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Purpose:
The purpose of the workshop is for PACE committee members:
1. Provide feedback on proposed engagement approach with external stakeholders.
2. Provide direction and input into the content of the proposed discussion document
3. Consider whether to include the Auckland Botanic Gardens in the plan review
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Memorandum

25 June 2020

To: Parks, Arts, Community and Events (PACE) Committee members
Cc: Local Board chairs
Subject: Regional Parks Management Plan Review – Workshop 1 July 2020
From: Jo Mackay, Project Manager, Service and Asset Planning, Service Strategy and Integration department
Contact information: jo.mackay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. The purpose of the 1 July 2020 workshop for the PACE committee and local board chairs is:
   - to provide feedback on the proposed engagement approach for the Regional Parks Management Plan Review
   - to provide direction for development of a discussion paper to support the first round of consultation
   - to consider whether to include the Auckland Botanic Gardens in the review.

2. The purpose of this memo is to introduce and provide background information for the workshop. The presentation for the workshop is attached to this memo.

Summary

- The Regional Parks Management Plan is 10 years old and due for review.
- The first public step in a review under the Reserves Act 1977 is to seek suggestions from the public to inform the review and development of a draft plan. To meet a legislative deadline in the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008, this consultation step must start in August 2020. Staff are preparing a discussion paper to introduce the review to the public and invite feedback.
- This workshop is to outline the engagement approach and proposed content of the discussion paper before presenting it to the PACE committee for approval at the meeting on 20 August 2020.
- The attached presentation presents the material for discussion at the workshop which also includes an assessment of whether to include the Botanic Gardens in the review.

Context

3. The regional parks network contains 30 regional parks on approximately 45,000 hectares of park land. Regional parks protect in perpetuity the intrinsic, natural, cultural, heritage and landscape values of the land and offer outdoor recreational opportunities for all Aucklanders.

4. The regional parks in scope of the review was reported at the 11 June 2020 PACE Committee. The 25 parks within the current management plan are in the review, and parks coming into the plan through the review are: Glenfern Sanctuary on Aotea/Great Barrier Island, Mahurangi East
extension, Motukorea/Browns Island, and Mutukaroa/Hamilton Island. This workshop will discuss whether or not to include the Auckland Botanic Gardens in the review. The potential inclusion of Te Motu a Hiaroa / Puketutu Island will be considered by its governance trust and the decision brought back to the PACE Committee on 20 August 2020.

5. The 2010 plan was written just before the formation of Auckland Council and will be reviewed and updated to reflect the current strategic framework.

6. The strategic direction for regional parks is set by the legislative and policy framework including council’s obligations to give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi (see Figure 1) and by council priorities, taking into account community views and preferences.

Figure 1: Key policy framework influencing management of regional parks

7. As an example, the Regional Parks Management Plan will seek to embed policies that align with the Auckland Climate Plan. In turn, the management plan will be a framework for plans and policies that are more site-specific, such as farm environmental management plans.

Expected extent of the review

8. The review is a ‘comprehensive’ review as defined by the Reserves Act 1977, a review of the whole plan, rather than a section of the plan.

9. The review of the 2010 plan will recognise enduring management direction.

10. The expected areas of change include:
    - working with mana whenua, to reflect Māori values and deliver outcomes
    - aligning with Auckland Council’s strategies and plans
    - revising policies to reflect changing and emerging issues, new opportunities, community input and council priorities
    - creating a monitoring and review framework
    - refreshing language, including a user-friendly online format
    - pitching at the right level to provide direction and guidance relevant for the next ten years.
Reminder of first steps

11. The full review timeline was outlined in the 11 June 2020 report to the PACE committee. The first steps are outlined in figure 2 below.

Figure 2: First steps in the review of the Regional Parks Management Plan

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 June and 1 July 2020</td>
<td>• Committee report &amp; workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From July 2020</td>
<td>• Mana whenua engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 August 2020</td>
<td>• Committee decision to start consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September – October 2020</td>
<td>• Public consultation period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local board involvement in the review

12. Local board involvement in the review was covered in the 11 June report to the PACE committee and is as indicated in Table 1. To date, ten local boards have indicated their interest in the review: Franklin, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Manurewa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Rodney, Waiheke, Waitākere Ranges, Whau, and Waitakatū.

13. Following the 11 June 2020 meeting, the PACE Committee chair invited local board chairs to the 1 July 2020 workshop (this workshop) and 11 local board chairs have accepted the invitation.

14. In addition, as part of the engagement approach, the project team propose to work with local boards in engaging with their communities.

Table 1: Timing of local board involvement in the RPMP Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board involvement</th>
<th>Indicative time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide input into the plan drafting</td>
<td>February-March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend amendments to the Draft Plan (to the Hearings Panel)</td>
<td>September-October 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

15. The focus areas for the workshop (as supported in the attached presentation) are:
   • proposed engagement approach
   • key topics in the draft discussion paper
   • consideration of whether to include the Auckland Botanic Gardens in the review.

Next steps

16. Staff will use the workshop feedback to finalise the discussion paper, consultation materials, and prepare for engagement, starting with mana whenua.

17. The PACE Committee decisions on 20 August will initiate the first public consultation from 1 September to mid-October 2020.

Attachments

Attachment: Presentation - RPMP Review - PACE Committee workshop - 1 July 2020
Komiti Whakarite Parae, Mahi Toi, Hapori, Kaupapa
PACE Committee Workshop with Local Board Chairs

Regional Parks Management Plan Review

Workshop 1 July 2020
Agenda

Purpose of today:

- To seek input into preparation for the Regional Parks Management Plan Review before formally seeking approval on 20 August for:
  
  - Proposed engagement approach
  - Discussion paper release
  - Consideration of Auckland Botanic Gardens
The regional park network

- 30 regional parks, c.45,000 ha

- Exemplars of natural, cultural, historic, landscape values within the region

- A significant network of public outdoor recreation opportunities
An enduring purpose as outlined in the 2010 plan:

“The parks are purchased, and are managed, to protect their intrinsic, natural, cultural and landscape values and to provide outdoor recreational opportunities for the enjoyment and benefit of the people of the region and are held in perpetuity for that purpose.”
What do we want to achieve in the Regional Parks Management Plan review?

- 10-year review:
  - Ensure the plan is fit for purpose for the next 10 years
  - Engage and renew the ‘community contract’
  - Treaty commitment to deliver Māori outcomes
- Management to protect park values while providing a quality visitor experience
- Encouraging stewardship / kaitiakitanga
Proposed engagement approach:

- Purpose of engagement
- Mana whenua and mataawaka
- Community consultation
Engagement is in two phases that build on each other

The proactive and inclusive engagement and communication approach includes:

- Engagement with mana whenua from the outset and throughout the review
- Two formal public consultation phases:
  - suggestions for the review (informed by a discussion paper)
  - submissions on the draft plan
- Targeted engagement on particular topics outside of those formal phases
By engaging effectively we will...

- Connect with the people of Tāmaki Makaurau
- Outline the purpose of the review
- Deliver on Treaty commitments and improve Māori outcomes
- Identify topics to be addressed in the first consultation round
- Seek feedback on the draft plan in the second consultation round
- Ensure people feel their voice and contributions have been heard
- Promote buy-in and understanding

In doing so we will reconfirm the ‘community contract’ represented by the management plan – how parks are managed on behalf of, and with, Aucklanders.
Attachment A

Engagement with Māori

Opportunities include:

- Further reflect Māori values and world view in the plan
- Express Māori values and sites of significance in the park story
- Involve mana whenua in decisions that matter to them
- Promote hauora / well-being and connection of Māori to the land
- Work together to implement parts of the plan, e.g. heritage restoration
- Economic activity, e.g. cultural tourism initiatives
- Independent role in monitoring and review of plan implementation
Engagement with mana whenua and mataawaka

Mana whenua:
- Early engagement will commence after this workshop
- Reach iwi through existing forums and iwi chairs
- Understand mana whenua priorities
- Agree a practical way to engage, e.g. through hui
- Keep IMSB informed

Mataawaka:
- Reach through mataawaka organisations
- Radio and other channels and fora
- Channel Māori responses through AK Have Your Say
Approach to community consultation

The following slides cover:

- Promotional channels
- First consultation – information we provide, and ways people can respond
- Second consultation – information we provide, and ways people can respond
## Both consultation rounds: promotional channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotional channels</th>
<th>Mana whenua*</th>
<th>Mataawaka</th>
<th>Park users</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Service delivery partners</th>
<th>Harder to reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Social) media and advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct contact (email and conversation)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-based promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network-based promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana whenua fora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanohi ki te kanohi with chairs and CEs</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First consultation round: gather suggestions
(1 September to mid-October 2020)

Information provided
- Discussion paper
- Link to the 2010 plan
- Supported by:
  - Radio interviews: e.g. Radio Waatea, Radio Samoa
  - Translated summaries in te reo Māori, Chinese, Korean
  - Social media posts and posters

Ways for people to make suggestions
- AK Have Your Say:
  - Questionnaire
  - Social pinpoint (maps),
  - Discussion forum
  - Quick polls
- Emails and letters
- In-person feedback:
  - Drop-in sessions
Second consultation round: receive submissions on the draft plan (July and August 2021)

**Information provided**
- Draft Plan with maps and a Summary
- Supported by:
  - Translated summaries including in te reo Māori, Chinese, Korean
  - Radio interviews: e.g. Radio Waatea, Radio Samoa
  - Webinars, briefings, recorded briefing online
  - Social media posts and posters

**Ways for people to submit**
- AK Have Your Say questionnaire
- Email submissions
- Postal submissions
- Hearings (late 2021)
Comments and Questions / Pātaia on engagement
Discussion paper:
Proposed structure and key topics
The discussion paper provides important background to prompt suggestions, ideas and feedback

- The discussion paper is a backgrounder to introduce and explain the review, and to prompt suggestions
- Visual presentation – text will be brief and engaging
- Neutral tone – we are not making proposals at this stage
The content outline of the discussion paper includes:

- **Introduction section:**
  - The regional parks
  - The Treaty, legislative and strategic context
  - Māori interests
  - The management plan role and this review
  - How to input into the review
  - A note about funding for regional parks

- **Scene-setting section:**
  - Regional park values, achievements, challenges, visitor experiences
  - Discussion of key topics to prompt responses
  - **Pose questions to prompt readers throughout**
The key topics to prompt suggestions

1. Protecting what is valued
2. Climate change and regional parks
3. Visitor experiences
4. Directions for parks already in the plan
5. Proposed focus for the parks coming into the plan
1. Protecting what is valued

Proposed outline:

- Acknowledge the vision is to protect intrinsic, natural, cultural, heritage, landscape values while enabling people to enjoy
- Management is informed by science, needs to meet national requirements and best practice, and to consider mana whenua, mataawaka and community views
- Recognise there’s a range of views about what and how to protect
- Acknowledge the challenges in halting kauri dieback and the trade-offs in the types of recreational experiences that can be provided
Protecting what is valued continued

Proposed type of questions to prompt feedback:

- What do you value about regional parks?
- How do you think we should balance environmental, heritage and recreation outcomes?
- What do you want regional parks to look like in 10 years’ time?
- How should long-term impacts on recreation be managed where the protection of natural values has to take precedence?
Climate change and regional parks
2. Climate change and regional parks

Proposed outline:

- Climate change impact and including what we are doing already to prepare for change and to reduce emissions
- The major levers on regional parks relating to emissions
- Constraints and boundaries of the management plan

- Explore adopting an emissions target for regional parks within the management plan with meaningful sub-targets
Climate change and regional parks continued

- Proposed type of questions to prompt feedback:
  - How could we respond to climate change through the management of regional parks?
  - Should there be an emissions target for regional parks?
  - How can park visitors help support climate action?
Visitor experiences
3. Visitor experiences

Proposed outline:

- Acknowledge range of offerings – access, information, tracks, beach access, picnic and barbecue facilities, overnight stays
- Visitor experiences are more than recreation – volunteering, learning, connecting with nature, wide range of recreational activities
- Visitor numbers are increasing, particularly in some parks
- Visitors and users are very happy with the experiences they are receiving (95% satisfaction with regional parks)
- Visitor use and expectations are changing in line with our changing communities
- The current management plan approach, including the principle of free access
Visitor experiences continued (2 question slides)

Proposed type of questions to prompt feedback:

- Do we have the right range of opportunities and recreation choices across our regional parks?
- What could be done differently in regional parks as needs, numbers, growth of city changes?
- Where are any conflicts... and do you have any ideas about how they could be resolved?
- What new directions or new opportunities offerings would you like to see?
Visitor experiences continued

Proposed type of questions to prompt feedback:

- Should we extend or reduce the range of experiences and services on regional parks? If so, what types?
- What kinds of commercial activities do you think would be appropriate on parks, to deliver additional services and experiences?
- What should visitors pay for?
Item 21

Directions for particular regional parks

Proposed focus for newly added parks
4. Directions for particular regional parks

Proposed type of questions to prompt suggestions for particular regional parks:

- What do you love about the park/s that you want to keep the same?
- What issues need to be addressed?
- What would you like to see more of at the park/s?
- What new opportunities do you see for the park/s?
## 5. Proposed focus for newly added parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional park</th>
<th>Proposed management direction and use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fern Sanctuary</td>
<td>Conservation and ecological restoration, education opportunity for visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wharang East extension</td>
<td>Increase access for recreational opportunities, preservation historic heritage, bach stay and back-to-basics camping opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otukorea / Browns Island</td>
<td>Preservation of volcanic landforms, historic and cultural sites, passive recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otukaroa / Hamlins Hill</td>
<td>Protect heritage features, sites of significance, revegetation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other issues and topics to prompt suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety and security cameras</th>
<th>Toilets</th>
<th>Wifi on parks</th>
<th>Smokefree vaping and marijuana</th>
<th>Paragliding and hang-gliding</th>
<th>Drones</th>
<th>Acknowledging mana whenua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shade</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Metal detectors</td>
<td>Group sizes</td>
<td>Freedom camping</td>
<td>Kolwī burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpark, EV charging</td>
<td>Cycle trails linking parks</td>
<td>Te Araroa Trail</td>
<td>Naturism</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>Nature play</td>
<td>Protecting wāhi tapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways</td>
<td>Walking tracks</td>
<td>Access to remote areas</td>
<td>Dog areas</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Mountain-biking and horse-riding</td>
<td>Signs in te reo Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds and baches</td>
<td>Concessions and leases</td>
<td>Commercial activities</td>
<td>Planting trees</td>
<td>Volunteering on parks</td>
<td>Music and noise on parks</td>
<td>Pou and puurākau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaques and memorials</td>
<td>Partnering</td>
<td>Farm and nature education</td>
<td>E-bikes and scooters</td>
<td>Vehicles on beaches</td>
<td>Fair rules of use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments and Questions / Pātai on the discussion paper
Scope question: Auckland Botanic Gardens
Is the Botanic Gardens part of the plan review?

- Management plan is out of date – developed in 2001
- Advantages of including the Botanic Gardens in this review:
  - Ability to consider the role of the Botanic Gardens in the context of Auckland’s regional open space network
  - Faces some similar issues to regional parks, e.g. managing different types of recreational use
  - Some process efficiencies (less effort overall than doing a plan review separately)
- Disadvantages:
  - Botanic Gardens has a distinct function and brand that is different to regional parks
  - Botanic Gardens has a different set of stakeholders to regional parks and unique issues to consider (reducing process efficiencies identified above)
- Proposed approach: Review Botanic Gardens Management Plan commencing FY22
From your feedback today our next steps are:

- Draft the Regional Parks Management Plan Discussion Document
- Prepare Communications and Engagement Plan
- Initiate engagement with mana whenua
- PACE Committee decisions on 20 August:
  - Confirm regional parks in scope
  - Approve public notification of the intention to prepare a management plan and invite written suggestions (Reserves Act 1977, s.41(5))
  - Approve a discussion paper for release
  - Approve the communications and engagement plan

- Public consultation: 1 September – mid-October 2020
Thank you
Memorandum

9 July 2020

To: The Chair and members of the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee

Subject: Update on COVID-19 and post-COVID-19 support for people who are homeless

From: Katarina Maki, General Manager, Community and Social Policy

Purpose

1. To provide an update on support offered as part of the COVID-19 response to people who are homeless and how this support will continue as part of the post-COVID-19 recovery.

Key points

- Homelessness is a serious issue in Auckland – council’s pre-COVID-19 forecast suggested that more than 26,000 people could be homeless in Auckland by 2021.

- Council has a critical role leading and coordinating cross-sectoral collaboration in Auckland and using the levers we have available to help make homelessness in Auckland rare, brief and non-recurring.

- Central government provides nationwide leadership and is the key funder of the sector.

- Council, central government and NGOs provided extensive support during the COVID-19 lockdown to people who are homeless. This included providing accommodation and wrap around support to over 600 people in Auckland.

- Council’s current focus is working with the sector to identify priorities for collaborative action to implement the regional plan in 2020/21. This includes jointly seeking funding from government, and finalising council’s internal Homelessness Action Plan, which focuses on activities council will undertake as an organisation.

- A detailed briefing will be provided to the August meeting of the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee.

Context

2. Homelessness is defined as: living situations where people are without shelter, in temporary accommodation, temporarily sharing overcrowded accommodation or living in uninhabitable housing and have no other options to acquire safe and secure housing.

3. At the 2013 census, over 20,290 Aucklanders were considered homeless. This is a 26 per cent increase since 2006 (data from the 2018 census is not yet available due to issues with data quality). A conservative forecast predicted this would increase to more than 26,500 people in Auckland by 2021.

4. We expect additional data on the nature and scale of homelessness in Auckland to be available soon and will provide this information to the Committee in our August report. The nature and scale of homelessness as currently known (Census 2013) in Auckland is illustrated in Figure 1 below.
Council has an important role to play

5. Central government has legislative responsibility for the provision of public/social housing, and integrated health and social services, and is leading efforts to address homelessness nationally.

6. Council plays an important role leading and coordinating Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa - Auckland’s regional, cross-sectoral homelessness plan. It also plays a role through:
   - planning and regulatory powers
   - close ties to local communities
   - funding for seeding initiatives
   - frontline staff who frequently engage with people who are homeless.

7. In August 2017 the Environment and Community Committee agreed that council’s position on improving, ending and preventing homelessness in Auckland should be that it is ‘rare, brief and non-recurring’ (ENV 2017/118).

Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa

8. Council is playing a ‘backbone’ agency role, taking a cross-agency, collective impact approach to developing and implementing Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa. Staff have focused on developing strong relationships with key government agencies, NGOs, iwi and philanthropy, to build consensus and commitment to the plan.

9. The Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa Leaders’ Group has developed and agreed a strategic framework. The Vision, Domains and Purpose from the strategic framework are shown in Figure 2 (see Attachment 1 for further details). The Leaders’ Group had agreed priorities for 2020/21, but these need to be revisited in light of significant progress during COVID-19 (see below for further details). We will present the strategic framework and updated 2020/21 priorities to the Committee for endorsement in August.
10. The Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa strategic framework takes a systems approach. It strengthens the focus on early intervention with vulnerable individuals, and prevention with vulnerable populations.

11. It also seeks to develop the foundations of an effective system including data, leadership, engagement with people with lived experience, and workforce development. Responding to the needs of Māori is a priority and is woven into the framework.

12. Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa has proven valuable in helping to coordinate action across the sector and council’s backbone role has been acknowledged as a critical factor in this success.

**Aotearoa New Zealand Homelessness Action Plan**

13. The government’s Aotearoa New Zealand Homelessness Action Plan (2020-2023) was released on 13 February 2020 (see Attachment 2 for a high-level summary). The vision is that ‘homelessness is prevented where possible, or is rare, brief and non-recurring’.

14. The national plan reflects council’s position and closely aligns with Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa.

15. The national plan identifies 18 actions to be implemented in 2020 and a further 18 longer term actions, with backing of over $350million of new government funding. The action plan was released prior to COVID-19. The he Ministry for Housing and Urban Development has confirmed that there won’t be any changes to the scale of funding or objectives of the action plan.

**Support for people sleeping rough during lockdown**

16. People sleeping rough were a particularly vulnerable group during the COVID-19 lockdown due to their living conditions, underlying health conditions and high level of mobility. They also had minimal ability to socially isolate while sleeping rough.

17. In collaboration with central government and NGOs, council offered support to people who were homeless. In particular council:

- delivered up to 3,400 ready-to-eat meal packs per week (funded by the Ministry of Social Development) to Auckland City Mission and emergency accommodation facilities to replace their meal services which were unable to operate at higher alert levels

- established a system to issue food parcels and other support directly to Aucklanders who may be struggling to access basic household supplies. In total, 16,510 households received support

- worked with telecoms partner Spark to provide pre-pay mobile phones to members of the homeless community to ensure they continue to get the support they need during the pandemic

- ensured continued access to key toilet and handwashing facilities across the region.

18. The sharp reduction in tourism caused by COVID-19 created significant spare motel capacity and the government used this as an opportunity to house people who had previously been sleeping rough.
19. As at 1 May 1208 motel units had been secured nationwide, including over a third in Auckland. (Some units will house more than one person but not all units will be in use.)

20. In addition to safe accommodation, people have received regular meals, access to medical care (both COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 related) and other social support.

21. Between 27 March and 10 June 2020, 615 people in Auckland were supported into emergency accommodation in motels.

22. It is estimated that around 70 to 80 per cent of people in the Auckland region who had been sleeping rough were placed in motels. The response focused primarily on people who had been rough sleeping. Some accommodation was also provided for people who had been living in overcrowded accommodation and for people who were involved in family harm incidents.

23. Those who have declined emergency accommodation have done so for a variety of reasons. This included:
   - substance use
   - lack of local accommodation
   - not wanting to stay in a motel where they were close to other people
   - not wishing to be temporarily separated from their pets.

24. There is ongoing work to provide support for these people and to identify suitable accommodation.

25. One NGO has described profound improvements in the health and wellbeing of people now housed in motels, including people that had previously been resistant to leaving the street.

26. As well as funding provided when the national plan was launched, an additional $107.6 million was provided by the government in Budget 2020.

27. The funding will enable people currently housed in motels to remain there until April 2021. During this period they will be provided with wrap around support services and a path to long-term, safe, stable accommodation.

28. The focus now will be minimising the number of people who return to rough sleeping. A small number of people have already moved from motels into permanent accommodation.

**Short-term focus for council**

29. Prior to the lockdown the Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa Leaders’ Group had agreed key priorities for 2020/21. We are seeking to reconfirm key priorities that are still relevant and add any new priorities that have been identified in light of the COVID-19 response. There will also be discussion on the best approach to progressing priorities and the role that council should continue to play.

30. Government’s Action Plan includes $16.6 million for a Local Innovation and Partnership fund. The fund, including criteria for applications, is currently being developed by the Ministry for Housing and Urban Development. We expect that details will be released by the end of July.

31. One of the priorities for the sector is likely to be developing cross-sectoral applications from Auckland to government’s $16.6 million Local Innovation and Partnership fund. Council will have a key role coordinating and facilitating development of proposals.

**Next steps**

32. We will provide a detailed briefing to the August Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee, including discussion of:
   - updated information on the nature and scale of homelessness in Auckland
   - council’s cross-sectoral work through Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa, including the strategic framework, priorities for action in 2020/21, and a monitoring and reporting framework
- council’s internal Homelessness Action Plan, focussing on activities council will undertake as an organisation
- further details on government’s post-COVID-19 plan for addressing homelessness and how this will operate in Auckland
- future briefings on homelessness policy to be provided to the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee in 2020.

**Attachments**

Attachment 1 – Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa Strategic Framework
Attachment 2 – Summary of the National Homelessness Action Plan
Memorandum

29 July 2020

To: The Chairpersons of the Parks, Arts, Culture and Events Committee and the Environment and Climate Change Committee
His Worship the Mayor and Members of the Parks, Arts, Culture and Events Committee
The Chairperson and Members of the Whau Local Board

Subject: 52-58 Canal Road, Avondale

From: Kataraina Maki, General Manager, Community and Social Policy

Purpose

1. To provide an update on 52-58 Canal Road, Avondale, in response to an informal request from Members of the Environment and Climate Change Committee.

2. This memo is provided through the Parks, Arts, Culture and Events Committee\(^1\), which has responsibility for sport and recreation, including parks and reserves.\(^2\) It also has the delegation for acquisition of property, relating to the committee’s activities, which include the acquisition of land as part of a land exchange under the Reserves Act 1977.

Key message

- Staff were informally requested to investigate options, including a land exchange
- Staff have been advised that the properties at 52-58 Canal Road are under contract and are not currently for sale
- The Whau Local Board supports public consultation on a possible land exchange
- The current landowner and purchaser do not wish to exchange their land for Canal Reserve
- The current landowner and purchaser have expressed concerns about the timeframes and public consultation processes under the Reserves Act 1977 for land exchanges
- There is no open space provision gap in this location
- There are currently no rules protecting trees on the site other than a pohutukawa
- Removal of trees from council berms is not permitted without prior approval.

Staff were informally requested to investigate options, including a land exchange

3. On 21 July 2020, members of the Environment and Climate Change Committee informally requested that staff investigate options, including an exchange of 52-58 Canal Road for Canal Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.

4. This request was made in response to public input from the Tree Council and two local residents who proposed that council intervene to protect a number of notable native trees on private land at 52-58 Canal Road.

Staff have been advised that the properties at 52-58 Canal Road are under contract and are not currently for sale

5. Staff have made contact with the real estate agent who negotiated the sale of 52-58 Canal Road.

6. The real estate agent advises that these properties are under contract. The conditions of the sale and purchase agreement are currently being met.

---

\(^1\) The Community Committee operating as the Parks, Arts, Culture and Events Committee

7. If these conditions are not met, and the existing contract is terminated, the real estate agent advises there are multiple other parties that are interested in acquiring the land.

**The Whau Local Board supports public consultation on a possible land exchange**

8. The Whau Local Board supports public consultation on a possible land exchange of 52-58 Canal Road for Canal Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.

9. The Whau Local Board, at a workshop on 29 July 2020, also proposed that staff investigate the possible exchange of other open space in the area in order to protect the trees at 52-58 Canal Road.

**The current landowner and purchaser do not wish to exchange their land for Canal Reserve**

10. Staff have also had discussions with the current landowner and the purchaser through the real estate agent, including the possibility of exchanging the four private properties with a combined area of 3873m² for Canal Reserve (3428m²) at 14 Canal Road under the Reserves Act 1977. 3

11. Both the landowner and the purchaser have indicated that they do not wish to exchange their land for Canal Reserve.

12. They observe that their land and Canal Reserve are not similar in terms of value and output.

13. Canal Reserve is a narrower site and has a single entrance. There is an overland flow path over parts of the reserve. These features limit development options and would deliver less yield than their existing land.

14. Both parties also raised concerns with the timeframes and public consultation processes under the Reserves Act 1977. These concerns would apply to other possible land exchanges.

**There is no open space provision gap in this location**

15. There is no open space provision gap in this location in accordance with the Open Space Provision Policy (2016).

16. Canal Reserve meets the informal open space needs of the local community.

17. Staff are also working with Kāinga Ora to turn two small road reserves in Bellgrove Place into a pocket park that will supplement open space provision in this area at no capital cost to council.

**There are currently no rules protecting trees on the site other than a pohutukawa**

18. The land at 52-58 is privately owned and staff have no legal authority to intervene.

19. Only one tree on the site is protected (a large pohutukawa). There are no rules under the Unitary Plan protecting any of the other trees.

20. The landowner is able to exercise their private property rights and only has a legal obligation to preserve the protected pohutukawa.

21. There is no budget allocated to purchase land to protect trees. Approval of unbudgeted expenditure would be required from the Finance and Performance Committee.

**Removal of trees from council berms is not permitted without prior approval**

22. Concerns have been raised regarding any trees that may be located on the council berm in front of the properties located at 52-58 Canal Road (and along Wainui Avenue).

23. Damage to anything in any public place is prohibited. The Local Government Act 2002 and Summary Offences Act 1981 prohibit wilful, negligent or malicious damage, obstruction, interference with any property.

24. Under the Te Ture ā-Rohe Marutau ā-Iwi te Whakapōreaarea 2013 / Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2013 the removal of vegetation like trees is not permitted from a public place unless written approval from the council has been provided.

---

3 This process protects the privacy of natural persons.
Conclusion

25. At this stage, staff advise that the option of a land exchange under the Reserves Act 1977 with 52-58 Canal Road is not possible:

- the properties are under contract and are not currently for sale
- there are multiple other parties that are interested in acquiring the land
- the current landowner and purchaser do not wish to exchange their land for Canal Reserve
- the current landowner and purchaser have expressed concerns about the timeframes and public consultation processes under the Reserves Act 1977 for land exchanges.
Memorandum

To: All Parks, Arts, Community and Events committee members

Subject: Auckland Council’s input into the government’s ‘Death, Funerals, Burial and Cremation: A Review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and Related Legislation’

From: Tian Liu, Planner, Plans & Places – North, West and Islands
Rosie Stoney, Senior Service Development Specialist, Parks Sports and Recreation – Parks Services

Contact information: tian.liu@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To provide an update on the progress with Auckland Council’s response on the Ministry of Health’s consultation on modernising the legislation relating to death, burial, cremation, and funerals in New Zealand, including the Burial and Cremation Act 1964, Cremation Regulations 1983 and the Health (Burial) Regulations 1946, following the Parks, Arts, Community and Events committee meeting held on 13 February 2020.

Summary

2. The Ministry of Health is currently consulting on the proposed changes to modernise legislation relating to death, burial, cremation and funerals in New Zealand.

3. Staff prepared a submission on the issues and possible options raised in the consultation document. This submission was later updated to reflect the feedback from the committee members during a workshop held on 18 March 2020.

4. Further feedback from committee members was sought by 10 July 2020. To date, no additional feedback that requires amendments to the updated submission has been received from committee members.

5. Staff is intending on presenting the submission to the delegated authority for approval. Once approved, the submission will be lodged with the Ministry of Health.

Context


7. The consultation document covers the identified issues and the possible options that the Ministry of Health is considering in order to address these for each of the following five main topics:
   - Death certification and auditing
   - Regulation of the funeral services sector
   - Burial and cemetery management
   - Cremation regulations and the medical referee system
● New methods of body disposal

8. With the original deadline for the submission being 10 April 2020, it was considered that the Parks, Arts, Community and Events committee meeting scheduled for 9 April would be too late for the committee to hear council’s submission. As such, the following resolution (PAC/2020/7) was carried at the committee meeting on 13 February 2020:

That the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee:

a) request staff to hold a workshop of the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee on 18 March 2020 to discuss council’s submission on the Ministry of Health’s Death, Funerals, Burial and Cremation: a Review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and Related Legislation consultation document.

b) delegate authority to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee, and an Independent Māori Statutory Board member, to approve council’s submission on the Ministry of Health’s Death, Funerals, Burial and Cremation: a Review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and Related Legislation consultation document.

Discussion

9. With the input from the relevant council departments, staff prepared a draft submission for Parks, Arts, Community and Events committee members to review. A workshop was held on 18 March 2020 to discuss the draft submission, as per the above resolution. The feedback from the committee members at the workshop are briefly summarised below:

● Concerns regarding burial on private land, particularly with timeframes due to cultural requirements and burials in floodplains

● Concerns about independent cemeteries

● Concerns about costs of maintaining graves/monuments

● Support for changes to provide for needs of community groups

● Concerns regarding the cost of taking on failing cemeteries

● Concerns regarding the practicality of storing ashes for five years

● Clarification on what a “failing” cemetery is

● Implications of forward bookings and revenues if taking on private cemeteries

● Clarification on who will make decisions on new methods of body disposal

● Inclusion of comments in the submission on how community consultation for changes to how cemeteries and burials will be managed

● Inclusion of additional information on the environmental impacts of existing burial practices

10. Following the feedback above, staff prepared an updated submission, and this was circulated to all committee members on 1 April 2020 via email. This updated submission included:

● Stronger emphasis and more detail on the points of support/concern that were identified by the committee members, with additional supporting data and evidence where possible

● Specific request to clarify the entity that will be responsible to make decisions on new methods of body disposal, with a recommendation that this responsibility would be best placed with the Ministry of Health as it is a health issue.

● Specific request to clarify what a “failing” cemetery is defined as

● Additional section to provide further information on the environmental impacts of existing burial practices
No comments were added in the submission on how community consultation will be managed as staff considered that this was more of an operational issue that would be discussed if what was being proposed by the Ministry of Health goes ahead.

11. Comments and feedback from the committee members on the updated submission were requested by 8 April 2020 to meet the 10 April 2020 deadline for the submission. However, due to Covid-19, Ministry of Health extended the deadline for submissions on the consultation document to 31 July 2020. Committee members were updated of this extension on 8 April 2020 via email, with comments and feedback from committee members requested by the end of May 2020.

12. Due to the on-going consequences of Covid-19, this deadline was further extended to provide a final opportunity for feedback.

13. No additional feedback that requires amendments to the updated submission has been received from committee members as of 24 July 2020.

Next steps

14. The current submission deadline has recently been extended to 31 October 2020. Staff recommend finalising and lodging Auckland Council’s submission ahead of this date. The Ministry of Health and the Society of Local Government Managers have an interest in Auckland Council’s submission and have requested to see it once it has been submitted.

15. Staff is intending on presenting the submission to the delegated authority for approval. Once approved, the submission will be lodged with the Ministry of Health.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Auckland Council’s Submission to the Ministry of Health – Deaths, Funerals, Burial and Cremation: a Review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and Related Legislation
Submission to the Ministry of Health


Auckland Council 24 July 2020
Mihimihi

Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,
ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,
ōna mana a-īwi taketake mai, tauīwi atu.
Tamaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini,
wenerau a te mano.
Kāhore tō rite i te ao.

I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place,
there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and flow of the tides of time,
and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who came those born of this land
and the newcomers among us all.

Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the multitude, envy of thousands.

You are unique in the world.
Submission to the Ministry of Health

Introduction

1. Auckland Council thanks the Ministry for Health for the opportunity to provide feedback on *Deaths, Funerals, Burial and Cremation: a Review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and Related Legislation*.

2. This submission has been approved by the Chair and deputy Chair of Auckland Council’s Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee and an Independent Statutory Māori Board member and represents the views of Auckland Council (the council).

3. Local board feedback is appended to the submission (Appendix 1).

Auckland context

4. Auckland Council owns 30 operational cemeteries, 23 closed cemeteries and three crematoria covering a total land area of 289 hectares.

5. Auckland currently experiences around 8,600 deaths per year. As the population grows and ages, the number of deaths is projected to increase, reaching an estimated 12,000 per year by 2038.

6. Annually, Auckland Council administers on average 2,600 burials (ash and body) and 2,500 cremations at our facilities.

7. Catering for the needs of people and families wishing to inter their loved ones’ remains (either through burial or interment of ashes) places significant demands on council’s financial and planning resources. That is particularly so given the cultural preference for burial over cremation by a growing sector of the population.

8. Activities within council’s 30 operational cemeteries and crematoria are regulated by the Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw 2014 (Bylaw) and Code of Practice (Code). The bylaw establishes the framework to make the Cemeteries and Crematoria Code of Practice 2014. The code seeks to protect, promote and maintain public health and safety, and minimise the potential for offensive behaviour in cemeteries and crematoria, covering:
   a. burial (interment)
   b. removing a body or remains (disinterment)
   c. built structures like vaults and mausoleums
d. grounds maintenance  
e. records.

9. Under the Auckland Unitary Plan, existing cemeteries across the Auckland region are covered by the Special Purpose – Cemetery zone. The objectives and policies identified for this zone seek to:
   
a. Ensure that cemeteries are appropriately located and managed to meet the needs of the community. This includes enabling the continued operation of existing cemeteries as well as encouraging new cemeteries to be located so that they accessible and appropriate to surrounding existing and future activities  
b. Ensure that cemeteries are managed to maintain or enhance the local environment and amenity values. The scale of accessory activities and buildings are limited to retain the spacious characteristics, and be proportionate to the scale and surrounding context, of the cemetery.

10. As Auckland’s population grows, Auckland Council’s cemeteries have all needed to be assessed for expansion to meet increasing demand. It is anticipated that as traditional independent (trustee and denominational) cemeteries reach their capacity there will be a greater reliance on council-owned cemeteries to provide burial services into the future. As the number of people living and working within Auckland continues to grow, and increased urbanisation, the council anticipates increased pressure on burial and cremation services offered from council-owned cemeteries.

11. Management of burial and cremation, meeting social, cultural and religious needs and investigating alternatives is an important area for Auckland Council.

Section 6: Proposed overarching duties regarding the disposal of bodies

Section 6.1: Treating remains with respect

Question 1: Do you agree that there should be a general duty on everybody to ‘treat any dead human body or human remains with respect’? If not, why not?

Question 2: Do you agree that any breach of this duty should be an offence punishable by infringement notice, or, on conviction, by a fine? If not, why not?

12. Auckland Council agrees that there should be a general duty on everybody to ‘treat any dead human body or human remains with respect’ and that any breach of this duty should be an offence punishable by infringement notice or by a fine in the case of a conviction. However, the council recommends that clear guidance is made available on what this means for those working in the funeral services sector.

Section 6.2: Disposing of a body within a reasonable time

Question 3: Do you agree that there should be a requirement that the person who has the duty to dispose of the body must do so without undue delay, including considering the mourning needs of the bereaved, any ceremonies to be performed, tikanga or other cultural practices, and any other relevant considerations (such as police investigations)? If not, why not?
Question 4: Do you agree that any breach of this duty should be an offence punishable by infringement notice, or, on conviction, by a fine? If not, why not?

13. Auckland Council agrees that there should be a requirement for the person who has the duty to dispose of the body to do so without undue delay, taking into account any relevant considerations, and that any breach of this duty should be an offence punishable by infringement notice or by a fine in the case of a conviction.

Section A: Death certification and auditing

Section A2: Issues with the current system of death certification and auditing

Question 5: What do you think are the key problems with the current system for certifying the cause of death and existing auditing systems?

Question 6: Can you provide any evidence about the size or extent of the problems with the current cause of death certification and auditing systems?

14. Auckland Council has no comments to add regarding the key problems with the current system for certifying the cause of death and existing auditing systems, or the size or extent of such problems.

Section A3: Modernising the death certification system

Question 7: What do you think about the options identified for modernising the death certification system? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options.

Question 8: Do you agree with the presented impacts of the options identified for modernising the death certification system? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the three options?

Question 9: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impacts, costs or benefits that could affect you?

Question 10: What is your preferred option to modernise the death certification system? Please provide the reasons for your view.

15. Auckland Council generally supports the proposed changes, but the council is concerned that preferred Option 2 does not include mandatory requirements to identify the deceased. This is important because cemeteries and crematoria rely on the information presented as being correct and derived from a robust system that correctly identifies the deceased. It is important for our council staff and our communities to have assurance that the death certification system is accurate and detailed. As such, the council prefers Option 3.
Sections A4-A6: Auditing death certification

Question 11: What do you think about the options identified regarding the auditing of death certification? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options.

Question 12: Do you agree with the impacts of the options regarding the auditing of death certification? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the three options?

Question 13: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impacts, costs or benefits that would affect you?

Question 14: What is your preferred option for auditing death documentation? Please provide the reasons for your view.

16. Auckland Council generally supports any changes that will establish an auditing mechanism to ensure that the death certification system is accurate.

Section B: Regulation of the funeral services sector

Section B2: Issues with the current system

Question 15: Do you agree that there are issues that could be improved with the funeral services sector? Are you aware of any other problems?

Question 16: Can you provide any evidence about the size or extent of the problems in the funeral service sector?

17. Auckland Council generally agrees with the issues identified regarding the funeral services sector and does not have any evidence about the size or extent of such problems.

18. One aspect the council believes could be improved on is ensuring people are aware of all the available body disposal options available and the environmental and public health impacts of each disposal option, particularly if new methods are being introduced as allowed for under Section E. Currently not all funeral service providers disclose such information to their customers.

Section B3: Regulating the funeral services sector

Question 17: What do you think about the options identified for regulating the funeral services sector? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options.

Question 18: Do you agree with the impacts of the options identified for regulating the funeral services sector? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the four options?

Question 19: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost or benefit that would affect you?
Question 20: What is your preferred option for regulating (or not) the funeral services sector? Please provide the reasons for your view.

19. Auckland Council does not support Option 1, which is the preferred option identified by the Ministry. The council has concerns about the lack of regulation in this sector and supports further policy development in this area. The council prefers Option 4 as it includes registration criteria and requirements, training requirements and will result in a higher standard of practice for those delivering funeral services. This option will ensure that this sector is well-regulated and managed.

20. In the case that council’s preferred Option 4 is not incorporated into the proposed legislation, the council requests that further guidance is provided for those in the funeral services sector and around the operation of funeral service businesses. The council supports the establishment of minimum standards for those working in the funeral services sector and the development of a mandatory code of conduct and complaints mechanism.

Section B4: Informing consumers about the costs of funeral services

Question 21: What do you think about the options identified for better informing consumers about the cost of funeral services? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options.

Question 22: Do you agree with the presented impacts of the options regarding better informing consumers about the cost of funeral services? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the three options?

Question 23: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost or benefit that would affect you?

Question 24: What is your preferred option for ensuring that consumers are fully informed of the component prices of funeral services? Please provide the reasons for your view.

21. Auckland Council does not support Option 1 as it is currently presented, which is the preferred option identified by the Ministry. The council has concerns about the lack of transparency around pricing and cost as this hinders the ability for families to make informed decisions and may result in bill shock. Due to market influences and business practices, the council acknowledges that pricing and costs may not be best addressed through legislation or regulation. If it is proposed to maintain the status quo, the council supports further policy development in this area and recommends that alternative measures could be adopted to address this identified issue. The council suggests that perhaps a best practice guide could be developed to support pricing and cost transparency within the funeral services sector.

22. The council would also like to note that all the options presented in the consultation document focus on monetary costs only and does not address the environmental and public health costs of the various body restoration, preservation and disposal methods. The council, as both a funeral services provider and a local authority, supports sustainable and environmental practices, and recommends that further investigation be carried out on these impacts. The council considers that this legislation review provides an opportunity for further
policy development in this area and that suitable policy guidance be included either within the updated legislation or via alternative measures in the form of best practice protocols.

**Section C: Burial and cemetery management**

**Section C2: Issues with the current system**

Question 25: Do you agree that there are issues that could be improved with the current framework for burials and cemetery management? Why/why not? Are you aware of any other problems?

Question 26: Can you provide any evidence about the size or extent of such problems outlined about the current framework for burials and cemetery management?

23. Auckland Council agrees that there are issues with the current burials and cemetery framework which could be improved by reform and modernisation of the management framework.

24. The council is sometimes approached to provide direction, advice or funding for non-local authority cemeteries within our districts. The process around managing non-local authority cemeteries and our obligation to them is often unclear as this sits with the Ministry of Health. The council has, however, been able to access advice, support and direction through the Auckland Regional Public Health Service and the Ministry of Health.

25. The council is also aware of issues with the quality of monument installation with unsecured adornments causing ground maintenance problems and improperly installed monuments leading to public safety risks.

**Section C3: A new burial and cemetery management framework**

Question 27: What do you think about the options identified regarding a new framework for burial and cemetery management? Do you want to suggest any additional options?

Question 28: Do you agree with the impacts of the options identified regarding a new framework for burial and cemetery management? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the three options?

Question 29: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost or benefit that would affect you?

Question 30: What is your preferred option for a new framework for burial and cemetery management? Please provide the reasons for your view.

26. The council’s feedback on specific elements of the proposed options are outlined below.
Proposed types of burial land and their management

Independent Cemeteries

27. Auckland Council does not support opening the provision of cemeteries to independent providers. The council is concerned that with the obligation to take on failing cemeteries, this could create perverse incentives for independent providers to step away from a cemetery at the end of its saleable life and transfer the long-term maintenance to local authorities with little or no perpetual maintenance funds to support this.

28. Auckland Council notes that all cemeteries need to make a surplus during their operational life, in order to fund their maintenance in perpetuity once the cemetery is closed and no longer generates revenue. If a dividend was returned to shareholders, then shortfalls in budget for future maintenance could occur, or prices for cemetery services could become unsustainable.

29. The council therefore supports the proposal within preferred Option 3 to not include provisions for independent cemeteries in the legislation.

Community Cemeteries

30. Auckland Council supports the provisions for new community cemeteries and bringing existing trustee cemeteries into this framework, as outlined in preferred Option 3. The council is aware of groups within our communities which would be interested in exploring this as an option.

31. The council however seeks clarity around the appointment of cemetery managers and the role of local government with regards to community cemeteries. The council also recommends increased management obligations on all cemetery types, as outlined in points 33 - 37 below.

Local authority cemeteries

32. Auckland Council supports a requirement for local authorities to consider applications for the provision of separate burial areas to meet specific religious or cultural requirements. Auckland Council cemeteries currently cater for a number of different groups with common burial needs such as members of the Hebrew and Muslim communities, services persons, as well as providing an urupa and natural burial area at Waikumete Cemetery. The council recommends that local authorities should be required to develop a policy and have standard criteria to assess these requests to provide for transparent decision making. The legislation should allow for flexibility in the way that such areas are developed, funded and managed and should not disadvantage communities with limited access to financial resources.

Management Obligations

33. Auckland Council supports consistent management obligations across all types of cemetery, except for burial on private land.
34. The council supports mandatory development of cemetery policies to outline how cemeteries will be managed. Cemetery managers should have the duty to create and maintain a policy for their cemetery, created in consultation with their communities, that covers at a minimum:

   a. Maintenance standards (including monument management),
   b. The provision of separate burial areas within the cemetery,
   c. The opening hours of the cemetery and hours that burial services can be carried out,
   d. Whether some plots are sold for limited tenure,
   e. Monumental and memorial specifications where applicable,
   f. How burials will be carried out (interment),
   g. How disinterment will be carried out,
   h. How records will be kept.

35. The council considers cemeteries maintenance standards as a level of service issue that should be left to cemetery managers to agree with their communities. The legislation should address this at a very high level only, creating an obligation for cemetery managers to have documented maintenance standards, including maintaining the land in a reasonable condition, ensuring the land is not used for other purposes, and is managed in a way to allow for continued and safe public access to gravesites.

36. In addition, the council considers that cemetery managers should be required to keep records of maintenance activities, capital developments, renewals and complaints from families and the public.

37. The council advises that the legislation should not restrict the style of cemetery or burial ground and should allow for different standards to be applied in different areas of the same cemetery.

**Maintaining Monuments**

38. Auckland Council does not oppose proposed changes to monument management with cemetery managers having increased and clarified powers. However, the council has concerns that the duty being proposed may lead to power struggles between families and local authorities/cemetery managers and may create expectations for higher levels of service from local authorities and reduce families’ own initiative to maintain monuments.

39. Another consideration for council is the potential cost of maintenance for monuments and headstones. The cost of maintaining headstones can range from $450 per headstone to address those which are health and safety risks, to several thousand dollars per headstone where a full replacement is required.

40. In most cases, the council would feel comfortable only maintaining graves and monuments when they pose a health and safety risk. Exercise of this power would need to be discretionary and documented in guidance and in a cemetery policy/bylaw. The council recommends that the legislation defines what an “unsafe monument” is and requires cemetery providers to consider other means to address the safety risk that allows retention
of monuments with historic values (for example laying a headstone down rather than removing it altogether).

41. The council supports cemetery managers having the power to do work on a heritage gravesite where there are safety concerns. The council however considers that the exemption proposed under the HNZTA 2014 may not be the best solution. The definition provided in the consultation document for "archaeological sites" under this Act is incorrect and it is noted that local authorities also have scheduled cemeteries and activities relating to heritage features in cemeteries which are covered by district plans. The council has concerns that including an exemption may result in potential for misuse, and recommends that an alternative solution could be modifying Section 61 of this Act to add a clause to the effect of "also applies to other situations where public safety is at risk". This would provide the ability to respond to immediate safety precaution while providing HNZ to ability to decline an unnecessary application, which will ensure transparency and reduce inappropriate misuse of the exemption. Another alternative could be including a provision in the proposed legislation to ensure monuments are managed to a standard so that it does not get to the situation where they are unsafe.

Approval of new cemeteries

42. Auckland Council supports the proposed changes for approval for new cemeteries. The council considers that there should be consistent criteria for establishing a new cemetery, regardless of the provider. These criteria should be published or publicly accessible.

43. The council requests that guidance on creating criteria for the approval of new cemeteries is provided for those exercising powers under the revised legislation.

Unlawful burial

44. Auckland Council supports the removal of the distance exception from this section of the legislation and agrees this is an outdated measure.

45. The council considers that clear definitions in the legislation would be essential to define what is considered ‘impractical’.

46. The council supports the inclusion of the requirement to notify the local authority of a burial. The council recommends including provisions in the statute to ensure any burial outside of an approved cemetery, including burial on private land, is recorded accurately with the details outlined in point 54 being provided to the local authority.

Disinterment

47. Auckland Council sees disinterment as a public health issue and believes health concerns need to be considered when disintering remains, particularly where someone has died of a contagious illness or had a communicable disease at the time of death. The council considers that it is important to be aware of the reason the person died and to take any necessary precautions when handling deceased remains.

48. Auckland Council supports the Ministry of Health retaining a central role in the approval of a disinterment licence. In Auckland, the Ministry of Health has a robust process through the
Auckland Regional Public Health Services team. Their officers are well-informed, knowledgeable and responsive. The council is not resourced or trained to take on this responsibility.

49. Auckland Council performs, on average, 15 disinterments each year. Given the relative infrequency and given that an error on the part of cemetery staff may be involved in the requirement for a disinterment, the council does not feel it is appropriate for the cemetery manager to have the power to approve a disinterment licence. However, the cemetery manager should still be involved in the decision-making process.

50. Under the Option 3, the preferred option identified by the Ministry, it is not clear who would approve disinterment of multiple graves in a local authority cemetery. The council requests clarification on this.

51. The council considers that the ability to involve the courts in a disinterment request would provide a level of transparency and consistency for all parties.

52. The council consider guidance for those making decisions under the revised legislation essential.

Local Government’s role in relation to all cemeteries

53. Auckland Council agrees the duty to dispose of a body in the unlikely event that there is no executor, personal representative or family member to do so, and the duty to keep publicly accessible records of cemeteries and burials within the district, should remain with the local authority.

54. The council believes the following record-keeping obligations should apply to those collecting records under the proposed legislation, to be passed on to the local authority:

   a. Full name of the deceased
   b. Any previous names
   c. Ethnicity
   d. Date of birth
   e. Date of death
   f. Date of burial or cremation
   g. Depth of grave
   h. Cause of death
   i. Contact person for administrative matters
   j. Next of kin information
   k. GIS reference of grave location
   l. Link to details of other interments within the same plot
   m. Details of memorial or other permanent items placed at the grave site
   n. Any complaints or correspondence with the family relating to the plot
o. Any damage or vandalism of the plot

55. The council considers that the impact assessment for preferred Option 3 does not assess all the additional roles given to local authorities despite the significant difference in the content when compared to Option 2. The council requests that further assessment be carried out to understand how the impacts of the additional roles proposed in Option 3 will be different to Option 2.

Obligation to assume responsibility for failing non-local authority cemeteries, or where a designated cemetery manager renounces their role

56. Auckland Council is aware of 13 larger-scale private and trustee cemeteries/burial grounds in the Auckland and acknowledges that there are also a number of other smaller privately-owned burial grounds scattered across the region.

57. The council does not support this obligation as the council considers it has potential to place a high cost burden on local authorities and ratepayers, particularly as it is unclear what the definition or criteria for “failing” covers. The council also notes that forward bookings and revenue gain are also areas of concern for taking on “failing” private cemeteries. In the case that this obligation is incorporated in the proposed legislation, the council recommends bonding provisions are included in the legislation to ensure cemeteries are not automatically handed over to the local authority once the cemetery is closed, at the end of its operation life or no longer generates favourable revenue.

58. The council requests the inclusion of strengthened management obligations to ensure records of burials, maintenance, asset ownership and renewals, capital activities, and finances are kept.

Duty of inspection and oversight, limited to an obligation to enter and inspect cemeteries to determine whether the requirements of the statute are being met, in response to information or complaints received.

59. Auckland Council generally supports the proposal; however, it is noted that this obligation has potential to have a cost burden and could be administratively challenging for local authorities to monitor and enforce compliance.

60. As such, the council supports the Law Commission’s recommendation of providing a power to inspect and enter but does not support this being an obligation. The council would support exercise of this power being discretionary with documented criteria or guidance on when this would occur.

Power to approve burial on private land.

61. Auckland Council does not support burial on private land in the Auckland region. The council does note, however, that this may be appropriate in other regions of New Zealand.

62. The council considers that allowing burial on private land would present multiple issues and would effectively lock up land in perpetuity within a region that is experiencing intensification and growth and is becoming increasingly ethnically and religiously diverse. The council does not support the proposal that local authorities must approve burials on private land if the
criteria outlined are met as the criteria do not cover all the potential effects. Some of these effects are discussed below:

a. Maintaining access to burial plots in perpetuity, even if ownership or use of the land changes, poses significant complications with future development.

b. Burial on private land may also inhibit development on adjoining properties in the future, even though there may not be an adverse impact on neighbouring landowners at time of approval.

c. All burials on private land must be accurately recorded on survey plans, Land Information Memoranda, district plans and other similar documents. The council is highly concerned that the records kept for burial on private land, including the name of the deceased, the date of the death, the date of interment and the exact location of the burial, will not be up-to-date and accurate.

d. It is not clear what the obligations will be for future landowners, particularly those who do not have any connection with the deceased that have been buried on the land.

e. Private burials may occur within or in proximity to unidentified archaeological sites, sensitive environments, heritage areas, and areas of interest to mana whenua.

f. The methods and depths of burial may vary, particularly if new alternative methods are being provided for within the proposed legislation. Depending on the method and the way the body has been treated, by-products from burials may result in contamination on site.

g. Burials are time-sensitive, particularly for some cultures. The requirement to get approval for burial on private land and obtaining resource consent to do so adds complications and stress for families. Given the current workloads, approvals and consents are also unlikely to be issued by local authorities within the timeframes required by their respective communities.

h. Burials may occur in areas that are not currently subject to natural hazards but may be in the future given the rate of climate change.

63. The council is concerned that there is a lack of impact assessment provided for the preferred Option 3, including risk and future costs or complications when remains are not documented clearly due to private burials.

64. The council is also concerned that given the new roles proposed to be given to local authorities, there is the risk that local authorities may end up being responsible for burials on private land as they are considered to be non-local authority cemeteries.

65. In the case that more relaxed burial on private land provisions are incorporated within the proposed legislation, the council requests further assessment of how to address the issues raised above, and guidance be developed for those making decisions on this matter.

Duty to provide facilities for the disposal of bodies, rather than cemeteries specifically

66. Auckland Council supports this proposal as it will provide flexibility to respond to changing needs within our communities. It also allows council to innovate and look beyond cemetery provision as the default method of catering for the deceased.
Considering applications from local authority cemetery managers to use cemetery land for alternative purposes

67. Under Option 3, the preferred option identified by the Ministry, the council’s understanding is that the role of considering applications from local authority cemetery managers to use cemetery land for alternative uses would lie with the local authority. The council does not feel that it is appropriate for council to have this role and recommends that an external authority considers such applications.

Section D: Cremation regulations and the medical referee system

Section D1: Cremation in New Zealand

Question 31: Do you agree that there are issues that could be improved with the current cremation or medical referee systems? Are you aware of any other problems?

Question 32: Can you provide any evidence about the size or extent of such problems outlined with the cremation or the medical referee systems?

68. Auckland Council generally agrees with the issues identified regarding the current cremation and medical referee system and does not have any evidence about the size or extent of such problems.

69. The council does note that the lack of information or register of where ashes are scattered is an issue for local authorities. While council keeps a record of ash scattering within their own cemeteries, there is no obligation for the public or the private funeral services sector to do so. This can therefore lead to unintentional consequences. For example, council may erect a toilet block on a local park where someone has scattered ashes and cause offence to the deceased family members, even though council has no record or knowledge that ash had been scattered at this location.

Section D3: Reform of cremation and crematorium management

Question 33: What do you think about the options identified regarding the reform of cremation and crematorium management? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options?

Question 34: Do you agree with the impacts of the options identified regarding the reform of cremation and crematorium management? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the two options?

Question 35: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost or benefit that would affect you?

Question 36: What is your preferred option to modernise the regulations for cremation in New Zealand? Please provide the reasons for your view.
70. Auckland Council supports the general direction of Option 2, the preferred option identified by the Ministry, but does not support it in its entirety. The council also has identified a range of matters that would require further clarification before council’s position on such proposals can be determined.

71. The council supports the following components of Option 2:
   - The additional clarification of responsibilities for crematoria operators regarding the storage of ashes following cremation.
   - The suggested criteria that must be met before unclaimed ashes are scattered or interred.
   - The additional clarification on who has right of custody of ashes after the body has been cremated.
   - The reduction in duplication with establishment and management of crematoria under different legislation.

72. The council does not support the proposal that scattering of ashes on land be managed by the RMA as suggested in Option 2. The council considers that would create a time-burden for cemetery staff and cause additional stress and complications for family members during a difficult period. The council does not consider the extent of environmental effects of individual scattering of ashes to be significant enough to be managed under the RMA, and notes that because the scattering of ashes is often time-sensitive, there is the question as to how practical it would be for consents, if required, to be issued within these timeframes. This may then lead to issues with compliance, monitoring and non-compliant scattering, particularly as ash scattering is not easily traceable. The council has concerns that the impact analysis of Option 2 makes no mention of the scattering of ashes on land, which makes it difficult to understand Ministry’s justification for such a proposal.

73. The council also has the following comments, recommendations and queries regarding Option 2:
   - While the council supports clarifying the criteria around holding and disposing unclaimed ashes, the council would prefer to be able to hold ashes indefinitely and store them in a vault where they are easy to retrieve should someone come looking for them. The council considers the proposed criteria for crematoria/funeral service businesses to be able to inter or scatter ashes to be light, particularly with regards to the five-year period and the only communication requirement for notice sent to last known address.
   - Further clarity is required on whether the right of custody of ashes after a body has been cremated can be delegated to an agent acting on the person’s behalf, for example a funeral director.
   - Further information is required regarding the relationship between the assessment criteria to allow the cremation of a body other than in a crematorium and RMA requirements. If this is in addition to RMA requirements, then the council questions whether there is potentially duplication in assessment. The council also has concerns about timeframes and practicality of obtaining consents for such cremations given the time sensitive nature of the activity.
• The council recommends that a definition of “appropriate location” for scattering of ashes is provided.
• The council recommends that there should be a national register for cremations. Cremation may not occur immediately after a person is deceased and a record of the date of each cremation should be kept. The register should also include the locations and identities of the person who ashes were scattered.
• The council recommends that there should be a general obligation for the public, cremator or funeral service businesses to update the national register.

74. Although not included in Option 2 currently, the council notes that it supports stronger regulatory controls over crematoria, including licensing of crematoria operators, and a mandatory code of practice to provide minimum levels of service provision and safety. The council also supports the development of national standards or other guidance for crematoria operators.

75. The council agrees that Option 1 is not appropriate in this instance and would support a modified version of Option 2 which addresses the above comments, feedback and recommendations.

Section D4: Reform of the medical referee system

Question 37: What do you think about the options identified regarding the reform of the medical referee system? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options.

Question 38: Do you agree with the impacts of the options regarding medical referee system? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the four options?

Question 39: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost or benefit that would affect you?

Question 40: What is your preferred option for changes to the medical referee system? Please provide the reasons for your view.

76. Auckland Council generally supports any changes that will improve efficiency and remove duplicated procedures. However, with the recommended appeal of the medical referee system, the council request clarity on what forms and information will be required prior to a cremation taking place under the new legislation.

Section E: New methods of body disposal

Section E1: New methods of body disposal

Question 41: Are you aware of any particular new methods of body disposal that could be made available in New Zealand? Please describe the process and the risks and benefits you see with the process.

Section E2: Issues with the current system
Question 42: Do you agree with the issues outlined regarding new methods of body disposal? Are you aware of any other problems?

Question 43: Can you provide any evidence about the size or extent of the problems regarding new methods of body disposal?

Section E3: Regulating new methods of body disposal

Question 44: What do you think about the options identified for regulating new methods of body disposal? Do you want to suggest any additional options?

Question 45: Do you agree with the impacts of the options identified for regulating new methods of body disposal? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the two options?

Question 46: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost, or benefit that would affect you?

Question 47: What is your preferred option to regulate new methods of body disposal? Please provide the reasons for your view.

77. Auckland Council agrees with the issues identified regarding new methods of body disposal and does not have any evidence about the size or extent of such problems.

78. The introduction of new methods to New Zealand will allow our country to respond to changing trends on body disposal and respond to our communities wants and needs. It will enable us to innovate to reduce the impact of burial and body disposal on the environment and reduce the amount of land required.

79. The council supports the proposal to allow for new methods of body disposal to be regulated by local authorities. The council are aware of new methods for body disposal elsewhere in the world, such as alkaline hydrolysis and composting, and anticipate further innovation in this space. However, the council seeks clarification on whose role it will be to approve new methods of body disposal. The council recommends that this responsibility may be best lie with the Ministry of Health as it is a region-wide health issue and local authorities would like to have information and guidance from the Ministry before making decisions on regulating new methods.

80. The council recommends that guidance for those exercising power under the proposed legislation could include:
   a. Assessment of effects of the method on the natural, social and cultural environment,
   b. Impact on neighbouring people, residents, businesses or activities in the area,
   c. Assessment of the safety of the method,
   d. Assessment of how bodies will be handled and stored and how the identity of each body will be traced and maintained while in the facility,
   e. Effectiveness of the method to dispose of the body in a dignified manner,
   f. Ensuring the duties of treating bodies with respect and that bodies are disposed of without undue delay are met,
g. How complaints and disputes should be managed.

81. Auckland Council supports innovation in this space and is actively investigating alternative methods to burial and cremation.

Feedback on other issues not covered in the review document

Burials in archaeological contexts

82. Auckland Council considers the legislation should include provisions covering the reburial of human remains/koiwi found in an archaeological context.

83. Koiwi/remains can be found by members of the public or by archaeologists as a result of coastal erosion, earthworks for development, during archaeological excavations, or by members of the public coming across burial repositories in rock crevices or similar places. For example, in 2008-2009, the remains of 88 individuals were found during the Northern Runway Development at Auckland Airport.

84. Discarded fragmentary remains may also be present in an occupation site. Burials may be found outside of formal cemeteries (for example in remote areas of settlement or in shipwrecks or where washed ashore from shipwrecks, as burials at sea) or as unrecorded graves in early cemeteries. It is common practice for koiwi from archaeological sites to be reinterred without the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 being followed. Often the remains are reburied close to where they were found, and in some cases in a designated urupā.

85. Another potential issue is for crime scenes to be disturbed. It is undesirable to impose unnecessary legal constraints and associated delays and costs on the process of reburial of koiwi. However, when human remains are buried outside a formal urupā or cemetery, it is important that as a minimum, the location is recorded and information concerning the location/existence of the koiwi can be accessed by individuals with a legitimate interest (such as the landowner).

Limited or renewable tenure on burial plots, ash chambers and cremation memorials

86. Consideration should be given to providing for limited or renewable tenure of burial plots and cremation memorials in the proposed legislation. Limited tenure plots are provided for in many other countries including some states in Australia. A move towards limited or renewable tenure would allow local authorities to manage the issue of limited space in existing cemeteries and the increasing cost of acquiring and developing new land for cemeteries. Over the medium to long term it could reduce the need to acquire new land for cemetery purposes. Ongoing licence fees from limited and renewable tenure provide an income stream to support the ongoing maintenance of gardens and grounds.

87. Auckland Council would support any recommendations to implement limited or renewable tenure given:

a. Limited tenure is not mandatory; the option for burial in perpetuity should remain.

b. At the end of the tenure period families should have the option to renew the tenure if desired.

c. Limited or renewable tenure should not be implemented retrospectively.
d. That the practice is regulated to ensure that human remains are treated with dignity and respect.

Scattering of ashes into water and marine areas

88. There are several competing interests affected by the scattering of ashes, including family wishes to scatter in a significant place, tikanga Māori and the impact of ashes on soil and plants. Auckland Council agrees with the Law Commission’s finding that the scattering of ashes should not be restricted under legislation. Instead individual local authorities should prepare guidance for appropriate locations after consultation with mana whenua.

89. Auckland Council considers there should be reference to how the scattering of ashes into water or marine areas will be managed by local government as per the recommendation above.

90. Auckland Council believes the matter of ash scattering and artefact placement on or near watercourses and marine areas is more appropriately addressed through continued discussions between council, mana whenua and other cultures.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi

91. The Burials and Cremation Act 1964 does not include mention of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the obligations the Act has towards Māori. Māori have a special relationship with the Crown different to that of all other cultures in Aotearoa which is not reflected in the wording of the 1964 Act given its proximity to the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975. Resulting Acts like the RMA 1991 contain several provisions that are specific to Māori and Te Tiriti. Other environmental legislation, such as the Conservation Act 1987, give greater weight to the principles of Te Tiriti. More recently developed legislation is also more explicit about what the Crown’s responsibility to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti.

92. Auckland Council supports the acknowledgement of Te Tiriti and Māori in the legislation including references to the Treaty principles.

Environmental and public health costs of body disposal methods

93. As touched upon previously within this submission document, Auckland Council considers that little consideration has been given to the environmental and public health costs of body disposal methods. The council recommends that further policy development should be undertaken in this area and that the proposed legislation should include provisions to encourage or promote more sustainable methods and practices.

94. Traditional burial methods have high environmental impacts. Burying the body at a depth of six feet prevents aerobic decomposition, and as a result, there is a build-up and gradual release of comparatively large amounts of methane when compared with natural burial methods. Materials used for the graves and in the coffin, as well as the embalming fluids used in body restoration and preservation and littering as a result of plastic grave adornments also lead to undesirable environmental outcomes.

95. Cremation also has its environmental costs. Bodies are routinely embalmed prior to the cremation process. Embalming products are categorised as hazardous and are regulated
under the hazardous substances legislation (HSNO). New Zealand’s Environmental Protection Authority categorises embalming products such as glutaraldehyde and formaldehyde as highly toxic and carcinogenic. The burning of coffins and caskets used in cremations also results in emission of highly toxic chemicals. In addition, the cremation process itself requires high heat and a lot of energy, which results in additional emissions.

96. The council considers that not enough information or prominence is given to alternative body disposal practices or methods. For example, embalming is often presented as the default option for body restoration and preservation, predominantly because people are unaware that it is not necessary to embalm and are not provided with the alternative option of chilling the body. Natural burial or alkaline hydrolysis are more sustainable body disposal methods that have less of an environmental impact in comparison.
Appendix 1.  Local Board Feedback

The New Zealand Law Commission is currently undertaking review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 to determine whether the legislation is in its current form meets public expectations. This short note firstly provides some context before offering some quick points relevant to the Aotea community.

Background:
Aotea is an island community with an average population of 1000 in a context where 60% of the land is administered by Te Papa Atawhai. The remoteness of Aotea has historically resulted in residents undertaking the action of burial on or near traditional homesteads and some families gifting land for burials adjacent to existing burial sites. The number of burials each year is relatively low with three last year. In view of this unique character of Aotea we have the following comments on the Burial and Cremation Act review.

Legislative provision:
1. To support eco burials.
2. To enable burials on private land as long as necessary consents have been obtained.
3. To support opportunities to establish crematoriums – as there are no crematoriums on Aotea.
4. To support the re-interment by iwi of their koiwi when required
5. That recognizes a tikanga process in the event a burial dispute arises where two or more iwi are involved deferring to the Maori Land Court if required.
6. To reflect a consent application process to scatter ashes – this is important due to the pristine nature of the Aotea environment
7. That recognizes the importance of tikanga Maori processes
Puketāpapa Local Board Feedback on Scattering Ashes on Waterways

20 February 2020

To be considered by Auckland Council in its response the Ministry of Health’s review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and related legislation

Introduction

As a local board we value guidance from tangata whenua; the diverse needs of our community; and the importance of protecting and enhancing the natural environment. We also appreciate the sensitivities around the death, and disposal of the body, of a loved one.

Locally, we have seen conflicting views and desires between those who wish to scatter human ashes in waterways, tangata whenua who see this as inappropriate, as well as other stakeholders who have concerns of how this practice impacts the environment and recreation at these locations.

As a local board we would like central government to provide clearer guidance on the development of local authorities’ guidelines on the place-based appropriateness of scattering ashes in waterways. This central government guidance should also discuss the role of tangata whenua in the development of any local guidelines as consultation with iwi groups on this topic is very important.

We believe this matter should be prioritised due to its relevance to all of Aotearoa.

Discussion: Auckland Council Guidance in relation to the scattering of ashes at Waiokōwhai Bay

Auckland Council’s guidelines were highlighted as a good example by the Law Commission in 2015. This is noted in NZLC R134—Death, Burial And Cremation: a new law for contemporary New Zealand:

"Local authorities should develop guidelines for the scattering of ashes in their region. Local iwi groups must be consulted in this process. Auckland Council’s recent guidelines provide a good example."

Although we agree that local authorities should develop guidelines and consult with local iwi groups, we believe Auckland Council’s current guidance on the scattering of ashes within waterways needs to be clarified. While this is an issue for Auckland Council to resolve, we believe it is of value for the Ministry to be aware of some of the operational pitfalls in the guidelines and related policies.

The ambiguity within the Auckland Council guidelines is highlighted locally along the Waiokōwhai Coast of the Manukau Harbour where some members of the Hindu community use the Waiokōwhai Bay to scatter ashes or place artifacts on or near the water. This practice has caused tension between those who undertake this practice and others who use the bay.
The following discussion focuses on how Auckland Council’s Cemeteries and Crematoria Code of Practice 2014 and Auckland Council’s “Scattering of Ashes” webpage relate to the tension at Waitakorokai Bay.

We do note that a possible future treaty settlement over the Manukau Harbour may provide further clarity or direction on this local issue, however, we hope the following discussion helps contextualise our view that the current guidelines do not provide enough clarity on the scattering of ashes in waterways and that further guidance from central government is needed.

**Auckland Council’s Cemeteries and Crematoria Code of Practice 2014**

An explanatory note on cremations within Auckland Council’s Cemeteries and Crematoria Code of Practice 2014 notes that:

*“Consideration must be given to the dispersal of human ashes into waterways as it is considered to be culturally inappropriate unless it is in an area specifically agreed to by tangata whenua, like Waitakorokai for example.”*

This explanatory note does not detail who from tangata whenua agreed to the dispersal of human ashes at Waitakorokai. It also does not clarify the area that should be considered as ‘Waitakorokai’. It is not clear whether ‘Waitakorokai’ refers to the Waitakorokai Coast, Waitakorokai Bay, Waitakorokai as a suburb or another place.

We believe that this ambiguity within the Code of Practice should be addressed. We acknowledge and support the endorsement by the Regulatory Committee of Auckland Council on 11 April 2019 (resolution number REG/2019/20) to update the Code of Practices.

**Auckland Council’s “Scattering of Ashes” webpage**

The Auckland Council “Scattering of Ashes” webpage has a section on waterways and oceans which notes:

*“Dispersion of ashes in waterways is culturally inappropriate for Māori, whereas this is a special part of the cultural beliefs of others. Speak to tangata whenua (the people of the land) before scattering ashes in the ocean or flowing water. Contact us for a list of people that can provide guidance on seeking approval or discuss with your funeral service provider, who will also be familiar with these groups.”*

When people contact Auckland Council “for a list of people that can provide guidance on seeking approval” for scattering ashes on waterways and oceans they are directed by a customer services representative to Te Punī Kōkiri – Ministry of Māori Development ‘for all culturally sensitive enquiries’.

The current process of referring people to a central government agency does not provide Auckland Council any oversight or understanding of subsequent conversations or agreements reached between the inquirer, the central government agency, and tangata...
whenua. This lack of information can cause issues when Auckland Council is then asked to comment on subsequent conflicting interests at council owned locations (such as Waiköwhai Bay).

Additionally, it is not clear in this process whether approval of one instance of scattering ashes from tangata whenua opens a location up for further occasions of this practice. If Council’s response to queries on scattering ashes is to direct people back to a central government agency, then local authorities should be better informed of how the Ministry deals with these queries and any outcomes reached.

We believe that the process of requesting approval from tangata whenua needs to be improved and we acknowledge Auckland Council’s Governing Body did resolve on 28 March 2019 (resolution number GB/2019/22) to:

“request the Chief Executive to instruct the appropriate council department/s to develop and report on a process to progress the discussion between council, mana whenua and other cultures on the matter of ash scattering and artefact placement on or near watercourses and marine areas to the Environment and Community Committee by June 2019.”

Conclusion

Ultimately this issue is one that will be resolved through conversations and understanding between cultures. It is a matter that affects all of Aotearoa and collaboration is the only way forward.

We hope that the examples discussed above highlight a need for clearer guidance from central government on the development of local guidelines for the scattering ashes in waterways. We also acknowledge that Auckland Council is aware that the current guidance on this issue needs to be improved (as highlighted by the Regulatory Committee and Governing Body resolutions from 2019).

The Puketapapa Local Board requests further clarity from central government on the process for those seeking to scatter ashes in waterways. We hope that central government, local authorities, tangata whenua and stakeholders are able to come to a shared understanding of what is appropriate when and where.
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Input


The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area plays host to several cemeteries and a crematorium, both publicly and privately managed. It is also home to a diverse and growing population including 47,000 residents of Pasifika heritage, 15,000 of Asian heritage and 13,000 of Māori heritage (2018 Census results) representing a variety of cultural and religious practices. The Board supports the need for updating death, burial, cremation and funeral legislation to reflect local New Zealand communities of today, particularly in relation to its aspirational outcomes “We are the heart of Māori and Pasifika” and “A place where everyone thrives and belongs”.

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board provides the following comments:

1. In our diverse communities of today, practices and legislation surrounding death, burial, cremation and funerals must allow people to express their grief in a culturally meaningful manner.

2. Timely delivery of death certification after the time of death is important in the grieving process of all families and is particularly crucial in tangihanga and Islamic funeral practices. The Board supports clarifying timeframes and expanding the pool of available certified practitioners to streamline the certification process.

3. For our community to be best served during times of mourning, the funeral industry needs to become more aware and reflective of cultural and religious practice and people groups. The Board requests investigation into the diversification of training in cultural and religious practices as well as initiatives to attract a more diverse industry workforce.

4. The Board notes the current provision of dedicated space and practices for certain religious and cultural groups in Auckland, including the Muslim sections.
at the Manukau Memorial Gardens, and offers this example as an effective model for meeting the needs of particular people groups.

5. The Board requests a review of signage and translation within cemeteries to make expectations of the public explicit and prevent maintenance and practice issues around gravesites before they happen.

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Ministry of Health's consultation document and requests to speak to its submission should an appropriate occasion arise.
15 Waiheke Local Board feedback on the Review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and Related Legislation

Resolution number WHK/2020/1

MOVED by Member P Walden, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) provide input into Auckland Council’s submission on the government’s ‘Death, Funerals, Burial and Cremation: a Review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and Related Legislation’.

   i. the opening of the provision of cemeteries to independent providers is not supported, such as those providing cemeteries for “eco” or “natural burials”, however requests provision of eco-burials within council’s facilities if supported by the local community.

   ii. supports it being lawful to bury someone on private land in the rural zone, providing the necessary consents have been obtained and it is accurately recorded on survey plans / Land Information Memoranda and other similar documents

   iii. local authorities should be required to provide separate burial areas within public cemeteries for groups with specific religious or cultural burial requirements.

   iv. maintenance standards for cemeteries are a level of service issue that should be left to local authorities to agree with their communities through long term and annual plan processes.

   v. support there being stronger legal provisions for the protection of historic cemeteries and grave sites.

   vi. supports management of community cemeteries being overseen by local authorities rather than by central government, including giving them the power to appoint trustees.

   vii. supports resource consents being required for all new crematoria and that they are publicly notified under the Resource Management Act.

CARRIED
Memorandum  7 August 2020

To: Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee

Subject: Safety Collective Tāmaki Makaurau (Safe Communities) : Strategic Plan and Implementation

From: Wayne Levick – Strategic Advisor (Arts, Community and Events)

Contact information: Wayne.Levick@AucklandCouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To provide an update on the strategic plan developed by the Safety Collective Tāmaki Makaurau, and outline its implementation.

Summary
2. The Safety Collective Tāmaki Makaurau is a network of agencies and community organisations, led by council, focussed on addressing the injury harm caused by alcohol, transport and falls. It brings an equity lens to its work, as this harm disproportionately affects communities that have significant lower socio-economic populations, and Māori and Pasifika.

3. The collective has agreed on an approach and strategy for the next two years. The work aligns with other strategies led or supported by council.

4. Information and other support provided to key local boards where harm is greatest have helped these boards achieve a greater focus on injury prevention planning in their draft 2020-2023 local board plans.

Context
5. In July 2019 Auckland achieved Safe Communities accreditation, following endorsement by council’s Environment and Community Committee in March 2019 (ENVI/2019/19).

6. Safe Communities is an international network and approach recognised by the World Health Organization as a means of delivering evidence-based injury prevention strategies at a local level. As part of this process, a network of key agencies and community organisations called the Safety Collective (the collective) was established.


8. The collective is chaired by Councillor Alf Filipaina. A Strategic Advisor (1.0 FTE) and a Data Analyst (0.5 FTE) are funded by ACC to support its work and are based in the Arts, Community and Events department.

9. Since achieving Safe Communities accreditation in July 2019, the collective has developed a strategic plan for the financial years 2020-2022, which outlines key themes. The plan and themes will be reviewed annually.
Discussion

Agreed strategy and approach

10. The collective has agreed that its strategy for the planning period July 2020 to June 2022 will focus on minimising the injury harm caused by alcohol, transport and falls across Tāmaki Makaurau, and addressing the significant inequities in outcomes experienced across key demographics (including Māori, Pasifika, gender and age). The strategic plan for 2020-2022 is attached (Attachment A).

11. As a network, the collective seeks to influence outcomes through aligning organisational activities, encouraging the use of data to inform decisions, building public awareness and supporting policy development through engagement and advocacy. It does not deliver frontline services.

12. A website for the Safety Collective launches in September 2020, outlining its strategy and relevant key injury data and prevention actions being proposed, to build awareness by public and key stakeholders as they become engaged in this work. Aligned with this, the collective will develop a social media presence making the network more open, transparent and accessible to collective members, the wider sector, and Auckland residents.

13. The collective will shortly launch New Zealand’s first practical guide for organisations looking to implement a life course approach to injury prevention planning. A life course approach can increase the effectiveness of activity designed to reduce or prevent harm by considering the range of factors that can influence the likelihood of harm, and then identifying opportunities to intervene before the harm occurs.

Alignment with strategic plans

14. The work of the Safety Collective aligns with the purpose of the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Act 2019, and the Auckland Plan 2050 - to deliver social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being. One example of this is that the Auckland Plan Outcome 1 ("Belonging and Participation") provides direction to improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities. Outcomes 2 ("Transport and Access") and 3 ("Advance Māori Wellbeing") are also highly relevant.

15. With its focus on addressing inequities the strategy aligns with council’s organisational strategy Kia Manawaroa Tātou, in particular goal four ("Focus on communities that need us most").

16. The strategy also aligns to council’s I am Auckland Children and Youth Strategic Action Plan and the Thriving Communities Action Plan. The former includes goals such as feeling safe, being healthy and thriving, getting around and getting connected; the latter has principles of social equity, relationships, and trust, and being solution focussed.

17. Practical examples of alignment between these and other strategies, and the work the collective has outlined in its strategic plan, include the following outputs:

- Minimising alcohol harm: contributing to the evaluation and review of council’s internal alcohol harm minimisation strategy, and the signage bylaw review (the bylaw could play a role in terms of minimising alcohol harm); supporting the work of the Community Action on Youth and Drugs (CAYAD) team who provide evidence based holistic programmes that address alcohol harm in schools

- Reducing transport injuries: supporting Auckland Transport’s Vision Zero strategy through actions such as encouraging safer speeds around schools; identifying and supporting investment into programmes that address driver licensing take up by Māori and Pasifika

- Falls prevention: promoting improved active transport and options for physical wellbeing to minimise the harm from falls and exploring barriers that older people face to attending community strength and balance classes; influencing approaches to design standards where this could impact on the rate of playground injuries.

Supporting the outcomes of local board plans 2020-2023
18. Local boards can positively influence injury outcomes for their residents through the planning and support of relevant initiatives. The collective collaborated with Auckland Regional Public Health Service to produce 21 local board wellbeing and injury prevention profiles in early 2020. These demonstrated outcomes across a range of wellbeing and injury indicators for each local board area in comparison to the whole of Tāmaki Makaurau. The profile for Tāmaki Makaurau as a whole is attached (Attachment B).

19. The data indicates that there is a correlation between increased risk of injury and local board areas that have higher percentages of lower socio-economic communities. This relates to a range of factors including environmental, social, economic and physical factors.

20. Workshops were held with Henderson-Massey, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, and Papakura in March and April 2020. Ōtara-Papatoetoe received information but was unable to prioritise a workshop due to heavy workload demands.

21. The purpose of the workshops was to explore the data and address potential strategies linked to the 2020-2023 local board plans. As a result, the quantity and/or quality of planning references to the three theme areas in the current draft plans has been positively influenced.

**Next steps**

22. Over coming months, the collective will support council staff to translate new local board three-year plans into tangible initiatives to reduce the impact of injury harm as work programmes are developed.

23. Staff will be available to report back to the PACE committee in FY 2021/2022.

**Attachments**

Attachment A - Safety Collective Tāmaki Makaurau: Strategic Plan
Attachment B - Wellbeing and Injury Prevention Profile – Tāmaki Makaurau
### Safety Collective Tāmaki Makaurau: Strategic Plan 2020-2022: Reduce Alcohol Harm

#### GOAL
Reduce alcohol-related harm and specifically the inequities across Tāmaki Makaurau

#### CURRENT SITUATION
- Rates of, and inequalities in, alcohol consumption and harms among Tāmaki Makaurau are significant, costly and preventable.
- Evidence-based alcohol harm-reduction strategies are frequently missing from key reports and alcohol prevention strategies. National Drug Policy.
- Alcohol is more affordable than ever.
- Long waiting times and inadequate education of outlets.
- Unproven alcohol advertising and sponsorship.
- Communities have little success in opposing license applications.
- Auckland’s Local Alcohol Policy fails to state courts, after almost 5 years.
- Funding for ITB enforcement is low.

#### KEY PARTICIPANTS
- ACC
- Age Concern
- Active
- Alcohol Healthwatch (Planning level)
- Auckland Council
- Auckland Emergency Management
- Auckland Regional Public Health Service
- Auckland Transport
- Community Action on Youth and Drugs
- District Health Boards (Alcohol Prevention and Suicide Prevention)
- Dropping Prevention Auckland
- The Fono
- HelpTāHea
- Health Promotion Agency
- Kāinga Ora
- Ministry of Health
- Office of Ethnic Communities
- Oranga Tamariki
- Post-Steering Injury Prevention Auckland
- Police
- Safefish Assistance
- Salar North
- Safefest
- Worksafe

#### ACTIVITIES
- Develop vision and strategy to influence and guide harm reduction and prevention approaches.
- Support aligned activities across the Collective and stakeholders including Council, Government, NGOs, and Community.
- Establish shared measurement practices to improve collection, analysis, and distribution of key data.
- Build public awareness, understanding, and action.
- Advance policy support.

#### OUTPUTS
- Develop Health and Injury Prevention profiles, highlighting inequities, and advocate for key local boards to strengthen 3 year plans. Workshop with 6 LIs: January-September, AC/AM.
- Report “Auckland Council’s Alcohol Strategy to Minimise Alcohol-Related Harm 2020” - support effective evaluation March-September, AC.
- Review own organisation’s alcohol policies & statements: Ongoing, ALL.

#### OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT TERM</th>
<th>MEDIUM TERM</th>
<th>LONG TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Mobilise collective to support Aucklanders to demand local and national political action on alcohol (and take local action where they can).</td>
<td>- Increase public support for, and adoption of, evidence-based alcohol policies, locally and nationally (specifically on pricing, availability and advertising/market ing).</td>
<td>- Reduce the inequalities in alcohol-related harm, especially between Māori and non-Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase evidence-based action on alcohol, together with improved data and transparency.</td>
<td>- Increase adoption of other evidence-based policies that will address the underlying determinants of alcohol use (poverty, racism and other discrimination, etc.).</td>
<td>- Increase the prevalence of Auckland drinkers complying with the low-risk drinking guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop closer understanding that policies will make some of the biggest differences to alcohol-related inequities from re-education and prevention.</td>
<td>- Reduce alcohol harms as a collective responsibility with better awareness.</td>
<td>- Reduce injuries from alcohol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reframe alcohol issues as a collective responsibility with better awareness.</td>
<td>- Support community led action to reduce harm – eg. align with HAP/CKAYAD work (Ongoing, ALL).</td>
<td>- Keep Auckland safe and thriving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strengthen local alcohol policy to address harm – eg. align with HAP/CKAYAD work (Ongoing, ALL).</td>
<td>- Public schools involvement in alcohol industry-funded education - promote Tūturu over Smashed project.</td>
<td>- Increase public support for, and adoption of, evidence-based alcohol policies, locally and nationally (specifically on pricing, availability and advertising/marking).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support community led action to reduce harm – eg. align with HAP/CKAYAD work (Ongoing, ALL).</td>
<td>- Mobilise collective to support Aucklanders to demand local and national political action on alcohol (and take local action where they can).</td>
<td>- Reduce the inequalities in alcohol-related harm, especially between Māori and non-Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase evidence-based action on alcohol, together with improved data and transparency.</td>
<td>- Develop closer understanding that policies will make some of the biggest differences to alcohol-related inequities from re-education and prevention.</td>
<td>- Reduce the inequalities in alcohol-related harm, especially between Māori and non-Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reframe alcohol issues as a collective responsibility with better awareness.</td>
<td>- Support community led action to reduce harm – eg. align with HAP/CKAYAD work (Ongoing, ALL).</td>
<td>- Keep Auckland safe and thriving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public schools involvement in alcohol industry-funded education - promote Tūturu over Smashed project.</td>
<td>- Increase public support for, and adoption of, evidence-based alcohol policies, locally and nationally (specifically on pricing, availability and advertising/marking).</td>
<td>- Reduce the inequalities in alcohol-related harm, especially between Māori and non-Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support community led action to reduce harm – eg. align with HAP/CKAYAD work (Ongoing, ALL).</td>
<td>- Mobilise collective to support Aucklanders to demand local and national political action on alcohol (and take local action where they can).</td>
<td>- Reduce the inequalities in alcohol-related harm, especially between Māori and non-Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase evidence-based action on alcohol, together with improved data and transparency.</td>
<td>- Develop closer understanding that policies will make some of the biggest differences to alcohol-related inequities from re-education and prevention.</td>
<td>- Reduce the inequalities in alcohol-related harm, especially between Māori and non-Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reframe alcohol issues as a collective responsibility with better awareness.</td>
<td>- Support community led action to reduce harm – eg. align with HAP/CKAYAD work (Ongoing, ALL).</td>
<td>- Keep Auckland safe and thriving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public schools involvement in alcohol industry-funded education - promote Tūturu over Smashed project.</td>
<td>- Increase public support for, and adoption of, evidence-based alcohol policies, locally and nationally (specifically on pricing, availability and advertising/marking).</td>
<td>- Reduce the inequalities in alcohol-related harm, especially between Māori and non-Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support community led action to reduce harm – eg. align with HAP/CKAYAD work (Ongoing, ALL).</td>
<td>- Mobilise collective to support Aucklanders to demand local and national political action on alcohol (and take local action where they can).</td>
<td>- Reduce the inequalities in alcohol-related harm, especially between Māori and non-Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase evidence-based action on alcohol, together with improved data and transparency.</td>
<td>- Develop closer understanding that policies will make some of the biggest differences to alcohol-related inequities from re-education and prevention.</td>
<td>- Reduce the inequalities in alcohol-related harm, especially between Māori and non-Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reframe alcohol issues as a collective responsibility with better awareness.</td>
<td>- Support community led action to reduce harm – eg. align with HAP/CKAYAD work (Ongoing, ALL).</td>
<td>- Keep Auckland safe and thriving.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL**

Improve transport safety and specifically the inequities across Tāmaki Makaurau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT SITUATION</th>
<th>KEY PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Ski members have enamoured at a faster rate than the national average, despite a recent downturn, and far more male growth in toddlers</td>
<td>- ACC</td>
<td>- Develop vision and strategy to influence and guide harm reduction approaches</td>
<td>- Vision</td>
<td>- Mobile collective to support all and Aucklanders backing safe speeds reduction programme and initiatives such as Te Ako Hīpāpata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Children in the most socio-economically deprived areas have a three times higher injury rate than children in the least deprived areas. Rates are also higher for Māori and Pacific children</td>
<td>- Age Concern</td>
<td>- Support aligned activities across the Collective and Stakeholders including Council, Government, NGOs, and Civil societies</td>
<td>- Alignment</td>
<td>- Help build community youth voice and knowledge to consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- AT has adopted “Vision Zero” and the Government has “Roads to Zero” (no harm acceptable, GPN reduction target Tāmaki Makaurau by 2037)</td>
<td>- Auckland Transport</td>
<td>- Establish shared measurement practices to improve collection, analysis and distribution of key data</td>
<td>- Measurement</td>
<td>- Develop a collector understanding of the Vision Zero approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National Road Safety Committee lacks Auckland, Māori, Urban voices</td>
<td>- ACC</td>
<td>- Build public awareness, understanding, and action</td>
<td>- Awareness</td>
<td>- Improve alignment of funding, based on risk and equity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHORT TERM**

- Mobile collective to support all and Aucklanders backing safe speeds reduction programme and initiatives such as Te Ako Hīpāpata
- Advocate for appropriate level of alcohol breath testing
- Driver licensing access issues for refugee communities

**MEDIUM TERM**

- Increase adoption of evidence-based transport safety policies, locally and nationally (specifically on speed reduction, active transport)
- Support collaborative response to suicide prevention on the transport network

**LONG TERM**

- Reduce deaths across the transport system
- Increase use of active modes of transport

**Attainments**

- Mobile collective to support all and Aucklanders backing safe speeds reduction programme and initiatives such as Te Ako Hīpāpata
- Help build community youth voice and knowledge to consultation
- Develop a collector understanding of the Vision Zero approach

**Keeping Auckland Safe and Thriving**
# Safety Collective Tāmaki Makaurau: Strategic Plan 2020-2022: Reduce Falls Harm

## GOAL
Reduce the risk of falling, rate of falls, and severity of harm from falls, and specifically the inequities, across Tāmaki Makaurau

### CURRENT SITUATION
- Falls are the leading cause of injury.
- High risk groups: individuals over 65, those living in their home for the first time, those over 400’s 50.
- People with poor bone health. High risk group is females 60.
- More adults using walkers - high severity injury: falls from staircases, e.g. stairlifts projects.
- Falls from playground equipment is the leading cause of fall-related injuries for children in the home and schools/parks.
- Isolation and loneliness is an increasing issue for many older people (risk factor for falls).
- Increasing proportion of population aged 65+ is both a challenge (falls increase) and an opportunity (welcomes to assist with programs).

### KEY PARTICIPANTS
- ACC (Planning Lead)
- Age Concern
- Active
- Alcohol Healthwatch
- Auckland Council
- Auckland Emergency Management
- Auckland Regional Public Health Service
- Auckland Transport
- Community Action on Youth and Drugs
- District Health Boards (falls prevention & suicide prevention)
- Growing Prevention Auckland
- The Force
- Help for Healers
- Health Promotion Agency
- Karanga Ora
- Ministry of Health
- Office of Ethnic Communities
- Oranga Tamariki
- Pacific Injury Prevention Auckland
- Police
- SafeKids Auckland
- Safer North
- Safer West
- Victoria
- Community strength and balance programs and lead agencies
- Fracture liaison service
- Community facilities

### ACTIVITIES
- Develop vision and strategy to influence and guide harm reduction approaches
- Support aligned activities across the Collective and Stakeholders including Council, Government, NGOs, and Community
- Establish shared measurement practices to improve collection, analysis, and distribution of key data
- Build public awareness, understanding, and action
- Advance policy support in key areas
- Mobilise funding and resources, particularly towards initiatives with a life course and equity focus

### OUTPUTS

#### Vision
- Develop Wellbeing & Injury Prevention profiles, highlighting successes, and advocate for key local boards to strengthen 3-year plan - workshops with 30s January-September, ACC/ALPHA
- Link with Council Advisory Panels (Seniors, Pacific Peoples, Ethnic Peoples), and outputs from Age-friendly Accreditation consultation (July December, ALL)

#### Alignment
- Inflamfree NZEA/TAIPA/UC/COAG/ set the parameters to support Falls Prevention and Suicide Prevention - ensures wider understanding and use of WHO's Injury Prevention Through Environmental Design principles (July-December, ALL)
- Align with campaigns & Age Concern Social Connection, and advocate for co-ordinated efforts to explore barriers to attending community strength and balance classes (Mens 50+, Counties Housing Trust) (July-December, ALL)

#### Measurement
- Obtain and analyse Falls & Fractures Dashboard data from the Live Stronger For Longer programme (July-September, ALL Data Analyst)
- Explore available data sets to analyse characteristics of local playground injuries (July-December, ALL, ACC Data Analyst)

#### Awareness
- Increase awareness of live stronger for longer (LSF) accredited programs that build in a progressive approach (Ongoing, ACC)
- Use LSF’s promotional material (refresh due mid 2020) (July-Sept, ALL)
- Support home strength and balance services targeting people 75 years and over who can’t attend group based, community programmes (Ongoing, ACC)

#### Policy
- Consider whether healthy homes or other resources can be applied to falls safety assessments and remodelling (2021-22)
- Engage retirement industry around supporting social value investments in communities (2021-22)

### SHORT TERM
- Increase in number of community strength and balance classes by targeted age/sex groups
- Reduce barriers such as transport options for community strength and balance programs
- Increase number of volunteer drivers for classes
- Enable online options for classes

### MEDIUM TERM
- Increase regular participation in community strength and balance classes by targeted age/sex groups
- Strength and balance classes more widely available and used at retirement villages and community facilities

### LONG TERM
- Reduce rate of hip fractures
- Reduce rate of other falls related injuries, for children (playground equipment) and older population
- Keep older people independent and well, doing the life they want to live
- Strength and balance exercises normalised as part of life for all adults
- Reduce isolation and loneliness, and improve social connections, amongst older population
## Safety Collective Tāmaki Makaurau:
### Strategic Plan 2020-2022: Improve Capacity and Capability

### GOAL
Improve capacity and capability of the Safety Collective, at a collective and organisational level

### CURRENT SITUATION
- Rates of and inequities in injury harm across Tāmaki Makaurau are significant, and preventable
- Life course approach is a recognised and effective methodology for addressing this harm
- Collective provides an opportunity to leverage support via activities/outputs among injury prevention organisations

### KEY PARTICIPANTS
- ACC
- Age Concern
- Action
- Alcohol Healthwatch
- Auckland Council (Planning)
- Auckland Council (Emergency Management)
- Auckland Regional Public Health Services
- Auckland Transport
- Community Action on Youth and Drugs
- District Health Boards (falls prevention and suicide prevention)
- Dropping Prevention Auckland
- The Fous
- Help to Hear
- Health Promotion Agency
- Kinaki Ora
- Ministry of Health
- Office of Ethnic Communities
- Otago Tāmaki
- PostSafe Injury Prevention Aukana
- Police
- SafeKids Antarctica
- SafeNorth
- SafeWest
- Worksafe

### ACTIVITIES
- Develop vision and strategy to influence and guide harm minimisation approaches
- Support aligned activities across the Collective and Stakeholders including Council, Government, NGOs, and Community
- Establish shared measurement practices to improve collection, analysis and distribution of key data
- Build public awareness, understanding, and action
- Advance policy support in key areas
- Mobile funding and resources, particularly towards initiatives with a life course and equity focus

### OUTPUTS
- Vision
  - Thematic workshops, and presentations to Collective Ongoing, All

### OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT TERM</th>
<th>MEDIUM TERM</th>
<th>LONG TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve coordination of activities and outputs</td>
<td>Improve programme effectiveness and impact</td>
<td>Reduce avoidable injuries and deaths across Tāmaki Makaurau, in particular addressing inequities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve data gathering processes so that inequities in harms can be identified (particularly for Māori, Pacific) efforts can be targeted, and progress monitored</td>
<td>Increase use of the course approaches, and focus on inequities, across the Collective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Improve capacity and capability across the Collective in terms of communications, policy, and funding networks | Increase funding into the injury prevention sector | }
## Safety Collective Tāmaki Makaurau: Summary Workplan 2020 - 2022

### Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 - 2021</th>
<th>2021 - 2022</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020 - 2021</strong></td>
<td><strong>2021 - 2022</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop vision and strategy to influence and guide harm minimisation approaches</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop practical reference guide to Life Course / Equity approach across council, agencies and NGOs (LEAD: AC/AM)</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>Thematic workshops, and presentations to Collective LEAD: ALL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support aligned activities across the Collective and stakeholders including Council, Government, NGOs, and Communities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop practical communications plan - wording key messages, audiences, influencers and meeting opportunities (share datasets) (LEAD: AL)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strengthen links with Council’s Policy &amp; Strategy teams, others LEAD: AC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establish shared measurement practices to improve collection, analysis and distribution of key data</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop communications protocols; templates &amp; guidance for submissions, use of social media, crisis + contact lists (LEAD: AL)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Encourage businesses (via Chamber of Commerce etc) to expand existing policies and/or resource wider action (LEAD: ALL)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build public awareness, understanding, and action</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop web &amp; social media presence (LEAD: AC)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Undertake stakeholder of existing and upcoming activity amongst the Collective, to maximise impact across the region (LEAD: ALL)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advance policy support in key areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Share datasets, analysis, evaluation as developed (LEAD: Data Analyst)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National funding &amp; resources, particularly towards initiatives with a life course and equity focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Create detailed work programme across the Collective, 12 months ahead and for subgroups (LEAD: ALL)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacity and Capability

- Develop Wellness & Injury Prevention profiles, highlighting inequities, and advocate for key Local Boards to strengthen 3 year plans - workshop with 6 (LEAD: AC/AM/PM)
- Refresh “Auckland Council Alcohol Internal Strategy to Minimise Alcohol-Related Harm 2020” - support effective evaluation (LEAD: AC)
- Align with Healthy Auckland Together and similar work programmes eg around marketing (LEAD: AL)
- Contribution to National Alcohol Data Network administered by ANROWS (LEAD: Data Analyst)
- Contribute to review of, and community action on; Auckland Council’s Signage bylaw (work aligns with AT) (LEAD: AL)
- Advocate to review LAP appeals process (LEAD: AMW)
- Publicise schools involvement in alcohol industry-funded education – promote Tāhūti, open sourced project (LEAD: AMW/DM/JO)
- Monitor national electorate 2020 policy statements (LEAD: AL)

### Alcohol

- Encourage connections, promotions and access to information in targeted languages (LEAD: AL)
- Review own organisation’s alcohol policies & statements LEAD: AL
- Support AMW pricing campaign (LEAD: ALL)
- Action on sports sponsorship - NZ Rugby and Warriors both renew alcohol sponsorship contracts in 2020 (LEAD: AMW)
- Support community-led action to reduce harm – eg align with HPA/CKT/AAD work (LEAD: ALL)
# Safety Collective Tāmaki Makaurau: Summary Workplan 2020 - 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>2020 - 2021</th>
<th>2021 - 2022</th>
<th>ONGOING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Wellbeing &amp; Injury Prevention profiles, highlighting inequities, and advocate for key Local Boards to strengthen 3 year plans - workshop with 5 local LEAD: AC/ANZ/PNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support funding allocation to urgently address the 75% (net) of schools with a high child poverty rate, and upgrade existing assets to bring them up to a good standard of quality (ongoing). LEAD: AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage Local Board support for safe streets programme LEAD: AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore available data sets relating to transport harm to build a more comprehensive understanding of the impact within the Auckland region LEAD: AC/ANZ/PNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support contributions to Traffic conference – AT hosting LEAD: AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Input into the Accessible Streets package from NZTA LEAD: AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Input to MDT/Waka Kotahi/AC data review LEAD: AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **FALLS**                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Develop Wellbeing & Injury Prevention profiles, highlighting inequities, and advocate for key Local Boards to strengthen 3 year plans - workshop with 5 local LEAD: AC/ANZ/PNI. |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Link with Council Advisory Panels (Senior, Pacific People, Older People) and outputs from Agile Auckland Consultation LEAD: AT |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Influence NZTA/Waka Kotahi/Councils/Kiwi’s Ora approach to design standards for roads, footpaths, & access infrastructure (pavement, public transport, parks & playgrounds) – ensure wider understanding and inter- |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Align with campaigns Age Concern Social Connect, and advocate for harmonisation of related work (ages of life) to align with community strength and balance classes (involving St John, Wha maka Wha): LEAD: AT |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Obtain and analyse falls & fractures dashboard data from the Live Stronger for longer programme LEAD: AC Data Analyte |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Explore available data sets to analyse characteristics of local playground injuries LEAD: MAAU/AC Data Analyte            |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Obtain and analyse falls & fractures dashboard data from the Live Stronger for longer programme LEAD: AC Data Analyte    |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Use best practice for falls prevention materials (refresh due mid 2020) LEAD: ALU                                         |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Consider whether healthy homes or other resources can be applied to falls safety assessments and remediation LEAD: AT     |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Engage retirement industry around supporting social value investments in communities LEAD: AT.                             |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Increase awareness of live stronger for longer (LS) accredited programmes that build in a progressive approach LEAD: ACC |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|   • Support home strength and balance services targeting people 75 years and over who can’t afford group housed, community programme LEAD: AK |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |

**Attachments**
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**Keeping Auckland Safe and Thriving**
Why Wellbeing and Injury Prevention?

Being healthy and well is more than being free from disease. Genetics and access to health care are important, but the greatest impact on health, wellbeing and injury harm are the environment and living conditions by which we are born, grow, work, live, and age.

In Auckland there is an 8-year difference in life expectancy across the city, with many early deaths caused by preventable conditions or harm. Between 2012 and 2016, Auckland saw 2,169 injury-related deaths, 63% were unintentional and most were predictable and preventable.

By acting locally to improve the environment around us we can support and encourage healthy behaviours and minimise injury. A local approach recognises that people and places are inter-related, and local context is critical if we are to focus on local needs and priorities and engage the community in developing solutions.

Local boards are intimately connected to the community, and crucial to positively transforming the wellbeing and injury outcomes of their residents through the planning and support of relevant initiatives. Whether it’s developing safe active transport networks; managing parks, playgrounds and open spaces; or building social connection, local boards are at the forefront.

Measuring wellbeing and injury prevention

Having access to the underlying data is the first step to support local action on wellbeing and injury prevention. This profile highlights a range of wellbeing and injury indicators that describe the connections between our environment and the impact this can have on people’s health, wellbeing and harm from injury.

Data is from the 2018 census unless otherwise stated.
Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee
20 August 2020
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**Attachments**

---

**OUR PLANET**
- 40% Census area units at high or very high risk of climate change

**OUR GREEN SPACE**
- 57% Residents within 10 minutes walk to large park

**OUR NEIGHBOURHOODS & CITY**
- Average number tobacco retailers 2km from home
- Average number alcohol retailers 2km from home
- Water fountains per 10,000 people
- Travel to education by public or active transport

**HOW WE LIVE**
- 6% Home always significantly mouldy

**OUR OPPORTUNITIES**
- 32% Children living in poverty
- 12% Youth not in employment, education or training (NEET)

**HOW WE CONNECT**
- 50% Positive sense of community
- 18% Korero to Reo (Maori residents)

**WHAT WE DO**
- 5.0 Average hours active last week (adults)
- 11% Smokers
- Hazardous drinking by DHB%

---

**WELeague & INJURY PREVENTION PROFILE**

**THE IMPACT ON US**

**Health & Wellbeing**
- 6% Living with Type2 Diabetes
- 82% Quality of life is rated good or better

**Falls**
- 650 Deaths from falls
- 37697 Hospital falls admissions
- 86020 ACC new moderate/serious fall claims
- 5,207,139 Days productivity lost for new and existing claims

**Alcohol Harm**
- 142.9 Rate of hospital admissions from conditions wholly attributable to alcohol
- 9% Deaths and serious injuries (DSI) drivers with alcohol test above limit or refused

**Transport**
- 3250 Police attended DSI events
- 14% Maori DSI
- 0.40 DSI per road kilometre

Profile data collected and presented by:
Auckland Regional Public Health Service
Ratonga Haouora a iwi o Tamaki Makaurau

---

**Attachment E**
Source and Notes

1. MELAA: Middle Eastern, Latin American and African People
2. Stats NZ Subnational Period Life Tables 2012-14
   Note: Compared to Auckland region life expectancy of 80.5 years, thresholds are 1 year less or greater than Auckland Life expectancy.
4. ARPHS GIS Mapping 2013
5, 6. ARPHS GIS Mapping 2019
7. Auckland Council Parks Recreation and Sport Asset mapping 2019
8. Census 2018 Significant mould is defined as larger than A4 sized
9, 12. Census 2013 Note: Child poverty defined as households with less than 50% median household income before housing costs
10. Auckland Regional Household Labour Force Report 2019
    Note: numbers suppressed over 4 previous quarters
11, 16. 2018 QOL Survey Note: combined Waiheke and Great Barrier result
13. NZ Health Survey 2016/17 Note: data is for the local DHB area
14. Sport New Zealand Note: 2-years combined data 2018-19
15. Ministry of Health National Diabetes Register 2018
17. NZ Injury Query System (NIQS). Injury Prevention Research Unit (IPRU), Otago University 2012-2016
    Note: From Ministry of Health NZ National Mortality Collection, for all intents.
18. NIQS 2014-2018 Note: From Ministry of Health NZ National Minimum Dataset (NMD), includes patients admitted and stayed in hospital past midnight with a principal diagnosis of a fall injury from any location.
    Excludes day patient and readmissions for the same fall.
19-20, 21. Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC) 2014-2018 Notes: (19) For new 'entitlement claims' that occur and are accepted during 2014-2018 for board residents. Entitlement claims cover moderate to serious falls beyond medical only treatment. (20) Ethnicity is prioritised (21) Includes all 'entitlement' claims, including both new and existing claims where payment is made for lost earnings. Does not include the initial seven days off work and includes days lost for both part-time and full-time workers.
22. Environmental Health Indicators programme, Massey University 2013-2017 Notes: Age-standardised rate (ASR) per 100,000 people, with 95% confidence intervals used to allocate alignment with regional average which differs to other regional average calculations. Includes conditions wholly attributable to alcohol where patient (aged 15 years and over) admitted to hospital (including emergency department (ED) visits < 3 hours). Caution must be made when considering the rates as they do not include conditions partially attributable to alcohol or emergency department visits seen within 3 hours, representing only some of the burden of hospital alcohol related harm.
23-26. CAS - NZTA Crash Analysis System and RAMM - Road Assessment and Maintenance Management from Auckland Transport 2014-2018 Notes: (24) Police attended transport events resulting in deaths and serious injuries that occur within the board boundaries to both residents and non-residents. (26) Includes transport events that occur on public roads and excludes those in areas such as car parks and driveways. The number of lanes on a road are not accounted for.

For more information and technical questions please contact
Wayne LeVick | Strategic Advisor – Safety Collective
E: wayneLEVICK@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Ailsa Wilson | Senior Health Advisor – Auckland Regional Public Health Service (ARPHS)
E: ailsaw@adhb.govt.nz
Minutes of a workshop of the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee held in the Reception Lounge, Town Hall on Wednesday, 1 July at 10am.

PRESENT
Chairperson, Cr Alf Filipaina
Deputy Chairperson Cr Dr Cathy Casey
Cr Josephine Bartley From 10.20am
Deputy Mayor Cr Bill Cashmore From 10.06am
Cr Fa’anana Efeso Collins Via electronic link, from 10.45am
Cr Pippa Coom
Cr Linda Cooper, JP
Cr Angela Dalton
Cr Chris Darby From 10.36am
Cr Christine Fletcher, QSO Via electronic link
Cr Shane Henderson Until 11.22am
Cr Richard Hills From 10.46am
Cr Tracy Muholland
Cr Daniel Newman, JP From 10.18am
Cr Greg Sayers Via electronic link
Cr Desley Simpson, JP From 10.26am
Cr Sharon Stewart, QSM
Cr Wayne Walker Until 11.33am
Cr John Watson Via electronic link

APOLOGIES
Mayor Phil Goff
IMSB Member Mook Hohneck
Cr Paul Young
Margaret Miles, Chair Upper Harbour Local Board

ALSO PRESENT
Izzy Fordham – Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board Via electronic link
Andy Baker – Franklin Local Board
Chris Makoare – Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board Via electronic link
Julie Fairley – Chair Puketapapa Local Board
Harry Doig – Deputy Chair Puketapapa Local Board
Lotu Fulli – Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board Via electronic link
Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee
20 August 2020

Phelan Pirrie – Rodney Local Board
Greg Presland – Waitakere Ranges Local Board
Sandra Coney – Waitakere Ranges Local Board member
Richard Northey – Waitemata Local Board

From 10.18am
Until 10.59am

Note: No decisions or resolutions may be made by a Workshop or Working Party, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.
**Purpose:**
The purpose of the meeting is to:
1. Provide feedback on proposed engagement approach with external stakeholders.
2. Provide direction and input into the content of the proposed discussion document
3. Consider whether to include the Auckland Botanic Gardens in the plan review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apologies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Phil Goff – on council business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr P Young, IMSB member M Hohneck and Upper Harbour Local Board Chair M Miles for absence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance via Electronic Link</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The electronic attendance of Cr E Collins, Cr C Fletcher, Cr G Sayers, Cr J Watson and Local Board Chairs – I Fordham, L Fuli and C Makoare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declarations of Interest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were no declarations of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Parks Management Plan Review Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A PowerPoint presentation was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduction – Matt Ward, Rachel Kelleher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key topics in the draft discussion paper – Jo Mackay and Rachel Kelleher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Protecting what is valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Climate change and regional parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Visitor experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Directions for particular regional parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Proposed focus for newly added parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members provided feedback on the key topics, asked and received answers to questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposed engagement approach – Jo Mackay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consideration of whether to include the Auckland Botanic Gardens in the review – Matt Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop closed at 11.41am
Kōmiti Whakarite Pārae, Mahi Toi, Hapori, Kaupapa
PACE Committee Workshop with Local Board Chairs
Regional Parks Management Plan Review

Workshop 1 July 2020

Agenda

Purpose of today:
• To seek input into preparation for the Regional Parks Management Plan Review before formally seeking approval on 20 August for:
  • Proposed engagement approach
  • Discussion paper release
  • Exclusion of Auckland Botanic Gardens from this review
The regional park network

- 30 regional parks, c.45,000 ha
- Exemplars of natural, cultural, historic, landscape values within the region
- A significant network of public outdoor recreation opportunities

An enduring purpose as outlined in the 2010 plan

“The parks are purchased, and are managed, to protect their intrinsic, natural, cultural and landscape values and to provide outdoor recreational opportunities for the enjoyment and benefit of the people of the region and are held in perpetuity for that purpose.”
What do we want to achieve in the Regional Parks Management Plan review?

- 10-year review:
  - Ensure the plan is fit for purpose for the next 10 years
  - Engage and renew the ‘community contract’
  - Treaty commitment to deliver Māori outcomes
- Management to protect park values while providing a quality visitor experience
- Encouraging stewardship / kaitiakitanga

Discussion paper:
Proposed structure and key topics
Review process – reminder of first steps

- 11 June and 1 July 2020
  - Committee report & workshop
- From July 2020
  - Mana whenua engagement
- 20 August 2020
  - Committee decisions to release the discussion paper and start consultation
- September – October 2020
  - Consultation: Community suggestions to inform the review

The discussion paper provides important background to prompt suggestions, ideas and feedback

- The discussion paper is a backgrounder to introduce and explain the review, and to prompt suggestions
- Visual presentation – text will be brief and engaging
- Neutral tone – we are not making proposals at this stage
Discussion paper content outline

- Introduction and context:
  - The regional parks
  - The Treaty, legislative and strategic context
  - Māori interests
  - The management plan role and this review
  - How to input into the review
  - A note about funding for regional parks
- Discussion of key topics
- Pose questions to prompt readers throughout

The key topics to prompt suggestions

1. Protecting what is valued
2. Climate change and regional parks
3. Visitor experiences
4. Directions for parks already in the plan
5. Proposed focus for the parks coming into the plan
1. Protecting what is valued

Proposed outline:
- Acknowledge the vision is to protect intrinsic, natural, cultural, heritage, landscape values while enabling people to enjoy
- Management is informed by science, needs to meet national requirements and best practice, and to consider mana whenua, mataawaka and community views
- Recognise a range of views about what and how to protect
- Acknowledge the challenges in halting kauri dieback and the trade-offs in the types of recreational experiences that can be provided

Proposed type of questions to prompt feedback:
- What do you value about regional parks?
- How do you think we should balance environmental, heritage and recreation outcomes?
- What do you want regional parks to look like in 10 years’ time?
- How should long-term impacts on recreation be managed where the protection of natural values has to take precedence?

2. Climate change and regional parks

Proposed outline:
- Climate change impact and including what we are doing already to prepare for change and to reduce emissions
- The major levers on regional parks relating to emissions
- Constraints and boundaries of the management plan
- Raise idea of adopting an emissions target for regional parks within the management plan with meaningful sub-targets

Proposed type of questions to prompt feedback:
- How should the council respond to climate change through the management of regional parks?
- Should there be an emissions target for regional parks?
- How can park visitors help support climate action?
3. Visitor experiences

Proposed outline:

- Acknowledge range of offerings – access, information, tracks, beach access, picnic and barbecue facilities, overnight stays
- Visitor experiences are more than recreation – volunteering, learning, connecting with nature, wide range of recreational activities
- Visitor numbers are increasing, particularly in some parks
- Visitors and users are very happy with the experiences they are receiving (95% satisfaction with regional parks)
- Visitor use and expectations are changing in line with our changing communities
- The current management plan approach, including the principle of free access

Visitor experiences continued

Proposed type of questions to prompt feedback:

- Do we have the right range of opportunities and recreation choices across our regional parks?
- What could be done differently in regional parks as needs, numbers, growth of city changes?
- Where are any conflicts… and do you have any ideas about how they could be resolved?
- What new directions or new opportunities would you like to see?
- Should we extend or reduce the range of experiences and services on regional parks? If so, what types?
- What kinds of commercial activities do you think would be appropriate on parks, to deliver additional services and experiences?
- What should visitors pay for?
4. Directions for particular regional parks

Proposed type of questions to prompt suggestions for particular regional parks:
- What do you love about the park/s that you want to keep the same?
- What issues need to be addressed?
- What would you like to see more of at the park/s?
- What new opportunities do you see for the park/s?

5. Proposed focus for newly added parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional park</th>
<th>Proposed management direction and use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenfern Sanctuary</td>
<td>Conservation and ecological restoration, education opportunity for visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahurangi East extension</td>
<td>Increase access for recreational opportunities, preservation of historic heritage, bach stay and back-to-basics camping opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motukorea / Browns Island</td>
<td>Preservation of volcanic landforms, historic and cultural sites; passive recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutukaroa / Hamlins Hill</td>
<td>Protect heritage features, sites of significance, revegetation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other issues and topics to prompt suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety, security cameras</th>
<th>Toilets</th>
<th>Wi-Fi on parks</th>
<th>Smoking and marijuana</th>
<th>Paragliding and hang-gliding</th>
<th>Drones</th>
<th>Acknowledging mana whenua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shade</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Metal detectors</td>
<td>Group sizes</td>
<td>Freedom camping</td>
<td>Kowhai burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parks, EV charging</td>
<td>Cycle trails linking parks</td>
<td>Te Araroa Trail</td>
<td>Naturism</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>Nature play</td>
<td>Protecting wāhi tapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways</td>
<td>Walking tracks</td>
<td>Access to remote areas</td>
<td>Dog areas</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Mountain-biking and horse-riding</td>
<td>Signs in te reo Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds and baths</td>
<td>Concessions and leases</td>
<td>Commercial activities</td>
<td>Planting trees</td>
<td>Volunteering on parks</td>
<td>Music and noise on parks</td>
<td>Pou and puraukau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaques and memorials</td>
<td>Partnering</td>
<td>Farm and nature education</td>
<td>E-bikes and scooters</td>
<td>Vehicles on beaches</td>
<td>Fair rules of use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments and Questions / Pātai on the discussion paper
Proposed engagement approach:

- Purpose of engagement
- Mana whenua and mataawaka
- Community consultation

Local boards’ involvement

- Local board chairs invited to this workshop
- Involved at key policy steps in line with agreed process of local board involvement in regional policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board involvement</th>
<th>Indicative time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide input into the plan drafting</td>
<td>February-March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend amendments to the Draft Plan (to the Hearings Panel)</td>
<td>September-October 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Opportunity to support engagement during consultation periods
Engagement is in two phases that build on each other

The proactive and inclusive engagement and communication approach includes:

- Engagement with mana whenua from the outset and throughout the review as well as engagement with mataawaka
- Two formal public consultation phases:
  - suggestions for the review (informed by a discussion paper)
  - submissions on the draft plan
- Targeted engagement on particular topics outside of those formal phases

By engaging effectively we will...

- Deliver on Treaty commitments and improve Māori outcomes
- Connect with the people of Tāmaki Makaurau
- Outline the purpose of the review
- Identify topics to be addressed in the first consultation round
- Seek feedback on the draft plan in the second consultation round
- Ensure people feel their voice and contributions have been heard
- Promote buy-in and understanding

In doing so we will reconfirm the ‘community contract’ represented by the management plan – how parks are managed on behalf of, and with, Aucklanders.
Opportunities to deliver Māori outcomes

Opportunities include:

- Further reflect Māori values and world view in the plan
- Express Māori values and sites of significance in the park story
- Involve mana whenua in decisions that matter to them
- Promote hauora / well-being and connection of Māori to the land
- Work together to implement parts of the plan, e.g. heritage restoration
- Economic activity, e.g. cultural tourism initiatives
- Independent role in monitoring and review of plan implementation

Engagement with mana whenua and mataawaka

Mana whenua:

- Early engagement will commence after this workshop
- Reach iwi through existing fora and iwi chairs
- Understand mana whenua priorities
- Acknowledge Treaty and legislative obligations on specific parks
- Agree a practical way to engage, e.g. through hui
- Needs to be within budget
- Keep IMSB informed

Mataawaka:

- Reach through mataawaka organisations
- Radio interviews and other channels and fora
- Channel Māori responses through AK Have Your Say
## Approach to consultation

The following slides cover:
- Promotional channels
- First consultation – information we provide, and ways people can respond
- Second consultation – information we provide, and ways people can respond

### Both consultation rounds: promotional channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotional channels</th>
<th>Mana whenua*</th>
<th>Mataawaka</th>
<th>Park users</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Service delivery partners</th>
<th>Harder to reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Social) media and advertising</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct contact (email and conversation)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-based promotions</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network-based promotions</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana whenua fora</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanohi ki te kanohi with iwi leaders</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Engagement approach informed by feedback from PACE Committee and Kaikati forum.
First consultation round: gather suggestions  
(1 September to mid-October 2020)

Information provided
- Discussion paper
- Link to the 2010 plan
- Supported by:
  - Radio interviews: e.g. Radio Waatea, Radio Samoa
  - Translated summaries in te reo Māori, Chinese, Korean
  - Social media posts and posters

Ways for people to make suggestions
- AK Have Your Say:
  - Questionnaire
  - Social pinpoint (maps),
  - Discussion forum
  - Quick polls
- Emails and letters
- In-person feedback:
  - Drop-in sessions

Second consultation round: receive submissions on the draft plan  
(July and August 2021)

Information provided
- Draft Plan with maps and a Summary
- Supported by:
  - Translated summaries including in te reo Māori, Chinese, Korean
  - Radio interviews: e.g. Radio Waatea, Radio Samoa
  - Webinars, briefings, recorded briefing online
  - Social media posts and posters

Ways for people to submit
- AK Have Your Say questionnaire
- Email submissions
- Postal submissions
- Hearings (late 2021)
Comments and Questions / Pātaí on engagement

Scope question: Auckland Botanic Gardens
Is the Botanic Gardens part of the plan review?

- Management plan is out of date – developed in 2001
- Advantages of including the Botanic Gardens in this review:
  - Ability to consider the role of the Botanic Gardens in the context of Auckland’s regional open space network
  - Faces some similar issues to regional parks, e.g. managing different types of recreational use
  - Some process efficiencies (less effort overall than doing a plan review separately)
- Disadvantages:
  - Botanic Gardens has a distinct function and brand that is different to regional parks
  - Botanic Gardens has a different set of stakeholders to regional parks and unique issues to consider (reducing process efficiencies identified above)
- **Proposed approach: Review Botanic Gardens Management Plan commencing FY22**

From your feedback today our next steps are:

- Draft the Regional Parks Management Plan Discussion Document
- Prepare Communications and Engagement Plan
- Initiate engagement with mana whenua
- PACE Committee decisions on 20 August:
  - Confirm regional parks in scope
  - Approve public notification of the intention to prepare a management plan and invite written suggestions (Reserves Act 1977, s 41(5))
  - Approve a discussion paper for release
  - Approve the communications and engagement plan
- Public consultation: 1 September – mid-October 2020
Thank you