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CCO Review Feedback – Whau Local Board

1. In response to the CCO Review, the Whau Local Board:
   b. Endorse in part the Council Controlled Organisations model for delivering aspects of council services, however seek that all substantive CCO’s:
      i. Demonstrate improved accountability to ratepayers and their representative elected members and an improved understanding and respect for the co governance role of local boards.
      ii. Be required to undertake early and ongoing engagement with local boards and community that enables genuine input and influence. Noting the opportune time for most impactful engagement is early in the project lifecycle.
      iii. Demonstrate an understanding that Auckland Council is much more expansive than just the central areas of the city and deliver services accordingly
      iv. Must actively improve the internal culture of their organisations and recognise the role of CCO’s is to serve the needs of the people of Auckland and to operate as an integrated part of the wider Auckland Council
      v. Work proactively across the CCO and council departments family and improve their relationships and communications with each other so a more cohesive, integrated approach is taken to developments and projects
   c. Endorse that Watercare Services continue as a water supply and wastewater disposal CCO noting it has current good working relationships with Healthy Waters and other Council agencies needs to be maintained.
   d. Endorse that Auckland Transport as a CCO noting that at a local level enhanced governance quality advice and support for decision making beyond stakeholder management is required for local boards. Noting there is a requirement for a stepwise change around communicating and connecting in a more positive manner with the broader community.
   e. Propose that ATEED Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development CCO be abolished, their staff and roles incorporated in the Auckland Council and their decision-making appropriately divided between the Auckland Council's governing body and local boards.
   f. Endorse that Panuku continue as a property and urban development agency as a CCO and there is opportunity to expand their role as a genuine placemaker and looking at a wider spatial area and being active in establishing agree Council service levels are attained e.g. community hall provision and open space.
   g. Request that CCO Board membership include a number of appointed elected members.

Watercare Services

2. Watercare Services (Watercare) are seen to be a CCO that is performing well and an entity that delivers a consistently high-quality service for Auckland across the potable water supply and wastewater management systems.
3. The Whau Local Board has experienced an effective relationship management process as governors. Watercare consistently demonstrate early decision input support to operational staff particularly in activities affecting the areas local open spaces. The local board are also aware Watercare’s efforts to connect with residents and resolve, or at the least explain and communicate, on any local complaint led issues that arise.

4. Watercare manage their own communication directly with customers through an informative direct billing process that seeks to educate around water conservation demonstrating their overall objectives as being public service driven rather than consumption or expansion led.

5. There appears to be a strong complementary relationship between Watercare and Auckland Council’s Healthy Waters team that has worked well over the past 9 years.

6. Watercare’s operations appear to be owned and fronted up by Watercare’s Board and senior management when there are matters of mixed public and local political views. This is vital for resident and elected member confidence in the organisation knowing it is robust and considered in its approaches within the framework of its core business.

Summary:

7. Watercare Services is to be acknowledged for its successful governance relationships and operational delivery and continue under current model.

Auckland Transport

8. The need for the establishment of Auckland Transport (AT) as a CCO is understood from a regional and network perspective and some significant advances have occurred across urban city centric public transport network taking forward and delivering in a timely manner aspects of; increased dual tracking, bus and train and integrated station upgrades, electrification of the rail network, zone simplification, and integrated ticketing.

9. Through AT benefits have been realised in the relationship with central government and NZTA. Examples include major roading corridor upgrades, cycling infrastructure, increased safety investment in active modes along with intersections and road shapes. Through AT, NZTA has identified that local boards have a stakeholder role with regards to State Highway development. Kiwirail has also started to think about localised rail corridor improvements beyond just that which affects rolling stock.

10. However, at the more local scale of roading, footpaths and town centres there are more mixed views about AT’s success. AT’s assets are pervasive across every neighbourhood and used almost daily by residents, hence there is a very high awareness of localised assets and opportunity for concern to be expressed when they don’t meet expectations. From an engagement perspective matters which affect people directly are much more likely to lift people to action and this is often received as a complaint. Matters which come to elected members from the public have typically arisen out of receiving either; a standard holding response from AT that feels to the customer as such and feels like it is slow in being answered, or not picking up the nuisance of the matter that is being expressed. Sometimes it is an ongoing matter that AT has looked to answer, but the member of the public is not happy with the reply. Getting beyond these matters to a governance level can be difficult for elected members as it can introduce doubt and question in the AT localised responsive system.

11. To assist local board members in their governance role a number of relationship management roles have been in place since early in the inception of AT. The local board has felt that a good level of support has been provided by the incumbent liaison manager,
but at times from a local board perspective it appears to be a disconnect between her on other parts of the AT organisation. What is more often being felt is that many matters are being managed through a stakeholder management manner through the nominated role rather than local boards being provided the information and opportunity to act as local governors.

12. The accountable staff in more senior roles and technical staff are not consistently connecting with the local board directly.

13. To facilitate the governance role of local boards the opportunity to resource the provision of quality local transport advice needs to be developed, particularly from a place development perspective (a core role of local boards). This includes the local boards role in enhanced walking and cycling connections to destinations of attraction including; employment, education and leisure.

14. Limited insight is given from a transport strategy and planning perspective toward the triennial AT Local Board Capital fund or Local Board Plans (which are legislatively required to be refreshed after local government elections). The local board has been informed that there is a small transport advisory team in the Chief Planning Office (which it has not had contact with) perhaps this could be grown, or more ideally AT staff at a appropriate senior level are better enabled to provide advice and be resourced to connect with local governors in local boards.

15. Auckland Transport will always be a target of debate in the community for doing too much or too little, either too fast or too slow. At a local level greater governance decision making could be facilitated through planning direction being supported to local boards, in turn these elected members will need to stand behind decisions made bringing increased public accountability.

16. Communication between Auckland Transport and Local Boards can be enhanced to enable better input on transport matters, particularly local safety projects, walking/ cycling connections and integration with wider local board planning. The current system of communication by using a Relationship Manager as a conduit for filtering decisions that AT have already made or advising the Local Board of low scale consultation late in the process, does not give Local Boards the degree of input into decision-making that should be required. Auckland Transport must take a more proactive response in informing the Local Board about plans in the Local Board area as they are the organization that is tasked with this responsibility, rather than relying on the Local Board to provide information requests or constituency advocacy communications.

Summary:

17. Regionally, Auckland Transport has taken forward substantive infrastructure improvements and systems integration that have benefited hundreds of thousands of people.

18. At a local level enhanced governance quality advice and support for decision making beyond stakeholder management is required.

19. There is also an opportunity to see what internal support may also be bolstered within Auckland Council

20. Auckland Transport to remain a CCO, provide there are much strengthened requirements to provide meaningful consultation and accountability to the Auckland Council Governing body and Auckland Council Local Boards and in turn to the ratepayers of Auckland. These requirements include:
i. recognition within the Auckland Transport organization that they are a Council Controlled Organisation and not a stand-alone business,

ii. that the Council Governing body holds decision-making authority for Auckland Transport and all CCO’s, in regard to the office accommodation needs of the CCO’s, and regarding bonus and supplementary payments to directors and staff of Auckland Transport and other CCO’s,

iii. the inclusion of an improved performance standard for Auckland Transport to align with the wider local planning and Auckland regional planning and vision documents including Local Board Plans for local projects of significance,

iv. A requirement for Auckland Transport to provide wider consultation and communication channels for Local Boards rather than only managing two contact through the relationship manager.

Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED)

21. Whilst ATEED may appear to have had success in developing Auckland as a destination with its significant events lifting the vitality of the wider Auckland experience for visitors and residents it is felt by the local board there is little that ATEED is achieving as a CCO that could not be achieved as a department with the Council organisation itself.

22. During the 2014 CCO review the Whau Local Board expressed its concerns with regards to Local Economic Development being removed from Auckland Council and being taken up by ATEED with the sense of a potential loss of the “local” aspect.

23. Whilst there has been active support from the staff who transitioned from AC to ATEED it is hard to identify any gains made. Beyond an operational level programme management there has been limited opportunity for active advice and support for the governance role of strategic analysis and direction setting. This is reflected in that the current three-year plans for the west local boards will likely not include stand-alone local economic development outcomes, rather a few initiatives will be included as contributors to other outcomes around youth, Māori and diverse community development.

24. The 2018/21 ATEED Statement of Intent identifies a cross cutting priority which includes having an ‘Enhance spatial focus’ across the west. At a local board governance and support level there is no awareness that ATEED is acting innovatively and with a step-change towards improving household prosperity across the west.

25. Over the past two terms there has been support toward supporting the Business Improvement Districts from staff in the CCO/External Partnerships team in Auckland Council’s governance division. This is practical on the ground support that assists the local board taking forward its governance direction around local economic development. There is a gap around town centre and business strategy and facilitation that could be taken forward through reinvesting staff and a portion of the budget allocated to ATEED back to a dedicated Local Economic Development team within council.

26. At a local board level there is limited understanding of local operational directions and even less involvement in informed decision making. Consideration should be made to increase accountability through an ATEED model that provides support to governors around strategic directions locally, or staff resource and associated support funding being re-established in Council - noting that previously this area was also under-resourced within Council.

27. ATEED in recent years has not effectively engaged with the Whau Local Board on a regular basis on local issues of employment and business development.
28. ATEED have a regional focus and the local board does not see any benefit to the local board area that is gained by having them separate to Council. In acting in their space as a CCO they do not have accountability to local boards as opposed if they were a dedicated Council department.

29. If ATEED remained as an external CCO they could be more effective by increasing discussion and action on local response to BID plans, local employment initiatives and business networking and knowledge-sharing opportunities.

Summary:

30. ATEED’s economic development support is experienced as being to be city centric with limitations around being able to also put a focus on local suburb-scale guidance and initiatives.

31. The local board questions the benefit to the city that are enabled specifically because it is a CCO. The board proposes that the ATEED functionality to be returned to the Auckland Council group as a distinct department, with the governing body sharing decision-making powers with local boards to enable both regional alongside of town centre and suburb scale economic development.

Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku)

32. The Whau Local Board acknowledges the positive relationship with Panuku with aligning quality development directions with local priorities outlined in the Whau Local Board plan.

33. Panuku as a CCO has proved to be a positive addition to the CCO model for the Whau Local Board that has driven coordinated urban planning and working with the development industry in the Whau, particularly Avondale and New Lynn.

34. Panuku has also had the role of property rationalisation and along with disposal of land and has taken forward the role optimisation consideration and sale of existing underutilised or constrained service land and making the resulting revenue available for local reinvestment.

35. Panuku has demonstrated an ability to respond to the market and has been able to attract and retained skilled staff who have been able to develop positive relationships and provide timely and insightful advice to support the Whau Local Board in its governance duties.

36. Panuku staff have also demonstrated a successful integration of their work programme duties actively working alongside of Council departments.

37. While there has been a strong relationship management process in place with the Local Board with specialist staff at senior levels making themselves directly available in a timely manner.

38. There is a need for Panuku to give greater regard to Council’s due-governance responsibilities to ensure that local boards take more part in this relationship as a partnership, not merely a stakeholder and that early influential engagement opportunities are provided to the local board.

39. There is an opportunity to expand Panuku’s investment planning so they can more proactively alongside of specialist Council staff identify the long term future needs of the local communities considering medium to long term investment approaches by itself and broader development industry to be more wholistic in assessing the impacts on communities and future local’s needs, for example pressure on green space due to housing intensification.
Summary:

40. Panuku should be retained as a Council Controlled Organisation for property management, rationalisation and urban development.
41. Look at opportunities where Panuku take forward broader scale plan development alongside of Council with a view to ensuring changing community needs are assessed and response needs such as community spaces, recreation needs, along with open space are programmed in.

Regional Facilities Auckland (RFA)
There are no strategic facilities managed under the RFA in the Whau Local Board area.
Whau Local Board feedback on the consultation report and proposed changes to Te Taruke-a-Tawhiri – Auckland’s Climate Action Framework (ACAF).

Whau Local Board supports all key moves for action that went out for public consultation. It is the view of this board that the framework be given the regulatory gravitas needed to directly influence project prioritization within Council and CCO departments. The framework needs to have power and authority to enable its key moves.

Points noted by the board:

- The Whau Low Carbon Plan, which was adopted by the board carries seven key action areas which directly align with the ACAF.
- The consultation summary carries overwhelming support for the Framework and also, regardless of geography or topography, we are all recognise the need for planning and action.
- Interestingly, the Whau public’s focus for the Whau area also resonates as the region particular areas of concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Challenges</th>
<th>As prioritized by Auckland region</th>
<th>As prioritized by Whau residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport</td>
<td>No. 1 priority at 31%</td>
<td>No 2 priority at 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge and awareness of climate change</td>
<td>No. 2 priority at 28%</td>
<td>No 1 priority at 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on natural environment</td>
<td>No. 3 priority at 25%</td>
<td>No 4 priority at 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal changes including sea level rise and erosion</td>
<td>No. 4 priority at 20%</td>
<td>No 5 priority at 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community preparedness for impacts</td>
<td>No. 5 priority at 17%</td>
<td>No 3 priority at 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whau Local Board Position:

- Communication and behavior change are integral to making meaningful change locally, nationally and globally. This board recommends that The Auckland Climate Plan uses the 17 Sustainable Development Goals as set by the Paris Agreement in 2016 to both base a campaign and awareness on, but also to use for evaluation and monitoring.
- Support a smaller number of priorities without diluting the intent and would also support a review of the layout of key moves to remove implied priority order.
- Emphasis is needed on “Access to public transport”. This needs significant change and delivery at scale and pace. Whau would welcome that acceleration but understands that what
is funded by Auckland Transport is not always in line with this framework. Auckland Transport projects should carry a climate impact statement at the start of any case brought before the local boards.

- To ensure effectiveness, clear regulations need to be in place at central as well as local government levels.

- Fully agrees with council seeking mana whenua support, ensuring a Maori lens on tools and strategies put in place to address climate change.

- Introduce an effective and ongoing campaign ensuring this translates to all cultures in NZ, and that this is an underpinning of the Aotearoa lived experience and culture.

- Potentially Ministry of Science, Research and Innovation being funded to the level that ensures leadership on not only research, but also climate action planning.

- We agree with an Action Plant that puts in places strategies and speedily implements those strategies to reduce emissions that cause climate change. It is important that this is measurable.

- The work to reduce the negative impacts of climate change needs to be happening concurrently with emissions reduction and also needs to be measurable.

- Private sector businesses must be encouraged by central and local government regulations to compete on a level playing field and also provide clarity to the public of reality vs expectation - for example insurance cover or mitigation support for properties in flood prone planes. This is not addressed in the proposed plan and perhaps should be.

- Climate crisis requires coordinated action by the Governing Body, local boards and CCOs. In keeping with the structure of Auckland Council, local boards are best placed to partner with local communities and implement local solutions. To facilitate this, the Whau Local Board supports a dedicated funding stream for local boards to address climate-related projects. Because of the lack of action plans in such events, there is greater and more enduring effects on individuals as well as the economy (the 2018 flood of New Lynn town centre is an example)

- The board supports the actions outlined under each key move, as well as the timelines proposed and would directly comment on the following:

  o **Key Move 3** *Make development and infrastructure climate compatible*. There seems to be emphasis on new infrastructure. There is dire need to act more quickly where weaknesses in infrastructure are identified, e.g. aging wastewater systems, culverts and drains not coping with accelerated development and housing. The board is of the opinion that with the recent establishment of the Urban Development Bill, there is opportunity to be more aggressive in the enforcement of sustainable design and construction. There is also the opportunity for central government (supported by council regulations) to put in place measures and incentives to meaningfully reward developers for addressing sustainability in new builds.

  o **Key Move 9** *Youth and intergenerational equity*. This move is admirable but may take a while to implement. The message may not get through to our more resistant, immovable older people if it’s being voiced by rangitahi; So, I thought maybe the following needs to be added to **Key Point 7**:

  o **Key Move 7** *Help Aucklanders become more resilient and reduce their carbon footprint – Undertake a widespread action and public awareness programme*. Promote green building eg with water resilience / water tanks on site as per normal, with opportunity to retrofit with
solar at a later date, ensuring that there is strategic planning for green spaces, including future community gardens (food).

- **Key Move 11** *Grow Low Carbon, resilient food system*— encourage the widespread development of community and home-based vegetable gardens.

**Closing Statement**

What the spread of the Covid-19 virus has highlighted for the board, as representatives of a community, is the need for social cohesion. Rather than sit back and react to the fall out, we in local government must lead communities into being more proactive about being climate resilient. A well-prepared action plan helps us do this.