File No.: CP2020/05420

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for local financial matters for the local board agreement 2020/2021, which need to be considered by the Governing Body in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 process.
2. To seek feedback on the proposed regional topics in the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. Our Annual Budget contains 21 local board agreements which are the responsibility of local boards to agree with the governing body. These agreements set out local funding priorities, budgets, levels of service and performance measures.
4. Auckland Council publicly consulted from 21 February to 22 March 2020 to seek community views on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 and local board priorities to be included in the local board agreements (Consultation part 1).
5. Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted significant pressure on the council’s financial position, which will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. The council is now considering what those impacts are likely to be, and plan to ask Aucklanders for their views on certain aspects of Auckland Council’s proposed ‘emergency budget’ in response to the financial impacts of COVID-19 (Consultation part 2).
6. Local boards are required to receive the feedback on the proposals in consultation part 1, which are not affected by the changes being considered by the council and therefore will not be subject to further consultation and make decisions on them. This must be done before consultation part 2 can get underway, so the scope of consultation part 2 is clear.
7. This report seeks decisions on local financial matters for the local board agreement, including:
   a) any new/amended Business Improvement District (BID) targeted rates
   b) any new/amended local targeted rate proposals
   c) proposed Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capital projects outside local boards’ decision-making responsibility
   d) release of local board specific reserve funds.
8. The council received feedback in person at community engagement events and through written forms, including online and hard copy forms, emails and letters.
9. This report summarises consultation feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021, including on local board priorities for 2020/2021.

Feedback on Ōrākei Local Board priorities for 2020/2021
10. The local board consulted on the following priorities:
   • Priority 1: Prioritising our natural environment working with the community, including Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei to improve water quality in Ōkahu Bay and to develop an integrated plan for Pourewa Valley.
• Priority 2: Continue advocating for transport initiatives, including the Gowing Drive linkage to the Glen Innes to Tamaki Drive Shared Path, and wider safety improvements.
• Priority 3: Community and park facility upgrades will continue, along with our commitment to ensuring our heritage assets are protected.
• Priority 4: We will support regional events, and seek funding for projects to support these locally, such as America’s Cup 2021.
• Priority 5: The Glen Innes Business Association is proposing to expand the boundary of the Business Improvement District (BID) across the boundary into the Ōrākei Local Board area. If the boundary expansion is successful the Glen Innes BID programme will represent about 190 business ratepayers and owners, with a proposed BID targeted rate of $250,000 from 1 July 2020. The BID expansion has now been delayed for one year, although feedback has been considered.

11. 138 submissions were received on Ōrākei Local Board priorities for 2020/2021, showing that most people either support most (53 per cent) or support all (33 per cent) of the local board’s priorities.

Feedback on regional proposals in the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 from the Ōrākei local board area

12. This report seeks local board views on the proposed regional Annual Budget topics including:
• the changes to rates and fees, key proposals:
  o waste management targeted rate
  o refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
  o Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.
• the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021
• other budget information.

13. Local board views on these regional matters will be considered by the Governing Body (or relevant committee) before making final decisions on the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

14. Out of the 4,765 submissions received on the regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021, 215 submissions were from people living in the Ōrākei local board area.

15. The waste management targeted rate proposal was supported by 91 respondents, while 36 did not support and 15 indicated ‘other’. Most respondents considered the proposal was the fairest solution, although concerns were raised on whether this model would lead to people not recycling or disposing of recycle rubbish inadequately. There were also concerns about cost.

16. The refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City proposal was supported by 89 respondents, while 34 did not support and 15 marked ‘other’. Respondents considered that this proposal would reduce the amount of landfill overall, although some had concerns that people would dump their rubbish on their neighbours’ bins, that too many targeted rates would be confusing and that this proposal raised equity issues due to cost.

17. The Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate proposal was supported by 73 respondents, who agreed that continuing the service through a targeted rate approach would be the most appropriate solution. 32 respondents were not supportive of the proposal and would prefer that the service be ended. Seven respondents did not support the proposal as they argued that the service should be subsidized by all general ratepayers.

18. Feedback received for the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021 reflected concern over the removal of trees in Owairaka (6 feedback points), impact of land development on wairua and heritage of Ohinerau, Mt Hobson and Te Kopuke/Titikopuke Mt St John (2 feedback points) as well as land management concerns (2 feedback points).
19. Auckland Council also consulted on the Council-Controlled Organisations (CCO) Review at the same time. The feedback received on this will be presented at a later date.

**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Ōrākei Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Ōrākei local board area.

c) recommend any new or amended Business Improvement District targeted rates to the Governing Body.

d) recommend any new or amended local targeted rate proposals to the Governing Body.

e) recommend that the Governing Body approves any proposed Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capital projects, which are outside local boards’ allocated decision-making responsibility.

f) recommend the release of local board specific reserve funds to the Governing Body.

g) provide feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021.

**Horopaki Context**

20. Local board agreements form part of the Auckland Council’s Annual Budget and set out local funding priorities, budgets, levels of service and performance measures.

21. Auckland Council publicly consulted from 21 February to 22 March 2020 to seek community views on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 and local board priorities to be included in the local board agreements. This is now referred to as consultation part 1.

22. Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted significant pressure on the council’s financial position, which will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. Work to date on the proposed Annual Budget will need to be adjusted to consider the new financial realities facing Auckland.

23. The financial report presented to the Emergency Committee during April 2020 indicated potential reductions in cash revenue of $350-650 million for financial year 2020/2021, depending on the length and extent of the disruption caused by COVID-19. The Emergency Committee requested staff provide further information to the Governing Body on the impacts of the various scenarios modelled against a rate increase of between 0 per cent and 3.5 per cent. They also resolved that further public consultation on the Annual Budget would include considering whether to adopt a 2.5 per cent rather than 3.5 per cent general rates increase for the 2020/2021 financial year, among a suite of other measures aimed at offering support to all ratepayers, including businesses, facing hardship due to the impacts of COVID-19.

24. The council is planning to ask Aucklanders for their views on certain aspects of Auckland Council’s proposed ‘emergency budget’ in response to the financial impacts of COVID-19. It is anticipated this will be carried out from late May until mid-June 2020. This will be in addition to the Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation we have already carried out from February to March 2020. This is referred to as consultation part 2.

25. Consultation part 2 is unlikely to revisit any of the specific proposals in consultation part 1. Therefore, the local boards and the Governing Body are required to receive the feedback on these proposals and make decisions on them. This must be done before consultation part 2.
can get underway so it is clear what decisions have already been made, and what decisions will be made after consultation part 2. In addition, local boards will be required to provide formal views to the Governing Body to inform consultation part 2 and further information will be made available to local boards when it becomes available for this to occur.

26. Further, some of the proposed changes to fees and charges required a Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) and the requirements for this were met in consultation part 1. It is important to complete this statutory process, especially where consultation part 2 will not be relevant to the decisions on these fees and charges.

27. This report includes analysis of the consultation feedback on the Ōrākei Local Board priorities for 2020/2021, and on the regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Ōrākei local board area.

Local financial matters for the local board agreement

28. This report allows the local board to agree its input and recommend other local financial matters to the Governing Body in May 2020. This is to allow time for the Governing Body to consider these items in the Annual Budget process.

Local targeted rate and Business Improvement District (BID) targeted rate proposals

29. The Glen Innes Business Association is proposing to expand the boundary of the Business Improvement District (BID) across the boundary into the Ōrākei Local Board area. If the boundary expansion is successful the Glen Innes BID programme will represent about 190 business ratepayers and owners, with a proposed BID targeted rate of $250,000 from 1 July 2020. The BID expansion has now been delayed for one year, although feedback has been considered.

Funding for Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI)

30. Local boards are allocated funding annually to spend on local projects or programmes that are important to their communities. Local boards can approve LDI capital projects up to $1 million, projects over that amount require approval from the Governing Body.

31. Local boards can recommend to the Governing Body to convert LDI operational funding to capital expenditure for 2020/2021 if there is a specific need to do so. Governing Body approval may be needed for the release of local board specific reserve funds, which are funds being held by the council for a specific purpose.

Local board input on regional plans

32. Local boards have a statutory responsibility for identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area in relation to the context of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of Auckland Council. This report provides an opportunity for the local board to provide input on the proposed Annual Budget.

33. Local Board Plans reflect community priorities and preferences and are key documents that guide both the development of local board agreements and input into regional plans.

Council-controlled organisation (CCO) review

34. An independent panel was appointed by Auckland Council to examine three areas: (1) the CCO model, roles and responsibilities, (2) the accountability of CCOs, and (3) CCO culture. Local boards had the opportunity to provide input into this in March 2020.

35. Auckland Council also consulted on the review of CCOs during the same period as the Annual Budget, from 21 February to 22 March 2020.

36. After receiving feedback, the panel will report on key issues, community and stakeholder feedback to the council in May 2020.

37. The panel will provide a final report and recommendations to the council in July 2020.
Types of feedback
38. Overall Auckland Council received feedback from 4765 people in the consultation period. This feedback was received through:
   - Written feedback – 3972 hard copy and online forms, emails and letters
   - In person – 793 submissions through 58 Have Your Say events and community events.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
Feedback received on Ōrākei Local Board priorities for 2020/2021
39. The local board consulted on the following priorities:
   - **Priority 1:** Prioritising our natural environment working with the community, including Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei to improve water quality in Ōkahu Bay and to develop an integrated plan for Pourewa Valley.
   - **Priority 2:** Continue advocating for transport initiatives, including the Gowing Drive linkage to the Glen Innes to Tāmaki Drive Shared Path, and wider safety improvements.
   - **Priority 3:** Community and park facility upgrades will continue, along with our commitment to ensuring our heritage assets are protected.
   - **Priority 4:** We will support regional events, and seek funding for projects to support these locally, such as America’s Cup 2021.
   - **Priority 5:** The Glen Innes Business Association is proposing to expand the boundary of the Business Improvement District (BID) across the boundary into the Ōrākei Local Board area. If the boundary expansion is successful the Glen Innes BID programme will represent about 190 business ratepayers and owners, with a proposed BID targeted rate of $250,000 from 1 July 2020. The BID expansion has now been delayed for one year, although feedback has been considered.

40. Key themes across all feedback received (through written and in person channels) were:
   - **Priority 1:** To continue focusing on water quality and stormwater management (8 feedback points), prioritise the implementation of the Pourewa Valley masterplan (4 feedback points), clean beaches (3 feedback points), and protect the environment (2 feedback points). In addition, concern was raised that investment in environment could affect rate increases (1 feedback point).
   - **Priority 2:** To increase cycling/pedestrian connections across the local board (8 feedback points) and to implement the Glen Innes to Tamaki Drive Shared Path (4 feedback points). Concern was raised about parking capacity at train stations (3 feedback points).
   - **Priority 3:** To address the lack of community facilities in Remuera and uneven distribution of facility provision in Kohimarama (2 feedback points), complete the Meadowbank Community Centre (1 feedback point) and continue development of the Waiaatarua Reserve Enhancement Plan (1 feedback point).
   - **Priority 4:** To consider concerns that contributing funding towards local and regional events such as America’s Cup would be a detriment to the local area and be viewed as an unnecessary expense (3 feedback points).
   - **Priority 5:** To consider the impact of the BID expansion on local communities (1 feedback point). Confusion was expressed as to the need for a BID expansion into the Ōrākei area (1 feedback point).

Feedback received
41. 138 submissions were received on Ōrākei Local Board priorities for 2020/2021, showing that most people either support most (53 per cent) or support all (33 per cent) of the local board’s priorities.
42. The Ōrākei Local Board held one community drop-in event.

Feedback on other local topics

43. Key themes across feedback received on other local topics include:

- **Community Facilities:** Establish a community centre in Remuera and place stronger emphasis on heritage protection in Remuera (5 feedback points), complete and appropriately fund existing projects over creating new projects (4 feedback points), build a new toilet block in Selwyn Reserve (2 feedback points) and renovate 11 Mt Hobson Lane (1 feedback point).

- **Parks, Sports, Recreation:** Maintain and increase off-leash areas in Waiatarua Reserve (3 feedback points). Madills Farm should be maintained as a recreation space for all users and activities, not just sports such as football predominantly undertaken by the Eastern Suburbs Football Club (3 feedback points).

- **Arts, Culture, Heritage:** Restore and preserve Remuera Railway Station (2 feedback points) and allocate funding to local heritage preservation (1 feedback point).

- **Planning and Transport:** Pedestrian and cyclist safety should be prioritised when upgrading footpaths and creating new connections (6 feedback points). In addition, Ellerslie should be prioritised as a transport hub and have provision for a public pool (3 feedback points).

- **Infrastructure and Environmental Services:** Restore and protect Wilson’s Beach Jetty (1 feedback point) and protect Ohinerau/Mt Hobson (1 feedback point). Eliminate sewage overflows into Pourewa Creek (1 feedback point).

Information on submitters

44. The tables and graphs below indicate what demographic categories people identified with. This information only relates to those submitters who provided demographic information.

**Age breakdown of submitters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Gender Diverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

Figure 2
The proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 sets out our priorities and how we're going to pay for them. The regional consultation on the proposed Annual Budget focused on changes to rates and fees, the key proposals were:

- waste management targeted rate
- refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
- Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.

The submissions received from the Ōrākei Local Board area on these key issues is summarised below, along with an overview of any other areas of feedback on regional proposals with a local impact.

Waste management targeted rate

Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to increase the waste management targeted rate.

Question 1: Waste management targeted rate

The cost of responsibly dealing with our kerbside recycling (paper, cardboard and plastics) has increased due to international market conditions.

To pay for this we propose to charge only those who use the service by increasing the targeted rate by $19.97 a year or $0.38 a week (the total cost changing from $121.06 to $141.03 incl. GST).

If we do not do this, we would have to fund the shortfall by increasing general rates for all ratepayers, including those who don’t get a kerbside collection service.
The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Ōrākei Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Q1 Waste management targeted rate</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support our proposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. Of the respondents who provided reasons for their support of the proposal, most agreed that the user-pay model was fair (12 feedback points) and highlighted the importance of an effective recycling system to protect the environment (4 feedback points). Some mentioned that although they were in favour, they would struggle to pay for the service (2 feedback points).

49. Those who provided reasons for not supporting the proposal expressed concerns that the user pay model would lead to people not recycling (8 feedback points), that it was too expensive (6 feedback points), that some people would dump rubbish in others’ bins or in parks (3 feedback points), that better solutions should be found, including ‘pay as you throw’ (3 feedback points) and that it would penalise those who recycle (1 feedback point). They also argued that everyone should be recycling so a targeted rate was illogical (1 feedback point).

50. Some of those who indicated ‘other’, expressed that the Council should work with retailers to reduce packaging at the source (5 feedback points) and expressed concerns on the efficiency of current recycling systems in general including sending rubbish overseas for recycling (5 feedback points). Some respondents were in support for having more green waste bins (1 feedback point) and increasing the frequency of recycling rubbish collection (1 feedback point).

Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

51. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to increase the refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City targeted rate.

Question 2: Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. In other parts of the city, residents pay for their collection via Pay As You Throw. The targeted rate for the Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas no longer meets the cost of collection.

To cover this extra cost we propose increasing the targeted rate in these areas by $14.23 a year or $0.27 a week for a 120 litre bin (the total cost changing from $129.93 to $144.16 incl. GST), and an additional $6.68 a year or $0.13 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191 to $211.91 incl. GST).

If we do not do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those living outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau cities.
The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Ōrākei Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-Q2 Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support our proposal?</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. Of those who provided reasons for supporting this proposal, most said that it would reduce the amount of landfill (8 feedback points), that it was a fair system (6 feedback points), that the cost was reasonable (1 feedback point) and that this was an efficient solution (1 feedback point).

53. Those who did not support the proposal were concerned that this model would incite people to dump rubbish in their neighbours’ bins (5 feedback points), that rates should be uniform across Auckland (5 feedback points), that the proposal raised equity concerns (4 feedback points), that the price was too high (4 feedback points) and that too many targeted rates would be confusing (2 feedback points).

54. Of those who indicated other, comments included concerns for overseas-managed rubbish separation (2 feedback points), and two requests for Auckland-wide compost collection services offered by Auckland Council.

**Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate**

55. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to increase the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.

**Question 3: Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate**

*Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pumpout service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal of this service in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area said they wanted to keep the service. The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal, for those in the Waitākere Ranges local board area who want the service, is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $260 and $320 a year (incl. GST). This increase would apply from July 2021. If we do not do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitākere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers, including those who don’t use the service.*
56. Of the submitters who provided comment on their support for a targeted rate, frequent comments included that this issue was not pertinent to them and they should therefore not be charged (17 feedback points) others argued that, if locals considered they needed the service, they should be able to keep it (4 feedback points).

57. Of those submitters that did not support the proposal and provided feedback, some suggested that the service should continue and that all Aucklanders should subsidise the cost (5 feedback points). Otherwise, other comments included resolving the issue through private contractors (3 feedback point).

58. Other feedback included requests for Council support on more composting toilets (2 feedback points).

Other feedback

59. Aucklanders were asked what is important to them and if they had any feedback on any other issues. This could include the key topics of how we charge for pool fencing inspections and adjusting our fees and charges:

60. Fees and charges: While most respondents providing feedback on the proposed pool fencing inspection charges preferred to continue with the existing model (28 feedback points), some respondents were supportive (16 feedback points). Across all feedback topics, respondents were largely against any increase in fees, charges, or rates.

61. Regional environmental protection: Respondents’ feedback on the environment reflected support for the protection of flora and fauna (5 feedback points), a need to investigate better waste divestment systems including composting and enhancement of recycling systems (4 feedback points), requests to consider the environmental impact of urban development (3 feedback point) and demand for education opportunities to learn more about environmental protection (3 feedback points). One respondent also commented that the Council should work to reduce its greenhouse emissions.

62. Water: Respondents requested improvements on water quality regionally (6 feedback points), improvements on water supply (2 feedback points) and finding solutions to better grey water collection (1 feedback point).

63. Transport: Some respondents requested more and cheaper parking (4 feedback points) and to address road safety for cars (3 feedback points). On public transport, respondents’ comments reflected a need for cheaper, more frequent and reliable public transport (7 feedback points). On active modes of transportation, there was support for better pedestrian and cycling safety and connectivity (8 feedback points), including between St Heliers and the CBD (1 feedback point), as well as more cycleways (2 feedback points). Finally, some respondents requested less spending on cycleways (2 feedback points).
Feedback on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021

64. Feedback was received from the Ōrākei Local Board area on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021.

65. Submitters were concerned about the removal of trees in Owairaka and the management of the maunga in general (6 feedback points). There were also concerns about the impact that land development would have on the wairua and heritage of Ohinerau, Mt Hobson and Te Kopuke/ Titikopuke Mt St John (2 feedback points). One respondent opposed the Authority’s intention to advocate for the transfer of adjoining lands as stated in the Operational Plan. One commenter was supportive of the values in the plan, as well as the intention to restore native flora and fauna.

Feedback on other regional proposals with a local impact

66. All feedback has been discussed in previous sections.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

67. The decisions recommended in this report are procedural in nature. New targeted rates and the release of reserve funds will not have any climate impacts themselves.

68. Some of the proposed projects these would fund may have climate impacts. The climate impacts of any projects Auckland Council chooses to progress with as a result of this, will be assessed as part of the relevant reporting requirements.

69. Some of the proposed projects these would fund will be specifically designed to mitigate climate impact, build resilience to climate impacts, and restore the natural environment.

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

70. The Annual Budget is an Auckland Council Group document and will include budgets at a consolidated group level. Consultation items and updates to budgets to reflect decisions and new information may include items from across the group.

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

71. Local board decisions and feedback are being sought in this report. Local boards have a statutory role in providing local board feedback on regional plans.

72. Local boards play an important role in the development of the Annual Budget. Local board agreements form part of the Annual Budget. Local board nominees have also attended Finance and Performance Committee workshops on the Annual Budget.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

73. Many local board decisions are of importance to and impact on Māori. Local board agreements and the Annual Budget are important tools that enable and can demonstrate council’s responsiveness to Māori.

74. Local board plans, which were developed in 2017 through engagement with the community including Māori, form the basis of local priorities. There is a need to continue to build relationships between local boards and iwi, and the wider Māori community.

75. The analysis included submissions made by mana whenua and the wider Māori community who have interests in the rohe / local board area.
76. Ongoing conversations between local boards and Māori will assist to understand each other’s priorities and issues. This in turn can influence and encourage Māori participation in council’s decision-making processes.

77. Some of the proposed projects these would fund may have impacts on Māori. The impacts on Māori of any projects Auckland Council chooses to progress with as a result of this, will be assessed as part of the relevant reporting requirements.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

78. This report is seeking local board decisions on financial matters in local board agreements that need to then be considered by the Governing Body.

79. Local boards are also providing input to regional plans. There is information in the consultation material for each plan with the financial implications of different options.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

80. Local boards are required to make recommendations on these local financial matters for the Annual Budget by 15 May 2020, to enable the Governing Body to make decisions on them when considering the Annual Budget in May.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

81. Local boards will approve their local board agreements and corresponding work programmes.

82. Recommendations and feedback from local boards will be provided to the relevant governing body committees for consideration during decision making at the Governing Body meeting.

83. The dates of these meetings are yet to be determined as the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown are still being considered.
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