

## Kaipātiki Local Board

# OPEN MINUTES

---

---

Minutes of a meeting of the Kaipātiki Local Board held in the Kaipātiki Local Board Office, 90 Bentley Avenue, Glenfield on Wednesday, 25 January 2023 at 10.07am.

---

### TE HUNGA KUA TAE MAI | PRESENT

<b>Chairperson</b>	John Gillon	
<b>Deputy Chairperson</b>	Danielle Grant, JP	
<b>Members</b>	Paula Gillon	<i>Electronic attendance from item 1 – item 11.</i>
	Erica Hannam	<i>Until item 15, 11.26am on Friday 27 January.</i>
	Melanie Kenrick	
	Tim Spring	<i>Absent from item 1 – item 10.</i>
	Dr Janet Tupou	<i>Absent from item 1 – item 10. Electronic attendance during item 11.</i>
	Adrian Tyler	<i>Electronic attendance from item 1 – item 19, Absent during item 11.</i>

---



## 1 Nau mai | Welcome

The Chairperson opened the meeting, welcomed those in attendance followed by Member Adrian Tyler leading the meeting with a karakia.

Whakataka te hau kite uru	Cease o winds from the west
Whakataka te hau kite tonga	Cease o winds from the south
Kia mākinakina ki uta	Bring calm breezes over the land
Kia mātaratara ki tai	Bring calm breezes over the sea
E hī ake ana te atakura	And let the red-tipped dawn come
He tio	With a touch of frost
He huka	A sharpened air
He hau hū	And promise of a glorious day
Tīhei mauri ora!	

### 1.1 Electronic Attendance

Resolution number KT/2023/1

MOVED by Member E Hannam, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **approve the request for electronic attendance from Member Paula Gillon and Member Adrian Tyler to accommodate the members representing council.**

**CARRIED**

Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 3.3.1, members of the local board or its committees have the right to attend meetings by means of an electronic link, provided conditions of the standing orders are met.

## 2 Ngā Tamōtanga | Apologies

Resolution number KT/2023/2

MOVED by Member E Hannam, seconded by Member A Tyler:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **accept the apology from Member Tim Spring and Member Dr Janet Tupou for lateness.**

**CARRIED**

## 3 Te Whakapuaki i te Whai Pānga | Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

## 4 Te Whakaū i ngā Āmiki | Confirmation of Minutes

Resolution number KT/2023/3

MOVED by Member A Tyler, seconded by Member M Kenrick:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 7 December 2022, as true and correct, with the following correction to the minutes**

attachment of item 16 - Adoption of business meeting schedule for the 2022-2025 electoral term:

- i) the May 2025 workshop and meeting dates to be held on Wednesday's not Thursday's.

**CARRIED**

## 5 He Tamōtanga Motuhake | Leave of Absence

There were no leaves of absence.

## 6 Te Mihi | Acknowledgements

There were no acknowledgements.

## 7 Ngā Petihana | Petitions

There were no petitions.

## 8 Ngā Tono Whakaaturanga | Deputations

There were no deputations.

## 9 Te Matapaki Tūmatanui | Public Forum

### 9.1 Cresta Ave Beach Haven Development - Ruth Jackson

Documents titled 'Kaipātiki Local Board presentation 13 Cresta 96 Beach Haven' and 'AUP H3 Residential - Single House Zone' were tabled. A copy of the tabled documents have been placed on the official minutes and are available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number KT/2023/4

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) receive the public forum item and tabled documents and thank Ruth Jackson for her attendance.
- b) note that the Kaipātiki Local board will be providing feedback.

**CARRIED**

### Attachments

- A 25 January 2023 - Kaipātiki Local Board Business Meeting - Kaipātiki Local Board presentation 13 Cresta 96 Beach Haven
- B 25 January 2023 - Kaipātiki Local Board Business Meeting - AUP H3 Residential - Single House Zone

## 10 Ngā Pakihi Autaia | Extraordinary Business

There was no extraordinary business.

### Precedence of Business

Resolution number KT/2023/5

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **agree that item 12: Local Board feedback on the draft Future for Local Government report – item 19: Workshop Records – Kaipātiki Local Board – December 2022 be accorded precedence at this time.**

**CARRIED**

### 12 Local board feedback on the draft Future for Local Government report

Resolution number KT/2023/6

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Member E Hannam:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **defer item to Kaipātiki Local Board 15 February 2023 business meeting.**

**CARRIED**

### 13 Resource management reform: Natural and Built Environment Bill and Spatial Planning Bill

Resolution number KT/2023/7

MOVED by Member M Kenrick, seconded by Member P Gillon:

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

- a) **provide the following feedback on the Natural and Built Environment Bill and Spatial Planning Bill to inform the council’s draft submission:**
  - i) **support the principle that the Resource Management Act system requires reform.**
  - ii) **support the purpose of the new resource management system:**
    - A) **to enable the use, development, and protection of the environment in a way that:**
      - 1) **supports the well-being of present generations without compromising the well-being of future generations; and**
      - 2) **promotes outcomes for the benefit of the environment; and**
      - 3) **complies with environmental limits and their associated targets; and**
      - 4) **manages adverse effects; and**
      - 5) **recognises and upholds te Oranga o te Taiao.**
- b) **express concern over the cost to Auckland Council of implementing these changes, including the cost of developing and monitoring new economic instruments, increased monitoring, enforcement, as well as review and compliance with the National Planning Framework.**
- c) **express concern that through the establishment of the Regional Planning Committees, the Spatial Planning Bill creates a new layer of local government,**

- but without any democratic accountability. We are concerned at the further erosion of democracy at the local government level in New Zealand.
- d) express concern about the proposed role of central government in determining priorities for local communities. Local priorities should be determined by local government, with central government providing funding through agreements.
- e) oppose the proposed structure and key elements of the Natural and Built Environment Bill and Spatial Planning Bill, particularly the following aspects (in no particular order):
- i) There is a reduction in input and decision-making by locally elected representatives over local matters.
  - ii) There is a reduction in local community input in both the planning framework and on a case-by-case basis development.
  - iii) There is no recognition of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 and unique governance role of local boards.
  - iv) Local board plans do not have statutory weight.
  - v) Moving decision-making away from territorial authorities means there is separation of decision-making between planning and funding decisions, which is a particular issue for future infrastructure.
  - vi) Territorial authorities are required to provide funding and implementation of a planning document that they do not have decision-making over.
  - vii) The lack of democratic input into the development of Spatial Plans in concerning. We believe that local government should 'own' both the Regional Planning Committee and the process and not be relegated to the position of 'members'.
  - viii) Reduction of consent categories from six to four with non-complying and restricted discretionary activities removed.
  - ix) Permitted baselines will be removed and replaced by a requirement for consent authorities to have regard to the likely state of the future environment, as specified in the Natural and Built Environment plan, Regional Spatial Strategies and National Planning Framework.
  - x) There is significant change to the test for public and limited notification, such as the removal of the threshold of effects being minor.
  - xi) The Bill states that public participation must be encouraged, however it does not provide any requirement for the Regional Planning Committee to respond meaningfully to this public engagement or make amendments based upon public input. It is vitally important that the information received from local communities, individuals, environmentalists, businesses and developers are taken into account when developing the plan.
  - xii) There is not enough ability to provide for tree protection in urban environments.
  - xiii) It is uncertain if the proposed system would achieve a key driver of the reform, which is to make the process less onerous for the public.
  - xiv) There is risk that local issues will not be able to be adequately reflected or addressed, such as heritage, special character, sites of cultural significance, protection of maunga (mountains), or coastal areas.
- f) does not agree with the proposed makeup of the Regional Planning Committee as outlined in the Spatial Planning Bill, and instead suggests that the Regional Planning Committee should be a committee of Council with all members being

- elected representatives. It is particularly important that elected members of local government run the process as they represent the different communities of interest within the region. In particular, the Kaipātiki Local Board does not believe that central government should have a member on the committee and instead any central government representative should be provided with ‘observer’ status with speaking rights, but not voting rights.
- g) oppose the inclusion of a fast-track consenting process that appears to be modelled from the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020, as captured in “Subpart 8 - Specified housing and infrastructure fast-track consenting process”, for the following reasons:
- i) The COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 provisions were for the specific purpose of providing economic stimulus in response to COVID impacts. Turning this provision into a ‘business as usual’ provision would undermine the usual resource consenting process, including the provision of local feedback.
  - ii) The fast-track consenting process could create a bypass for significant and complex developments for which local communities have an interest in providing feedback.
  - iii) The fast turnaround for feedback on complex applications with a large amount of documentation means that effective and thorough feedback from local boards and the community will be difficult to provide within timeframes.
  - iv) That parties with ‘a greater than average interest’ be allowed to participate in the process, for example, relevant local groups (environmental, historical, cultural, etc.) who can demonstrate an actual interest in the project.
- h) strongly oppose s590 (2)(b) and (3) of the Natural and Built Environment Bill, where compensation is required by the Territorial Authority to the allotment owner, when an esplanade reserve is required to be taken on a subdivision of less than 4 hectares, noting that:
- i) this change in process will likely be unaffordable to Territorial Authorities who will then likely not follow through with acquiring esplanade reserves from subdivisions,
  - ii) consequentially that contravenes the outcomes set out in the purposes of the Bill regarding the need to consider coastal erosion, environmental benefits and current and future generational wellbeing, as many of these strips become environmental preserves or coastal walkways.
- i) opposes s25 (3) of the Spatial Planning Bill where it states that “the regional planning committee must not have regard to (a) effects on scenic views from private properties or land transport assets that are not stopping places”. Views of our beautiful maunga, awa and reserves deserve to be protected and not be obstructed. Often these views contribute to community wellbeing and mental health.
- j) strongly support the significantly more aggressive position in relation to compliance and enforcement in the Natural and Built Environment Bill.
- k) support strengthening tree protection measures in the Natural and Built Environment Bill, as proposed by the Tree Council’s “Stop the Chop” campaign, including:
- i) deleting the restriction on councils protecting trees in s125, noting that as proposed this removes and prevents the general tree protections on

public land, undeveloped land and rural land currently in the Resource Management Act 1991.

- ii) supporting the proposed directions to councils protecting trees in the National Planning Framework.
- iii) requiring the urgent and immediate introduction of the elements of the National Planning Framework that will direct councils to protect trees, rather than waiting for up to 8 years to implement this element.
- iv) supporting a requirement for councils to maintain a schedule of notable trees for their region and require those councils who do not currently have such a schedule to create one by a specified date.

**CARRIED**

#### 14 Kaipātiki Local Board Feedback on Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Community Participation) Amendment Bill

Resolution number KT/2023/8

MOVED by Member A Tyler, seconded by Member M Kenrick:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) endorse Auckland Council’s submission on the Government’s Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Community Participation) Amendment Bill, with the following change:
  - i) remove the proposed amendment related to “requiring people appealing the granting or renewal of a licence to have a demonstrated tie to the relevant community”, on the grounds that individuals and organisations with no direct tie to the community may provide very relevant information and/or support, or indeed may be the only advocate for under-resourced communities with high risk of alcohol-related harm. This change could be detrimental to the very communities that Council would like to see more empowered. Also, as applicants themselves do not need to demonstrate such a tie to the relevant community, the proposed change would be an unfair one.
  - ii) include an amendment to give greater weighting to expert and local submissions on the granting or renewal of a licence (instead of the amendment addressed in clause i).

**CARRIED**

*Note: Item 15 was taken after item 11*

#### Precedence of Business

Resolution number KT/2023/9

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) agree that item 16: Kaipātiki Local Board Chairperson’s Report – item 11: Local Board feedback on Auckland Unitary Plan changes 78-83 be accorded precedence at this time.

**CARRIED**



**16 Kaipātiki Local Board Chairperson's Report**

Resolution number KT/2023/10

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **note the chairperson's verbal report.**

**CARRIED**

**17 Members' Reports**

Resolution number KT/2023/11

MOVED by Member M Kenrick, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **note the written report from Member Melanie Kenrick.**

**CARRIED**

**17.1 Member report - E Hannam**

Resolution number KT/2023/12

MOVED by Member E Hannam, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **note the verbal report from Member Erica Hannam.**

**CARRIED**

**17.2 Member report - Deputy Chairperson D Grant**

Resolution number KT/2023/13

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson D Grant, seconded by Member E Hannam:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **note the verbal report from Deputy Chairperson Danielle Grant.**

**CARRIED**

**18 Governing Body and Independent Māori Statutory Board Members' Update**

There were no updates provided at this time.

**19 Workshop Records - Kaipātiki Local Board - December 2022**

Resolution number KT/2023/14

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson D Grant, seconded by Member A Tyler:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **note the record for the Kaipātiki Local Board workshop held on Wednesday 14 December 2022.**

**CARRIED**

### Adjournment of Meeting

Resolution number KT/2023/15

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **agree to adjourn the meeting until 10am on Friday 27 January 2023.**

**CARRIED**

*Meeting adjourned at 10.46am until 10am on Friday 27 January 2023.*

*Meeting reconvened at 10.09am on Friday 27 January 2023.*

*Member T Spring joined the meeting.*

*Member A Tyler left the meeting and was absent for the vote on item 11.*

### Adjournment of Meeting

Resolution number KT/2023/16

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **agree to adjourn the meeting until 11.00am.**

**CARRIED**

*Meeting adjourned at 10.10am until 11.00am*

*Meeting reconvened at 11.15am.*

### 1.2 Electronic Attendance

Resolution number KT/2023/17

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **approve the request for electronic attendance from Member Janet Tupou to accommodate the members representing council.**

**CARRIED**

Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 3.3.1, members of the local board or its committees have the right to attend meetings by means of an electronic link, provided conditions of the standing orders are met.

## 11 Local Board feedback on Auckland Unitary Plan changes 78-83

A document titled 'Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) - Plan Change 78 – opinion by Jeremy Salmond' was tabled. A copy of the tabled document has been placed on the official minutes and are available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number KT/2023/18

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) provide the following feedback on proposed changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) as detailed in PC 78, PC 79, PC 80, PC 81, PC 82, and PC 83:

**General**

- i) note that the AUP became operative in 2016 after what is widely considered to have been a robust consultation and hearings process.
- ii) note that the AUP already delivers sufficient supply of housing for short, medium, and long term, including provisions for housing in central and fringe areas, as noted in the GM Auckland Plan Strategy & Research presentation to Planning Committee, 26 May, and 2 June 2021, and reported in Agenda / Minutes for the Planning Committee's October 2021 meeting:
- A) At least 909,000 net redevelopment opportunities exist now,
- B) 840,000 to 1.4 million redevelopments are considered commercially feasible,
- C) 300,000 to 320,000 are expected to be realised over the next 30 years,
- D) Projections allow for 15-20% greater demand possibilities: Projected short-term demand (2020-2023) 45,000; projected medium demand (2024-2031) 98,000; projected long-term demand (2032-2051) 239,000.
- Therefore there should be only an absolute minimum of changes to the AUP zoning through this plan change process.
- iii) note the most recent opinion of the late Jeremy Salmond (attached) regarding Special Character Areas, and recognise that this may have implications for special character areas in the Kaipātiki Local Board area.
- iv) we support warm, dry, affordable homes for our community with high standards of design, especially in areas of frequent public transport, appropriate infrastructure, access to adequate outdoor recreation space, and developed in a planned way rather than an ad hoc basis, however;
- v) we do not support the changes to the AUP foisted upon Auckland Council by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021, without being subject to the same public, democratic scrutiny and process as per the AUP.
- vi) as previously stated, we believe that the Governing Body should have seriously considered judicial challenge as a valid response to the NPS-UD (and indeed other National Policy Statements) instead of accepting it as "mandatory", as NPSs are not parliamentary legislation and open to judicial review.
- vii) we are extremely concerned about the radical impact that the new density and height-to-boundary rules will have on our community, which will allow far more intense and higher developments throughout the Kaipātiki Local Board area, and overrides the considerable public consultation that was done to shape the AUP.
- viii) we note that changes to most of the Kaipātiki Local Board area will include:
- A) the effective removal of the single-house zone,
- B) the effective conversion of all Mixed Housing Suburban zoning to Mixed Housing Urban zoning,

- C) allowance of three dwellings allowed per site without a resource consent, preventing Council from mitigating impacts on the surrounding area, including infrastructure, traffic, etc,
- D) reduction of the minimum site for a dwelling from 400-600m<sup>2</sup> to 300-400m<sup>2</sup>,
- E) reduction of distance to boundary to 1m,
- F) removal of minimum on-site parking requirements,
- G) removal of overlays, including the Special Character Areas and Significant Ecological Areas, and removal of notable trees,
- H) introduction of “walkable catchments” around rapid transit stops (and the city centre and metropolitan centres not in Kaipātiki) where building heights are required to be six or more storeys

**Submission and feedback endorsements**

- ix) endorse and support the thorough feedback provided by the Ōrākei Local Board to plan changes 78-83, much of which also applies to the Kaipātiki Local Board area, including their concern that council has not taken a precautionary response to zone changes.
- x) endorse and support submission 2191 from Graham and Sarah Hughes, of Northcote Point. The board acknowledges the considerable detail provided in this comprehensive submission. In particular, the local board supports consideration be given to applying the 'Residential - Low Density Residential Zone' to sub-block 8.7, and that this area be given an overlay of 'Special Character Areas Overlay Residential and Business'. Sub-block 8.7 is defined as the block bordered by Queen Street, Princes Street, Duke Street and Beach Road, being the odd numbered properties on Queen Street from 55 through to 83 inclusive, and even numbered properties on Princes Street with numbers 56 through to 72 inclusive.
- xi) endorse and support submission 2064 from Pest Free Kaipātiki Restoration Society. In particular, the local board supports consideration being given to reducing the amount of allowable impermeable site coverage on sites that have a Significant Ecological Area – Terrestrial (SEA-T) overlay from 60% of the site to less than 50%; and that the minimum amount of SAE-T coverage on a site to qualify for SEA-T protection be reduced from 30% to 20% in order to prevent fragmentation and cumulative loss and harm from development.
- xii) endorse and support submission 1404 from Birkenhead Residents Association. The board acknowledges the consultation undertaken by the Association during the pre-consultation phase and believes their submission reflects the feedback of the wider community, specifically around the impact on Special Character Areas. In particular, the local board supports consideration being given to the following points:
  - A) The relatively narrow extent of the SCA Overlay in Birkenhead means that: (a) many individual properties scored by Council as having high character value will lose the protection of the SCA Overlay and may be replaced with non-character buildings (with limited design controls to protect the local amenity) – this will erode the area’s connection to its distinctive built heritage; and (b) even in areas of Birkenhead that under PC78 would retain the SCA Overlay, these areas are surrounded by areas of only slightly lesser special character but that are proposed to lose the SCA Overlay. This means that properties that are actively detrimental to the area’s special

character may be built in close proximity to properties of high character value

- B) Support the inclusion of infrastructure constraints relating to water and wastewater as a qualifying matter in PC78. Our particular concern in relation to water and wastewater is that Wai Manawa / Little Shoal Bay and Le Roys Bush are already badly affected by freshwater flooding and sewage overflows after heavy rainfall. Increased intensification will only make that worse, because more building site coverage means more stormwater runoff. The area does not have the stormwater infrastructure to manage that – it is a sensitive ecological area that would be badly harmed by increased silting and runoff. Auckland Council is already responding to these issues through its work on a Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for Wai Manawa / Little Shoal Bay. It would be counterproductive to allow increased intensification in the hydrological catchment of Wai Manawa at the same time as Council is already trying to mitigate the effects of existing stormwater runoff in the same area.

- xiii) support submissions encouraging the provision of sufficient open space across the city.

#### Walkable Catchments

- xiv) we request that all walkable catchments be conditional on:

- A) whether adequate infrastructure can be provided,
- B) the retention of existing levels of public spaces, parks, and reserves, and the provision of additional public spaces, parks and reserves commensurate with the expected increase in population,
- C) the adoption of a ‘sunlight admission control’ which protects sunlight and daylight in public spaces including parks, reserves, lakes, foreshore, and beaches, and height controls to ensure the same are not dominated by the surrounding built environment.
- D) including pedestrian infrastructure, such as seating and mature trees.
- E) including minimum parking spaces and appropriate spread of disabled parking and loading zones.

- xv) we do not support walkable catchments where they will adversely affect Special Character areas,

- xvi) we do not support walkable catchments being applied to ferry terminals. The Kaipātiki Local Board area has three ferry terminals within its catchment: Northcote Point, Birkenhead Point and Beach Haven. The majority of land surrounding the ferry terminals currently has an overlay of, special character, coastal instability, or protected tree schedules. The three ferry terminals within the Kaipātiki area all have historical significance. Both Northcote and Birkenhead ferry terminals have historical walks that encompass the wharf area and the surrounding streets. Northcote Point Ferry Terminal do not provide all weather service. The ferry is often unable to provide a service, and so it is therefore disingenuous to provide intensive housing based on transport connectivity.

#### Special Character Areas

- xvii) support Special Character Areas (SCAs), both residential and business as a qualifying matter.

xviii) we request the retention of the existing Special Character Areas and boundaries, as identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter D18 Special Character Areas Overlay (including Birkenhead Point and Northcote Point). Our particular concern is that the change creates a bias towards further erosion of the SCA Overlay, by:

- A) undermining the SCA Overlay, even in areas where PC78 currently leaves it intact; and
- B) authorising the destruction of properties of high character value, where PC78 removes the SCA Overlay.

Those two impacts would be a great loss to the city, but with only a minimal effect on overall housing capacity. We seek an amendment to PC78 that modifies the application of Council's scoring system for identifying where to retain the SCA Overlay. Our proposal is that a 50% threshold (still a majority of character-supporting buildings) should be sufficient, with properties scoring 4, 5 or 6 counting towards this percentage. Council's own materials refer to properties scoring 4 as "character-supporting" – such properties should count towards inclusion in the SCA Overlay, not towards removal. This approach would result in materially greater coverage of Birkenhead as a Special Character Area, which we believe is an accurate reflection of the area's distinctive character value and heritage.

xix) note the following excerpts from Parliamentary Hansard that confirm that the understanding of members of parliament was that under the NPS-UD, Auckland Council would have the discretion to retain Special Character Areas:

- A) Nicola Willis (National Party): We also listened intently to local authorities who said that they needed to maintain some discretion so that they could exclude areas from intense housing development that were not properly suited to it—areas, for example, that were subject to natural hazards, areas that had historic heritage, areas which would not be able to support the level of housing that this bill implies. So, we tidied up the qualifying matters section of this bill to ensure that local authorities were able to carry over assessments formed during previous planning processes.
- B) Eugenie Sage (Green Party): But it is on those matters that there were changes to the bill to provide a little bit more flexibility for councils to ensure that medium density happens in more suitable—well, doesn't happen in unsuitable areas.
- C) Simon Watts (National Party): An issue that was raised a lot in my electorate was around the exclusions around particularly heritage zoning. If any of you have been to the beautiful Devonport Peninsula on the North Shore, it is a stunning location. I'm slightly biased, but it is a lovely part of our city, and I'm glad to see that a number of the considerations around special character zones—that the council will be able to ensure that those protections remain. And that's really important, not only for heritage but also for environmental aspects and other risk considerations.

#### Historic Heritage

- xx) support the changes proposed within plan change 83:
- xxi) support the list of historic heritage places being a dynamic current schedule.

- xxii) enable the addition of new historic places to the historic schedule. Note that Auckland Council officers have acknowledged that many sites within Kaipātiki have not yet been assessed for addition to the schedule.

#### Infrastructure

- xxiii) note that the wide application of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS), which will allow development to occur randomly whether or not within a walkable catchment or near a centre or serviced by infrastructure, make it difficult to plan infrastructure and run a reliable and affordable public transport network.
- xxiv) support the inclusion of infrastructure constraints relating to water and wastewater as a qualifying matter in PC78.
- xxv) support insufficient water pressure or access to water to fight fires as a qualifying matter.
- xxvi) support the inclusion of flood plains, water courses and areas at risk of coastal inundation as a qualifying matter.

#### Transport

- xxvii) support the proposed changes to transport provisions in PC79, with the following changes:
- A) require all new builds to have compulsory minimum on-site car parking per dwelling,
  - B) require all new builds to have adequate vehicle access for emergency services and support the request by Emergency Services that new design enables access for paramedics.
  - C) undertake further consultation with disabled people around requirements for accessible parking,
  - D) amend references to the provision of cycling and walking to include micro-mobility vehicles.
  - E) strongly support the proposals to improve pedestrian safety on private ways in developments
  - F) support consideration of how heavy vehicles will access rubbish for collection at the design stage but note that ideally loading and collection can take place kerbside.
  - G) support future proofing new developments to include electric vehicle charging, noting that there may be some safety considerations to this.

#### Notable Trees

- xxviii) support the following changes proposed within plan change 83:
- A) update legal descriptions and/or addresses where they have changed as a result of development and subdivision,
  - B) correct minor errors such as spelling grammar,
  - C) improve the location of symbology in the Notable Trees Overlay to ensure the trees are accurately identified where the location has been verified,
  - D) update the number of trees for different species where this has been omitted,
  - E) improve species descriptions where these are not specific enough,

- F) remove 51 notable trees (27 listings in full and 11 partial listings) where there is evidence they have been physically removed as a result of consents (often development or subdivision related) emergency works and/or deteriorated health.
- xxix) note that a long-term approach is required to support the protection of notable trees being managed.
- xxx) support the list of notable trees being a dynamic current schedule.
- xxxii) enable the addition of new nominated trees to the Schedule on an on-going basis.
- xxxiii) strengthen the provisions which protect notable trees and annually review and add nominated trees.
- xxxiv) support the Notable Tree criteria set out in the Regional Policy Statement B4.5.2
- b) does not provide feedback on variations 4 and 5, as they do not apply to the Kaipātiki Local Board area.
- c) appoint Chairperson John Gillon and Deputy Chairperson Danielle Grant to speak to the local board views at a hearing in 2023.
- d) delegate authority to the chairperson to make a replacement appointment in the event Chairperson and/or Deputy Chairperson appointed in resolution c) are unable to attend the hearing.

**CARRIED**

#### Attachments

- A 25 January 2023 - Kaipātiki Local Board Business Meeting - Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) - Plan Change 78 – opinion by Jeremy Salmond

#### Adjournment of Meeting

Resolution number KT/2023/19

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) agree to adjourn the meeting until 2.30pm on Wednesday 8 February.

**CARRIED**

*Meeting adjourned at 11.26am on Friday 27 January 2023 until Wednesday 8 February 2023.*

*Member E Hannam left the meeting.*

*Meeting reconvened at 2.47pm on Wednesday 8 February 2023.*

*Member A Tyler rejoined the meeting.*

*Note: Chairperson J Gillon, Deputy Chairperson D Grant, Member P Gillon, Member M Kenrick, Member T Spring, Member Dr J Tupou and Member A Tyler were in attendance in person.*



## 15 Annual Budget 2023/2024 local board consultation content

Documents titled 'Kaipātiki Local Board consultation document content' and Kaipātiki Local Board supporting information' was tabled. A copy of the tabled documents has been placed on the official minutes and are available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number KT/2023/20

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Member A Tyler:

**That the Kaipātiki Local Board:**

- a) **urge the Governing Body to find another way to fund the budget shortfall other than cutting local board budgets by \$16 million. We believe that the cuts being asked for are unpalatable and that it is wrong to cut local funding that will have widespread negative effect when there are many other regional options that could be considered.**
- b) **note that the proposed reduction of \$16 million to local board operational funding will need to be sought from both the local boards Locally Driven Initiatives and the Asset Based Services budgets, both of which directly support our local services such as arts and culture, environment and climate response, library services and opening hours, community programmes, events and youth.**
- c) **note that only a small portion of Asset Based Services budget is available to be considered for savings due to existing contractual commitments and the inability to realise savings for FY24. This means that the proposed reduction will more likely represent a significant cut of up to 50% of the board's Locally Driven Initiative budget.**
- d) **request that the local consultation questions include a method of prioritisation and have options for submitters to provide at least five services of importance, rather than three services of importance.**
- e) **note that the draft consultation questions request a written, and therefore qualitative, response which will be open to interpretation and potentially difficult to base budget prioritising decisions on, as well as taking considerable staff resource to process, and note that such quantitative data can be presented to the community to support the difficult spending prioritisation the board is facing in a manner that qualitative data cannot.**
- f) **request that the consultation question format be changed to a quantitative methodology that collects direct ranking and prioritisation data, for instance by gathering numbered rankings, in order to clearly reflect community spending priorities.**
- g) **approve the tabled local consultation document content and local supporting information content for inclusion in the Annual Budget 2023/2024 consultation material.**
- h) **delegate authority to the local board Chair to approve any changes required to finalise the local consultation document and supporting information content for the Kaipātiki Local Board for the Annual Budget 2023/2024.**
- i) **approve the following Have Your Say event in the local board area during the Annual Budget 2023/2024 consultation period:**
  - i) **Drop-in event with presentation, Monday 27 March 2023, 6pm-8pm, Glenfield War Memorial Hall.**
- j) **delegate authority to the local board Chairperson to approve any changes required to the Have Your Say event.**

k) delegate to the following elected members and staff the power and responsibility to receive feedback and hear from the public through “spoken (or New Zealand sign language) interaction” at the council’s public engagement events during the consultation period for the Annual Budget 2023/2024:

- i) local board members and Chairperson
- ii) General Manager Local Board Services, Local Area Manager, Local Board Senior Advisor, Local Board Advisor, Local Board Engagement Advisor
- iii) any additional staff approved by the General Manager Local Board Services or the Group Chief Financial Officer.

**CARRIED**

**Attachments**

- A 25 January 2023 - Kaipātiki Local Board Business Meeting - Kaipātiki Local Board consultation document content
- B 25 January 2023 - Kaipātiki Local Board Business Meeting - Kaipātiki Local Board supporting information

**20 Te Whakaaro ki ngā Take Pūtea e Autaia ana | Consideration of Extraordinary Items**

There was no consideration of extraordinary items.

3.02 pm

The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

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

**DATE:**.....

**CHAIRPERSON:**.....