

I hereby give notice that an ordinary meeting of the Waitematā Local Board will be held on:

Date: Tuesday, 21 March 2023
Time: 1.00pm
Meeting Room: Council Chambers and via Microsoft Teams
Venue: Town Hall 301-317 Queen St,
Auckland, 1010

Waitematā Local Board

OPEN AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson	Genevieve Sage	
Deputy Chairperson	Greg Moyle, (JP, ED)	
Members	Alexandra Bonham	Anahera Rawiri
	Allan Matson	Sarah Trotman, (ONZM)
	Richard Northey, (ONZM)	

(Quorum 4 members)

16 March 2023

Contact Telephone: (09) 353 9654
Email: Katherine.kang@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

ITEM	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
1	Nau mai Welcome	5
2	Ngā Tamōtanga Apologies	5
3	Te Whakapuaki i te Whai Pānga Declaration of Interest	5
4	Te Whakaū i ngā Āmiki Confirmation of Minutes	5
5	He Tamōtanga Motuhake Leave of Absence	5
6	Te Mihi Acknowledgements	5
7	Ngā Petihana Petitions	5
8	Ngā Tono Whakaaturanga Deputations	5
	8.1 Deputation - Emily Bradley - Big Street Bikers	6
	8.2 Deputation - Ngā Puna o Waiōrea representatives and Gael Baldock - Student parking	6
9	Te Matapaki Tūmatanui Public Forum	7
10	Ngā Pakihi Autaia Extraordinary Business	7
11	Chairperson's report	9
12	Board member reports	11
13	Ward Councilor's Update	13
14	Helicopter Activity - Compliance and Monitoring Report - Options Assessment	15
15	Council-controlled organisation forward work programme and engagement approach for Quarter Four (April-June 2023)	27
16	Local Government New Zealand – membership of Auckland Council	35
17	Evaluation of the 2022 Auckland Council Elections	41
18	Waitematā Local Board workshop records	45
19	Governance Forward Work Calendar	47
20	Te Whakaaro ki ngā Take Pūtea e Autaia ana Consideration of Extraordinary Items	

1 Nau mai | Welcome

Chair G Sage will welcome those present and begin the meeting with a karakia.

2 Ngā Tamōtanga | Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

3 Te Whakapuaki i te Whai Pānga | Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

4 Te Whakaū i ngā Āmiki | Confirmation of Minutes

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 21 February 2023 as a true and correct record.

5 He Tamōtanga Motuhake | Leave of Absence

At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

6 Te Mihi | Acknowledgements

At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

7 Ngā Petihana | Petitions

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

8 Ngā Tono Whakaaturanga | Deputations

Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Waitematā Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

8.1 Deputation - Emily Bradley - Big Street Bikers

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To deliver a presentation to the board during the deputation segment of the business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. Emily Bradley on behalf of Big Street Bikers will be in attendance to present to the local board on the rollout of a network of Locky Dock secure e-bike parking and charging stations in Waitematā.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the presentation on the rollout of a network of Locky Dock secure e-bike parking and charging stations in Waitematā and thank Emily Bradley for their attendance.

8.2 Deputation - Ngā Puna o Waiōrea representatives and Gael Baldock - Student parking

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To deliver a presentation to the board during the deputation segment of the business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. Representatives of Ngā Puna o Waiōrea and Gael Baldock will be in attendance to present to the board on the issue of student parking in the Auckland Zoo user pays, overflow car park outside their school and TAPAC.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the presentation and thank the Ngā Puna o Waiōrea representatives and Gael Baldock for their attendance.

9 Te Matapaki Tūmatanui | Public Forum

A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from members.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public forum had been received.

10 Ngā Pakihi Autaia | Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

- (a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and
- (b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-
 - (i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
 - (ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

- (a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-
 - (i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
 - (ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but
- (b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”

Chairperson's report

File No.: CP2023/02641

Item 11

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide the opportunity for the Waitematā local board chair to provide an update on projects, meetings and other initiatives relevant to the local board's interests.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. An opportunity for the Waitematā Local Board Chair to update the local board on activities he has been involved in since the last regular meeting.
3. In accordance with Standing Order 2.4.7, the chair may, by way of report, bring any matter to the attention of a meeting of the local board or its committees that is within their role or function to consider.

Ngā tūtohunga


Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the Waitematā Local Board Chairperson's report for February to March 2023.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Chair Sage Board Report February March 2023	

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Author	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Glenn Boyd - Local Area Manager

Board member reports

File No.: CP2023/02642

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide an opportunity for the local board's elected members to update the Waitematā Local Board on matters they have been involved in following the previous month's meeting and other matters of interest to the board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. An opportunity for members of the Waitematā Local Board to provide a written or verbal update on their activities for the month or any other matter they wish to raise with the board.
3. This is an information item, and it is optional for board members to provide a written board member report for inclusion in the agenda.

Ngā tūtohunga


Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the written report from Member R Northey for February and March 2023.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Member Richard Northey Report February and March 2023	

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Author	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Glenn Boyd - Local Area Manager

Ward Councilor's Update

File No.: CP2023/02863

Item 13

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor Mike Lee with an opportunity to update the Waitematā Local Board on Governing Body issues.
2. A verbal update will be provided at the meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

3. Waitematā Local Board's Standing Orders clauses 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 provide provision in the local board meeting for Governing Body members to update their local board counterparts on regional matters of interest to the local board, or on any Council business matter the Governing Body member wishes to raise with the local board.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the verbal update from Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor, Mike Lee.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Author	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Glenn Boyd - Local Area Manager

Helicopter Activity - Compliance and Monitoring Report - Options Assessment

File No.: CP2023/01725

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To provide the Waitematā local board members with a summary of the findings of a Compliance and Monitoring Report about helicopter activity in the Auckland region with a focus on Waiheke, Aotea Great Barrier, and Waitematā Local Board areas; and to outline and seek comment on an assessment of options available to address helicopter activity based on that report.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. Planning Committee resolution PLA2022/40 for the meeting of 5 May 2022 (Attachment A) directed that a compliance and monitoring investigation to be undertaken to determine compliance levels with consents conditions and to provide an overview of patterns of activity on Waiheke and central Auckland; and for an assessment of options for managing helicopter activity based on the investigation findings to be reported back to the committee.
3. The Compliance and Monitoring report has been completed. A copy is provided as Attachment B to this report for information purposes.
4. The Compliance and Monitoring Report and Assessment and analysis of Options will be reported (as separate reports) to the Planning, Environment and Parks Committee meeting on 30 March.
5. For the purposes of this report, the findings of the Compliance and Monitoring report and the options analysis have been summarized.
6. Regarding compliance, the Compliance and Monitoring Report identifies that there is a high level of compliance with consents conditions by the consent holders. Consent holders are adhering to flight paths; and flight take-offs and landings are within the consented limits. Non-compliance is largely limited to changes in helicopter type to newer models. The standard of record keeping is considered reasonable and no evidence of deliberate under recording of flights was found.
7. The investigation into the pattern of helicopter activity, comparing Waiheke and other parts of Auckland identified that Waiheke helicopter activity is comparable to other parts of Auckland.
8. Discussions with the Civil Aviation Authority have identified that the levels of helicopter activity are not unsafe in terms of the relevant regulations.
9. Regarding complaints, the Compliance and Monitoring report identifies that the level of complaints (Auckland wide) received to council's complaints register about helicopter activity is low. There were 11 complaints received in 2020; six complaints received in 2021; and nine complaints received in 2022. For the Waitematā local board area the following complaints were recorded for the Herne Bay area. There were four complaints in 2020; one complaint in 2021 and two complaints in 2022.
10. Four options to address helicopter activity, based on the findings of the Compliance and Monitoring report have been investigated. The options are set out below:

Option 1: Defer until AUP review. This option defers review of planning regulations until the next review of the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) commencing from 2026.

Option 2: Early implementation of National Planning Standard 15 (NPS15) for helicopter noise measurement. This would manage noise effects in line with the national standards and align the HGI Plan and AUP.

Option 3: A more detailed plan modification to HGI Plan – helicopter rules; introducing Non-complying activity status in residential zones; and changing activity status of Restricted Discretionary Activities to become Discretionary Activities. This option removes the Restricted Discretionary Activity category.

Option 4: Plan change to AUP and a Plan modification to HGI Plan – helicopter rules - introducing Prohibited Activity status for helicopter activity in residential zones (HGI Plan and AUP); and changing activity status of Restricted Discretionary Activities to become Discretionary Activities (HGI Plan only).

11. Subject to receiving and reviewing any comments from the local board in response to this report, Option 2 is the preferred overall option, while it is noted that option 4 is essentially the option requested by the Waitematā Local Board.

Ngā tūhunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) note the findings of the Compliance and Monitoring report
- b) re-confirm previous Resolutions of 15 December 2021, WTM 2021/298; or advise of changes after considering the contents of this report.

Horopaki Context

12. Concern has been expressed by some Auckland residents, public interest groups, and three local boards about the number of and noise generated by helicopters and helipads in the Auckland area, the regulatory framework and process of considering resource consent applications, and whether consent holders are complying with consent conditions.
13. A report was provided to the Planning Committee on 5 May 2022 responding to resolutions from the Waitematā Local Board, the Waiheke local Board, and the Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board:
- a) Waitematā Local Board resolutions of 15 December 2021, WTM 2021/298 (a) to (c)
 - b) Waiheke Local Board resolutions of 15 December 2021, WHK /2021/178 (a) to (f)
 - c) Aotea Great Barrier Local Board resolutions of 22 March 2022.
14. The Waitemata Local Board resolved as follows:

[Waitemata Local Board Meeting, 14 December 2021](#)

13 Notice of Motion – Deputy Chair A Bonham to Recommend Plan Changes to AUP to Prohibit Recreational Helicopter Landings and Take-offs in Urban Residential Areas

Resolution number WTM/2021/298

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

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) recommend the Planning Committee instigate a plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan so that recreational helicopter landings and take-offs in urban and suburban residential areas become a prohibited activity
- b) recommend that recreational helicopter landings and take-offs in the coastal zone where adjacent to an urban or suburban residential area becomes a prohibited activity
- c) request that these resolutions are forwarded to the Planning Committee, the Regulatory Committee, the Climate Change Committee, the Mayor's Office and all other local boards.

CARRIED

15. Planning committee resolution PLA2022/40 (for the meeting of 5 May 2022) directed that a compliance and monitoring investigation be undertaken into compliance with consents conditions and to provide an overview of patterns of activity of helicopter activity with a focus on Waiheke and central Auckland; and that options for managing helicopter activity based on the investigation findings be assessed and reported to the committee.
16. The Compliance and Monitoring Report and an Options Report assessing four options to manage helicopter activity, based on the findings of the Compliance and Monitoring report will be reported to the Planning, Environment and Parks Committee on 30 March 2023.
17. A summary of the findings of the Compliance and Monitoring report and the four Options assessed is provided below.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

Compliance and patterns of activity

18. Flight log data has been obtained and analysed for a one-year period (April 2021 to April 2022). The key findings of the report relevant to Waitematā Local Board area summarised below.
19. Investigation of compliance with consent conditions showed a high level of compliance by consent holders with resource consent conditions. Consents holders are adhering to flight paths and flight numbers are within the consented limits. Non-compliance is largely limited to deviation from helicopter model, generally due to upgrading of helicopter type to a more modern aircraft. It is noted that the modern helicopters are generally quieter than those replaced.
20. Flight patterns research identifies busy areas in Auckland (based on the presence of commercial helipads). The levels of activity expressed as a percentage of all helicopter activity is as follows: Waiheke (3%) Mangere (3%), Mt Wellington (2%), Waitakere (2%), Papakura (2%); North Shore (50% and Howick (25%).
21. Flight tracking on consents in the Hauraki Gulf Islands including Aotea Great Barrier, and for the Waitematā Local Board area showed very low volumes of helicopter traffic and flights were often associated with emergency services or maintenance works.
22. Between 1 January 2020 – 31 December 2022, there were 26 complaints about helicopter noise or nuisance logged through council's official system (Refer attachment B). There were 11 complaints in 2020; 6 complaints in 2021; and 9 complaints in 2022. The suburbs with the highest number of complaints were Waiheke (8), Herne Bay (7) and Kumeu (2). The remainder were individual complaints for suburbs Mairerahi, Matakana, Mount Eden, New Windsor, Onehunga, Riverhead, Rodney, Takapuna, Waiau Pa. The complaints within the Waitematā local board area are limited to Herne Bay. These are as follows:

Complaints about helicopter noise or nuisance logged through council's complaints registry			
Suburb	2020	2021	2022
Herne bay	4	1	2

23. The CAA have reviewed aircraft movements and do not have any specific concerns with regards to flight safety.

Options assessment

24. Having regard to the findings of the Compliance and Monitoring report, four options have been assessed to address helicopter activity in relation to the concerns raised by the local boards. These are:
- Option 1 - Defer until AUP review.
25. This option defers a review of helicopter planning regulations until the next review of the AUP commencing from 2026 under current legislation.
- Option 2 - Early implementation of National Planning Standard - NPS15 for helicopter noise measurement.
26. This option is for amendments to the HGI Plan only –for the early implementation¹ of the mandatory directive contained in NPS15(1) that specifies use of *New Zealand Standard 6807:1994 – Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas to exclude 4.3 use of averaging.*
27. This option would implement NPS15 in the HGI Plan - Part 13 Transport by deleting the text at Rule 13.8.2 which specifies averaging (specifically, the use of 3-day rolling average) for the measurement of helicopter noise; and adding new text to provide clarification about the noise measurement method required under NPS15. As the three-day rolling average is not used in the AUP no change to the AUP would be required.
28. This option could occur in a short time-frame because s58I(3) of the RMA specifies that an amendment required by the National Planning Standards must not be subject to the processes set out in Schedule 1 of the RMA; and a public notice is released not later than 5 working days following, advising that amendments have been made. This process means that the amendments implemented are not open to challenge through submissions or appeals.
- Option 3 - Plan modification to HGI Plan – helicopter rules; introducing Non-complying activity status in residential zones; and changing activity status of Restricted Discretionary Activities to become Discretionary Activities
29. This option is for a plan modification to the HGI Plan only, to bring the HGI provisions into closer alignment with the AUP across the issues of activity status, notification guidance, and the implementation of NPS15 – helicopter noise measurement.
30. This option would involve the introduction of Non-complying activity status to helicopter activity in the residential zones to achieve a consistent approach with the AUP in relation to urban areas (the AUP applies Non-complying activity status in residential zones). (The AUP currently applies Non-complying activity status in residential zones).
31. This option would also involve increasing the activity status of helicopter activity that is a Restricted Discretionary Activity² (other than in Residential zones) to become a Discretionary Activity. The Discretionary Activity status rather than Non-complying recognises the Hauraki Gulf Islands separation by sea from mainland Auckland; and supports the intention that underpins the current provisions to provide for a range of transport modes including enabling access to remote properties and in association with commercial activities including tourism.

¹ The National Planning Standards are not required to be implemented until the next review of the AUP

² This option would retain the HGI Plan permitted activity category which provides for rural activity, fishing and utilities operation. All other helicopter activity (private and commercial uses) is provided for as restricted discretionary activity subject to meeting specified criteria (otherwise becoming Discretionary Activities).

32. Amending the status from Restricted Discretionary Activity to Discretionary would also be accompanied by deletion of the averaging provision in the noise standard, and the limitations on matters for discretion in considering applications. Consequently, the HGI Plan and AUP are brought into alignment in relation to implementation of the NPS15 helicopter noise measurement directives (that ‘averaging’ not be applied³).
33. The removal of Restricted Discretionary Activity would also align the HGI Plan with the AUP on the issue of notification, removing the presumption of non-notification for some helicopter activity. The HGI Plan Restricted Discretionary Rules presume non-notification (subject to assessment of whether special circumstances apply – determined on a case-by-case basis). This option would remove the Restricted Discretionary Activity category and therefore also removes the non-notification provisions included in that rule.

Option 4: Plan change to AUP/ Plan modification to HGI Plan – helicopter rules - introducing Prohibited Activity status for helicopter activity in residential zones (HGI Plan and AUP); and changing activity status of Restricted Discretionary Activities to become Discretionary Activities (HGI Plan only).

34. This option would remove any ability to establish helicopter activity in residential zones in both the AUP and HGI Plan, by making this a Prohibited Activity. This option would also amend the HGI Plan rules to remove the category of Restricted Discretionary Activities and provide for these as Discretionary Activities instead (as outlined in Option 3 above). This would bring the helicopter provisions of the HGI and AUP into closer alignment.
35. For the AUP, the proposed application of Prohibited Activity status in residential zones involves adding helicopters as a Prohibited Activity in all residential zone’s activity tables.
36. For HGI Plan this option is essentially the same as Option 3 except that helicopter activity in residential areas is proposed to be a Prohibited Activity rather than a Non-complying Activity. The replacement of Restricted Discretionary Activity to become Discretionary Activity is the same as outlined in Option 3.
37. It is noted that the introduction of Prohibited activity status was sought in the Waitematā Local Boards Notice of Motion considered on 14 December 2021. Resolution number WTM/2021/298 recommended recreational helicopter landings and take-offs in urban and suburban residential areas become a Prohibited activity.
38. An assessment of Options 1 to 4 in terms of benefits, costs, effectiveness/efficiency and risk is set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1: High Level Assessment of Options 1 to 4 against benefits, costs, effectiveness/efficiency and risk				
	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness/efficiency	Risk
Option 1 Defer until AUP Review	Economic benefit - does not incur costs of additional plan changes	Least financial cost, however possible cost to people (social/cultural effects) from noise levels and flight frequencies if new helipads are created under existing provisions. Possible opportunity cost (economic) for businesses that cannot obtain consents	Retains misalignment of AUP and HGI noise measurement methods	Noise measurement may impact on determination of activity status.

³ The AUP does not specify method, the NZ Standard NPS15 as a national standard applies.

	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness/ efficiency	Risk
<p>Option 2 Early implementation of NPS15</p>	<p>Implements NPS15 ahead of AUP review.</p> <p>Immediate effect – (in accordance with s581(3) of the RMA the implementation process Must Not use Schedule 1 process)</p> <p>Aligns AUP and HGI noise measurement methods.</p> <p>This option does not change activity status categories, but strengthens the Restricted Discretionary Activity category (removal of 3-day averaging lifts the “bottom line” of compliance assessment against the noise standards)</p> <p>Addresses noise effects by reducing minimum distance to notional boundary; and (Potentially) reduces flight numbers.</p>	<p>Administrative costs to prepare text amendments, and update HGI Plan and notify changes made.</p> <p>Streamlined Implementation process significantly reduces cost of changes to HGI Plan - (the directive under s581(3) to not use Schedule 1 process. There are therefore no submissions or appeals processes involved.</p> <p>A conservative estimate places the starting cost for Option 2 at circa \$5K.</p>	<p>Narrow scope focus will implement NPS15 and align AUP and HGI noise measurement methods.</p> <p>This option does not change activity status categories but strengthens the Restricted Discretionary Activity category as removal of 3-day averaging when measuring compliance with noise standards sets a higher “bottom line.”</p> <p>This would potentially reduce the number of take-offs and landings on a busy day and/or increase setback distances to notional boundaries from which compliance with noise standards is measured</p>	<p>Low risk.</p> <p>In accordance with s581(3) of the RMA the implementation process Must Not use Schedule 1 process. (i.e., there is no public consultation)</p> <p>The amendments so introduced have immediate effect and cannot be challenged.</p>

	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness/efficiency	Risk
<p>Option 3: Plan modification to HGI Plan – helicopter rules; introducing Non-complying activity status in residential zones; and changing activity status of Restricted Discretionary Activities to become Discretionary Activities</p>	<p>Brings AUP and HGI into closer alignment with both plans apply Non-complying activity status in residential zones.</p> <p>Also Implements NPS15 (through deletion of Restricted Discretionary Activity)</p>	<p>Economic and social costs to helipad operators – helipad applications will be more complex, with higher risk of being declined.</p> <p>Economic cost to council/ratepayers from Costs of initiating a Plan modification. Significant research cost to prepare evidence to standard required to support proposed changes. Significant pre-engagement process required with all stakeholders e.g., helicopter/tourism operators and wider community.</p> <p>Higher cost than Option 2 due to requirement to use Schedule 1 process. Further costs incurred due to increased complexity.</p> <p>It should be noted that there will overlap with AUP review which duplicate process including relitigating any decision made.</p> <p>For a complex plan change such as Option 3 a conservative estimate places the starting cost at \$250K⁴.</p>	<p>Likelihood of extended plan change processes (submissions and hearing) and appeals to decisions processes will be unlikely to be resolved ahead of the AUP review In this context, and in the interests of avoiding duplication of process, the AUP review is a more efficient/effective process to undertake a wider review of the regulatory framework for managing helicopter activity.</p>	<p>Likelihood of extended plan change processes (submissions and hearing and possibly Environment Court appeals). Appeals to decisions processes may not be able to be resolved ahead of the AUP review. Compliance and monitoring report findings for a low level of complaints and high compliance with consent conditions; and CAA advice on safety (no issues raised).</p> <p>Combined, these factors indicate that the statutory tests for (justification of) a plan change may not be met.</p>

⁴ Based on Council initiated Plan Change - Te Wairoa sites of Significance

	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness/efficiency	Risk
Option 4: Plan change to AUP/ Plan modification to HGI Plan – helicopter rules - introducing Prohibited Activity status for helicopter activity in residential zones (HGI Plan and AUP); and changing activity status of Restricted Discretionary Activities to become Discretionary Activities (HGI Plan only).	Applies a moratorium on helicopter activity.	Higher cost than Option 3 noting the evidential base that is necessary to support this approach. (two plan changes) – a conservative estimate places each plan change with a starting cost at \$250K ⁵ .	Unlikely to succeed.	As with Option 3. A very high level of evidence is needed to justify prohibition. The current level of evidence is not considered to meet the threshold necessary to support this level of regulation. A higher level of risk applies as justification of Prohibited activity status is a very high legal test. Compliance and Monitoring report findings for high compliance and low level of complaints indicates the tests would not be met.

Discussion

39. Considering the existing rules and assessment criteria, high levels of compliance with consent conditions and low level of complaints registered and noting that the level of activity is not considered unsafe by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), a comprehensive change to helicopter provisions is considered to have low justification ahead of the AUP review commencing in 2026. Nevertheless, four options have been identified and if the Planning, Environment and Parks Committee considers some change in approach is needed then Option 2 is recommended – ‘Early implementation of NPS15’. This is considered to be the most effective and efficient option with highest benefit, least cost, and least risk of the four options. This option does not involve changes to activity status. It would however make compliance with noise standards more difficult to achieve, particularly in residential areas. Helipad applications might not meet required noise standards – which they otherwise might have met when applying the rolling average noise measurement method. The non-compliance with the noise standards would result in a helipad application becoming a Discretionary activity (rather than a Restricted Discretionary Activity which is the status that would apply if the noise standard were met).
40. While noise is able to be considered under the current Restricted Discretionary Activity status, the 3-day averaging sets a lower “bottom line” against which any noise assessment takes place. Given the concern with noise, and the fact that ultimately the National Planning Standards will not enable the 3-day averaging we consider that the Restricted Discretionary Activity category should be updated to align with NPS15. This would reset the “bottom line” and would result in narrowing the range of helicopters/helipad sites able to be considered as Restricted Discretionary Activity in terms of their ability to comply with the required noise standards. This option would align the HGI and AUP noise measurement methodologies and results in strengthening the HGI Plan assessment criteria applicable to determination of activity status.

⁵ Based on Council initiated Plan Change - Te Wairoa sites of Significance

41. The impact of the rolling average on setback distances of helipads to nearest nominal boundaries was reported in the 5 May 2022 report to the Planning Committee. The report highlighted that both the AUP and HGI Plan apply Ldn 50dB highlighting that for the AUP noise standard compliance is based on a single (24 hour), while the HGI Plan noise standard uses a rolling three-day average. The report went on to identify the effect of the use of each method on helipad location setback distances to nominal boundaries:
- Applying the AUP rules, an indicative setback distance to comply with 50 dB Ldn for one flight (landing and take-off) is a minimum of approximately 100m from the helipad to the nearest notional boundary. In comparison, using the HGI Plan Ldn three-day rolling average, the minimum setback distance could be reduced by around 50m for one flight (i.e. the setback is approximately 50m).*
42. The effect of the reset to the “bottom line” by Option 2 would be to increase the setback distance to the nearest nominal boundary by approximately 50m as outlined above (factors such as helicopter type, flightpath, duration of ground idle and topography will determine actual setback distance).
43. It is considered that in the context outlined, Option 2 ‘Early implementation of NPS15’ is an appropriate interim measure for the HGI Plan; and it is considered that a full review of helicopter provisions should be deferred until the review of the AUP which is scheduled to commence in 2026.
44. Regarding Option 4 – introduction of Prohibited status. It is considered that it would be a very difficult task to justify a blanket prohibition on recreational helipads in residential and coastal zones based on the current evidence. In order for a plan change that seeks to classify helipads as a prohibited activity in certain zones to succeed, the plan change would need to meet the statutory tests under the RMA. The analysis of options indicates it would be very difficult for the council to demonstrate that prohibited activity status was “the most appropriate” under the applicable statutory tests.
45. The introduction of Prohibited activity status would require proposing significant change to the existing policy framework of the AUP by introducing new AUP objectives and policies that support prohibited activity status. Comprehensive investigative assessments would need to be undertaken by council to support the prohibited status.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

Climate impact statement

46. The Government’s first Emissions Reduction Plan (ERP) released by 16 May 2022 sets out how New Zealand will meet its first emissions budget (2022-2025) and set the path towards meeting long-term climate targets.
47. Auckland Council’s climate plan, Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan, has called for a 64 percent reduction in transport emissions by 2030. Council’s Transport Emissions Reduction Plan, August 2022 outlines concrete actions to dramatically reduce transport emissions by 2030. The plan identifies that aviation emissions account for 7% of Auckland’s emissions profile and sets a pathway for this to be reduced by 50% by 2030. It should be noted that commercial airlines are the highest contributor in the emissions profile and are the target category for aviation emission reduction. The level of helicopter activity would represent a very small quotient in the emissions profile for Auckland.
48. The Government’s ERP and the Councils TERP will be relevant to the assessment of helipad applications and may be considered in any determination as to whether ‘special circumstances’ are triggered in association with a resource consent assessment.
49. These plans will also have relevance to any future changes proposed to the regulatory framework of the AUP and HGI Plan.

Greenhouse gas emissions - Resource Management Amendment Act amendments in force from 30 November 2022

50. RMAA amendments relating to greenhouse gas emissions came into force on 30 November 2022. The amendments made by the RMAA provide for climate change and greenhouse gas emissions to be considered in an application for resource consent for a helipad. We note however where the helipad resource consent application has a restricted discretionary status, these are permissible considerations only if they are inside the scope of the matters over which the council has restricted its discretion. Where the helipad resource consent application has a Discretionary or Noncomplying activity status 'the effects of climate change' may be relevant under section 7(i) in the context of council's Part 2 assessment (albeit the relevance of those effects will depend on the specifics of the application in question).
51. In terms of the plan change options discussed in this report it should be noted that Option 2 which retains Rule 13.8.2 Restricted Discretionary Activity and that the Matters of Discretion for this rule does not provide for consideration of climate change or greenhouse gases. A policy and rule framework relating to greenhouse gas emission reduction is likely therefore to need to be the subject of a separate plan change process. Option 3 which proposes removing the Restricted Discretionary Activity category and replacing it with Discretionary and Non-complying status would enable consideration of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. This matter would be fully considered as part of the AUP review commencing in 2026.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views**

52. The Resource Consents and Compliance and Monitoring departments prepared the Compliance and Monitoring report referred to in this report and have contributed to the preparation of this report.
53. Eke Panuku, Auckland Transport and Auckland Unlimited would be consulted as part of any process involving changes to the provisions for Helicopters in the AUP and HGI plan.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views**

54. This report responds to resolution from the Planning Committee May 5, 2022, PLA2022/40(e) which directs council officers to report on options to manage helicopter activity based on the findings of Compliance and Monitoring investigation which is the subject of PLA2022/40(c).
55. The Compliance and Monitoring Report and Assessment and analysis of Options will be reported (as separate reports) to the Planning, Environment and Parks Committee meeting on 30 March. For the purposes of this report, a copy of the Compliance and Monitoring report is provided as Attachment A. The Compliance and Monitoring report and the options analysis have been summarized in this report.
56. Overlapping of reporting timeframes precludes inclusion of the Waitematā local board comments into the Planning, Environment and Parks Committee report. Any comments received from the local boards will be provided to this committee in a verbal update.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement**

57. Mana whenua would be consulted as part of any process involving changes to the provisions for Helicopters in the AUP and HGI plan.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

58. Given existing mandatory work being undertaken (e.g. implementing the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management and National Policy Statement on Urban Development), the Plans and Places department does not have the resources available (people or budget) to prepare a plan change to the HGI Plan or AUP plan or both. Plan changes must follow the Schedule One process in the Resource Management Act. The process is costly and involves notification, submissions or hearings and appeals processes.
59. Option 2 Implementation of NPS15 is also not currently budgeted for. It is a low-cost option as it must be implemented without using the Schedule One process.



Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

60. Option 1 'Defer until AUP review is the option with highest risk.
61. Option 2 (preferred option) has the least risk as it is limited to the implementation of NPS15 and is directed towards dealing with helicopter noise. The implementation process specified in s581(3) of the RMA states that Schedule 1 must not be used. This means there is no public consultation process. As such, amendments to implement NPS15 would occur in a short timeframe and are not open to challenge through submissions or appeals.
62. Options 3 and 4 are considered to be at higher risk from appeals and subsequent court processes. This is particularly possible for Option 4. Factors elevating risk for these two options include that the justification of these plan change options is considered low. It is considered that there is insufficient evidence to meet relevant statutory tests. The evidence indicates that existing rules for helicopter activity provide for an adequate assessment of effects (subject to implementation of NPS15). Additionally, the results of the compliance and monitoring report show high levels of compliance with helicopter consents and low levels of complaints. The justification for a plan change is therefore considered low.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

63. The Waitematā Local Board consider the findings of the Compliance and Monitoring Report and Assessment and analysis of Options.
64. The Waitematā Local Board confirm its previous resolutions remain unchanged; or advise of any changes.
65. The Waitematā Local Board provide comments on the Analysis of Options to the reporting officer. Note that any comments received from the local boards on the options assessment will be provided to the Planning, Environment and Parks Committee at its meeting on 30 March 2023 in a verbal update. This is due to overlapping of reporting timeframes precludes inclusion of the Waitematā local board comments into the Planning, Environment and Parks Committee report.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Planning Committee resolution PLA2022/40	
B 	Helicopter Compliance and Monitoring Report, Proactive Compliance Unit, March 2023	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Alison Pye - Senior Policy Planner
Authorisers	John Duguid - General Manager - Plans and Places Glenn Boyd - Local Area Manager

Council-controlled organisation forward work programme and engagement approach for Quarter Four (April-June 2023)

File No.: CP2023/02654

Item 15

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide the Waitematā Local Board with the council-controlled organisation (CCO) forward work programme and engagement approach in its area for Quarter Four (April-June 2023).

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The 2022/2023 CCO Local Board Joint Engagement Plans were adopted in June 2022. These plans record CCO responsibilities and local board commitments with Auckland Transport, Tātaki Auckland Unlimited, Eke Panuku Development Auckland and Watercare.
3. Local boards and CCOs are expected to review the joint engagement plans (CCO responsibilities and local board commitments) in June 2023.
4. CCOs provide local boards with the CCO work programme in their area. Each work programme item lists the engagement approach with the local board, activity status, updates and milestones anticipated for the next quarter.
5. Providing local boards with the CCO work programme addresses the 2020 CCO Review's recommendation to coordinate CCO actions better at the local level.
6. As per the 2022/2023 CCO Local Board Joint Engagement Plans:
 - CCOs, when creating their work programme, consider the priorities identified in the local board plan and any relevant strategies or policies specific to the local board area
 - Local boards advise CCOs of issues or projects of significance, communicate the interests and preferences of their communities and allow for flexibility in terms of engagement, recognising differing levels of interest.
7. CCOs and local boards workshop the CCO work programme and engagement approach regularly to identify and maximise opportunities for good community outcomes within the local board area.
8. This report provides a formal update of the CCO forward work programme, engagement approach and anticipated milestones for Quarter Four (April-June 2023). This report also includes the status on CCO work programme items since the last report in September 2022.
9. The Waitematā Local Board will receive the next CCO work programme and engagement approach report in June 2023 which will include an update on projects from Quarter Four (March-June 2023) and expected milestones for work in Quarter One (July-September 2023).

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the council-controlled organisations forward work programme and engagement approach for Quarter Four (April-June 2023).

Item 15

Horopaki Context

What are CCO Local Board Joint Engagement Plans?

10. The [2020 Review of Auckland Council's council-controlled organisations](#) recommended that CCOs and local boards adopt an engagement plan to:
 - help cement CCO and local board relations
 - agree on a common understanding of accountability between CCOs and local boards
 - coordinate CCO actions better at the local level.
11. These plans record the commitment between Auckland Transport, Tātaki Auckland Unlimited, Eke Panuku Development Auckland, Watercare and the local boards to work together.
12. Each local board adopted their 2022/2023 CCO Local Board Joint Engagement Plans in June 2022. These plans include CCO responsibilities and local board commitments.
13. This report does not update the CCO responsibilities and local board commitments. Local boards are expected to revise these in their next engagement plans in June 2023.

What are the CCO work programme items?

14. CCOs provide local boards with a work programme that lists the different CCO projects happening in the local board area.
15. The work programme is not a full list of projects in the Waitematā Local Board area. It includes work programme items for engagement purposes. Providing local boards with the CCO work programme addresses the 2020 CCO Review's recommendation to coordinate CCO actions better at the local level.
16. As per the joint engagement plans:
 - CCOs, when creating their work programme, consider the priorities identified in the local board plan and any relevant strategies or policies specific to the local board area
 - Local boards advise CCOs of issues or projects of significance, to communicate the interests and preferences of their communities and to allow for flexibility in terms of engagement, recognising differing levels of interest.
17. Each work programme item records an engagement approach with the local board, activity status, updates and milestones anticipated for the next quarter.
18. The CCO work programme is intended to be reported through a local board business meeting quarterly for clarity and transparency. These updates may include the following types of changes:
 - new work programme items and proposed engagement level
 - changes to the engagement approach with the local board
 - updates to status or anticipated milestones during the next quarter.

19. The work programme and engagement approach are workshopped regularly between CCOs and local boards to identify and maximise opportunities for good community outcomes within the local board area.
20. The engagement approach is based on the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) standards which are provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1: International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Engagement Approach Levels

CCO engagement approach	Commitment to local boards
Inform	CCOs will keep local boards informed.
Consult	CCOs will keep local boards informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how local board input influenced the decision. CCOs will seek local board feedback on drafts and proposals.
Collaborate	CCOs will work together with local boards to formulate solutions and incorporate their advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.

21. Local boards received the last update to the CCO work programme and engagement approach in September 2022. CCOs have been updating local boards on their work programmes through induction workshops since November 2022.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

22. The following sections list changes since September 2022 to the CCO work programme for any:
 - completed work programme items
 - new work programme items
 - changes to engagement levels.

Auckland Transport

Completed work programme items since September 2022

23. Auckland Transport has completed five projects on the schedule since September 2022. These projects include, Ponsonby footpath maintenance, minor safety improvements and sections of pathways such as the Domain Pathways and stages of the Tamaki Drive improvements.
24. Due to the scale and nature of many projects, activities and contracts are managed and delivered in sections. Where local board boundaries cross, updates and milestones will be reported in other local board reports and therefore, noted for Waitemata. An example of this would be the Glen Innes to Tamaki Drive Cycle Path, which is being delivered in sections, the last section (Section 4) is planned to extend along the Orakei Basin to Tamaki Drive, adjacent to Ngapipi Road and the recently completed Tamaki Drive cycle and pedestrian facilities and road upgrades. <https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/glen-innes-to-tamaki-drive-shared-path/>. Other examples would be the New North Road Project and Regional projects such as Speed Management, Safety, or the Auckland Cycle Programme.

25. Many regional projects that occur across multiple local board areas such as the Regional Public Transport Plan and the Parking Strategy or Speed Management Plans and Speed changes will be coordinated regionally through Council's Local Board Services Operations and Policy Team. This is to achieve consistency in messaging and communications.
26. As set out in the Attachment A. There are a larger number of projects that are showing 'in progress' and these are at different stages of investigation and planning and design.

New work programme items since September 2022

27. Auckland Transport has added new projects to the Waitematā work programme. This is due to the level of interest raised in workshops, conversations and to ensure the local board has a comprehensive overview of what is happening across the city. Workshops and updates will continue to be provided (providing more information) to complement the list in Appendix A.
28. Of note is the establishment and reporting on the City Centre Integration Programme. The Integration Programme team provide updates to the local board monthly on programmes such as Midtown, Downtown, Karangahape Road, Parking and Loading and Road Corridor Improvements. This reflects the importance and level of work occurring across the city centre and shows how these projects are linked and integrated to improve the lives and economy of the country's largest city. The roll out of projects in the city centre need to be coordinated and managed ensuring the narrative and transformation is consistent across all Council groups.
29. The Waitemata Local Board is updated on small, and significant projects including associated milestones monthly, invited to provide input into many of these consultations before the public are involved and for more significant projects, endorsement is sought. This approach means the local board are aware of any issues arising and can advise constituents as matters as they arise. Key transformational projects such as the City Rail Link (CRL), City Centre network changes, downtown and the City Centre Master Plan need to be clearly understood and delivered.
30. Auckland Transport will continue to support the local board in providing quality advice on projects and developments and where this is possible such as for the city centre works, these will be integrated with our partners and stakeholders and communicated to stakeholders and communities proactively, through appropriate channels. Auckland Transport will strive to be as proactive as possible and find ways to communicate, be transparent and relate to communities and businesses to improve transparency.
31. Significant issues and changes will be communicated timely and in a unified way and the LB will be updated on any significant changes or issues as a matter of priority.
32. The Local Boards have a significant role in advocating for and shaping the projects in their area, these improvements are aligned with the Local Board Plans and with areas of priority for the term.

Changes to work programme item engagement levels since September 2022

33. Since September 2022, there have been changes to engagement levels to report as well as to the status of projects. There are four main reasons for this:
 - The new Council election and the mayor's expectations for Auckland Transport. This meant that several transport projects were paused and measures to ensure the projects continue to represent value and supported by the Local Boards, as an initial critical step to progress.
 - Budget changes and reprioritisation across the organisation.
 - Auckland's State of Emergency relating to Covid19 between 2020 and 2022 and the associated delays and reprioritisation/budgets during this period; and

- The recent Auckland State of Emergency and flooding. Projects in areas where flooding was suffered were paused. Many of these projects including repair projects are now progressing.
34. Auckland Councils Annual Budget is currently being considered and may impact planned and reported projects.
35. Key projects of interest such as the Karanga-a-hape Road Neighbourhood project have been delayed and the City Rail Link project is progressing in stages.
36. Projects that are likely to be of high interest are city shaping projects such as the Waitemata Harbour Crossing and Auckland Light Rail however these are still in early stages of planning.
37. Auckland Transport's work programme items are provided in Attachment A.

Tātaki Auckland Unlimited

Completed work programme items since September 2022

38. Tātaki Auckland Unlimited has completed the following work programme items:
- Rangatahi youth enterprise summit
 - REPCO Rally New Zealand 2022 (FIA World Rally Championship).
39. Tātaki Auckland Unlimited's work programme items are provided in Attachment B.

Eke Panuku Development Auckland

Completed work programme items since September 2022

40. Eke Panuku Development Auckland has completed the following work programme items:
- City Centre Establishment Plan
 - Tiramarama Way Stage 2.

New work programme items since September 2022

41. Eke Panuku Development Auckland has added new projects to the work programme including:
- Cost reduction to mitigate budget challenges
 - Service Property Optimisation (Jervois Rd, Ponsonby).
42. Eke Panuku Development Auckland's work programme items are provided in Attachment C.

Watercare

Completed work programme items since September 2022

43. Watercare has completed the following work programme items:
- Newmarket – targeted asset renewals.

New work programme items since September 2022

44. Watercare has added new projects to the work programme including:
- Central Interceptor: Herne Bay Extension
 - Herne Bay Branch 5.
45. Watercare's work programme items are provided in Attachment D.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi **Climate impact statement**

46. This report does not have a direct impact on climate, however the projects it refers to will.
47. Each CCO must work within Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Action Framework. Information on climate impacts will be provided to local boards on a project or programme basis.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera **Council group impacts and views**

48. Auckland Transport, Tātaki Auckland Unlimited, Eke Panuku Development Auckland and Watercare have been conducting induction sessions with local boards since late 2022 to overview their CCO's purpose and work programme.
49. Local boards advise CCOs of issues or projects of significance, communicate the interests and preferences of their communities and allow for flexibility in terms of engagement, recognising differing levels of interest.
50. The joint engagement plans and work programme items are shared with the integration teams that implement local board work programmes and give council staff greater ongoing visibility of CCO work programmes.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe **Local impacts and local board views**

51. This report on the CCO work programme items ensures the communication of clear, up-to-date information from CCOs to local boards on projects in their area.
52. As per the joint engagement plan, CCOs, when creating their work programme, consider the priorities identified in the local board plan and any relevant strategies or policies specific to the local board area.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori **Māori impact statement**

53. This report does not have a direct impact on Māori, however the projects it refers to will.
54. Local boards and CCOs provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to their decision-making processes. These opportunities will be worked on a project or programme basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea **Financial implications**

55. This report does not have financial impacts on local boards.
56. Any financial implications or opportunities will be provided to local boards on a project or programme basis.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga **Risks and mitigations**





57. Due to local elections, local board induction, and summer closedown, some local boards may not have workshoped with CCOs on the work programme and engagement approach.
58. Not having a workshop risks the local board's ability to fulfil their commitment to advise CCOs of issues or projects of significance and to communicate the interests and preferences of their communities.

59. This report addresses this risk by providing the current CCO work programme and engagement approach to provide clarity and transparency.
60. If local boards prefer a more formal commitment for workshops with their CCOs, this arrangement can be addressed through revision of the next CCO Local Board Joint Engagement Plans (CCO responsibilities and local board commitments) in June 2023.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

61. The local board will receive the next CCO forward work programme report in June 2023 which will include an update on projects from Quarter Four (March-June 2023) and expected milestones for work in Quarter One (July-September 2023).
62. CCOs and local boards will have an opportunity to workshop the CCO forward work programme through April and May before the next report in June 2023.
63. CCOs and local boards are expected to revise their next joint engagement plans (CCO responsibilities and local board commitments) in June 2023.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Auckland Transport	
B 	Tātaki Auckland Unlimited	
C 	Eke Panuku Development	
D 	Watercare	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Glenn Boyd - Local Area Manager

Local Government New Zealand – membership of Auckland Council

File No.: CP2023/02655

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. The purpose of this report is to provide local boards with information that enables them to provide feedback to the Governing Body when it considers Auckland Council's ongoing membership of Local Government New Zealand.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. The Mayor of Auckland leads the development of the annual plan. The mayor is promoting reduction of expenditure and in this context has asked for consideration of the council's ongoing membership of Local Government New Zealand. This will be considered by the Governing Body at its meeting on 23 March 2023.
3. The council currently pays a subscription of approximately \$400,000. In addition, there are costs associated with attending the annual conference and other activities. That expenditure could be applied to other council services.
4. Although Auckland Council is large enough to continue without using the resources and services provided by Local Government New Zealand, key questions are: should New Zealand have an association of local government? And, if so, should Auckland Council support this even though it might not need to use any of the resources or services provided by Local Government New Zealand?
5. This report provides information that will assist local boards to provide feedback to the Governing Body.
6. Local board feedback is due on 15 March 2023 for full inclusion or 21 March 2023 for appending and will be collated and reported to the Governing Body.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) consider its feedback for the Governing Body's consideration of Auckland Council's ongoing membership of Local Government New Zealand.

Horopaki Context

7. Local Government New Zealand is constituted as an incorporated society (New Zealand Local Government Association Inc). The members of the society are individual councils.
8. The objectives of Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ), under the constitution, are summarised as:
 - promote the national interests of local government
 - advocate on matters affecting the national interests of local government
 - dialogue with government, parliamentarians and government agencies
 - provide information to members

- research matters on behalf of member authorities
 - provide advice and training opportunities
 - hold conferences.
9. The components of LGNZ are:
- National Council, which is the governing body of LGNZ
 - National Council Committees, to guide best practice
 - Zones, which are geographical groups of councils and Auckland Council
 - Sector Groups, which are groups of councils based on local government sectors (metropolitan, provincial, regional, rural).
10. The president and vice-president are elected at an annual general meeting (AGM) by ballot of member councils.
11. The National Council comprises the president and 17 members who are generally appointed by zones and sectors. Provision has been made in the LGNZ constitution for three members of Auckland Council on the National Council, one of which is reserved for a representative of Auckland Council's 21 local boards. The National Council employs the chief executive.
12. Zones and sectors generally:
- make appointments to the National Council
 - provide advice to the National Council
 - disseminate information to members
 - assist the National Council with dealing with issues
 - receive updates from LGNZ on issues facing local government.
13. Auckland Council is not a member of a geographical zone of councils. It is its own Zone, recognising the 21 local boards in the Auckland Council model. The Auckland Council Zone meets four times per year and is attended by representatives of the 21 local boards and the Governing Body. The LGNZ President and Chief Executive, or their nominees, report to the Zone on the key issues facing the local government sector and being addressed by the National Council.
14. Auckland Council gets a number of benefits from its interactions with LGNZ. These benefits include keeping abreast of national issues affecting local government, influencing local government issues on the national agenda, providing sector leadership, and elected representatives being able to connect and network with their peers from across the country.
15. Auckland Council's annual subscription for 2022/2023 is \$350,352.26 excluding GST and covers an April to March financial year.

Composition of the National Council

16. The National Council comprises:
- the President
 - the chair of Te Maruata
 - one member elected by each of zones 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
 - three members elected by the Metropolitan Sector Group (except Auckland Council)
 - two members elected by the Regional Sector Group
 - one member appointed by each of the provincial and rural groups
 - the Mayor of Auckland

- one elected member appointed by the Auckland Council governing body
 - one elected member appointed by the Auckland Council local boards.
17. Committees of the National Council include:
- Te Maruata
 - the Young Elected Members' committee
 - the Community Board Executive Committee (an advisory committee)
 - other committees set up by the National Council from time to time.
18. Although the members of LGNZ are the councils, the LGNZ constitution provides for one position on the National Council to be appointed by Auckland Council local boards.
19. A decision about the ongoing membership of LGNZ is made on behalf of Auckland Council as a whole and is made by the Governing Body.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

20. The Mayor of Auckland has a statutory role of leading the development of, among other things, the annual plan. Local boards will be aware that the mayor is proposing an annual plan that seeks to reduce council expenditure.
21. In this context, the mayor has asked that the ongoing membership of LGNZ is considered. The subscription together with related costs such as conference attendance is over \$400K. That amount could be used for other council purposes.
22. Before the formation of Auckland Council, the eight legacy councils each paid their subscriptions to LGNZ. The subscription paid by Auckland Council is not the sum of those subscriptions, but a lower amount. As the subscription has already been discounted (by about \$200K), seeking a further significant reduction is not considered to be an option.
23. LGNZ's latest annual report (for 2021/22) shows that its gross surplus (revenue less direct costs) was just over \$2 million and its net surplus before tax (after deducting operating expenses) was \$341,007.
24. There are 78 councils in New Zealand with populations ranging in size from 600 (Chatham Islands) to 1.7 million (Auckland). The average population size per council is approximately 85,000 (about the size of an Auckland Council ward). After Auckland Council the next largest council in terms of population is Canterbury Regional Council with a population of 655,100. The largest city is Christchurch with a population of 389,130. Auckland Council is considerably larger than any other council in New Zealand.
25. LGNZ comprises and represents all councils in New Zealand. It is the body that central Government Ministers consult when seeking a view from the local government sector.
26. LGNZ provides resources such as policy advice, elected member development and conferences that are available to the whole sector.
27. Auckland Council, on the other hand, is large enough to provide policy advice and elected member development without calling on LGNZ services; although in the past there has been a collaboration between LGNZ and Auckland Council at a staff level and on National Council and its committees at the elected member level.
28. LGNZ's latest annual report notes that LGNZ has coordinated a sector response to major reforms, including the RMA reforms and Three Waters. LGNZ has also organised webinars about issues raised by the Future for Local Government Review.

29. In the future, there is the possibility of major local government reforms arising from the report of the Future for Local Government Review Panel. If this happens, it could be beneficial for Auckland Council to be a part of a sector approach to those reforms, in which case a future council might choose to rejoin LGNZ if the current council resigns its membership.
30. Issues around climate change will likely become more important in the future and it may be important to coordinate a sector approach to these.
31. Key questions are: should New Zealand have an association of local government? And, if so, should Auckland Council support this even though it might not need to use the resources or services provided by LGNZ?

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi **Climate impact statement**

32. As a consequence of the pandemic, LGNZ has held some meetings online but not all. If Auckland Council resigned its membership of LGNZ there would be less air travel between Auckland and Wellington by those attending meetings.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera **Council group impacts and views**

33. There are no impacts on the council group.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe **Local impacts and local board views**

34. LGNZ exists primarily for elected members (as compared to Taituarā which exists for local government managers). Under the constitution, councils are the members of LGNZ. The constitution recognises local boards by providing a position on the National Council to be elected by Auckland Council's 21 local boards.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori **Māori impact statement**

35. The LGNZ National Council has a committee known as Te Maruata. It promotes the participation of Māori in local government and provides a network for Māori elected members.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea **Financial implications**

36. The current expenditure on LGNZ activities, approximately \$400,000, could be used on other Auckland Council activities.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga **Risks and mitigations**

37. There is a risk, if Auckland Council is not a member of LGNZ, of Auckland Council not being able to influence the position of the sector on various policy matters. This risk is considered to be low as Auckland Council is large enough to be seen by central government as an important local government participant to be communicated with separately to the sector as a whole.
38. There is a risk to LGNZ that if Auckland Council resigns its membership that this will adversely impact LGNZ's financial position.

39. Being part of LGNZ has the benefit that the council can socialise Auckland issues with the elected representatives of other councils. There is a risk that Auckland Council could lose the understanding and support of other councils if it withdraws from LGNZ. Loss of support by other councils could affect Auckland Council's relationship with central government.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

40. Local board feedback is due on 15 March 2023 for full inclusion or 21 March for appending and will be collated and reported to the Governing Body.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Author	Warwick McNaughton - Principal Advisor
Authorisers	Carol Hayward - Team Leader Operations and Policy Oliver Roberts - Planning & Operations Manager Glenn Boyd - Local Area Manager

Evaluation of the 2022 Auckland Council Elections

File No.: CP2023/02853

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To evaluate the 2022 Auckland Council elections and to provide opportunity for feedback from the local board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. An evaluation of the Auckland Council 2022 elections is attached in Attachment A.
3. This follows a submission to Parliament's Justice Committee last month. That submission focused on assessing the need for legislative changes. This evaluation incorporates key points from that submission but focuses on Auckland Council's election processes.
4. The report suggests the council consider moving from the postal voting method to a combination of postal and booth voting whereby booths are staffed on election day and do not close until 7 pm. This is a response to criticism that it was difficult to cast a special vote for those who wanted to cast their vote on the final day.
5. This would incur a cost of more than \$20,000 and would delay the announcement of election results.
6. Feedback is being sought on this proposal and on any other aspects of the Auckland Council election process that can be improved.
7. The report gives advance notice of other decisions relating to the 2025 elections.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) Kohuki / consider its feedback on the evaluation of the Auckland Council local elections 2022.

Horopaki

Context

8. An evaluation of the council's elections is carried out following each triennial election. The evaluation usually coincides with an inquiry conducted by a parliamentary select committee and is reported at the same time as a draft submission to the committee.
9. The Justice Committee invited submissions to its inquiry with a submission closing date of 14 February 2023, which was earlier than expected. A draft submission was presented to local boards in February for their comment.
10. Whereas the intent of the submission to the Justice Committee was to consider any changes to legislation that might improve the elections, this current evaluation is about the council's own elections and how they might be improved.
11. The evaluation is attached and includes much of what has already been reported in the draft submission together with information relevant to Auckland's own elections.
12. The evaluation and any further comments the local board has will be reported to the Governing Body.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

13. The local government voting process is straightforward using the postal voting method:
 - voters do not have to register separately for the residential roll – the Parliamentary electoral roll is used
 - voting documents are posted to each elector’s address as provided on the Parliamentary electoral roll
 - a voter completes their voting document and either posts it back or deposits it in a ballot box; at the last election 136 of these were located at Countdown supermarkets, train stations and other council facilities
 - voters have almost three weeks to do this.
14. Nevertheless, there was some criticism on social media about it being difficult to cast a special vote on election day itself (there were queues at some special voting centres).
15. Staff believe that the main reason for people needing to cast special votes is that they did not receive their voting documents in the mail, for example where their residential address on the electoral roll was not up to date.
16. It is the responsibility of the Electoral Commission to maintain the electoral roll. There is a period, prior to nominations being called, for the roll to be updated. This includes the Electoral Commission mailing each elector’s registered address with a request to update their details if they are not correct. However, if the elector has moved, they will not receive this notice unless it is forwarded. The Electoral Commission may remove the elector from the roll, or mail their voting documents to the wrong address.
17. Improving the process for reminding electors to update their address details on the electoral roll lies with the Electoral Commission.
18. Another solution is to provide more time for voting on election day itself so that those who need to cast a special vote, and who leave it until election day, have more time to do so. The Local Electoral Act and Regulations provide three authorised voting methods:
 - postal voting
 - booth voting
 - a combination of booth voting and postal voting.
19. If the council resolved to adopt a combination of booth voting and postal voting, voting would close at 12 noon for those using the postal and ballot box options but would not close until 7 pm for those wishing to visit a voting booth in order to cast their vote on election day.
20. There would be an additional cost. A sufficient number of voting booths would need to be staffed on election day. The cost of staff for each booth would be approximately \$1,000 (based on 4 staff working a 10-hour day being paid the current living wage of \$23.65 per hour). One booth in each local board area would have a total staff cost of over \$20,000. It might be necessary to provide more than one booth in the rural local board areas. Venue costs could be minimised if council facilities are used.
21. Staff would appreciate feedback on whether local boards support the option of moving from postal voting to a combination of postal and booth voting

Decisions required for the 2025 elections

22. A number of decisions need to be made for the 2025 elections.
23. If the council wishes to change the electoral system from First Past the Post to Single Transferable Vote it must do so by 12 September 2023 (Local Electoral Act 2001, section 27).

24. The Local Government Electoral Legislation Bill, when enacted, will require the council to resolve by 20 December 2023 whether to have Māori representation. There must be prior engagement with Māori and the community before making this decision. If the decision is to have Māori representation then the council must provide for Māori wards when it conducts its review of representation arrangements.
25. The council is required to conduct a review of representation arrangements for the 2025 elections. This includes reviewing the number of councillors, whether they are elected at large or by ward and, if by ward, the number of wards, their names and their boundaries. It also includes reviewing the number of members on each local board, and whether they are elected at large or by subdivision. The names of local boards can also be reviewed. The proposed process for doing this will be reported later this year.
26. The council may also resolve to change the order of names on voting documents. It will need to do this prior to the Electoral Officer notifying the 2025 election.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi **Climate impact statement**

27. The key aspect of this report investigates the provision of booth voting on election day to make it easier to cast special votes. The climate impact of people travelling to a booth is likely to be mixed, depending on where they are located.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera **Council group impacts and views**

28. There are no impacts on the group.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe **Local impacts and local board views**

29. Local board comments in response to the evaluation report will be conveyed to the Governing Body.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori **Māori impact statement**

30. Demographic data shows that turnout for electors of Māori descent was lower than the average turnout. An analysis conducted by Auckland Council's Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU) suggested that a range of interrelated factors may be contributing to these discrepancies, including:
 - differences in the perceived relevance of local government to the everyday life of different communities
 - differences in family and work commitments and an ability to pay attention to local politics in light of other life priorities
 - differences in civics education
 - the complexity of the local government system and voting process, along with differences in knowledge about local government across communities in Auckland
 - for some communities, a lack of identification with and ability to see one's identity reflected in the local governance system
 - a distrust of and disengagement from the local government system, particularly amongst Māori
 - the existence of a social norm of non-voting in some families, neighbourhoods and communities.

31. The issue of Māori representation is being considered. The Local Government Electoral Legislation Bill, currently proceeding through Parliament, will require the council to make a decision on Māori representation by 20 December 2023.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

32. Moving from postal voting to a combination of postal voting and booth voting would incur additional costs. These are not quantified but based on likely costs of staffing booths on election day additional costs would be more than \$20,000.


Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

33. Voter turnout has been steadily low over the last couple of elections, however, there is the risk that if the council does not improve the voting experience, where there has been criticism, that voter turnout will decrease further.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

34. Feedback from the local board is due on 18 April 2023 and will be reported to the Governing Body.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Evaluation of Auckland Council's 2022 Local Elections	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Warwick McNaughton - Principal Advisor
Authorisers	Carol Hayward - Team Leader Operations and Policy Glenn Boyd - Local Area Manager Louise Mason - General Manager Local Board Services

Waitematā Local Board workshop records

File No.: CP2023/02643

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

- To provide an opportunity for the Waitematā Local Board to receive the records of its recent workshops held following the previous local board business meeting. Attached are copies of the proceeding records taken from the workshops held on:
 - 7 February 2023
 - 14 February 2023
 - 28 February 2023
 - 7 March 2023
 - 14 March 2023

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary






- In accordance to Standing Order 12.1.4, a record of the proceedings of every Waitematā Local Board workshop held over the past month, including the names of the members attending and the general nature of the matters discussed during the workshop, shall be circulated to the members of the local board.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- receive the Waitematā Local Board workshop records for the workshops held 7 February and 14 March 2023.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Workshop Records 7 February 2023	
B 	Workshop Records 14 February 2023	
C 	Workshop Records 28 February 2023	
D 	Workshop Records 7 March 2023	
E 	Workshop Records 14 March 2023	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Glenn Boyd - Local Area Manager

Governance Forward Work Calendar

File No.: CP2023/02946

Item 19

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To present the Waitematā Local Board with the updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary


2. This report contains the governance forward work calendar, a schedule of items that will come before the Waitematā Local Board at business meetings and workshops over the coming months.
3. The governance forward work calendar for the local board is included in Attachment A to the agenda report.
4. The calendar aims to support local boards' governance role by:
 - ensuring advice on agendas and workshop material is driven by local board priorities
 - clarifying what advice is required and when
 - clarifying the rationale for reports.
5. The calendar will be updated every month. Each update will be reported back to business meetings and distributed to relevant council staff. It is recognised that at times items will arise that are not programmed.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the governance forward work calendar as of 31 March 2023.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	March Governance Forward Work Calendar	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Glenn Boyd - Local Area Manager