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Cost of your dog being impounded

To get your impounded dog back from Council, you need to pay the relevant fees:

**Pay outstanding fees**

- Impoundment fee - $78 for a first offence, $20 daily sustenance if in shelter.
- Registration fee - all impounded dogs must be registered before they are released. After August 2\(^{nd}\) a neutered dog costs $140 if not renewed on time.
- Micro-chipping fees - all impounded dogs must be micro-chipped before they are released.

**So minimum payment is $78 impound fee – whether your dog is returned to you from AMO or from shelter.**

If your dog’s registration isn’t up to date, after 2\(^{nd}\) August 2020, a neutered dog will cost $140 to re-register.

- That would mean a total cost of $218 to get your dog back within 1 day. Every day you don’t pay a $20 sustenance fee is added to the cost.

**If you don’t pay within 7 days your dog is forfeited to Council.**
Impact on capacity if there is a closure

- Current Situation: 267 spaces
- Silverdale closes: 187 spaces (−21.0%)
- Henderson closes: 205 spaces (−13.5%)
Impact on capacity if there is a closure

ON AVERAGE 83% FULL

ON AVERAGE 76% FULL

Silverdale closes 187 spaces
Henderson closes 205 spaces

On average 155 Dogs in council pounds
## North of the bridge – registered dogs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>LB Rank in Auckland</th>
<th>Highest number of dogs</th>
<th>3rd highest number of dogs</th>
<th>11th highest number of dogs</th>
<th>12th highest number of dogs</th>
<th>13th highest number of dogs</th>
<th>33% of all dogs registered in Auckland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>11,547</td>
<td>9,015</td>
<td>4,684</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>34,057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus &amp; Bays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DOGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Growth of Rodney NE Area

- There is high growth of housing underway, or planned for the NE area of Rodney;
  - Hall Farm, Wainui      575 homes
  - Milldale, Wainui       4,500 homes
  - Warkworth             7,500 homes
  - Dairy Flat             20,000+ homes
  TOTAL                   32,575+ homes
How will RFS (requests for service) suffer if AMO’s spend more time on road going to only a West or South pound facility?

- 35,008 RFS calls (incl proactive) YE 2019 increase vs 2018
- 13,664 were High priority (39%)
  - 99% were responded to within 1 hour.

- 39% were related to dogs roaming or to be picked up.
  - 8,112 were roaming dogs
  - 5,507 were pick up dog (contained)
Auckland Animal Shelters – Some key facts.

1. Council’s capacity evaluation assumes a “business as usual” scenario when all of NZ and Auckland is facing anything but! More dog owners are likely to be under financial stress to pay any impound and even dog registration fees. Due to an inability to pay, the numbers of dogs at pounds is likely to go up, not stay the same! (Minimum impound fee is $78, even if AMO’s return dog to owner rather than impound at shelter).

2. Actual Animal Management Department expenditure to 31 May 2020, including shelters, from OIA request was $11m, including Council overhead costs.

3. Budgeted Council overhead costs total $4.7m (Operations Overhead $2.1M, Corporate Overheads $2.6M)

4. Operating expenditure for the shelters to 31 May was only $1.7m (just 16% of the total Animal Management expenditure YTD). Excluding Council overhead costs. Also from an OIA request.

5. Dog registration revenue, infringement & impound fees and other revenue received for the 11 months to 31 May totalled $10.6m. This total completely covers the direct costs of the whole Animal Management cost centre.

6. According to the Dog Control Act 1996, dog registration fees, impound fees, adoption fees, infringement fees cannot be used on other Council activities. The Dog Control Act, Section 9, Revenue states: “All money received and retained by a territorial authority under this Act shall be expended only for purposes authorised by or under this Act.”

7. According to Dept of Internal Affairs Enforcement Guidelines relating to the Dog Control Act it recommends that education and enforcement should be primarily funded, not just by fees from Dog owners, but also RATES. YTD 31 May 2020 Income received covers 96% of the expenditure for the year (including council overheads). Only 4% of expenditure YTD would be covered by rates monies.

8. In the Emergency Budget Consultation Document there is a single bullet point under the side heading ‘Savings’:

   “Reduction in the number of animal shelters from three to two, as well as the closure of the Walkeke animal shelter - $300,000 saving.”

This represents only 2% of the Animal Management Budget, however the impact on closing a pound could be huge if Council’s prediction of capacity needs is wrong. Council has euthanised nearly 17,000 dogs over 6 years. While the number of dogs euthanised has reduced in the last 2 years, this is reliant on the owners being able to pay to get them back. Only $300,000 to operate a shelter facility must make it one of the leanest Council run entities!

9. One of the reasons behind the 3 shelter strategy was to “provide capacity for emergencies e.g. flooding, earthquake etc”. The emergency could be site specific to one shelter, or an Auckland wide emergency. Closing a shelter reduces this capability to act with urgency in an emergency.

10. The 3 shelters have a combined capacity of 267 and that, on average over the last 2 years they have had 155 dogs impounded. Based on these figures closure of either Henderson or Silverdale pound will mean:

    - If Silverdale closes Council Animal Shelters will be ON AVERAGE 84% FULL
    - If Henderson closes Council Animal Shelters will be ON AVERAGE 76% FULL

It will only take an extra 32 (if Silverdale closes) or 50 dogs (if Henderson closes) to be impounded during an ‘average period’ for Auckland Council Shelters to be at 100% capacity.

12. Under the ‘Code of Welfare - Temporary Housing of Companion Animals’, pounds must have suitable isolation facilities immediately available if any animals are either suspected, or diagnosed with, a contagious disease, or a condition that requires segregation. e.g. Parvo, Kennel Cough etc.
Local board input into the Emergency Budget 2020/2021

File No.: <<leave blank – Infocouncil will insert this when the report is saved in HPRM>>

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek feedback on the proposed regional topics in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary


3. The Annual Budget 2020/2021 was first consulted on in February/March 2020 (consultation part 1). Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted significant pressure on the council’s financial position. This will have flow-on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. The council has considered what those impacts are likely to be and have asked Aucklanders for their views on aspects of the proposed budget, now referred to as Emergency Budget 2020/2021, through a second round of consultation (consultation part 2).

4. During the second round of consultation, Aucklanders were asked for their views on three key proposals:
   - general rates increase for 2020/2021 of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent
   - rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19
   - suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers.

5. The council received feedback through telephone interviews, written forms, including online and hard copy forms, emails, letters and telephone interviews.

6. This report summarises the public feedback received through consultation part 2 on the proposed Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

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

8. Out of the 34,915 submissions received on the regional proposals in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021, 2,149 submissions were from people living in the Rodney Local Board area.

9. For question one, 48.4 per cent of the submitters supported a 2.5 per cent rates rise, compared to 30.3 per cent of submitters supporting a 3.5 per cent rates rise.

10. Many of the remaining submissions for question one were either truly “don’t know” or asking for a different rates rise, including requests for a zero per cent rise.

11. The majority of submissions on the question of rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19 (question two) were in favour of this proposition, with 58.3 per cent in agreement. A further 30.6 per cent did not support the rates postponement, and 11.0 per cent selected “I don’t know.”

12. Close to three-quarters (or 73.1 per cent) of the responses to the proposal on suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers (question three) were in favour. A further 14.1 per cent did not support the suspension, and 12.8 per cent selected “I don’t know.”
Ngā tūtōhunga
Recommendations

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) receives consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Rodney Local Board area.

b) provide feedback on the proposed Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

Horopaki

Context

13. Auckland Council publicly consulted from 21 February to 22 March 2020 to seek community views on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 (consultation part 1).

14. Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted considerable pressure on the council’s financial position, which will have flow-on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. Given the new financial realities facing Auckland, work has been undertaken to adjust the proposed budget, now referred to as Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

15. The council has undertaken further public consultation with Aucklanders for their views on Auckland Council’s proposed ‘Emergency Budget’ in response to the financial impacts of COVID-19 (consultation part 2) which included 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. This was carried out from 29 May to 19 June 2020.

16. The Emergency Budget consultation asked Aucklanders for their view on three main proposals:

- general rates increase for 2020/2021 of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent
- rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19
- suspending the targeted rate by accommodation providers.

17. This report includes analysis of the consultation feedback on the regional proposals in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Rodney Local Board area.

Local board input on regional plans

18. Local boards have a statutory responsibility for identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in their 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 Emergency Budget.

19. Local Board Plans reflect community priorities and preferences and are key documents that guide both the development of local board agreements, which are adopted every year as part of the Annual Budget, and input into regional plans.

Types of feedback

20. Overall Auckland Council received feedback from 34,915 submitters in the consultation period. This feedback was received through:

- written feedback – hard copy and online forms, emails and letters
- over the phone.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

21. The proposed Emergency Budget 2020/2021 sets out priorities and how they will be paid for. The regional consultation on the proposed Emergency Budget focused on changes to rates and fees; the key proposals were:
   - general rates increase for 2020/2021 of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent
   - rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19
   - suspending the targeted rate by accommodation providers.

22. The submissions received from the Rodney 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.

23. Sometimes the council receives submissions that have come via a platform created by an external organisation – these are referred to by the council as pro forma submissions. The council has received an unusually large number of pro forma submissions in this consultation process – a total of 9,793. These have primarily come from two organisations – the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance (9,002) and Generation Zero (371).

24. When people submit via the council’s official consultation platform (either the hardcopy feedback form or the digital form), they are directed to the council’s consultation document and supporting information which are the statutory basis for the consultation process. People who submit via pro forma submissions often will not have had this same information presented to them when they submit, although each pro forma submission is different in its approach.

25. For example, the submission form set up by the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance did not refer to the council’s consultation material and did not ask the same questions that were included on the council’s feedback form. Generation Zero’s submission form also did not ask the same questions as the council’s feedback form. However, Generation Zero did include links to the council’s consultation material in the information supporting their submission form.

26. As with all feedback, pro forma submissions must be given due consideration with an open mind, and it is up to elected members to determine the weight that is given to this feedback.

27. A breakdown of the numbers of submissions by channel or method of replying, for the Rodney Local Board can be seen in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Number of submissions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offline</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARA</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenZero</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro forma</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partners</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2149</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General rates increase for 2020/2021

28. Aucklanders were asked about a proposed general rates increase of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent for 2020/2021.
DRAFT

Question 1: We are proposing an average general rates increase of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent for 2020/2021. We looked at, but could not responsibly propose, rates increases below 2.5 per cent because of the severe impacts that would have on council services, new infrastructure, our debt levels and employment and business activity in Auckland.

The scale of the financial challenge that we face for next year with a revenue loss of over half a billion dollars due to COVID-19 means that spending on some council services will need to be reduced and many capital projects will be delayed even with the 3.5 per cent increase we had previously planned.

With a lower rate increase of 2.5 per cent, we would need to further reduce spending on council services and further delay investment in transport, parks and community and town centre projects.

Which increase do you support?

29. The table below gives an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 – Rates Increase</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5 per cent</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 per cent</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1229</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. From reviewing the commentary provided by the 21.3 per cent who responded “I don’t know”, a large number of the responses included requests for other levels of rate setting, including a zero per cent rise.

31. The figures included in this table omit submissions that did not directly answer this question. These may have come from any source but were predominantly received as pro forma submissions.

Rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19

32. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to introduce a COVID-19 Rates Postponement Scheme.

Question 2: We are proposing a COVID-19 Rates Postponement Scheme. This will allow ratepayers who are struggling financially as a result of COVID-19 to defer up to $20,000 of their rates for the 2020/2021 year. At the end of the postponement period ratepayers would have to 30 June 2022 to pay off the balance (including interest and administration fees).

What do you think of our proposal?

33. The table below gives an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2 – Rates Postponement</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I support the proposal</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t support the proposal</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1267</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. The majority of submissions from the Rodney local board area (58.3 per cent) supported the proposal to postpone rates payments for ratepayers who are struggling financially as a result of COVID-19.
35. The figures included in this table omit submissions that did not directly answer this question. These may have come from any source but were predominantly received as pro forma submissions.

**Suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers**

36. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to suspend the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers.

**Question 3: Suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers**

Restrictions on travel and mass gatherings due to COVID-19 have resulted in us reducing our spending on visitor attraction and major events. We are proposing to suspend the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (APTR) which helps fund these activities until 31 March 2021. The APTR will only be charged for the last three months of the next financial year (2020/2021) as we increase our spending in this area. This proposal will assist the accommodation sector who are struggling financially.

**What do you think of our proposal?**

37. The table below gives an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3 – Suspension of targeted rate for accommodation providers</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I support the proposal</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t support the proposal</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1265</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. A strong majority (73.1 per cent) of submitters support the suspension to the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (APTR) until 31 March 2021. A further 14.1 per cent rejected the proposal, and 12.8 per cent selected “I don’t know.”

39. The figures included in this table omit submissions that did not directly answer this question. These may have come from any source but were predominantly pro forma submissions.

**Other feedback**

40. Aucklanders were asked if they had any feedback on any other issues including the in-principle decisions made from the first round of consultation.

41. The proposals that we previously consulted on, and that have been agreed in principle, subject to consideration of any further feedback received in the Emergency Budget consultation are:

- increase to the waste management base service targeted rate
- increase to the waste management standard refuse rate in former Auckland City and Manukau City areas
- discontinuation of the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate for ratepayers in the Upper Harbour Local Board area effective from 1 July 2021
- introduction of a new targeted rate for Central Park Henderson Business Improvement District.

**Feedback on other local topics**

42. Key themes across feedback received on other local topics include:
REDUCTION OF ANIMAL SHELTER SERVICE. A total of 95 mentions were on the topic of the proposed closure of one of the animal shelters, all of which opposed the proposal. Many of these (58) were received via pro forma submissions regarding animal shelter provision.

CHARGING FOR PARK AND RIDE. A total of 79 mentions were on this topic. There was high opposition to charging for park and ride facilities, with 95 per cent indicating a negative sentiment towards the proposal to introduce charges to park and ride.

OPINION ON WATER SUPPLY ISSUES. A total of 44 mentions were received on this topic, of which 61 per cent were negative in sentiment.

SUPPORT FOR CYCLEWAYS. A total of 44 mentions were on the topic of cycleways. There was mixed support with 43 per cent of these mentions being positive, and 55 per cent being negative in sentiment.

Information on Submitters

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 years or younger</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24 years</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years or older</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
44. 62 per cent of submitters in Rodney were between ages 35 and 64.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha/NZ European</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Middle Eastern/Latin</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total people providing ethnicity</strong></td>
<td><strong>108%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. 89 per cent of submitters in Rodney were of European heritage. All other ethnicities were 11 per cent.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**  
**Climate impact statement**

46. The decisions recommended in this report are procedural in nature.

47. Some of the proposed projects in the Emergency Budget 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.

48. Some of the proposed projects in the Emergency Budget 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**

50. The Emergency Budget is an Auckland Council Group document and will include budgets at a consolidated group level. 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
51. 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.
52. Local boards play an important role in the development of the Emergency Budget. Local board nominees have also attended Finance and Performance Committee workshops on the Emergency Budget.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
53. Many local board decisions are of importance to and impact on Māori. Local board agreements and the Emergency Budget are important tools that enable and can demonstrate council’s responsiveness to Māori.
54. 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.
55. The analysis included submissions made by mana whenua and the wider Māori community who have interests in the rohe / local board area.
56. Ongoing conversations between local boards and Māori will assist in understanding each other’s priorities and issues. This in turn can influence and encourage Māori participation in council’s decision-making processes.
57. Some of the proposed projects in the Emergency Budget 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
58. Local board input will be considered by the Governing Body for the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 decision-making.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
59. Local boards are required to make recommendations on these local financial matters for the Emergency Budget by 10 July 2020, to enable the Governing Body to make decisions on them when considering the Emergency Budget in 16 July.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
60. Recommendations and feedback from local boards will be provided to the relevant Governing Body committees for consideration in advance of decision making at the Governing Body meeting on 16 July.
61. Local boards will approve their local board agreements between 20 to 24 July and corresponding work programmes in August.
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Rodney Local Board

Feedback on the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 summary document

8 July 2020

Rodney's disadvantage

The Rodney Local Board faces a large imbalance in asset-based services (ABS) funding compared to other local boards. Any cuts to ABS funding should be proportional across Auckland.

For example, we don’t have any pools, leisure centres or indoor sports facilities whatsoever in an area that covers 46 per cent of Auckland’s land area. Our local board has had to use local discretionary initiative (LDI) funding to do what other boards have ABS funding for.

Only one of our halls receives ABS funding for staff, and neither of our two arts centres receive ABS funding to operate. Our arts centres are largely self-funding apart from an annual grant from our LDI totalling $60,000.

This means we have had to focus on core business and doing a few things well. We leverage all our budgets and use volunteers to help in our parks to achieve council’s environmental outcomes. Our board does not enjoy the levels of legacy funding other parts of Auckland do.

We believe now is the time to address the ABS funding imbalances across Auckland.

LDI Capex

Town centre improvements

We have allocated $1m to town centre improvements across three of our growth centres: Warkworth, Helensville and Huapai.

We need the funding for this work to remain in place so that this work is completed as soon as possible as these town centres have seen no improvements for more than a decade. As well, in the current environment, post-COVID-19, supporting business centres is vital.

Most of this work has been done. We have Helensville improvements underway and the Warkworth work is in the tender process. Both were due to be completed in the 2019/2020 financial year.

One local initiative (OLI)

We want to use the $1m LDI Capex we committed to our OLI to progress the design stage work in 2020-2021 so it’s shovel-ready for 2021-2022.

It has taken the Rodney Local Board six years of consultation and planning to get to this stage and we don’t want to lose momentum. Again, we have no pools, leisure centres or indoor sports facilities at all in our entire local board area covering 46 per cent of Auckland’s land area, so this project is of the highest importance for our community.
LDI opex

The Rodney Local Board doesn’t provide community grants in the way other local boards do given our limited funding. Our only grants program is intended to leverage the work of the Water Quality Targeted Rate by matching dollar for dollar with riparian planting and fencing.

We have identified LDI cuts involving trimming existing budgets on a range of environmental programmes, deferring some planning, but keeping a focus on improving our town centres and the environment.

Some of our town centres are in a sorry state because they have not had investment in many years; we need to rectify this. Town centre economic development is even more important now in a post-COVID world, so we need to be able to continue to use our LDI capex and opex for town centre improvements such a repairing or replacing bins and street furniture and carrying out plantings that address decades of deferred and lack of spending, to support struggling businesses.

Auckland Transport

We do not want to see cuts in Auckland Transport road safety work in Rodney. Rodney continues to have the highest rates of deaths and serious injuries in Auckland. Work to prevent these tragedies should continue to be the highest priority for Auckland Transport and Auckland Council.

Our local board supports the proposed Unsealed Road Improvements Programme put forward by Auckland Transport that would replace the current Seal Extensions Programme. This would see better value for money, more roads made safer, less of a focus on sealing and more focus on improving more roads quicker with a range of methods. This work will be able to be done for less per kilometre than the way the existing budget is allocated. Under a 3.5 per cent rates increase in the Emergency Budget we would like to see a minimum of $2 million for the Unsealed Road Improvements Programme targeted at carriageway widening, safety improvements and pavement strengthening.

We would be deeply concerned by any cuts to Auckland Transport maintenance and renewal budgets. Our roads already suffer from repeated asset sweating with increasing issues around potholes. Maintenance and renewals are vital to maintaining a safe road network for Auckland’s residents.

Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF)

All our LBTCF is allocated to building footpaths because there is a list of more than 90 footpaths required across Rodney. The footpaths are in growth areas where development contributions have not been allocated to connect old and new housing areas with adequate infrastructure. Auckland Transport has less than $3 million a year across Auckland for this purpose and this is inadequate to meet growth requirements. We do not support any cuts to the Local Board Transport Capital Fund.