

Date: Wednesday 1 May 2024
Time: 3:30pm
Meeting Room: Local Board Office
Venue: 10 Belgium Street
Ostend
Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board

OPEN MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS

ITEM	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
4	Long-Term Plan 2024-2034: local board consultation feedback and input	
A.	Waiheke Local Board LTP 2024-34 consultation feedback	3

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

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	
Overall direction for Long-term plan	20%	43% Support	30%	The Waiheke community generally supports the central proposal. It is noted some topic areas there is also significant support for pay more and get more.
Transport Roads, public transport and safety improvements across the transport network	13%	43% Support	44% Support	The importance of quality sealed roads, cycleways and footpaths were highlighted within feedback. Affordable low emission public transport was also a high priority. Feedback was balanced between the central proposal and pay more. Of particular concern was the potential removal of the council funded Gold Card extension.
Water Managing stormwater to minimise flooding and protect waterways	9%	50% Support	41%	The largest proportion individual submitters supported the central proposal. A significant proportion (40%) supported pay more and get more.
City and local development Delivering urban regeneration and lead development of the city centre	41% Support	40%	18%	A slim majority of individual submitters felt this was not a high priority.
Environment and regulation Protecting and restoring the natural environment	13%	33%	54% Support	Our community is open to paying more to protect the health of our marine environment (including combating exotic Caulerpa) and preserving our natural environment.

Topic	support / Do not support			Local board input
	Pay less and get less	Central proposal	Pay more and get more	
Parks and community A wide range of arts, sports, recreation, library and community services including a fair level of funding for local boards	17%	40%	43% Support	The Waiheke community does not support the proposed capital reductions to the Waiheke Local Board renewal budget. Proposed cuts are inequitable compared to other boards. Deferring works now will lead to significant future cost across the asset base and potential failure of the Te Ara Hura track network – a major visitor drawcard for the Auckland region. Submitter feedback was balanced between the central proposal and pay more. The use of Waiheke’s parks, facilities and tracks by the significant number of visitors on Waiheke was a common theme. There was concern about how the island can develop in line with the Local Board Plan vision of Waiheke as a sanctuary in the gulf. Waiheke is a key asset for Auckland council and the Auckland region.
Economic and cultural development Major events funding and economic development	47% Support	37%	16%	The larger proportion of individual submitters felt this was not a high priority.
Council support Supporting the delivery of services, enabling effective governance, emergency management and grants to regional amenities	23%	52% Support	25%	The majority of individual submitters supported the central proposal.

Transport Plan

Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local board input
Investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay, including introducing capped weekly public transport passes	Support	Comments noted the importance of affordable low emission public transport. Of particular mention was the potential removal of the council funded Gold Card extension, a great well-being cost to the elderly on fixed incomes.
Network optimisation, reducing temporary traffic management requirements and introducing dynamic lanes	Support	Traffic Management Plan requirements are considered overly bureaucratic and expensive and should be reviewed.
Stopping some initiatives previously planned such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.	Mixed	Comments noted the importance of pedestrian safety however costs for crossings was excessive. The community generally supported cycleways.

North Harbour Stadium

Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local board input
Keeping the stadium precinct as it is now, and maintaining it at a cost of \$33 million over 10 years	N/A	Submitter feedback was evenly balanced (19%)
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	N/A	Submitter feedback was evenly balanced with a slightly larger number supporting this option (22%)
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)	N/A	Support for change management was at 12 per cent

Auckland Future Fund and Auckland Airport Limited Shares

Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local board input
Creating a diversified investment fund for Auckland (the Auckland Future Fund)	Do not support	54 per cent of individual submitters and 33 per cent of organisation submissions did not support this proposal. 98 per cent of proforma submissions supported the proposal.
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	Do not support	

Ports of Auckland

Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local board input
Keeping underlying ownership of the port land and wharves but entering into a lease for the port operations for a period of 35 years	Do not support	27 per cent of individual submitters and 17 per cent of organisation submissions supported this proposal.
Continuing to operate under the current arrangements and delivering more profits and dividends	Support	55 per cent of individual submitters and 67 per cent of organisation submissions supported this proposal.
If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland continuing to use the profits and dividends to fund council services	Support	64 per cent of individual submitters and 83 per cent of organisation submissions supported this proposal.
If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland, investing the profits and dividends in the proposed Auckland Future Fund	Do not support	Only 25 per of individual submitters supported this proposal.
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	N/A	There were a limited number of submitter comments on this question.

Port Land

Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local board input
Captain Cook and Marsden wharves transferred to council within 2-5 years	Support	61 per cent of individual submitters and 50 per cent of organisation submissions supported this proposal. Note a strategic review of the long-term ferry, cruise ship and future passenger service infrastructure requirements should be investigated prior to any redevelopment. Note Waiheke has a strategic imperative to prioritise ferry infrastructure and inter-modal access in the downtown area, and the local

		board and community should be consulted on any redevelopment situations.
The Bledisloe Terminal site transferred to council for use in another way within 15 years	SPLIT	<p>Feedback was evenly balanced.</p> <p>Note a strategic review of the long-term ferry, cruise ship and future passenger service infrastructure requirements should be investigated prior to any redevelopment.</p> <p>Note Waiheke has a strategic imperative to prioritise ferry infrastructure and inter-modal access in the downtown area, and the local board and community should be consulted on any redevelopment situations.</p>

Changes to other rates, fees and charges

Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local board input
Resuming the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extending it to 2034/2035	Support	79 per cent of individual submitters supported the proposal. 67 per cent of organisation submitters and 100 per cent of proforma submitters supported the proposal.
Resuming the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extending it to 2034/2035	Support	75 per cent of individual submitters supported the proposal. 67 per cent of organisation submitters and 33 per cent of proforma submitters supported the proposal.
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	63 per cent of individual submitters supported the proposal. 83 per cent of organisation submitters and 100 per cent of proforma submitters supported the proposal.
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	Support	56 per cent of individual submitters supported the proposal. 83 per cent of organisation submitters and 67 per cent of proforma submitters supported the proposal.
Changing the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate	Low response rate.	The board feels the affected areas are best placed to respond to this proposal.
Increasing the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year)	Low response rate.	The board feels the affected areas are best placed to respond to this proposal.
Applying the Recycling Targeted Rate to all schools	Do not support	64 per cent of individual submitters, 50 per cent of organisation submitters and 100 per cent of proforma submitters did not support the proposal.
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	Low response rates.	The board feels the affected areas are best placed to respond to this proposal.

Other matters

Proposal	Support/Do not support	Local board input
Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2023/2024	N/A	There was no feedback received.
Fairer funding - Local Board Funding Policy moving to the fairer funding model (include whether there is support for 'pay more get more' and 'pay less get less' options)	Support	<p>Note: The board agree with the principle of allocating funding on a more equitable basis, however request the funding model for the Hauraki Gulf Islands be reviewed. If there is insufficient total budget available to provide an increase, then this should also be reviewed.</p> <p>Submitters commented on the importance of fairer funding and a fairer budget share to reflect the size of Waiheke's rates take. The local budget should recognise both the deprivation on Waiheke and the fact that the population increases from 10,000 to 40,000 in the Summer (up to a million per annum) which puts pressure on amenities and facilities, transport, wastewater and waste management infrastructure. Funding does not currently recognise the benefit to the wider region of a well-functioning tourism destination. 65-70 per cent of visitors to Waiheke are from the Auckland region.</p> <p>The Fairer Funding model gives Waiheke a chance to continue providing quality community services to our already isolated community.</p> <p>Waiheke already struggles in many respects to achieve services that are available elsewhere in Auckland such as fit-for-purpose cycleways and recreational facilities.</p>

Waiheke Local Board key advocacy initiatives

Initiative	Description
Equitable capital funding	<p>The budget proposed for Waiheke under the central proposal is inequitable and insufficient.</p> <p>The proposed budget provides no opportunity to maintain and develop amenities for our community or visitors in line with our agreed plans and strategies.</p> <p>The funding model is flawed and furthers the inequity as proposed budgets are linked to critical assets, however there is no requirement to spend that budget on those assets.</p> <p>There is also a significant historic infrastructure and facilities deficit on Waiheke. The previous and</p>

	<p>proposed budgets are not sufficient for the council or the local board to address this in the future.</p> <p>Waiheke’s significant track network should be recognised as a valuable regional recreational asset for our community and visitors.</p> <p>Deferring works now will lead to significant future cost and potential failure of the Te Ara Hura track network - a major visitor drawcard for the Auckland region and considered by many as New Zealand’s next Great Walk.</p> <p>Rakino Hall also requires resolution. This has been a longstanding issue for the board and the removal of budgets after many years of prioritising local budgets, is frustrating.</p>
Increased decision-making	<p>Increased decision-making and Local Board ownership over all council owned and operated assets on Waiheke to facilitate future asset development and enhanced community facilities for the community.</p> <p>Waiheke has significant capital investment projects that can’t be considered as there is no way for Waiheke to invest or rationalise our property portfolio. We are unable to invest in even basic assets for our community eg toilets.</p>
Stormwater management	<p>Implementation of effective flood control by use of nature-based solutions, proactive stormwater maintenance and necessary capital investment.</p>
Marine protection	<p>Working with relevant authorities, partners, and mana whenua to support the implementation of marine protection strategies and eliminate the exotic Caulerpa from the Hauraki Gulf.</p>
Retention of funding to deliver the Waiheke 10-year Transport Plan	<p>In line with the Waiheke 10-year Transport Plan and the Memorandum of Understanding with Auckland Transport, the board requests retention of funding to deliver safer quality roading, footpaths and a cycling network to a standard consistent with the rest of Auckland (taking into account Waiheke’s character). This includes safe school travel networks. Effective water management using water sensitive design techniques to cope with road run-off are also essential. The board also seeks a review of the criteria for transport infrastructure investment to ensure it takes account of populations, which substantially fluctuate due to visitor numbers. Extension of the New Zealand Cycle Trail through Waiheke continues to be a future aspiration.</p>

<p>Mātiatia Masterplan</p>	<p>The board is progressing the development of a strategic plan for council-owned land at Mātiatia and requests that any future development is guided by this plan and appropriate funding is allocated within the Long-term Plan 2024-2034 (LTP) and continues to be allocated in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2024-2034 (RLTP), for both transport and non-transport infrastructure related priorities.</p>
<p>Including Waiheke ferry services within the Public Transport Operation Model (PTOM) or its successor – Sustainable Public Transport Framework (SPTF)</p>	<p>Passenger ferry services from Mātiatia and Kennedy Point wharves need to be incorporated into the Public Transport Operation Model (PTOM) system to ensure resilience, equity and affordability. The matter is being actively pursued with the Governing Body, Auckland Transport and the Minister of Transport.</p> <p>Council agencies must support ferry service competition on routes by providing a level playing field across all dimensions within its control.</p>
<p>Visitor Levy</p>	<p>The boards seeks the support from the Governing Body to implement a visitor levy to help fund the costs to the council of visitor impacts.</p>