

Waitematā Local Board

OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of a hybrid meeting of the Waitematā Local Board held in the Waitematā Local Board Office, Ground Floor, 52 Swanson Street, Auckland and via MS Teams on Tuesday, 21 June 2022 at 1.00pm.

PRESENT

Chairperson	Richard Northey, (ONZM)	
Deputy Chairperson	Alexandra Bonham	
Members	Glenda Fryer	
	Graeme Gunthorp	
	Kerrin Leoni	Present from 1.07pm due to technical difficulties
	Genevieve Sage	Present from 1.11pm due to technical difficulties
	Julie Sandilands	

ALSO PRESENT

Councillor	Pippa Coom
------------	------------

1 Welcome

Chair Northey opened the meeting with a karakia.

2 Apologies

There were no apologies.

The chair carried out a roll call of members.

Member	Attendance
Chair Richard Northey	In-person
Deputy Chair Alex Bonham	In-person
Member Glenda Fryer	In-person
Member Graeme Gunthorp	In-person
Member Kerrin Leoni	Online – present from 1.07pm
Member Genevieve Sage	Online – present from 1.11pm
Member Julie Sandilands	In-person

3 Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

4 Confirmation of Minutes

Resolution number WTM/2022/105

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) confirm the minutes of its ordinary meeting, held on Tuesday, 17 May 2022, as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

5 Leave of Absence

There were no leaves of absence.

6 Acknowledgements

There were no acknowledgements.

7 Petitions

There were no petitions.

8 Deputations

There were no deputations.

9 Public Forum

9.1 Public Forum - Allan Matson

Allan Matson was in attendance to speak on behalf of Civic Trust Auckland and Character Coalition in relation to the board's feedback on Council's proposed draft plan changes to implement the NPS-UD and MDRS. A document was tabled in support of this item and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Member KL Leoni joined the meeting at 1.09 pm.

Member GS Sage joined the meeting at 1.11 pm.

Resolution number WTM/2022/106

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Member G Gunthorp:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **thank Allan Matson for his tabled presentation and attendance at the meeting**
- b) **take the presentation into account in the local board's consideration of item 12.**

CARRIED

Attachments

- A 21 June 2022, Waitematā Local Board - Item 9.1: Allan Matson, Civic Trust Auckland and Character Coalition - NPS-UD and MDRS Submission

9.2 Public Forum - Boopsie Maran

Boopsie Maran was in attendance to speak on behalf of a local dairy owner regarding acquiring an AT Hop machine for their dairy. A document was tabled in support of this item and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number WTM/2022/107

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Member GF Fryer:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **thank Boopsie Maran for her presentation and attendance at the meeting and the tabled letter from Dela**
- b) **refer the letter to Auckland Transport.**

CARRIED

Attachments

- A 21 June 2022, Waitematā Local Board - Item 9.2: Public Forum - Boopsie Maran - letter from dairy owner

10 Extraordinary Business

There was no extraordinary business.

11 Ward Councillor's report

Resolution number WTM/2022/108

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Member J Sandilands:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **receive the written and verbal report from the Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor, Pippa Coom.**

CARRIED

12 Local board feedback on the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021

Fiona Spratt, Planning Team Leader – Central, was in attendance to speak to this report.

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham, seconded by Member GF Fryer:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022, and particularly that more submissions came from the Waitematā Local Board area than any other board area
- c) note the National Policy Statement on Urban Development's stated objectives are to improve wellbeing, address the climate crisis and the housing affordability crisis and its interpretation of a response based on meeting all these goals realistically and strategically
- d) note that Auckland has many rich, mature trees, quality homes and beautiful older and newer suburbs, the latter of which have often been masterplanned. In the future there is a need to provide more decent and affordable homes close to the city, town centres, and rapid transit while retaining green space, plantings, community, good design, architectural interest, a sense of place and diversity of living options
- e) note that focusing development where it can best be supported, whether the city experiences growth or degrowth, would reduce economic risk, cost less and improve environmental, social and cultural wellbeing, and economic outcomes
- f) note that low density sprawl into greenfield is highly problematic regarding food security, reducing emissions, and ensuring access to the city's amenities for youth and seniors, and while the NPS-UD enables the city to go out as well as up, there is an opportunity to meet the quality compact form desired in the Auckland Unitary Plan
- g) provide the following feedback as the local board's response to the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022
- h) support with some qualifications the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre (question one of the local board feedback template), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 1200m is a far distance for some to walk (most walk around 800m)

- B) there is some confusion over which point the 1200m is drawn from the city centre
- C) adding more homes could mean more cars and this could negatively affect wellbeing, congestion, and safety and therefore parking maximums need to be part of the solution
- D) it is likely that more people will mode shift if doing so is easy, enjoyable and convenient
- E) research by Jeff Speck suggests a neighbourhood is 'walkable' when walking routes are safe, comfortable, enjoyable and useful
- ii) recommend that:
 - A) the port is considered its own zone and not as the edge of the city
 - B) development is focused closer to the city and around transport stations
 - C) council enable more development where it is easy to mode shift
 - D) council enable more apartments in an easy walk to transit stations for those without cars
 - E) low-traffic 'walkable' neighbourhoods are created limiting through-routes and ensuring safe street crossings
 - F) space is maintained for loading/unloading, deliveries, drop-offs and pickups (ideally kerbside)
 - G) a holistic, human, and place-based approach to refining the rules is supported, based on what people are actually likely to do keeping in mind topography and safety
 - H) considering parking maximums on private developments in walkable catchments where an RPZ is in place
 - I) there is provision for consolidated parking on the edge of centres or walkable catchments
 - J) reconsider walkable catchments based on topography and safety
- i) support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres (question two), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 800m is a distance that people walk regularly and aligns with best practice planning
 - B) there are concerns over increasing congestion in an already overly congested setting
 - ii) recommend maintaining low traffic neighbourhoods that restrict through traffic, enable micro-mobility use on the road, and free up pavements for pedestrians
- j) support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops (question three), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 800m is a walkable distance that evidence suggests people will walk
 - B) there is an opportunity to create more streets like Ponsonby Rd, Karangahape Rd, O'Connell St and High St that are attractive and function well
 - ii) recommend that:

- A) Plans enable six-storey mixed use streets within an easy five-minute walk of bus stops on fast, frequent bus routes with bus lanes/clearways at peak times with journey times of up to 30 minutes from city or metropolitan centres (peak and off peak)
 - B) Planning rules enable the transition on these routes towards an unbroken urban fabric of mixed-use streets with activated ground floors which will in time realise the “15-minute” neighbourhood in which shops, services, cafes, medical centres, schools and transport are with a 15-minute walk. This is likely to turn arterial routes into great places in themselves
 - C) Enable these streets to be sustained at similar density along entire major bus routes, for example all the way along Great North Road, College Hill, and New North Road
 - D) Enabling perimeter blocks (with central garden area) on/behind arterial routes close to bus stops
 - E) Requirements for new developments to create lanes through cul-de-sacs as porous neighbourhoods increase walkability
 - F) Considering parking maximums on private developments in walkable catchments where a RPZ is in place and provision is made for consolidated parking on the edge of centres or walkable catchments
- k) support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility (question four), with the following feedback:
- i) recommend also extending this zone along all arterial routes with frequent, fast bus services
- l) support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres with high accessibility (question five), with the following feedback:
- i) note that:
 - A) 200m is a reasonable distance to walk
 - B) enabling higher storey and perimeter blocks down frequent bus routes would enable more housing in areas with high accessibility and over times create vibrant streets
 - C) such areas are readily accessible for travel for work, education, and recreation
 - ii) recommend:
 - A) extending this zone along all arterial routes with frequent, fast bus services
 - B) zoning these centres to have shops, amenities, and cafes to create a vibrant area
 - C) prohibiting/restricting or disincentivising and further significant urban development that is not in walkable catchments to centres or rapid, frequent transport (including bus routes
- m) support with qualifications the proposal to include special character areas as a qualifying matter (question 6), with the following feedback:
- i) note that:
 - A) this is a topic that has very much drawn mixed views from residents

- B) loss of character housing is distressing to many Aucklanders who make the point that once their history is lost it can never be replaced
 - C) the views of future residents could not be expressed in this consultation, but they will be even more affected by climate change if urban sprawl continues, and therefore intensification is required
 - D) there is a need to enable housing close to transport, the city centre and metropolitan centres
 - E) the amount of special character areas currently identified effectively reduces the housing supply the area can create, which is a negative outcome given the proximity to the city
 - F) it is not likely in itself the NPS-UD will lead to the production of well-designed, quality housing suitable and affordable for New Zealand families with two working parents on average incomes in Waitematā. The market has not delivered on this in the last three decades and is unlikely to now without intervention from central government
 - G) Auckland's collection of wooden housing is unique in the world
 - H) by chance or design, the historic areas of St Mary's Bay, Freeman's Bay, Ponsonby, Grafton and Parnell all share many of the characteristics of Charles Montgomery's "happy cities". It is worth considering how to translate these biophilic and community-building qualities into new-developments
- ii) recommend that:
- A) there is a strong focus on well-designed quality housing that is suitable for living in permanently and working from home if necessary
 - B) green space and biodiversity corridors are protected and enhanced
 - C) residential areas in Waitematā transition to become low-traffic neighbourhoods to avoid congestion, and reduce emissions and air pollution
 - D) economic levers are adjusted to incentivise more new builds, and encourage more co-housing, non-profit community providers and papakāinga housing in which future residents have a say in what they want from their future homes
- n) support with qualifications the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified (question 7), with the following feedback:
- i) note that:
- A) a huge amount of evidence and work went into establishing the current special character overlay
 - B) the Waitematā Local Board received appreciably more submissions on this subject because many people care deeply about holding on to what is left of Auckland's historic areas, and we thank the submitters for this work and this care
 - C) many submissions contain strong and passionate views both for extending the proposed special character areas and also for reducing them
- ii) recommend:
- A) retaining exemplars of our highest-quality heritage areas that tell the story of Auckland's history through its earliest suburbs – Parnell, Grafton, Freeman's Bay, St Mary's Bay, Ponsonby, and Grey Lynn – for the benefit of present and future generations

- B) enabling some areas closest to transport and centres to evolve over time but with a focus on creating positive urban design outcomes
 - C) including areas of mana whenua pre-colonial sites of significance with suitable signage
 - D) including areas of settler housing/industry (of different classes) and other migrant stories, including French/Irish Catholics, Chinese and Pasifika stories in Parnell, St Mary's Bay, Freeman's Bay, Ponsonby, Arch Hill, Grafton, and Grey Lynn
 - E) enabling more intensification on all fast frequent bus routes and considering some of the boundaries to ensure that there is more development in areas closer to transport and centres
 - F) current special character areas should be low traffic neighbourhoods whether intensified or not
 - G) considering parking maximums within 400m of fast, frequent transit stations and parking controls on arterial roads that are fast, frequent bus routes
 - H) consolidating parking on the edge of city centres, metropolitan centres, and town centres
 - I) ensuring green space and trees are not lost and that tall buildings incorporate trees into their designs
 - J) a masterplan approach opposed to a pepper potting approach
 - K) incentivising development of brownfield sites, including the City Works area and Great North Road area
 - L) supporting precinct form codes to enable perimeter blocks and other environment and age-friendly developments with density done well
 - M) balancing vibrancy, noise, and pollution with areas of calm and rest
 - N) considering the proposals of the residents' associations of the heritage suburbs to work out the areas of high value
 - O) reviewing the Unitary Plan to better ensure the wellbeing of residents in the city centre and mixed-use areas through planning rules, noise limits, walkability, ensuring a quality public realm etc.
- o) support the proposed business special character areas of high quality that have been identified (question eight) and believe all appropriate business special character areas have been identified in the report
- p) support the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with long term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter (question nine), with the following feedback:
- i) note that:
 - A) Auckland does not have sufficient water in the region to meet the needs of the current population
 - B) out of sequence infrastructure renewal is either done on top of existing plans which may be economically unsustainable or means existing areas that need infrastructure upgrades is deferred
 - C) water and water quality is important to mana whenua and all New Zealanders
 - D) resources and supplies of other materials required for construction and infrastructure is finite and should be used as strategically as possible

- ii) recommend:
 - A) restricting development to within the existing city boundaries to allow pace of infrastructure to catch up with the outer limits from the city centre
 - B) within these existing urban boundaries, the application of infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter should only be applied if it would be impracticable or prohibitively costly to overcome the constraint
 - C) avoiding damage to the water network or allowing sewage into the harbour or damage to streams
 - D) considering having a qualifying matter retaining sufficient horticultural and farmland and wilderness as part of planning
 - E) protecting the blue network and biodiversity corridors as qualifying matters
- q) support the below being qualifying matters (question 10):
 - i) the Auckland War Memorial Museum viewshaft
 - ii) most of the existing maunga viewshafts
 - iii) quality character buildings in the City Centre zone and Queen Street valley precinct
 - iv) many of the existing built form controls including ensuring sunlight into public spaces and height controls in Aotea Square and elsewhere
- r) request the addition now, or in the next review of the Auckland Unitary Plan, of additional requirements over issues like the proportion of public open space and limits on the level of noise, light and air and other pollution
- s) support controls to ensure sunlight in public spaces
- t) support for sunlight and air movements in new developments
- u) recommend the following:
 - i) creating liveable, attractive developments to encourage more people to stay and invest in the city
 - ii) enabling green roofs and walls, and shade trees
 - iii) planning green corridors with trees and raingardens that service wildlife and residents
- v) thank the submitters for their proposals and their care and passion for the future of Auckland.

Resolution number WTM/2022/109

MOVED by Member G Gunthorp, seconded by Member J Sandilands:

Member G Gunthorp moved an amendment to the original recommendation by way of addition:

- n) support with qualifications the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified (question 7), with the following feedback:
 - ii) recommend that:
 - P) remove special character area classification from cliffside/waterside areas in Herne Bay where modern houses are prevalent, instead protecting specific properties with heritage classification
 - Q) remove special character area classification from within 400m of Parnell station, instead protecting specific properties with heritage classification
 - R) remove special character area classification from Grafton, instead protecting specific properties with heritage classification

The meeting adjourned at 2.31pm and reconvened at 2.36pm.

The motion was taken in parts.

Resolution number WTM/2022/110

MOVED by Member G Gunthorp, seconded by Member J Sandilands:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- n) support with qualifications the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified (question 7), with the following feedback:
 - ii) recommend that:
 - P) remove special character area classification from cliffside/waterside areas in Herne Bay where modern houses are prevalent, instead protecting specific properties with heritage classification

The motion was put to the vote by a show of hands and was declared LOST by two votes to five.

LOST

Resolution number WTM/2022/111

MOVED by Member G Gunthorp, seconded by Member J Sandilands:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- n) support with qualifications the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified (question 7), with the following feedback:
 - ii) recommend that:
 - Q) remove special character area classification from within 400m of Parnell station, instead protecting specific properties with heritage classification

The motion was put to the vote by a show of hands and was declared LOST by three votes to four.

LOST

Resolution number WTM/2022/112

MOVED by Member G Gunthorp, seconded by Member J Sandilands:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- n) support with qualifications the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified (question 7), with the following feedback:
 - ii) recommend that:
 - R) remove special character area classification from Grafton, instead protecting specific properties with heritage classification

The motion was put to the vote by a show of hands and was declared LOST by two votes to five.

LOST

Resolution number WTM/2022/113

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham, seconded by Member GF Fryer:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021**
- b) **note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022, and**

- particularly that more submissions came from the Waitemata Local Board area than any other board area
- c) note the National Policy Statement on Urban Development's stated objectives are to improve wellbeing, address the climate crisis and the housing affordability crisis and its interpretation of a response based on meeting all these goals realistically and strategically
 - d) note that Auckland has many rich, mature trees, quality homes and beautiful older and newer suburbs, the latter of which have often been masterplanned. In the future there is a need to provide more decent and affordable homes close to the city, town centres, and rapid transit while retaining green space, plantings, community, good design, architectural interest, a sense of place and diversity of living options
 - e) note that focusing development where it can best be supported, whether the city experiences growth or degrowth, would reduce economic risk, cost less and improve environmental, social and cultural wellbeing, and economic outcomes
 - f) note that low density sprawl into greenfield is highly problematic regarding food security, reducing emissions, and ensuring access to the city's amenities for youth and seniors, and while the NPS-UD enables the city to go out as well as up, there is an opportunity to meet the quality compact form desired in the Auckland Unitary Plan
 - g) provide the following feedback as the local board's response to the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022
 - h) support with some qualifications the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre (question one of the local board feedback template), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 1200m is a far distance for some to walk (most walk around 800m)
 - B) there is some confusion over which point the 1200m is drawn from the city centre
 - C) adding more homes could mean more cars and this could negatively affect wellbeing, congestion, and safety and therefore parking maximums need to be part of the solution
 - D) it is likely that more people will mode shift if doing so is easy, enjoyable and convenient
 - E) research by Jeff Speck suggests a neighbourhood is 'walkable' when walking routes are safe, comfortable, enjoyable and useful
 - ii) recommend that:
 - A) the port is considered its own zone and not as the edge of the city
 - B) development is focused closer to the city and around transport stations
 - C) council enable more development where it is easy to mode shift
 - D) council enable more apartments in an easy walk to transit stations for those without cars
 - E) low-traffic 'walkable' neighbourhoods are created limiting through-routes and ensuring safe street crossings

- F) space is maintained for loading/unloading, deliveries, drop-offs and pickups (ideally kerbside)
- G) a holistic, human, and place-based approach to refining the rules is supported, based on what people are actually likely to do keeping in mind topography and safety
- H) considering parking maximums on private developments in walkable catchments where an RPZ is in place
- I) there is provision for consolidated parking on the edge of centres or walkable catchments
- J) reconsider walkable catchments based on topography and safety
- i) support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres (question two), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 800m is a distance that people walk regularly and aligns with best practice planning
 - B) there are concerns over increasing congestion in an already overly congested setting
 - ii) recommend maintaining low traffic neighbourhoods that restrict through traffic, enable micro-mobility use on the road, and free up pavements for pedestrians
- j) support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops (question three), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 800m is a walkable distance that evidence suggests people will walk
 - B) there is an opportunity to create more streets like Ponsonby Rd, Karangahape Rd, O'Connell St and High St that are attractive and function well
 - ii) recommend that:
 - A) Plans enable six-storey mixed use streets within an easy five-minute walk of bus stops on fast, frequent bus routes with bus lanes/clearways at peak times with journey times of up to 30 minutes from city or metropolitan centres (peak and off peak)
 - B) Planning rules enable the transition on these routes towards an unbroken urban fabric of mixed-use streets with activated ground floors which will in time realise the "15-minute" neighbourhood in which shops, services, cafes, medical centres, schools and transport are with a 15-minute walk. This is likely to turn arterial routes into great places in themselves
 - C) Enable these streets to be sustained at similar density along entire major bus routes, for example all the way along Great North Road, College Hill, and New North Road
 - D) Enabling perimeter blocks (with central garden area) on/behind arterial routes close to bus stops
 - E) Requirements for new developments to create lanes through cul-de-sacs as porous neighbourhoods increase walkability

- F) Considering parking maximums on private developments in walkable catchments where a RPZ is in place and provision is made for consolidated parking on the edge of centres or walkable catchments
- k) support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility (question four), with the following feedback:
 - i) recommend also extending this zone along all arterial routes with frequent, fast bus services
- l) support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres with high accessibility (question five), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 200m is a reasonable distance to walk
 - B) enabling higher storey and perimeter blocks down frequent bus routes would enable more housing in areas with high accessibility and over time create vibrant streets
 - C) such areas are readily accessible for travel for work, education, and recreation
 - ii) recommend:
 - A) extending this zone along all arterial routes with frequent, fast bus services
 - B) zoning these centres to have shops, amenities, and cafes to create a vibrant area
 - C) prohibiting/restricting or disincentivising and further significant urban development that is not in walkable catchments to centres or rapid, frequent transport (including bus routes)

CARRIED

Resolution number WTM/2022/114

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham, seconded by Member GF Fryer:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- m) support with qualifications the proposal to include special character areas as a qualifying matter (question 6), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) this is a topic that has very much drawn mixed views from residents
 - B) loss of character housing is distressing to many Aucklanders who make the point that once their history is lost it can never be replaced
 - C) the views of future residents could not be expressed in this consultation, but they will be even more affected by climate change if urban sprawl continues, and therefore intensification is required
 - D) there is a need to enable housing close to transport, the city centre and metropolitan centres
 - E) the amount of special character areas currently identified effectively reduces the housing supply the area can create, which is a negative outcome given the proximity to the city

- F) it is not likely in itself the NPS-UD will lead to the production of well-designed, quality housing suitable and affordable for New Zealand families with two working parents on average incomes in Waitematā. The market has not delivered on this in the last three decades and is unlikely to now without intervention from central government
 - G) Auckland’s collection of wooden housing is unique in the world
 - H) by chance or design, the historic areas of St Mary’s Bay, Freeman’s Bay, Ponsonby, Grafton and Parnell all share many of the characteristics of Charles Montgomery’s “happy cities”. It is worth considering how to translate these biophilic and community-building qualities into new-developments
- ii) recommend that:
- A) there is a strong focus on well-designed quality housing that is suitable for living in permanently and working from home if necessary
 - B) green space and biodiversity corridors are protected and enhanced
 - C) residential areas in Waitematā transition to become low-traffic neighbourhoods to avoid congestion, and reduce emissions and air pollution
 - D) economic levers are adjusted to incentivise more new builds, and encourage more co-housing, non-profit community providers and papakāinga housing in which future residents have a say in what they want from their future homes
- n) support with qualifications the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified (question 7), with the following feedback:
- i) note that:
- A) a huge amount of evidence and work went into establishing the current special character overlay
 - B) the Waitematā Local Board received appreciably more submissions on this subject because many people care deeply about holding on to what is left of Auckland’s historic areas, and we thank the submitters for this work and this care
 - C) many submissions contain strong and passionate views both for extending the proposed special character areas and also for reducing them
- ii) recommend:
- A) retaining exemplars of our highest-quality heritage areas that tell the story of Auckland’s history through its earliest suburbs – Parnell, Grafton, Freeman’s Bay, St Mary’s Bay, Ponsonby, and Grey Lynn – for the benefit of present and future generations
 - B) enabling some areas closest to transport and centres to evolve over time but with a focus on creating positive urban design outcomes
 - C) including areas of mana whenua pre-colonial sites of significance with suitable signage
 - D) including areas of settler housing/industry (of different classes) and other migrant stories, including French/Irish Catholics, Chinese and Pasifika stories in Parnell, St Mary’s Bay, Freeman’s Bay, Ponsonby, Arch Hill, Grafton, and Grey Lynn

- E) enabling more intensification on all fast frequent bus routes and considering some of the boundaries to ensure that there is more development in areas closer to transport and centres
- F) current special character areas should be low traffic neighbourhoods whether intensified or not
- G) considering parking maximums within 400m of fast, frequent transit stations and parking controls on arterial roads that are fast, frequent bus routes
- H) consolidating parking on the edge of city centres, metropolitan centres, and town centres
- I) ensuring green space and trees are not lost and that tall buildings incorporate trees into their designs
- J) a masterplan approach opposed to a pepper potting approach
- K) incentivising development of brownfield sites, including the City Works area and Great North Road area
- L) supporting precinct form codes to enable perimeter blocks and other environment and age-friendly developments with density done well
- M) balancing vibrancy, noise, and pollution with areas of calm and rest
- N) considering the proposals of the residents' associations of the heritage suburbs to work out the areas of high value
- O) reviewing the Unitary Plan to better ensure the wellbeing of residents in the city centre and mixed-use areas through planning rules, noise limits, walkability, ensuring a quality public realm etc.

CARRIED

Under Standing Order 3.15.5, Member Sandilands requested her dissenting vote be recorded.

Resolution number WTM/2022/115

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham, seconded by Member GF Fryer:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- o) support the proposed business special character areas of high quality that have been identified (question eight) and believe all appropriate business special character areas have been identified in the report
- p) support the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with long term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter (question nine), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) Auckland does not have sufficient water in the region to meet the needs of the current population
 - B) out of sequence infrastructure renewal is either done on top of existing plans which may be economically unsustainable or means existing areas that need infrastructure upgrades is deferred
 - C) water and water quality is important to mana whenua and all New Zealanders
 - D) resources and supplies of other materials required for construction and infrastructure is finite and should be used as strategically as possible

- ii) recommend:
 - A) restricting development to within the existing city boundaries to allow pace of infrastructure to catch up with the outer limits from the city centre
 - B) within these existing urban boundaries, the application of infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter should only be applied if it would be impracticable or prohibitively costly to overcome the constraint
 - C) avoiding damage to the water network or allowing sewage into the harbour or damage to streams
 - D) considering having a qualifying matter retaining sufficient horticultural and farmland and wilderness as part of planning
 - E) protecting the blue network and biodiversity corridors as qualifying matters
- q) support the below being qualifying matters (question 10):
 - i) the Auckland War Memorial Museum viewshaft
 - ii) most of the existing Maunga viewshafts
 - iii) quality character buildings in the City Centre zone and Queen Street valley precinct
 - iv) many of the existing built form controls including ensuring sunlight into public spaces and height controls in Aotea Square and elsewhere
- r) request the addition now, or in the next review of the Auckland Unitary Plan, of additional requirements over issues like the proportion of public open space and limits on the level of noise, light and air and other pollution
- s) support controls to ensure sunlight in public spaces
- t) support for sunlight and air movements in new developments
- u) recommend the following:
 - i) creating liveable, attractive developments to encourage more people to stay and invest in the city
 - ii) enabling green roofs and walls, and shade trees
 - iii) planning green corridors with trees and raingardens that service wildlife and residents
- v) thank the submitters for their proposals and their care and passion for the future of Auckland.

CARRIED

13 Local board feedback on proposed supporting plan changes to accompany the Medium Density Residential Standards and National Policy Statement on Urban Development plan change

Resolution number WTM/2022/116

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham, seconded by Member G Gunthorp:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **note the content outlined in the agenda report relating to the development of draft plan changes and variations to the Auckland Unitary Plan to be considered for notification at the August 2022 Planning Committee meeting together with the Intensification Planning Instrument on Medium Density Residential Standards and implementing Policies 3 and 4 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020**
- b) **provide feedback as the local board's response to the matters discussed in this report:**
 - i) **Transport:**
 - A) **support the proposed changes, including addressing access to residentially zoned parking spaces and rear sites to prioritise pedestrian and disability access and safety and to improve access efficiency and convenience for all user groups**
 - B) **not support creating parking minimums for accessible parking/loading vehicles except in large developments with high usage needs**
 - C) **support all developments having available servicing by waste trucks, furniture removal trucks, deliveries, and taxi drop-offs and pick-ups but they should preferably be kerbside**
 - D) **support council consent officers working with Auckland Transport officers to understand how the kerbside can be best used for multiple purposes**
 - E) **support the reallocation of space to ensure kerbside can support a well-functioning city**
 - F) **support some kerbside space in intensifying areas to be allocated for bookable car shares like City Hop**
 - G) **where applicable and feasible, property access should be from side streets, not arterial roads**
 - H) **support parking maximums on private developments in walkable catchments where a resident parking zone is in place, and make provision for consolidated parking on the edge of centres or walkable catchments**
 - ii) **Notable trees - Schedule 10**
 - A) **support the proposed changes, particularly those that will add more notable trees which merit inclusion to the schedule, including those proposed for the Waitematā Local Board area**
 - B) **strongly support protecting existing trees, green corridors, mature trees, and the ecoservice value of trees**
 - C) **support using setback rules so that space is created in new developments for shade trees that benefit footpath users**

- D) support budgets and planning which ensure decent public social infrastructure including green spaces and trees
- iii) Historic heritage - Schedule 14
 - A) support the proposed changes, particularly scheduling all the properties in the board area that are proposed
 - B) note that these are:
 - (i) Parkfield Terrace Historic Heritage Area
 - (ii) The former Sisters of St Francis Convent, the former Auckland Masonic Temple and the former Gladstone Brewery, all in St Benedict's Street
 - (iii) The Jervois Road Streamline Moderne Block Historic Heritage Area
- iv) Variations to incomplete plan changes
 - A) reiterate its opposition to the proposals in PC 60 for the rezoning and sale of the Georgina St and Cooper St reserves.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 3.13pm until 3.20pm

14 Local board feedback on Auckland Transport's Draft Parking Strategy (2022)

A document was tabled in support of this item, and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number WTM/2022/117

MOVED by Member G Gunthorp, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) provide the following feedback, taking into consideration their community's feedback, on the Draft Auckland Parking Strategy (2022)
- b) receive the tabled document demonstrating different applications of EV charger in the footpath and road corridor
- c) provide the following feedback on the proposed 'tiered approach':
 - i) note that pricing needs to be more fluid, based on demand and on a clear strategy
 - ii) support the implementation of tiered system across the region
 - iii) urge that any changes to the parking strategy must help deliver both the City Centre Masterplan and Access for Everyone
- d) provide the following feedback on the Strategic Transport Network:
 - i) in principle support the reallocation of parking spaces to high-capacity lanes, such as T2, T3, bus and cycle lanes, when traffic flow/demand supports that action
 - ii) support retaining parking at off-peak times where appropriate
 - iii) urge AT to continue to consult with affected stakeholders when changes are proposed, including local boards, residents (and their representative associations), business (and their representative associations)

- iv) not support the widening of arterial roads, if possible, as the funds required for widening are better spent on improving streetscapes and town centres
 - v) urge sufficient loading/unloading, pick-up and drop-off areas need to be made available nearby areas of significant up-zoning on many arterial roads in the Auckland Unitary Plan in anticipation of more residential and business use
 - vi) note that movement across arterial road pavements/cycle lanes into private property is undesirable as will compromise the safety of sidewalks, and property access should be encouraged to be via side streets
- e) provide the following feedback on Town Centres/Higher Density Zones:
- i) support the improvement of town centre streetscapes through the conversion of parking spaces into people spaces
 - ii) support the use of parklet programs to approach streetscape improvement, such as where retailers/hospitality outlets can opt-in to have parking spaces converted to parklets at their cost. Once that carpark has been converted, it should not revert even if the retailer changes. Parklets should be easy to implement by businesses, in carparking spaces, footpaths, or berms
 - iii) urge AT to continue to engage fully with agencies such as city fringe business associations with concerns about losing parking, including through providing support such as resource around signage, advertising, access improvements, bus amenity and cycle amenity, and indication of nearby parking to assist in any transition of road corridors
 - iv) support altering parking on side streets to support local businesses and higher-density residential areas where required and practicable, including changing from parallel to angle, time limiting spaces, and creating loading zones
 - v) urge AT and Auckland Council staff to work together to ensure better alignment and outcomes, with more focus on streetscape, noting that the split in responsibilities and priorities between AT and Auckland Council has resulted in underwhelming outcomes regarding streetscape developments in some areas compared to major projects (such as Karangahape Road)
- f) provide the following feedback on Parking Policies (Group 1), specifically regarding compliance and enforcement:
- i) urge increased enforcement in the city centre and town centres, particularly at night
 - ii) urge increased CCTV enforcement be undertaken, to improve efficiency and safety of enforcement officers
 - iii) suggest that bus lane enforcement could be undertaken by using CCTV on buses
 - iv) recommend more towing of illegal parking be undertaken, particularly where vehicles are parking on footpaths, cycle lanes, and areas that reduce space for active modes
 - v) urge AT to continue to push the Ministry of Transport for central government to devolve the setting of parking fines to local authorities without a cap on fines that can be set

- g) provide the following feedback on Parking Policies (Group 2), specifically regarding Park & Ride:**
 - i) note that the Waitematā Local Board area does not have any park & ride zones**
 - ii) support the pricing of all park & ride, as this ensures ratepayers are not overly subsidising high-value land**
 - iii) support accompanying pricing with advertising campaigns promoting the use of connecting buses and integrated fares**

- h) provide the following feedback on Parking Policies (Group 3), specifically regarding micro-mobility parking, loading zones, and EV chargers:**
 - i) support more bike and scooter parking is needed in primary positions, as close as possible to places of interest and at regular frequent intervals on shopping streets**
 - ii) support parking zones for cycle/scooter hire, working with hire companies to implement geo-fencing**
 - iii) note that micro-mobility parking is most useful when in smaller numbers in many locations rather than a few large corrals**
 - iv) recommend the definition of loading zones to include other very short-stay commercial uses, including taxi pick-up/drop-off**
 - v) recommend a comprehensive policy document is required for public EV charging stations, as they are likely to become more prevalent in the future**
 - vi) not support the use of cable covers for private on-road EV charging, as they have the potential to impede footpath users (especially those in wheelchairs and prams), to create clutter and visual pollution, and create targets for vandalism**
 - vii) not support EV chargers being located on footpaths as they impede vulnerable road users and can be dangerous**
 - viii) support EV chargers being located in the road corridor with suitable protection (such as raised kerbs)**

- i) provide the following feedback on Parking Policies (Group 4), specifically regarding Residents' Parking Zones:**
 - i) note that it is not clear how Residents' Parking Zones fit into the tiered system**
 - ii) recommend that RPZ administrative fees should not be loss-making, and costs should be covered by the income received from RPZ fees, which may necessitate an increase in fees every year**
 - iii) note that "Hide & Ride" is a major problem in the Waitematā Local Board area where Residents Parking Zones end, and a solution to this is needed. For example, a resident has reported they cannot park anywhere near their own house on weekdays as they are 10 metres beyond the RPZ so commuters flood those streets before catching the bus**
 - iv) suggest that parking pricing and RPZ implementation must be communicated to the Auckland Council Community Facilities team, as increases to parking pricing may lead to overflow into parks, potentially requiring enforcement to ensure suitable capacity for park users rather than commuters**

- j) note that parking issues are rife in the local board area including:**
 - i) design flaws – a lack of physical barriers allows vehicles to be parked on footpaths and in inappropriate locations**
 - ii) taxis – particularly at night when there is less enforcement, taxis will illegally park on footpaths and across pedestrian zones**
 - iii) loading zones – being used by non-commercial vehicles and for longer than allowed**
 - iv) Hide & Ride – edges of RPZ are being overloaded with commuters**
 - v) Parks – city parks are being used for hide & ride and business parking**
 - vi) Driveway parking – cars parking across/in driveways, reducing pedestrian access**
 - vii) Berm parking – due to non-enforcement, vehicles are being parked on berms, destroying vegetation and reducing pedestrian access. Note that in narrow streets this can slow traffic so any removal of this parking should be accompanied by infrastructure changes to ensure speeds are kept low**
- k) Note that some of the issues above are due to limited enforcement, low fines, poor design, and incorrect road designation/insufficient legal enforcement avenues**
- l) Provide the following feedback on developers passing on the costs of parking to ratepayers:**
 - i) Note that increasing density in Auckland means people need to understand and allow for the cost of private vehicle ownership and storage**
 - ii) Support Aucklanders moving to a low- or no-car lifestyle and want to ensure they do not incur the costs of other people who have not allowed for a car parking space**
 - iii) Support reducing the effects of developers under-providing parking on site**
 - iv) Support the criteria for on-street allocation being made clear should an RPZ be introduced in the future**
 - v) Recommend parking maximums in new developments in walkable catchments to rapid transport, and city, metropolitan, town and local centres with high accessibility to reduce congestion and to help realise low traffic neighbourhoods**
 - vi) Recommend Auckland planners should consider how to encourage private developments to provide shared cars for hire, loading/unloading zones, and provide sufficient storage for micromobility, cargo bikes, and prams. Loading zones should be provided kerbside**
- m) note that many of the pleasures of Auckland and children’s activities are currently only accessible by car in practice, and visiting family across town can be very difficult and time consuming unless by car, potentially discouraging people from giving up a car which might then be used for all journeys**
- n) urge Auckland Transport to play a more proactive role in encouraging drivers to give up cars by ensuring that there are cars available to use on the occasions when people really do need them, potentially by working with City Hop and businesses in town centres (many of whom have large parking areas) to ensure there are shared vehicles easily accessibly in areas zoned for high density that have good, frequent, rapid public transport**

- o) note that consolidated parking is seen as a way to improve efficiency, public safety, landscaping and place values, which may be what central government intends when encouraging a parking strategy be developed in conjunction with the NPS-UD.

CARRIED

Attachments

- A 21 June 2022, Waitematā Local Board: Item 14: Local board feedback on Auckland Transport's Draft Parking Strategy (2022) - EV charger images

15 Adoption of the Waitematā Local Board Agreement 2022/2023

Maclean Grindell, Senior Local Board Advisor, was in attendance to speak to this item.

Resolution number WTM/2022/118

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Member GS Sage:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) adopt the local content for the Annual Budget, which includes the Waitematā Local Board Agreement 2022/2023, the message from the chair, and local board advocacy (Attachment A).
- b) adopt a local fees and charges schedule for 2022/2023 (Attachment B).
- c) delegate authority to the Chair to make any final changes to the local content for the Annual Budget 2022/2023 (the Waitematā Local Board Agreement 2022/2023, message from the chair, and local board advocacy).
- d) note that the resolutions of this meeting will be reported back to the Governing Body when it meets to adopt the Annual Budget 2022/2023, including each Local Board Agreement, on 29 June 2022.

CARRIED

16 Approval of the Waitematā Local Board Auckland Emergency Management work programme 2022/2023

Melanie Hutton, Head of Resilience Auckland Emergency Management, was in attendance to speak to this item.

Resolution number WTM/2022/119

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham, seconded by Member GF Fryer:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) approve the Auckland Emergency Management work programme 2022/2023 (Attachment A to the agenda report) as summarised in the table below.

Activity name	2022/2023 budget for approval
Community emergency resilience programme	\$0
Business emergency resilience programme	\$1,000

CARRIED

17 Approval of the Waitematā Local Board External Partnerships-Business Associations work programme 2022/2023

Resolution number WTM/2022/120

MOVED by Member J Sandilands, seconded by Member GF Fryer:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **approve the External Partnerships-Business Associations work programme 2022/2023. (Attachment A to the business report) as summarised in the table below:**

Activity name	2022/2023 budget for approval
Supporting Grey Lynn Business Association	\$20,000

CARRIED

18 Approval of the Waitematā Local Board Tātaki Auckland Unlimited work programme 2022/2023

Sarah Leo Anderson, Local Economic Development Advisor Tātaki Auckland Unlimited, was in attendance to speak to this report.

Resolution number WTM/2022/121

MOVED by Member GF Fryer, seconded by Member J Sandilands:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **approve the Tātaki Auckland Unlimited work programme 2022/2023 (Attachment A to the agenda report) as summarised in the table below**

Activity name	2022/2023 budget for approval
Local Small Business Mentors Programme	\$11,000
Young Enterprise Scheme Kick Start Days Sponsorship (continuation)	\$5,000

CARRIED

19 Approval of the 2022/2023 Waitematā Local Board Infrastructure and Environmental Services Work Programme

Prasanthi Cottingham, Relationship Advisor Infrastructure and Environmental Services, was in attendance to speak to this item.

Resolution number WTM/2022/122

MOVED by Member J Sandilands, seconded by Member GS Sage:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **approve the 2022/2023 Infrastructure and Environmental Services work programme and associated budgets, as summarised in the table below (Attachment A to the agenda report):**

Activity name	2022/2023 budget for approval
Bike hub - Queens Wharf	\$10,000
Climate Action Activator - Waitematā	\$40,000
Climate Action Network - Waitematā	\$11,000
Kia rite kia mau - climate preparedness and resilience for school communities	\$15,000
Low Carbon Lifestyles - Waitematā	\$30,000
Newmarket / Middleton stream restoration - Waitematā	\$6,250
Schools treasuring Waiōrea	\$15,000
Te Wai Ōrea lake and wetland restoration	\$20,000
Urban Ark strategic plan implementation - Waitematā	\$40,000
Waipapa Stream restoration	\$20,000
Waipāruru stream restoration	\$10,000
Waitematā waste away	\$41,000
Waitītiko / Meola Creek restoration - Waitematā	\$21,000
Total	\$279,250

- b) approve in principle the 2023/2024 Infrastructure and Environmental Services work programmes (Attachment A to the agenda report)
- c) note that the indicative programmes and budgets for 2023/2024 are subject to change, and will be confirmed on an annual basis through the approval of the respective work programmes.

CARRIED

20 Approval of the 2022/2023 Waitematā Local Board Customer and Community Services work programme

Katrina Morgan, Work Programme Lead Community Facilities, and Martin Wong, Area Operations Manager Community Facilities, were in attendance to speak to this item.

Resolution number WTM/2022/123

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham, seconded by Chairperson R Northey:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) approve the 2022/2023 Customer and Community Services work programme and its associated budget (Attachment A to the agenda report).

- b) approve in principle the 2023/2024 Customer and Community Services work programme (Attachment A to the agenda report), noting that the LDI Opex allocations will be balanced to budgets in the associated future years' work programme.
- c) approve in principle the 2024/2025 Customer and Community Services - Community Facilities only work programme (Attachment A to the agenda report), noting that the LDI Opex allocations will be balanced to budgets in the associated future years' work programme.
- d) approve the Risk Adjusted Programme projects identified in the 2022/2023 Customer and Community Services work programme (Attachment A to the agenda report).
- e) provide feedback for consideration by the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee on projects funded from the Landslide Prevention, Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets (Attachment D to the agenda report).
- f) note that funding for the Coastal Renewals, Landslide Prevention, Local Parks and Sports Field Development budgets is subject to approval by the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee
- g) note that there may be minor changes to year one of the 2022/2023 Local Board Customer and Community Services Work Programme, and other changes in years 2 and 3 which are approved in principle, due to Annual Budget decisions affecting capital budgets and that changes required will be discussed with and reported to the local board early in the new financial year.

CARRIED

21 Waitematā Local Board Quick Response Grant round two 2021/2022 grant allocations.

Arna Casey, Grants Advisor, was in attendance to speak to this item.

Resolution number WTM/2022/124

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Member GS Sage:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) agree to fund the applications received for the Waitematā Quick Response Grants round two for the amounts as listed in Table One below:

Application ID	Organisation	Main focus	Requesting funding for	Amount approved
QR2220-218	All My Friends Limited	Arts and culture	Towards venue hire and artists fees	\$2,420.00
QR2220-223	Artsense Productions Limited	Arts and culture	Towards producer fees and marketing including social media	\$3,000.00
QR2220-208	Asthma New Zealand Incorporated	Community	Towards the costs of asthma spacers	\$1,500.00

QR2220-222	Authenticity Aotearoa	Community	Towards the cost of a photographer and a live illustrator for the Womxn of Colour Conference 2022	\$1,500.00
QR2220-212	Melanoma New Zealand	Community	Towards wages of an Education Nurse and an Administrator	\$1,260.00
QR2220-216	Grey Lynn 2030 <i>Grey Lynn 2030 Transition</i>	Community	Towards educational and promotional mater, room hire, refreshments and sewing haberdashery	\$2,300.00
QR2220-209	Social Innovation New Zealand	Community	Towards catering for the Social Innovation Conference 2022	\$2,000.00; and specifically request local board branding
QR2220-220	The Yes And Trust	Arts and culture	Towards coordinator wages for the Fun Size Festival	\$2,000.00
Total				\$15,980.00

- b) decline the following applications received for the Waitematā Quick Response round two, listed in table two below:

Application ID	Organisation	Main focus	Requesting funding for	Decline reason
QR2220-205	The Auckland Women's Centre Incorporated	Arts and culture	Towards the costs of a yoga facilitator, art equipment, room hire and advertising	Decline – Grants round oversubscribed

QR2220-202	Everybody Eats Charitable Trust	Community	Towards food costs, cutlery and packaging	Decline - Ineligible due to having been previously funded for the same activity this financial year
QR2220-224	Fireplace Arts & Media Limited	Arts and culture	Towards the cost of two musicians for "Station Music" at Parnell Station	Decline – Grants round oversubscribed
QR2220-219	Little Wild Music Limited	Arts and culture	Towards venue hire	This application was withdrawn.
QR2220-221	The Actor's Program	Arts and culture	Towards the cost of a lighting rig	Decline – There is low alignment with the local board's priorities and/ or community outcomes
QR2220-214	The Upside Downs Education Trust	Community	Towards the cost of subsidising speech and language therapy	Decline – There is low alignment with the local board's priorities and/ or community outcomes
QR2220-207	Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust	Community	Towards counsellor helpline training, management, and support from July 2022 to March 2023	Decline - Ineligible due to having been previously funded for the same activity this financial year

CARRIED

Item 23 was taken at this point with the consent of the meeting due to its potential impact on Attachments A and B of item 22.

23 Changes to local board members appointments and delegations

Resolution number WTM/2022/125

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Member GF Fryer:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **appoint Member Genevieve Sage as the alternate for the Parks, Sports and Recreation topic portfolio area**
- b) **appoint Member Genevieve Sage as the alternate liaison for the Newmarket Business Association**
- c) **appoint Member Genevieve Sage as the alternate liaison for the Parnell Business Association.**

CARRIED

22 2022/2023 Joint CCO Local Board Engagement Plans and 2021/2022 Quarter Three Update

Maclean Grindell, Senior Local Board Advisor, and Andrea Webley, Local Board Engagement Advisor, were in attendance to speak to this item.

Member G Gunthorp left the meeting at 4.11 pm and returned to the meeting at 4.13 pm.

Resolution number WTM/2022/126

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Member GF Fryer:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **adopt the Joint CCO Local Board Engagement Plan 2022/2023 as agreed between the local board and Auckland Council's substantive Council-Controlled Organisations: Auckland Transport, Eke Panuku Development Auckland, Tātaki Auckland Unlimited and Watercare with the following updates to personnel:**
 - i) **Senior Advisor: Caroline Teh**
 - ii) **Member Genevieve Sage: Co-Portfolio: Parks, Sports and Recreation**
- b) **note that the attachments to the Joint CCO Local Board Engagement Plan 2022/2023 will be updated as needed, with changes reported to the local board each quarter**
- c) **authorise the chair of the local board to sign this agreement on behalf of the local board, alongside representatives from the four CCOs.**

CARRIED

24 Draft Auckland golf investment plan

Maclean Grindell, Senior Local Board Advisor, was in attendance to speak to this item.

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Member G Gunthorp:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) support in principle the draft Auckland golf investment plan titled *Where all Aucklanders benefit from publicly owned golf land* attached to this report (Attachment A) provided the land is retained in Council ownership and continues to be available for sport and recreation activities
- b) support the three policy objectives set in the draft Auckland golf investment plan:
 - i) increased equity, sport and recreation by opening up publicly owned golf land to all Aucklanders
 - ii) increased equity and participation by providing a broad range of golf experiences that attract and retain participants and services targeted at low participation groups
 - iii) best practice in ecosystem management and biodiversity conservation of publicly owned golf land
- c) support the principles of the decision-making framework proposed in the draft Auckland golf investment plan, in which future use of publicly owned golf land will be considered in the context of local needs, increased equity, participation and environmental outcomes
- d) note that local boards are the key decision makers in regard to local provision of sporting activity and open space management, which does not appear to be reflected in the current Plan and recommend that the Golf Investment Plan be reviewed to ensure it aligns with the Governance Framework Review proposals for greater local decision making and accountability for local boards on local matters
- e) note the varied responses and views from the consultation period, as well as the overall support on the environmental aspects of the plan, in particular Policy Objective 3 (best practice in ecosystem management and biodiversity conservation)
- f) support staff updating the draft document with the information and feedback collected, in order to make the plan more efficient so it can meet both needs of golf in the future, as well as the community needs for more equity in participation.

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstained</u>
Deputy Chairperson A Bonham Member GF Fryer Member G Gunthorp Member KL Leoni Chairperson R Northey Member J Sandilands	Member GS Sage	

The motion was declared CARRIED by 6 votes to 1.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 4.34 and readjourned at 4.37.

25 Allocation of the Waitematā Local Board Transport Capital Fund

Ben Stallworthy, Elected Member Relationship Partner AT was in attendance to speak to this item.

Resolution number WTM/2022/127

MOVED by Member G Gunthorp, seconded by Member J Sandilands:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **approve the allocation of up to \$87,000 from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund for Auckland Transport to deliver all or part the Rose Road Plaza project**
- b) **request that if the project cannot be delivered within the allocated budget that Auckland Transport report back to the board with advice and options for the board to consider and prioritise delivery accordingly**
- c) **request Auckland Transport to provide a rough order of costs for the delivery of the Parnell Wayfinding Signage project.**

CARRIED

26 Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund 2022 - Local Board views

Macleon Grindell, Senior Local Board Advisor, was in attendance to speak to this item.

Resolution number WTM/2022/128

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham, seconded by Member J Sandilands:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **endorse the following application to be considered for investment through the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund 2022:**
 - i) **Western Springs Association Football Club
Western Springs Community Precinct Development
Seddon Fields, 180 Meola Rd, Western Springs
\$1,800,000.00**

CARRIED

27 Urgent decision to approve Waitematā Local Board feedback to be included in Auckland Council's feedback on the draft National Adaptation Plan (NAP)

Resolution number WTM/2022/129

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham, seconded by Member J Sandilands:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) **receive the urgent decision to approve local board feedback on Auckland Council's feedback on the draft National Adaptation Plan (NAP).**

CARRIED

28 Chairperson's report

Resolution number WTM/2022/130

MOVED by Member GF Fryer, seconded by Member G Gunthorp:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the Chair's report for June 2022.

CARRIED

29 Board member reports

Resolution number WTM/2022/131

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the written reports from Deputy Chair Bonham and Member Gunthorp
- b) receive verbal reports from Member Fryer, Member Leoni, Member Sage, and Member Sandilands for June 2022.

CARRIED

30 Governance Forward Work Calendar

Resolution number WTM/2022/132

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Member J Sandilands:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the governance forward work calendar as at 21 June 2022.

CARRIED

31 Waitematā Local Board workshop records

Resolution number WTM/2022/133

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Bonham:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the Waitematā Local Board workshop records for the workshops held 24 May, 31 May, 7 June, and 14 June 2022.

CARRIED

32 Consideration of Extraordinary Items

There was no consideration of extraordinary items.

5.13 pm

The Chair thanked Members, staff and public for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD
AT A MEETING OF THE WAITEMATĀ LOCAL BOARD
HELD ON

DATE:.....

CHAIR:.....