

Date: Tuesday 30 April 2024
Time: 4:00 pm
Meeting Room: Council Chambers
Venue: Town Hall

Waitematā Local Board

OPEN MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS

| ITEM | TABLE OF CONTENTS | PAGE |
|------|--|------|
| 10 | Long-Term Plan 2024-2034: Waitematā local board consultation feedback and input | |
| | A. 30 April 2024, Long-Term Plan 2024-2034: Waitematā local board consultation feedback and input - Waitematā Local Board feedback on Long-term Plan 2024-2034 regional topics | 3 |

Waitematā Local Board feedback on Long-term Plan 2024-2034 regional topics

1. Overall direction for Long-term plan

| Topic | support / Do not support | | | Local board input |
|---|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|
| | Pay less and get less | Central proposal | Pay more and get more | |
| 1.1 Overall direction for Long-term plan | | | Support | <p>a. Note a high level of support from our individual submitters (42%) and organisations (35%) on this scenario.</p> |
| 1.2 Transport Roads, public transport, and safety improvements across the transport network | | | Support | <p>a. Note specific strong community support from feedback for public transport, walking and cycling initiatives and for improved road maintenance.</p> <p>b. There was also support for scaling back some projects, depending on the extent to which they had progressed.</p> <p>c. Reducing costs for transport projects, particularly less onerous traffic management plans, and the use of pre-fab solutions where appropriate are supported, as long as the final quality of the project is high.</p> <p>d. Note concerns were raised with regards to removing some initiatives.</p> |
| <p>Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.7: Member S Trotman requested that her dissenting vote against 1.2.a to be recorded. Member A Matson, Deputy Chair G Moyle and Member S Trotman requested that their dissenting votes against 1.2.d to be recorded.</p> | | | | |
| 1.3 Water Managing stormwater to minimise flooding and protect waterways | | | Support | <p>a. Note strong community support in our local consultation for flood resilience and water quality as being of high interest and concern</p> |

| Topic | support / Do not support | | | Local board input |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|
| | Pay less and get less | Central proposal | Pay more and get more | |
| 1.4 City and local development Delivering urban regeneration and lead development of the city centre | | | Support | a. Note strong community support for urban regeneration and development in the city centre, around CRL stations and elsewhere. b. Recommend allocating funding to masterplan Queens Wharf within the first three years of the LTP to ensure electrification, transport needs, heritage, amenity, economic development and public access are all considered together to ensure optimal outcomes. c. Support pay-more get-more with regards to the allocation of adequate funding for seismic strengthening of Council's heritage buildings. The Local Board received considerable consultation feedback stating support for the restoration of the Leys Institute. d. Ensure good public realm outcomes as quickly as possible in the Downtown West area. |
| Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.7: Deputy Chair G Moyle requested that his dissenting vote against 1.4.d be recorded. Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.3: Member S Trotman requested that her abstention from 1.4.d be recorded. | | | | |
| 1.5 Environment and regulation Protecting and restoring the natural environment | | | Support | a. Note strong community support in our local consultation for environmental protection, compliance, enhancement, and restoration as being of high interest and concern. b. Urge that sufficient funding is allocated to ensure the great majority of multi-unit developments can be included in foodscrap services. |
| 1.6 Parks and community A wide range of arts, sports, recreation, library, and community services including a fair level of funding for local boards | | | Support | a. Note strong community support for these services and funding. b. Support reducing costs by adopting a circular waste strategy in which tree litter is used in nearby parks as mulch and compost. c. Recommend bins in parks and reserves are returned where their absence is causing problems. |

| Topic | support / Do not support | | | Local board input |
|---|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | Pay less and get less | Central proposal | Pay more and get more | |
| 1.7 Economic and cultural development Major events funding and economic development | | | Support | a. Note feedback support for the central proposal but also there was higher support expressed for cultural development. b. It is critical that funding is made available to support central city cultural and creative activities as the major metropolitan city for New Zealand. |
| 1.8 Council support Supporting the delivery of services, enabling effective governance, emergency management and grants to regional amenities | | | Support | a. Note that under the Central Proposal it is proposed to deliver \$300 million in asset sales (disposing of surplus property) over 10 years, which is in addition to the existing Transform and Unlock programme being delivered by Eke Panuku. b. Under the 'pay more' option this proposal would not proceed, and properties maintained potentially for future Council and public use. |

2. Transport Plan

| Proposal | Support / Do not support | Local board input |
|---|--------------------------|--|
| 2.1: Investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay, including introducing capped weekly public transport passes | Support | |
| 2.2: Network optimisation, reducing temporary traffic management requirements and introducing dynamic lanes | Support | |
| 2.3: Stopping some initiatives previously planned such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways. | Support | a. The Local Board notes and supports the high priority submitters gave to safety and believes the planned raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways should proceed. b. The Local Board supports reasonable reduction in these types of programmes where no funding or planning has already been committed. |
| Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.7: Member S Trotman, Deputy Chair G Moyle requested that their dissenting votes against 2.3.a be recorded; Member R Northey and Member A Bonham requested that their dissenting votes against 2.3.b be recorded. | | |

3. North Harbour Stadium

| Proposal | Support / Do not support | Local board input |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| 3.1: Keeping the stadium precinct as it is now, and maintaining it at a cost of \$33 million over 10 years | Support | |
| Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.7: Member R Northey requested that his dissenting vote be recorded. | | |
| 3.2: Redeveloping the stadium precinct funded through the reallocation of \$33 million and the sale of some stadium precinct land while retaining the existing community playing fields and any other external funding available | Do Not Support | |
| Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.7: Member R Northey requested that his dissenting vote be recorded. | | |
| 3.3: Change the operational management of the stadium to ensure greater use by the community (noting this option can be considered in addition to either of the options above) | Support | a. Significant stadiums need to ensure that opportunity benefits occur for local community utilisation. |

4. Auckland Future Fund and Auckland Airport Limited Shares

| Proposal | Support / Do not support | Local board input |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| 4.1: Creating a diversified investment fund for Auckland (the Auckland Future Fund) | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The creation of a diversified investment fund will add further fiscal resilience to Auckland Council. b. Note Submitters feedback suggests there is an even spread to support vs not support. c. It is important that these funds are ethical and align with Auckland's strategic goals, for example Te Tāruke ā Tāwhiri. d. The Local Board confirms the requirement to ensure that funds are retained and utilised ongoing and not used to pay down debt. |
| Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.7: Member R Northey and Member A Bonham requested that their dissenting votes against the board's direction be recorded. | | |
| 4.2: Transferring council's shareholding of just over 11 per cent in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) to the fund to enable the subsequent sale of any or all the shares | Support | a. The current shareholding does not mean that Council has influence in the direction of the airport and it should become the basis for the diversified portfolio. |
| Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.7: Member R Northey and Member A Bonham requested that their dissenting votes against the board's direction be recorded. | | |

5. Ports of Auckland

| Proposal | Support / Do not support | Local board input |
|--|-------------------------------|---|
| 5.1: Keeping underlying ownership of the port land and wharves but entering a lease for the port operations for a period of 35 years | Do Not Support | |
| <p>Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.7: Member S Trotman and the Deputy Chair G Moyle requested that their dissenting votes against the board's direction be recorded.</p> <p>Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.3: Member A Matson requested that his abstention recorded.</p> | | |
| 5.2: Continuing to operate under the current arrangements and delivering more profits and dividends | Support | |
| 5.3: If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland continuing to use the profits and dividends to fund council services | Support | |
| 5.4: If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland, investing the profits and dividends in the proposed Auckland Future Fund | Support | |
| <p>Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.7: Member R Northey and Member A Bonham requested that their dissenting votes against the board's direction be recorded.</p> | | |
| 5.5: Any other aspects of the proposal including in relation to self-insurance, and implementation options for the proposed Auckland Future Fund and possible changes to the council's shareholding in Port of Auckland Limited and to the ownership of the Port Land | Support - to an extent | a. Support within reason the ability for Council to self-insure up to a point. |

6. Port Land

Secretarial note: Note Chair G Sage took no part in discussion on 6. Port Land, Chair G Sage left the room at 5.27pm and re-entered the room at 5.37pm.

| Proposal | Support / Do not support | Local board input |
|---|--------------------------|--|
| 6.1: Captain Cook and Marsden wharves transferred to council within 2-5 years | Support | |
| 6.2: The Bledisloe Terminal site transferred to council for use in another way within 15 years | Do Not Support | a. Should Captain Cook and Marsden Wharves be made available for public use, the Port Operation |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | <p>should retain access to Bledisloe Terminal for its operations.</p> <p>b. note that there is a reasonable indication an operator could possibly maintain viability on a smaller footprint, meaning part of the Western edge of Bledisloe Wharf adjacent to the Marsden Wharf could be opened up for public use.</p> |
| <p>Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.3: Member R Northey requested that his abstention from 6.2.b be recorded.</p> | | |

7. Changes to other rates, fees, and charges

| Proposal | Support / Do not support | Local board input |
|---|--------------------------|--|
| 7.1: Resuming the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extending it to 2034/2035 | Support | |
| 7.2: Resuming the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extending it to 2034/2035 | Support | a. Support Option two |
| 7.3: Broadening the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme | Support | |
| 7.4: Discontinuing the Long-Term Differential Strategy and raising the share of NETR, WQTR and CATTR paid by businesses to align with their share of the general rate | Do not Support | <p>a. There should continue to be the gradual and consistent reduction in the differential rate on businesses towards the fair differential planned in previous Long-Term Plans.</p> <p>b. Businesses share of the NETR, WQTR and CATTR should reflect the current differential in their general rates as proposed</p> |
| 7.5: Changing the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate | No View | |
| 7.6: Increasing the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) | No View | |
| 7.7: Applying the Recycling Targeted Rate to all schools | Support | a. Note that all Crown entities should pay rates. |
| 7.8: Continuing the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collections to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026 | Support | |

