

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

Date: Tuesday, 18 March 2025
Time: 1.00pm
Meeting Room: Council Chamber,
Venue: Auckland Town Hall,
301-305 Queen Street,
Auckland

Waitematā Local Board

OPEN AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

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

(Quorum 4 members)

Katherine Kang
Democracy Advisor

13 March 2025

Contact Telephone:
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 - Neil Pollett - Green Bottle - A planned kerbside collection pilot in Waitematā for refillable glass bottles and jars	5
8.2	Deputation - Troy Churton - The Auckland Marine Rescue Centre Trust Trustee - The Auckland Marine Rescue Centre Trust's work and future plan	6
8.3	Deputation - Lucy Powell - Memorial Committee Dutch Veterans - Proposal to relocate the Dutch War Memorial seat in Dove Myer Robinson Park, Parnell	7
8.4	Deputation - Tricia Reade - Friends of Symonds Street Cemetery - Issues faced in the maintenance of Symonds Street Cemetery	7
8.5	Deputation - Connor Sharp - Greater Auckland - Speed limit reversals in the Waitematā area	8
9	Te Matapaki Tūmatanui Public Forum	8
10	Ngā Pakihi Autaia Extraordinary Business	8
11	Ngā Pānui mō ngā Mōtini Notices of Motion	9
12	Notice of Motion - Member Richard Northey - Speed Limit Reversals	11
13	Local Board Transport Capital Fund Projects 2025-2026	13
14	Auckland Transport Kōkiri / Local Board Transport Agreement Interim Update - March 2025	19
15	Waitematā Local Board Digital Heritage Initiative 2024/2025	23
16	Feedback on options to address local board operating cost pressures for Annual Budget 2025/2026	31
17	Local board views on draft plan change to add trees and groups of trees to the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part and to the Notable Trees overlay	43
18	Local board input into Auckland Council's submission on the Term of Parliament (Enabling 4-year Term) Legislation Amendment Bill	49
19	Urgent decision noting report - Waitematā Local Board's input to Auckland Council submission on the Local Government (Water Services) Bill	53
20	Chairperson's Report	55
21	Board Members' Reports	57

22	Ward Councillor's Update	59
23	Waitematā Local Board Workshop Records	61
24	Hōtaka kaupapa / Governance forward work calendar for business meeting and workshop agenda items	63
25	Te Whakaaro ki ngā Take Pūtea e Autaia ana Consideration of Extraordinary Items	

PUBLIC EXCLUDED

26	Te Mōtini ā-Tukanga hei Kaupare i te Marea Procedural Motion to Exclude the Public	67
15	Waitematā Local Board Digital Heritage Initiative 2024/2025	
	A. Supplier Brief	67
	B. Supplier Presentation	67

1 Nau mai | Welcome

Chair G Sage welcomed those present and opened 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) whakaū / confirm the minutes of its ordinary meeting, held on Tuesday, 18 February 2025, as a true and correct.

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 - Neil Pollett - Green Bottle - A planned kerbside collection pilot in Waitematā for refillable glass bottles and jars

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To deliver a presentation to the Waitematā Local Board (the local board) during the deputation segment of the business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. Neil Pollett, on behalf of the Green Bottle, will be in attendance to speak to the local board about a planned kerbside collection pilot in Waitematā for refillable glass bottles and jars.
3. The pilot would be an opt in trial (not compulsory) for up to 2,000 interested households with the aim of demonstrating this type of collection can work alongside regular recycling collections. The aim is to reduce the environmental impact of waste and the related carbon emissions involved in recycling by over 90 percent.
4. The trial is based on some earlier research Green Bottle undertook in Waitematā from Waiōrea Community Recycling Centre a year ago. The majority of respondents indicated a kerbside collection would be their preferred alternative in terms of returning participating bottles and jars. This is included in **Attachment A**.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the presentation from Neil Pollett on a planned kerbside collection pilot in Waitematā for refillable glass bottles and jars, and thank him for his attendance.

8.2 Deputation - Troy Churton - The Auckland Marine Rescue Centre Trust Trustee - The Auckland Marine Rescue Centre Trust's work and future plan

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. AMRCT trustee Troy Churton will be in attendance on behalf of the organisation to speak to the Waitematā Local Board about the AMRCT's work and future plan.
3. The AMRCT oversees the provision of marine rescue facility at Solent Street, Mechanics Bay. The presentation will highlight the benefits the AMRCT delivers and their plan in improving the long-term sustainability of the facility.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the presentation from the Auckland Marine Rescue Centre Trust (AMRCT) trustee Troy Churton on the AMRCT's work and future plan, and thank Troy Churton for his attendance.

8.3 Deputation - Lucy Powell - Memorial Committee Dutch Veterans - Proposal to relocate the Dutch War Memorial seat in Dove Myer Robinson Park, Parnell

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To deliver a presentation to the Waitematā Local Board (the local board) during the deputation segment of the business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. Lucy Powell, on behalf of the Memorial Committee Dutch Veterans, will be in attendance to speak to the local board about their proposal to relocate the Dutch War Memorial seat in Dove Myer Robinson Park, Parnell.
3. The Dutch War Memorial Seat in Dove Myer Robinson Park was built by members of the Netherlands Veterans Legion and gifted to Auckland Council in 1963. The Memorial Committee Dutch Veterans is raising concerns around the growth of Te Hā the Pōhutukawa Tupuna having impacts on the Dutch War Memorial seat.

Ngā tūhonga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the presentation from Lucy Powell on behalf of the Memorial Committee Dutch Veterans, on their proposal to relocate the Dutch War Memorial seat in Dove Myer Robinson Park, Parnell.

8.4 Deputation - Tricia Reade - Friends of Symonds Street Cemetery - Issues faced in the maintenance of Symonds Street Cemetery

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To deliver a presentation to the Waitematā Local Board (the local board) during the deputation segment of the business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. Tricia Reade, on behalf of the Friends of Symonds Street Cemetery (FSSC), will be in attendance to speak to the local board about the current state of the Symonds Street Cemetery and the issues faced in its maintenance.
3. Symonds Street Cemetery is one of New Zealand's oldest urban cemeteries. It was Auckland's main burial ground from 1842 until 1886 when Waikumete Cemetery opened.
4. Patricia Reade, FSSC Chair, Joanna Ryan C FSSC committee member and Garry Lamber FSSC Researcher will also be in attendance to support the presentation.

Ngā tūhonga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the presentation from the Friends of Symonds Street Cemetery on the current states of Symonds Street Cemetery and the issues faced in its maintenance, and thank Tricia Reade, Patricia Reade, Joanna Ryan C and Garry Lamber for their attendance.

8.5 Deputation - Connor Sharp - Greater Auckland - Speed limit reversals in the Waitematā area

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To deliver a presentation to the Waitematā Local Board (the local board) during the deputation segment of the business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Connor Sharp, on behalf of Greater Auckland, will be in attendance to speak to the local board about the speed limit reversals in the Waitematā area.
3. Greater Auckland Inc was established in 2015 to provide evidence-based commentary and encourage informed debate on transport and urban form issues.
4. On 26 February 2025, Auckland Transport released the details of which streets will see increased speed limits in response to the governments Setting of Speed Limits 2024 Rule. Details can be found via [Auckland Transport website](#).

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the presentation from Greater Auckland on the speed limit reversals in the Waitematā area, and thank Connor Sharp for his 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 three minutes per speaker 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.”

11 Ngā Pānui mō ngā Mōtini | Notices of Motion

Under Standing Order 2.5.1 (LBS 3.11.1) or Standing Order 1.9.1 (LBS 3.10.17) (revoke or alter a previous resolution) a Notice of Motion has been received from Member R Northey for consideration under item 12.

Notice of Motion - Member Richard Northey - Speed Limit Reversals

File No.: CP2025/04035

Item 12

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

1. Member Richard Northey has given notice of a motion that they wish to propose.
2. The notice, signed by Member Richard Northey and Member Alex Bonham as seconder, is appended as Attachment A.

Motion

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) request Auckland Transport urgently to reassess the list of streets proposed to have their reduced speed limits reversed, to ensure both compliance with the speed rule and consideration of local board and community input, noting the Board's support for Katoa Ka Ora speed management programme (resolution WTM/2023/81), and the public support for safe speeds in Waitematā.
- b) Agree to write to the Minister of Transport requesting a review of the Speed limits Rule, taking into consideration the recently reported drop in the numbers of deaths and serious injuries, the benefits to productivity of fewer crashes, and the government's announced intention to give local boards more decision-making over roads in their communities.
- c) request that this resolution is circulated to all Local Boards, the Transport, Resilience and Infrastructure Committee, Auckland Transport and the Chief Executive of Auckland Transport.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A↔	Member Richard Northey Notice of Motion - Speed Limit Reversals	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Authors	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authorisers	Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Local Board Transport Capital Fund Projects 2025-2026

File No.: CP2025/04156

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval from Waitematā Local Board (the local board) to allocate further Local Board Transport Capital funding of \$785,503 for the 2025/2026 Financial Year Plan.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. At its workshop on 3 December 2024, Auckland Transport informed the Waitematā Local Board that it had been allocated additional funding for the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) after the finalisation of the 2024-2034 Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP).
3. The LBTCF budget has been increased from \$1.735m to \$2.421m for the 3-year term, giving an additional \$686,000 to the Waitematā Local Boards transport capital fund.
4. Savings from currently active projects provide a further boost of \$60,000 and an unallocated amount of \$29,000 is available for the board to allocate towards projects which require additional funding.
5. With the additional budget after finalisation of the RLTP (\$775,000) savings on current projects (\$60,000), and currently unallocated funds (\$29,000) the local board has a total of approximately \$785,503 available for the remainder of the 3-year term.
6. The local board were presented with a list of candidate projects at the 3 December 2024 workshop together with the indicative costs of the projects (Attachment A). The local board now has an opportunity to allocate further funding to these projects.
7. Following the Waitematā Local Board workshop on 3 December 2024 members of the local board attended a site visit to Auckland Domain on 18 February 2025 with the Auckland Council project team. A subsequent site visit with Waitematā Local Board members and the Auckland Domain Committee took place on 24 February 2025.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) allocate \$706,503 to complete the Domain Shared Paths project, including Site 1 – Titoki Street Carpark to Football Road, and Site 2 – Football Road to The Crescent.
- b) allocate \$79,000 towards the delivery of illumination of the wayfinding plinths in Parnell.
- c) note that any further cost savings from current Local Board Transport Capital Fund projects for the 2023-2026 electoral term will be redistributed amongst these projects should further funding be required or identified during delivery.
- d) note that if all current Local Board Transport Capital Fund projects are delivered, any outstanding or remaining Transport Capital Funding will be allocated to the following projects in priority order:
 - i) Rose Side islands - \$150,000.00

Horopaki Context

8. Auckland Transport manages Auckland's transport network on behalf of Auckland Council. Auckland Transport's Kōkiri Agreement provides a structured annual process for local boards to engage with and influence transport projects and programmes. Every year local boards and Auckland Transport work together to set 'levels of engagement' for projects and programmes that Auckland Transport is delivering. This process clearly defines the board's expectations and Auckland Transport's responsibilities.
9. The levels of engagement noted in the Kōkiri Agreement are derived from the International Association for Public Participation's (IAP2) doctrine, were agreed between Auckland Council and Council Controlled Organisations in 2020; and are as follows:
 - **Collaborate** - Auckland Transport and the local board are working together to deliver the project or programme. The local board leads the process of building community consensus. The local board's input and advice are used to formulate solutions and develop plans. Local board feedback is incorporated into the plan to the maximum extent possible. The engagement level for the local board transport capital projects is Collaborate.
 - **Consult** - Auckland Transport leads the project or programme but works with the local board providing opportunities to input into the plan. If possible, Auckland Transport incorporates the local board's feedback into the plan; and if it is not able to provides clear reasons for that decision.
 - **Inform** – Auckland Transport leads the project or programme but works with the local board providing opportunities to input into the plan. If possible, Auckland Transport incorporates the local board's feedback into the plan; and if it is not able to provides clear reasons for that decision.
10. The Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) is an Auckland Transport fund established in 2012 to allow local boards to deliver small projects in their local area that would not normally be prioritised by Auckland Transport. Since 2020, when COVID 19 lockdowns impacted on Auckland Council's revenue the LBTCF has been reduced.
11. Last year, the total budget for all local boards was reduced from the indicative budget of \$45m to \$29.5m for the 3-year term. After the finalisation of the 2024-2034 Regional Land Transport Plan, this budget was increased to \$48.7m of which \$17m is approved for the current FY2025 and \$20.4m is endorsed for FY2026.
12. The indicative budget for Waitematā Local Board Local Board has been increased from \$1.735m to \$2.431m for the 3-year term.
13. With cost savings from the currently active projects of \$60,000 and \$29,000 in unallocated funds there is an indicative budget of \$785,503 now available to the local board for allocation.
14. Through this report, the local board can allocate funds to projects as discussed with the local board at the 3 December 2024 workshop (Attachment A), inclusive of indicative costs.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

Active projects

15. The following table recaps the status of current active projects in the programme as per workshop on 3 December 2024.

Recap and Update on projects to deliver in 3-year term

Projects	Resolved Budget + AT Approved budget	Project Status	Cost Savings	Funding required to be resolved to complete the project
New Street Pedestrian crossing	\$375,000.00	External Consultation	\$60,000.00	-
Domain Shared paths	\$887,200.00	External Consultation	Option 1: Deliver site 2 only and cancel site 1 - cost saving \$131,000.00 OR Option 2: cost saving \$0	Option 3: Deliver both site 2 and 1, \$785,000
Waipapa Greenway Wayfinding	\$86,000.00	Detailed Design	-	Option 1: Non-illuminated plinths- \$0 Option 2: Reduce the scope – 54k Option 3: Illuminated plinths -79k
O'Neil Street safety Improvement	\$357,000.00	Detailed Design	-	-
		Total	Confirmed \$60,000.00	

Table 1:

16. The following table shows the breakdown of costs of Domain Shared Paths, both site 1 and site 2 and indicates the additional budget required to complete both sites. Following the Waitematā local board workshop on 3 December 2024, members of the local board attended a site visit to Auckland Domain on 18 February 2025, with the Auckland Council Project team. This table was presented to the local board members on this site visit. A subsequent site visit with Waitematā local board members and the Auckland Domain Committee took place on 24 February 2025.

Path	Resolved or remaining budget	Updated cost estimates	If delivering only one path – impact on budget	If delivering both paths – budget shortfall
Site 1: Titoki St to Football Rd	\$887,200 - \$236,772 (spend to date) = \$650,427 (remaining budget)	\$916,000	-\$265,573 shortfall	\$796,573
Site 2: Along the Crescent		\$531,000	\$119,427 remaining	
Total	\$650,427	\$1,447,000		\$796,573

Table 2

17. On 3 December 2024 Auckland Transport staff provided advice to the local board that the New Street Pedestrian Crossing project is projected to have a cost saving of \$60,000.
18. On the 11 February 2025 Auckland Transport updated the local board on the rescope and cost savings of the New Street Pedestrian Crossing project.

New LBTCF Budget

19. Auckland Transport attended a workshop with the local board on 3 December 2024. At this workshop, Auckland Transport confirmed that through the 2024-2034 Regional Land Transport Plan process, additional budget was now available for the board to allocate to LBTCF projects.
20. With this additional budget and savings from current active projects, the local board now has an indicative budget of \$785,503.
21. At the workshop, Auckland Transport presented several candidate projects with indicative costing for the local board to consider for funding (See Attachment A).
22. After discussion, the local board indicated that its priorities lay with the projects in the following table:

Item 13

23.

Project Name	Project Description	High level cost estimate
Site 1: Titoki Street to Football Road 1.8m x 350m	A new 1.8m wide pathway to be constructed from the Titoki Steet Carpark to Football Road which will provide easier access to the fields and the carpark.	\$706,503
Site 2: Name: Football Road to the Crescent 1.8m x 170m	A new 1.8m wide pathway will link Football Road to the existing toilet facilities on the Crescent. Raised speed tables will be installed across Wintergarden Road and Kiosk Road to improve pedestrian safety.	
Illuminate the plinths on the Parnell Wayfinding project.	The Parnell BID requested that 3 of the plinths planned for the wayfinding project in the town be illuminated.	\$79,000
Total new projects		\$785,503

Other projects considered:

24.

Project Name	Project Description	High level cost estimate
Rose Road side islands	Side islands on the reserve side to improve pedestrian safety by reducing the crossing distance for the pedestrians and to prevent cars parking and blocking the park entrance.	\$150,000
Park Road Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	Arising from a request from Auckland University, this project would provide a safer crossing location over Park Road to service the demand from the university to access the shops. Likely to require signalisation via either: Option A – a signalized crossing only – as close as possible to the most major desire line - \$400,000 Option B – Fully signalising the intersection with Domain Drive and providing suitable crossing legs - \$1.0m	\$400,000 - \$1,000,000

Auckland Transport recommends the Local Board prioritise funding for the completion of the Domain Pathways project and the delivery of the Parnell Wayfinding project within the existing budget envelope.

25. The Waitematā Local Board may wish to consider funding the further identified projects from a future funding allocation in the next political term.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

Climate impact statement

26. Auckland Transport engages closely with the council on developing strategy, actions and measures to support the outcomes sought by the Auckland Plan 2050, the Auckland Climate Action Plan and the council's priorities.
27. Auckland Transport reviews the potential climate impacts of all projects and works hard to minimise carbon emissions. Auckland Transport's work programme is influenced by council direction through Te-Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan.

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

28. The Local Board Transport Capital projects noted for decision do not impact on Council facilities.

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

29. The Local Board Transport Capital projects were workshopped with members prior to this report being submitted. On the 3 December 2024 workshop, local board members expressed support for the Auckland Domain Shared Paths project as a priority for the use of their Local Board Transport Capital Fund. Preference for these paths was again reflected in the Domain Committee workshop held on the 24 February 2025.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

30. Auckland Transport is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader legal obligations in being more responsible or effective to Māori.
31. Auckland Transport's Māori Responsiveness Plan outlines the commitment to 19 mana whenua tribes in delivering effective and well-designed transport policy and solutions for Auckland. We also recognise mataawaka and their representative bodies and our desire to foster a relationship with them. This plan is available on the Auckland Transport website - <https://at.govt.nz/about-us/transport-plans-strategies/maori-responsiveness-plan/#about>
32. In this case, neither decision involves a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water so specific Māori input was not sought.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

33. The budget envelope for the 2023-2026 Local Board Transport Capital Fund is required to be spent before end of June 2026, and failure to spend will result in funding being returned to savings, as this cannot be carried over into the next 3-year LBTCF term (starts June 2026).

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

34. The proposed decisions do have some risk, as any construction project can be affected by a range of factors including weather, contract availability or discovery of previously un-identified factors like unmapped infrastructure.
35. The costs outlined in Attachment A are indicative costings and selected projects may cost more or less than the amount indicated. Once projects are selected, further investigation will confirm project costings.
36. Auckland Transport manages risk by retaining a 10 percent contingency on the projects and historically there are several occasions the organisation has used budget surpluses in other

programmes to support delivery of the LBTCF. However, there is always a small risk that more money may be required from the LBTCF.

Item 13

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

37. Auckland Transport will finalise designs and proceed to construction as per the decision of the Local Board relating to its Transport Capital Fund projects.
38. These projects will be delivered by end of June 2026 as per the funding envelope of the electoral term.
39. Auckland Transport will continue to keep the Local Board informed through its regular workshop sessions and any further correspondence aligned with delivering outcomes through its Kōkiri Agreement.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A⇒	LBTCF Workshop Presentation dated 3 December 2024	
B⇒	Memo Auckland Domain Shared Paths Project options Dated 20/02/25	

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Authors	Alex Elton-Farr, Elected Member Relationship Partner
Authorisers	John Gillespie, Head of Stakeholder and Community Engagement Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Auckland Transport Kōkiri / Local Board Transport Agreement Interim Update - March 2025

File No.: CP2025/04160

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval from the Waitematā Local Board (the local board) to install cycle racks in Seddon Fields as a component of the Point Chevalier to Westmere Improvement Project, which is within the Kōkiri Agreement.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Kōkiri Agreement 2024-2025 is a local board's engagement plan with Auckland Transport's (AT) work programme.
3. Developing the agreement is an annual process. During this process AT provides advice on its work programme, seeks feedback from the local board, responds to this feedback, and establishes an endorsed plan for engaging on work in the local board area.
4. This interim report seeks the local board's approval on a minor project that sits within the Kōkiri Agreement.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) whiwhi / receive the March 2025 interim update on the Kōkiri / Local Board Transport Agreement 2024-2025.
- b) whakaaro/ consider the advice in Attachment A to install cycle racks at Seddon Fields.

Horopaki

Context

5. In mid-2023, development of the Kōkiri Agreement was initiated to build a more structured and supportive relationship between local boards and Auckland Transport (AT). The Kōkiri Agreement is formed through an annual process that includes the following steps:

October/November	AT provides quality advice to local boards on the next financial year's work programme.
March	Local boards provide their feedback, prioritise projects or programmes, and request levels of engagement for each project.
April/May	AT responds to that feedback, and a Kōkiri Agreement is written for each local board.
June/July	AT seeks formal endorsement of the Kōkiri Agreement from local boards.

6. AT reports quarterly on the prioritised projects and programmes listed in the local board's Kōkiri Agreement.

7. This process provides a clear annual structure for engaging with AT. Local boards are able to influence AT’s work programme through the annual Kōkiri Agreement process.
8. Following the “Bike to Football” trial to Western Springs Football Club over one week in September that saw approximately 1000 cycle trips, AT received a request to provide additional bike racks at this location to cater for children and adults attending the club by bike.
9. Fulfilling this request underpins the projects commitment to provide a greater degree of amenity for active mode users. This commitment has led the context of the project’s workshops with the local board – the most recent being 8 October 2024.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

10. Kōkiri Agreements prioritise the projects or programmes that are of most interest to the local board. Clear local board prioritisation provides AT with expectations of transport related objectives, in addition to the objectives provided in the local board plan. This information helps AT to either inform its planning or to offer better explanations for why certain projects or programmes cannot be delivered.
11. However, plans evolve and change, so AT reports quarterly on progress of projects in the Kōkiri Agreement. This means that local boards are kept informed and have a regular opportunity to provide formal feedback to AT about their work programme.
12. This report is an interim report requesting that decisions are made on a proposal, so this option can be expediated.
13. The levels of engagement in the Kōkiri Agreement are derived from the International Association for Public Participation’s (IAP2) doctrine and are as follows:

Collaboration	AT and the local board work together to deliver the project or programme. The local board leads the process of building community consensus. The local board’s input and advice are used to formulate solutions and develop plans. Local board feedback is incorporated into the plan to the maximum extent possible.
Consultation	AT leads the project or programme but works with the local board, providing opportunities to input into the plan. If possible, AT incorporates the local board’s feedback into the plan, and if it is not able to, provides clear reasons for that decision.
Informing	AT leads the project or programme informing the local board about progress. Local board members may be asked to provide their local knowledge and insight by AT, however there is no expectation that the project must be modified based on that input.

14. Attachment A – consists of a memorandum to the Waitematā Local Board and provides information on the proposal from the Point Chevalier to Westmere Improvement Project team. The proposal is to install bike racks at the Seddon Fields site of Western Springs Football Club.
15. Auckland Transport advises that the board consider the proposal to install these cycle racks and resolve to install the racks at the advised location.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi Climate impact statement

16. This report does not have a direct impact on climate, however the projects it refers to will.

17. AT engages closely with the council on developing strategy, actions and measures to support the outcomes sought by the Auckland Plan 2050, the Auckland Climate Action Plan and the council's priorities.
18. AT reviews the potential climate impacts of all projects and works hard to minimise carbon emissions. AT's work programme is influenced by council direction through Te-Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan.

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

19. The Kōkiri Agreement is a product of the Local Board Relationship Project. AT started the project in response to a 2022 'Letter of Expectation' directive from the Mayor that stated in part that:
"The Statement of Intent 2023-2026 must set out how AT will achieve closer local board involvement in the design and planning stage of local transport projects that affect their communities."
20. The Kōkiri Agreement gives effect to this intent. AT receives local board feedback via regular engagement. AT also surveys local board members quarterly about engagement, providing an indication of satisfaction.
21. The Kōkiri Agreement was developed working closely with Auckland Council's Governance and Engagement Department.
22. The Kōkiri Agreement is reported to the Local Board Chair's Forum on a regular basis.
23. This work relies on historical engagement with both Auckland Council and with other major council-controlled organisations (CCO) through the previous joint CCO engagement plans.

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

24. The local board endorsed the Kōkiri Agreement 2024-2025 at their 11 December business meeting. This report seeks local board approval on a proposal within an existing project that sit within the Kōkiri agreement.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

25. Auckland Transport is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader legal obligations in being more responsible or effective to Māori.
26. AT's Māori Responsiveness Plan outlines the commitment to 19 mana whenua in delivering effective and well-designed transport policy and solutions for Auckland. We also recognise mataawaka and their representative bodies and our desire to foster a relationship with them. This plan is available on the Auckland Transport website - <https://at.govt.nz/about-us/transport-plans-strategies/maori-responsiveness-plan/#about>
27. The Kōkiri Agreement is focused on AT's interaction with local boards, as such Māori input was not sought at a programme level. However, when individual projects or operational activities have impact on water or land, Auckland Transport engages with iwi to seek their views. These views are shared in reports seeking decisions from the local board.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

28. The resolution sought for the bike racks at Seddon Fields does not have any financial implications for the Waitematā local board. Any associated costs would be met by the Point Chevalier to Westmere Improvement Project.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

29. If a local board provides any formal direction on changes to the Kōkiri Agreement, there are risks to consider. First, the local board needs to be able to commit to the time required for the level of engagement requested. If decisions are not able to be made or are slowed down by local board decision-making, there can be significant financial costs.
30. Auckland Transport suggests that this risk is mitigated by the local board providing sufficient workshop time to allow for timely discussion of activities listed in Kōkiri Agreement.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

31. After local boards receive this report, AT will respond to any additional resolutions.
32. The usual quarterly Kōkiri report is also planned for April 2025.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A⇒	Memorandum outlining the proposal to install cycle racks at Seddon Field.	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Authors	Alex Elton-Farr Elected Member Relationship Partner – Auckland Transport
Authorisers	John Gillespie – Head of Stakeholder & Community Engagement Auckland Transport.

Waitematā Local Board Digital Heritage Initiative 2024/2025

File No.: CP2025/04033

Item 15

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. For the Waitematā Local Board (the local board) to progress and approve an approach to implement the Digital Heritage initiative, a project which forms part of the local board's 2024/2025 work programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. This report presents a programme line from the Waitematā 2024/2025 Local Board Work Programme, approved by the local board at its 18 June 2024 meeting for the 2024/2025 financial year (WTM/2024/94). The Work Programme line was approved as follows:
g) approve the establishment of the Chief Planning Office: Plans & Places Work Programme for 2024/2025 to include new line-item ID 4454 Waitematā Digital Heritage Initiative with the allocation of \$40,000 Locally Driven Initiatives funding.
3. This programme line is intended to deliver on Waitematā Local Board Plan 2023 objectives and initiatives relating to formal and informal heritage protection, identification, and enhancement. These are:
Outcome: Our Places: *The character and heritage of our neighbourhoods is valued and conserved within our urban landscapes –*
Initiative: *Seeking opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible*
4. The Waitematā Local Board Annual Plan 2024/2025 consulted on, and subsequently the local board approved (WTM/2024/73) the key initiative of *seeking opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible.*
5. This project was originally identified, investigated, and scoped towards an end solution by elected member representatives prior to the final work programme adoption.
6. This scoping included a potential and preferred supplier to provide the proposed end-solution which is a publicly accessible digital mobile/computer application that provides historic heritage content and storytelling for the Waitematā Local Board area, with an estimated budget of \$40,000. A briefing was given to the local board by the potential and preferred supplier, which included a proposal brief document and presentation of concept (*Confidential Attachment A & B of this report*). This occurred in April 2024.
7. The programme line was agreed to in-principle by Plans and Places (now Planning and Resource Consents) at the work programme adoption in June 2024, with the department holding the work programme line and associated budget.
8. A meeting occurred in July 2024 that involved further discussion and investigation with department staff, which provided insights into the council group's concerns relating to security, duplication, value for money, procurement process, and resource constraints.
9. It was ultimately concluded and agreed that the proposed product would be in conflict with capacity and resource requirements allocated to the development of an existing council platform, [Tūtangi Ora](#), a historic heritage database anticipated to be publicly accessible by late 2025.
10. Further options such as non-contestable funding agreements have been preemptively investigated by Local Board Services, however overarching council group advice does not

recommend this option, and further staff advice would be required to ensure the local board can meet its objectives and ensure compliance with council group processes. A resolution of the Local Board to proceed with this may result in additional delays to project delivery and may necessitate further decision reports for the Local Board.

11. Investigation by Local Board Services since work programme approval in June 2024 has resulted in a series of advice checks and input from across the organisation that the local board should consider when exercising its decision-making.
12. There are significant risks to the project as it was originally proposed which this report identifies, and which take it beyond council's threshold for accepted risk appetite (*refer to Attachment C of this report*).
13. This report recommends options for the local board that can fulfil its objectives as part of its Annual Plan 2024/2025 and that align to the staff advice and recommendations.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) reallocate \$20,000 operational funding from line item 4454 Waitematā Digital Heritage Initiative towards a new line-item *Community Wellbeing: Libraries & Learning Services for the investigation and enhancement of existing and additional content for the STQRY platform*, a publicly accessible culture and heritage storytelling application
- b) recommend that the approach to implement the Digital Heritage Initiative for the 2024/2025 financial year is through the development of the Uptown Walking Tour content, to be incorporated in the STQRY platform
- c) retain \$20,000 operational funding, to be made available for reallocation in Quarter three or Quarter four of the 2024/2025 financial year, enabled via the Quarterly Report and to be supported with staff advice as it relates to outstanding projects or deliverables of the adopted local board work programme.
- d) note that any underspend from line-item 4454 and the NEW line-item will be returned to savings unless otherwise re-allocated to existing work programme activities or approved by Finance as suitable for carry-forward into the 2025/2026 financial year for the express purpose of project delivery relating to heritage initiatives as agreed to and advised by the relevant department.
- e) note that if approved, Quarter 3 reporting (March-May) for 2024/2025 will include the first progress update and commentary for the associated activity.

Horopaki Context

14. The [Waitematā Local Board Plan 2023](#), and the subsequent [Waitematā Annual Plan 2024/2025](#) identify outcomes, objectives, and initiatives relating to the value, character, and importance of heritage in the Local Board area.
15. The primary heritage objective in the Local Board Plan aligns to the outcome of *Our Places*, stated as: *the character and heritage of our neighbourhoods is valued and conserved within our urban landscapes*.
16. The Waitematā Local Board Annual Plan 2024/2025 reinforces the commitment and intention to deliver on heritage storytelling, enhancement, and recognition through the adopted initiative, stated as: *seeking opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible*.

17. The local board has generated an idea for a digital product that can deliver the aforementioned objectives, however it remains that the end-solution is not well-understood by the department staff (Planning and Resource Consents) who would be responsible for overseeing the development and implementation, inclusive of any contractual arrangements or obligations.
18. Constraints within the department, including the existing development and implementation of Tūtangi Ora (Historic Heritage Information) for public access in late 2025 means there is a limitation of resource.
19. Local Board Services has attempted to identify an alternative solution with the collaboration and input from Planning and Resource Consents that can meet the Local Board's agreed objectives. This has resulted in the staff recommendation of engaging the Community Wellbeing: Library & Learning services team to propose a solution using existing assets, services, and licensed products.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

Options Considered:

STQRY

20. Staff from the Libraries & Learning Services team have provided advice about the possibilities of the [STQRY](#) application and its ability to meet the Waitematā Local Board objective of seeking opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage stories through digital means. Though they operate across the region, there is a possibility to deliver enhanced local content.
21. STQRY is an existing platform that provides publicly accessible heritage content, heritage walking tours, and cultural information. The Libraries & Learning Services team administer and manage the content creation and delivery of additional content through STQRY.
22. The STQRY platform is widely used both internally and externally, including internationally, such as by the Mulvane Art Museum in Topeka, USA, and by other public institutions within New Zealand such as Unitec New Zealand.
23. STQRY functionality is available on both mobile and web-based platforms. There are several existing offerings within the Waitematā Local Board for [Auckland Stories](#), such as walking tours for [Uptown](#), [Midtown](#), and [Downtown](#) Auckland, which are legacy offerings developed prior to the current department assuming oversight of the platform.
24. Using the STQRY platform, content is displayed on several applications: Auckland Stories, Stqryguide, and Walk Auckland. The walks developed by Libraries and Learning Services are accessed via the Walk Auckland application. Currently, customers have to access multiple applications to find information related to specific content, including for Waitematā.
25. An opportunity exists for content relevant to Waitematā to be made more accessible and visible to residents, particularly those in the city centre, alongside visitors to Auckland.
26. The primary benefit of STQRY is that it is already utilised by council departments, noting that Libraries and Learning Services are a regional team that deliver activities throughout Auckland. Libraries and Learning Services maintain their own subscription to this service for the purposes of providing publicly accessible cultural and heritage information and storytelling.
27. Secondary benefits include more active review of existing content, and the ability to create new content and potentially expand on the functionality and presentation of the STQRY application at little to no cost compared to procuring and developing a new, bespoke solution.
28. Since the Libraries and Learning Services team operate primarily at a regional level, the pipeline of longer-term development for STQRY will benefit the Waitematā Local Board

beyond this electoral term as the offering continues to be enhanced, regardless of local board work programme investment.

29. Utilisation of the STQRY application to deliver heritage content for the Waitematā Local Board is the preferred staff option for programme delivery in 2024/2025 and has been recommended as such.
30. Staff capacity is a potential constraint, as the demands of the regional work programme in the first half of 2025 are significant, and this may cause delays.
31. Libraries and Learning Services have recently acquired the subscription with STQRY, and this project will be considered a 'pilot' opportunity for the development of a new walking tour within Waitematā, aimed improving and updating content for the Uptown offering.
32. Existing research and the validation of new research will need to be undertaken, in particular to the formation of the route and relevant stops and the content they represent.
33. Further scoping may be necessary relating to production costs, such as professional services.
34. Mana whenua and iwi engagement will be included as part of the project development and there may be delays to implementation as working relationships are progressed and approvals sought.

Non-Contestable Funding Agreement

35. The possibility of a non-contestable funding agreement or service agreement with the local board preferred supplier remains, however is not recommended. Further, best practice aligns with an Expression of Interest model, and as part of this an implementation or project plan would be recommended in order for Council to better understand the project scope and what it is seeking from a potential supplier.
36. A non-contestable funding agreement would need to be approved by a supervising department. There are related requirements and contractual obligations as part of the terms of a funding agreement which would need to be fulfilled in order to satisfy Auckland Council's protocols and obligations.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi Climate impact statement

37. Receiving a decision-making report will not result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions.

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

38. The development of a new digital solution that is publicly accessible and that connects to existing council databases, information, or products may have an impact on the activities of departments such as Technology Services, in particular as it relates to planned workstream activities, risk management, and systems support.
39. No council operating department are resourced to support the information-gathering for the purposes of a new application or product, due to capacity and resource constraints.
40. There is an identified duplication between the development of a new digital solution at a Local Board level and the provision of Tūtangi Ora (Historic Heritage Information), expected to be publicly accessible by late 2025. This database provides information on over 20,000 heritage places across the Auckland region, including the following:
 - archaeological and maritime sites
 - built and botanical heritage areas and places
 - sites of significance to mana whenua

- bibliography of historic heritage documentation.
41. Department input has been sought from Risk & Audit, Legal, Information & Communications Technology (ICT), Planning and Resource Consents, and Procurement.

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

42. If Auckland Council were able to achieve implementation of a new solution, a future Local Board would not be obligated to fund any potential ongoing costs related to server or information maintenance, or application support.
43. There is no confirmation that associated department staff would have capacity or resource to continue support for a new solution, meaning that longer term inclusion in work programme planning and activity may be problematic.
44. Establishing interest amongst potential partners or stakeholders has not occurred, though there may be opportunities for both internal and external groups to participate or contribute, such as City Centre placemaking departments, BIDs, City Rail Link, and community organisations.
45. Stronger public support and awareness may generate opportunities in the short and long term that could enhance the accessibility, profile, and user base of an end-solution.
46. There is additional consideration that the long-term sustainability of a new product or solution would be better serviced in the possession of a community group or external organisation operating under the terms of a partnership agreement. The arrangements relating to product ownership, maintenance and support, alongside risks relating to data privacy and security would need to be thoroughly investigated by appropriate departments such as Technology Services to ensure alignment with council group policies and obligations.
47. Additionally, the local board has generated further ideas within the context of supporting digital initiatives relating to heritage protection, identification, and storytelling. As part of best practice work programme development, it is recommended the local board include these in the draft work programme development for 25/26 or future years to trigger investigation and response by the appropriate department.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

48. There is an opportunity to further investigate and explore storytelling and heritage information relating to Māori narratives, culture and identity that could be integrated into the STQRY platform for the Local Board area. Further staff advice will be required.
49. The original proposal does not necessarily account for the inclusion or identification of Māori narratives, culture, and identity as it relates to informal heritage information or cultural storytelling. A process of consideration and engagement with Mana Whenua is recommended in the development or expansion of the end-solution which could be of significant interest to Māori and provide opportunities for collaboration and partnership.
50. Auckland Council is a delegate of the Crown exercising powers of local government in Auckland. It has statutory obligations to Māori in order to recognise and respect the Crown's responsibility to take appropriate account of the principles of the Treaty.
51. The identification and promotion of Māori values would support deliverables and commitments relating to [Kia Ora Tāmaki Makaurau](#), Auckland Council's performance measurements framework for Māori Outcomes. Māori Identity and Wellbeing is a key outcome in [Auckland Plan 2050](#). These policies and frameworks are the mechanisms through which Auckland Council meets or delivers on its commitments and obligations to Māori.

52. The Waitematā Local Board Plan 2023 promotes and seeks opportunities to contribute towards Māori Outcomes. In relation to this project, there is opportunity to deliver on the following:
- Partner with Mana Whenua and iwi, and mataawaka to celebrate Māori culture and identity, such as through events, placemaking, or narrative wayfinding.
53. Additional advice and input will be needed from relevant departments to better capture the proposed benefits and opportunities for Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

54. There are identified financial implications relating to the delivery, or non-delivery of this work programme line.
55. The establishment cost of \$40,000 operational funding was provided by the identified supplier when the project was originally scoped, prior to work programme adoption in June 2024. This indicative budget was approved by the local board and agreed to by Planning and Resource Consents pending further assessment and investigation.
56. To implement the initiative for the 2024/2025 financial year, the Libraries and Learning Services department have requested \$20,000 operational funding to enable them to further develop local board content using the STQRY application.
57. The lower budget of \$20,000 also acknowledges that at this stage, no external consultant or contractor has been identified as a requirement for 2024/2025 project implementation.
58. Council has a responsibility to seek value consideration and undertake value assessment wherever possible in order to achieve cost-effectiveness, establish a minimum viable product, and achieve core elements of a design solution that can meet the established or proposed objectives. This is related to council delivering value for money to ratepayers and applies across council group activities.
59. This financial investment by the local board is considered suitable for the purpose of meeting its core objective in *seeking opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible*.
60. There is further consideration that Library and Learning may not need to utilise the full amount of requested funding due to efficient use of existing resources. Not spending the reallocated amount of operational expenditure by end of financial year will contribute to Council savings unless re-allocated and spent or approved for carry forward.
61. The remaining \$20,000 operational funding from work programme line item 4454 will be supported by staff advice for re-allocation in quarter three or quarter four for the 2024/2025 financial year via the Quarterly Reporting process.
62. Beyond the staff recommendations, there is further consideration that the entire amount of \$40,000 operational funding be carried forward for use in the 2025/2026 work programme, to allow relevant departments to have greater input into investigating the local board proposal and develop a better and more robust offering in response.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

63. There are several identified risks relating to this work programme line as it was originally envisioned, which is to procure a preferred external supplier to develop a digital solution to promote heritage content for the Local Board area.
64. Advice has been sought from Risk & Audit, Legal, Technology Services, Planning and Resource Consents, and Procurement relating to delivery of the project as originally envisioned. This advice has been considered in the formation of this report and the staff recommendation.

65. Significant risks identified are identified as follows:
- **Conflict of interest in vendor selection** - The risk of not achieving fair, transparent, and optimal vendor selection resulting in non-compliance with procurement policies, suboptimal vendor performance, and reputational damage.
 - **Non-alignment with ICT strategy and Model** - The risk of not achieving organisational objectives due to misalignment between ICT initiatives and the overall ICT strategy and operating model, resulting in fragmented systems, non-alignment with existing ICT services and data management, inefficiencies, increased costs, and an inability to support strategic goals effectively
 - **Data Privacy / Security** - The risk of not achieving compliance and data protection objectives due to inadequate system / measures and, resulting in data breaches, unauthorised access, regulatory penalties, reputational damage, and potential legal actions
 - **Non-adherence of standard procurement process** - The risk of not achieving cost efficiency, compliance, and timely delivery objectives due to deviations from the standard procurement process, resulting in financial loss, regulatory non-compliance, reputational damage, and disruptions to operational activities.
 - **Risk of conflict/duplication within departments of the Council Group** - given applications (STQRY) / Tūtangi Ora already exist within Council, splitting limited resources to develop new solutions may lead to prolonged delay and reputational damage.
66. Further advice on Auckland Council's risk appetite can be found in the visual aid (*Attachment C*) of this report.
67. Auckland Council's risk appetite for technology services is minimal, meaning the organisation accepts only a very low amount of risk relating to information security, ICT, and critical systems and service. Priority should be given to ensure all practical measures are in place to prevent risks to these areas from occurring.
68. Identified risks that fall outside the acceptable threshold are considered 'out of appetite' and Auckland Council should take actions that can lower the residual risk rating to within acceptable limits and rectify any weaknesses.
69. The development of a new digital solution is in conflict with the advice, guidance, and oversight of Technology Services at this time, and is currently incompatible with the policies and procedures that exist to protect Auckland Council's information. Project ownership and oversight from staff within Technology Services would be recommended in order to satisfy appropriate and relevant protocols, policies, and requirements.
70. Technology Services has advised that the original cost estimate of \$40,000 for procuring a new solution would likely only cover the application development, and would not account for ongoing maintenance support, which would incur further costs.
71. Identified non-alignment with Auckland Council's ICT strategy and model is a significant risk. Auckland Council has policies relating to Information Security that provide guidance, principles, and obligations that the organisation follows relating to technology and information security. Further advice would be needed from Technology Services to ensure that any risks during the development of a new product are mitigated and minimised.
72. This process would apply in any event that a supplier is engaged to deliver a digital product or solution on behalf of Council where an intention or requirement was established to utilise, connect, or integrate with any proprietary information or technology services owned or operated by Auckland Council.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

73. Should the local board approve the decision to proceed with the staff recommendation, Local Board Services will liaise with Finance to arrange for transfer of the allocated budget. Local Board Services will then organise a workshop with the Libraries and Learning Services staff to discuss the delivery timeline and options to be delivered by 30 June 2025. Noting their status as a regional team, there may be limitations on workshop availability, and this is likely to instead involve local participation through Community Wellbeing staff such as the Community Broker.
74. If the local board approves an alternative decision, further staff advice and guidance will be given at the next appropriate workshop, which may culminate in an additional decision report in line with the direction of the Local Board.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A	Supplier Brief - CONFIDENTIAL	
B	Supplier Presentation - CONFIDENTIAL	
C	Risk Appetite	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Authors	Nick Palmisano - Senior Local Board Advisor
Authorisers	Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Feedback on options to address local board operating cost pressures for Annual Budget 2025/2026

File No.: CP2025/04233

Item 16

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide feedback on options to manage local board cost pressures in the context of Fairer Funding, for reporting back to the Joint Governance Working Party (JGWP) in April 2025, to support a recommendation to the Governing Body for Annual Budget 2025/2026.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Fairer Funding was adopted through the [Long-term Plan 2024-2034 \(LTP\)](#), to be implemented from 1 July 2025 (year two of the LTP). This included new funding of \$84 million operating and \$50 million capital over two years to transition most local boards significantly closer to funding equity. \$35 million of new operating funding was planned for in 2025/2026 and allocated to local boards through the LTP.
3. Through the council's Annual Budget 2025/2026 refresh process, staff have identified that some costs are forecast to be higher than previously anticipated, and operating revenue budgets set in the LTP are at risk of not being achieved. In a memorandum to the Budget Committee and local board members on 2 December 2024 (Attachment B), staff provided an update on this emerging issue but did not recommend local boards take urgent action at that point or propose material service changes in their consultation materials based on these early indications.
4. Thirteen local boards (identified as funded below their equitable levels) were allocated a portion of the \$35 million new operating funding in 2025/2026 exceeding their individual cost pressures, however there are eight local boards (that were identified as funded at or above their equitable levels) which were allocated little or no additional funding, and staff anticipate the level of implementable advice and options available to these local boards will be insufficient to fully mitigate the size of their individual cost pressures without materially impacting service levels.
5. After a recent budget refresh exercise, which concluded in February, the revised total cost pressures and revenue shortfalls identified for local community services is \$13.9 million across 21 local boards, comprising of:
 - Known variations to asset schedules within full facility contracts (subject to final price negotiation) were not budgeted for in the LTP, \$5.1 million
 - Utilities costs (driven primarily by Electricity and Gas forecasted prices), \$5.8 million
 - Improved libraries rostering to meet health and safety requirements, reduce the likelihood of unplanned facility closures and deliver planned levels of service, \$1.5 million
 - Revenue shortfalls from pools and leisure facilities and venue for hire, \$2.4 million
 - Improvements in leasing revenue is an overall net positive contribution of \$0.3 million, however this differs by local board. Where they are net positive, this could be used to mitigate the effect of cost pressures. Leasing revenue improvements can arise because of local board decisions.
6. While this initial budget refresh exercise has been completed, staff are continuing to investigate the cost pressures to identify mitigations and other offset opportunities.

7. Between 4 and 6 March 2025, finance staff have workshopped with all local boards the updated local board budget position (based on the best available information), including individual local board positions, and options to manage the collective local board cost pressures. A further budget update since these workshops has occurred (and local boards informed through a memo), reducing the overall cost pressures for local boards from \$18 million to \$13.9 million.
8. This report seeks local board feedback on the three potential options and is an opportunity for local boards to provide their views including other matters relating to local cost pressures to the Joint Governance Working Party, to support a recommendation to the Governing Body for Annual Budget 2025/2026

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) tuku / provide feedback on the three identified options to manage local board cost pressures in the short term.
- b) tuku / provide feedback on any other matters relating to local board cost pressures and budgets.

Horopaki Context

9. Fairer Funding was adopted through the [Long-term Plan 2024-2034 \(LTP\)](#) and is to be implemented from 1 July 2025 (year two of the LTP) to transition towards significant funding equity for most local boards over four years, including the allocation of \$35 million of new operating funding to 13 local boards for 2025/2026. Eight local boards have been allocated little to no new funding.
10. Cost pressures can arise when the costs of delivering a service are forecast to increase beyond what is projected in the LTP. These can occur as new information becomes available after the adoption of an LTP or Annual Plan, and budgeting assumptions are updated.
11. The total net operating cost pressures identified for local community services for 2025/2026 is \$18 million and relate to 'asset-based services'. This is the total across all 21 local boards and does not include cost pressures relating to any other area of the council group operations.
12. Operating cost pressures relating to networks of asset-based services (e.g. pools, libraries, open space maintenance) have historically been managed across local boards at a regional level by the Governing Body. In this approach additional levers are available, such as changes to the level and distribution of general rates funding and minimum service levels. There is also the ability for staff to drive efficiencies across the regional network, and to manage "unders and overs" across that network.
13. Local boards have two main levers for responding to cost pressures in the short term. These are:
 - a) utilising new operating funding from their share of the \$35 million in 2025/2026 provided to support a transition to Fairer Funding, or
 - b) by making changes to services including prioritisation and trade-off decisions across their service portfolio.
14. Staff also have some levers available to help manage the costs and revenues for asset-based services as part of their day-to-day operational management of these services.

15. The eight local boards that will not receive sufficient new funding would need to respond to cost pressures by reviewing service levels, making prioritisation and trade-off decisions to remain within their existing funding levels, and then work with staff to ensure the efficient delivery of those services. However, staff do not expect the level of implementable options and advice available for 2025/2026 to be sufficient to cover the full amount of their individual cost pressures.
16. On 14 February 2025, staff presented a report to the Joint Governance Working Party (JGWP) about cost pressures for local boards, how local boards can currently manage these cost pressures, and possible transitional support which the JGWP could recommend to the Governing Body as part of annual budget decision making. This report is included in Attachment A. At this time the updated local cost pressure position was unknown, however since then, updated estimates of cost pressures have been forecasted.
17. The JGWP resolved (resolution JGWPC/2025/4) on three potential options to address local board cost pressures in the short term, and has requested staff seek formal local board feedback on these to support a recommendation to the Governing Body for Annual Budget 2025/2026:
 - i) Local boards manage within existing local board funding envelopes
 - ii) Recalibration of the \$35 million operating funding increase (for local boards) in 2025/2026
 - iii) Seeking additional funding to accommodate cost pressures including utilising the Delivering Differently budget.
18. As operating cost pressures are ongoing, local boards should also consider in their feedback, how this would be managed for future years.
19. Staff will collate local board feedback and report back to the JGWP in April to support a recommendation to the Governing Body, per JGWPC/2025/4 c).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

20. Through the budget refresh process staff identified \$13.9 million of net operating cost pressures related to delivering existing levels of service for local community services. The distribution by local board is presented below. Staff are continuing to investigate these cost pressures, including identifying mitigations, and have identified some regional scheduled maintenance costs were incorrectly attributed to local boards. A memo was distributed to all local boards on 12 March 2025 explaining the corrections, and this has reduced the total net operating cost pressures to \$13.9 million from the \$18 million presented in workshops, as presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: distribution of cost pressures to local boards

LB Cost pressure	Full Facilities scheduled maintenance	Utilities	Improved libraries rostering	Pools and Leisure revenue shortfall	Venue Hire revenue shortfall	Leasing	Total net OPEX cost pressures
Albert-Eden	0.61	0.21	0.07	0.00	-0.04	-0.11	0.75
Devonport-Takapuna	0.39	0.16	0.06	-0.21	-0.01	0.07	0.46
Franklin	0.58	0.32	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.04	1.07
Great Barrier	-0.01	-	0.00	0.00		0.00	-0.01
Henderson-Massey	-0.14	0.62	0.14	0.17	0.14	0.12	1.04
Hibiscus and Bays	0.74	0.10	0.09	-0.15	0.02	-0.00	0.80
Howick	-0.13	0.39	0.10	0.68	-0.02	-0.07	0.96
Kaipatiki	0.53	0.29	0.07	0.24	-0.01	-0.12	1.01
Mangere-Otahuhu	0.42	0.41	0.13	0.04	0.01	0.03	1.03
Manurewa	0.31	0.26	0.06	0.17	-0.02	0.01	0.79
Maungakiekie-Tamaki	-0.07	0.55	0.07	0.00	0.05	-0.11	0.48
Orakei	-0.10	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.17	0.08	0.25
Otara-Papatoetoe	0.41	0.49	0.11	0.25	0.00	0.04	1.30
Papakura	0.36	0.21	0.06	0.00	-0.00	0.04	0.67
Puketapapa	0.37	0.24	0.03	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.63
Rodney	-0.08	0.07	0.09	0.00	-0.04	-0.01	0.04
Upper Harbour	0.53	0.27	0.02	0.15		-0.03	0.95
Waiheke	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.00	-0.06	0.05
Waitakere Ranges	-0.05	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.06	0.04	0.12
Waitemata	-0.08	0.47	0.16	0.50	0.13	-0.27	0.91
Whau	0.43	0.08	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.61
Total 21 local boards	5.06	5.25	1.50	1.85	0.53	-0.28	13.92

21. Analysis was completed to compare the level of individual local board cost pressures against each local board's allocation from the new operating funding in 2025/2026. This is because the new funding is yet to be allocated towards a service or activity, and if this was used to cover cost pressures, there would not be an impact to existing service levels.
22. Analysis showed that 13 local boards had sufficient new operating funding to cover their individual cost pressures, however this would result in a reduction of up to 61 per cent in their new operating funding, which was provided for the purpose of funding equity and which local boards expected to deliver additional outcomes for their communities.
23. Eight local boards with little to no new funding would only have the option to look across existing services to find cost reductions or revenue opportunities to offset cost pressures. However, advice on strategic options and opportunities for local boards to change asset-based services to reduce cost will initially be limited. Advice is more readily available for activities currently funded from 'Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI)' operating funding which is a only a small proportion of the local board operating costs.
24. For these eight local boards, this could mean between 36 per cent and 84 per cent funding reduction from their existing 'Locally Driven Initiatives' programme of services and activities. Changes at this level are likely to be material to existing levels of services, as most of these services and activities have been ongoing for many years and are designed to achieve local board plan outcomes. Any material changes to existing levels of service are likely to trigger a requirement for public consultation; however local boards were not recommended to consult in detail on specific opportunities in the Annual Budget 2025/2026 consultation. Therefore this gives rise to a risk that certain opportunities may not be implementable unless further consultation is held.

Table 2: analysis of cost pressures compared to available funding by local board

LB Cost pressure (\$ millions)	LDI opex (2024/2025)					
	2025/2026 baseline OPEX funding	included in baseline OPEX for 2025/2026	Fairer Funding \$34.6m OPEX top up	Total net OPEX cost pressures	Additional OPEX available	Remaining cost pressure
Albert-Eden	10.7	1.5	3.7	0.7	2.9	
Devonport-Takapuna	9.6	1.3	0.0	0.5		0.5
Franklin	13.2	1.5	3.3	1.1	2.2	
Great Barrier	1.7	0.6	1.1	-0.0	1.1	
Henderson-Massey	20.8	1.9	0.0	1.0		1.0
Hibiscus and Bays	14.5	1.6	1.3	0.8	0.5	
Howick	21.2	2.2	0.1	1.0		0.9
Kaipatiki	11.0	1.3	2.1	1.0	1.1	
Mangere-Otahuhu	16.1	1.9	0.0	1.0		1.0
Manurewa	10.8	1.6	5.8	0.8	5.1	
Maungakiekie-Tamaki	13.4	1.3	0.8	0.5	0.3	
Orakei	11.4	1.3	1.0	0.2	0.8	
Otara-Papatoetoe	15.9	1.6	0.0	1.3		1.3
Papakura	12.5	1.4	0.0	0.7		0.7
Puketapapa	8.0	0.9	2.4	0.6	1.8	
Rodney	10.3	1.8	8.0	0.0	8.0	
Upper Harbour	12.0	1.1	0.0	0.9		0.9
Waiheke	4.6	0.7	1.0	0.0	0.9	
Waitakere Ranges	8.7	1.2	0.4	0.1	0.3	
Waitemata	16.8	1.4	0.0	0.9		0.9
Whau	10.3	1.3	3.4	0.6	2.8	
Total 21 local boards	253.4	29.3	34.6	13.9	27.9	7.3

Supporting a transition to fairer funding

25. To support this significant shift in the way local boards are funded, some key principles and assumptions were agreed as part of the adoption of Fairer Funding:
 - No local board is worse off in its level of funding (than under the prior ABS/LDI funding model).
 - Achieving significant funding equity for most local boards in four years.
26. The level of implementable advice across local community services and environmental management may not be available for the Annual Budget 2025/2026 to fully cover the full quantum of local boards individual cost pressures. Additional options to address local cost pressures in the short term have been developed for JGWP consideration to help all local boards transition to the new way of funding.

Options analysis for addressing local board cost pressures

27. The Joint Governance Working Party on 14 February 2025 (resolution JGWPC/2025/4) requested staff to seek local board feedback on the following potential options to address local board cost pressures in the short term:
 - i) Local boards manage within existing local board funding envelopes
 - ii) Recalibration of the \$35 million operating funding increase (for local boards) in 2025/2026
 - iii) Seeking additional funding to accommodate cost pressures including utilising the Delivering Differently budget.
28. A combination of options will likely be needed to resolve the full range and quantum of cost pressures for 2025/2026, but consideration should also be given to whether these options should be temporary (e.g. one year) or implemented for a longer period (e.g. two years, or on an ongoing basis).

29. Based on of the current projected size of local cost pressures it is unlikely any overall funding changes to local boards would be considered significant (per council's Significance and Engagement Policy), and therefore would not require public consultation to implement. However, changes to local funding levels requires a Governing Body decision.
30. A Governing Body decision is required to implement options 2 and 3 as these involve a change to how funding for local boards is distributed and involves a departure from the adopted Local Board Funding Policy 2025.

Option 1: Local boards manage within existing local board funding envelopes

31. This option requires local boards to fund services within LTP funding allocations, including any new funding received. This is in line with the Local Board Funding Policy 2025, makes progress towards bringing 19 local boards to within 5 per cent of their equitable funding level in 2025/2026, and places no additional burden on ratepayers.
32. Under this approach local boards would address cost pressures by:
 - i) Utilising new operating funding
 - ii) Adopting and seeking staff advice on opportunities to increase revenue or reduce costs in some areas to make room for increased costs in others. These may include minor changes to services, or trade-off decisions across a range of locally funded services and must be implementable in time to support the 2025/2026 Annual Budget (including re-consultation if significant)
 - iii) Working with staff during the financial year to continuously seek out cost efficiencies and revenue enhancements for asset-based services as part of their day-to-day operational management of these services.
33. Local boards that will not receive any new funding, or that will receive insufficient new funding to address cost pressures, are limited to available staff advice on opportunities and changes to services. The implications of delays to the provision of advice over their portfolio of services until 2026/2027 may mean that local boards look to more flexible areas of their funding, which are well understood and supported with staff advice (for example services and activities previously funded from LDI). Reducing these services may impact on the delivery of local board plan outcomes.
34. Based on initial estimates of local cost pressures, staff had advised that local boards did not need to consult on significant service level changes, therefore seven of the eight local boards with little to no new funding consulted broadly on priorities. This limits the level of implementable opportunities without having to further consult.

Option 2: Recalibration of the \$35 million operating funding increase for local boards in 2025/2026

35. Of the \$35 million new operating funding in 2025/2026 provided to support the transition to funding equity, a portion could be used to provide temporary support for local boards unable to fully offset cost pressures. Some of the additional funding may not otherwise be utilised if there are insufficient options and advice on new and increased service levels. This would involve allocating funding to local boards with little to no new funding to address cost pressures from the \$35 million new funding, then distributing the remainder based on the equitable rankings.
36. The impact of using this option is that local boards that were allocated additional operating funding would see a reduction to that level of operating funding, with the reduction in the level of operating funding used to cover cost pressures from other local boards.
37. Based on the budget information at end of February 2025, modelling was carried out and presented to local boards showing the impact should all local cost pressures be covered from the \$35 million new funding first, with the remainder distributed equitably as per the Local Board Funding Policy 2025. Since then there has been a reduction to the overall size of local cost pressures from \$18 million to \$13.9 million, which means the modelled impact is expected to be less than what was presented through workshops.

38. However this is only one possible scenario, and there are various ways this option can be applied, including:
- whether all local cost pressures are covered from the \$35 million first, or only for those local boards that cannot cover their own
 - the proportion of local cost pressures covered from the \$35 million first, and this could be on a scale from zero per cent to 100 per cent.
39. This option would represent slightly less progress towards funding equity for the 2025/2026 year than anticipated in the LTP. This approach remains consistent with a transition to equitable funding over four years and places no additional burden on ratepayers should it be used temporarily, until sufficient advice is available and implementable for local boards to manage cost pressures over their full portfolio of services.

Option 3: Seeking additional funding to accommodate cost pressures, including utilising the Delivering Differently budget

40. The Governing Body is responsible for decision making on the overall funding level for local boards and could allocate additional local funding to support cost pressures. This could be achieved without increasing general rates within the existing overall LTP funding level if there are sufficient improvements to other assumptions (such as interest rates and depreciation costs), or by balancing the application of funding across a wider range of services including regional activities. These options are not available to local boards, and any new local targeted rates could not be implemented in time for 2025/2026.
41. Once budget projections have been fully updated across the group, it will be clearer whether or not the emerging cost pressures for local services can be accommodated within the currently projected rates increase for 2025/2026. If it can be, then it will be up to the Governing Body to approve that allocation, after considering budget trade-offs across the group. If it cannot be, then the Governing Body is expected to be able to have some flexibility to make minor adjustments to the rates increase as part of its final budget decision-making in May 2025. However, the current political direction on this is clear that a higher rates increase is the last resort.
42. While progress will still be made towards funding equity, any permanent direct funding provided to individual local boards to address cost pressures is an inequitable way of distributing general rates funding and would increase the challenge of progressing towards full funding equity. This also departs from the adopted Local Board Funding Policy 2025.
43. Under this option, additional funding could be provided for one or more years until sufficient advice is available for local boards to manage cost pressures, and could be managed at a regional level to be provided to local boards as needed to minimise the impact on funding equity.
44. The Joint Governance Working Party resolved specifically for staff to investigate whether the Delivering Differently budget could be used to temporarily resolve local cost pressures. The majority of the funding for this programme is debt funded (such as capital grants) which cannot be re-purposed to mitigate local operational cost pressures. The remaining funding is for the purpose of supporting local boards shift away from asset-based service provision and future unaffordable renewals, and it's important that progress on this work continues.

Summary of options and risks

45. The following table summarises the impact, risks and alignment to the proposed principles for each option. A combination of options may be used to resolve the level of cost pressures for local boards in both 2025/2026 and beyond.

Option	Risks and/or impacts
Option 1: Local boards manage within	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice not fully ready across local board service portfolio to implement for 2025/2026.

<p>existing local board funding envelopes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities and services with advice to respond this year may be limited to those tailored to local priorities and reducing these will impact the delivery of local board plan outcomes.
<p>Option 2: Recalibration of the \$35 million operating funding increase for local boards in 2025/2026</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding equity gap between local boards would be slightly larger than planned (5 per cent of funding equity by 2025/2026). • A one-year approach would mean local boards may have cumulative cost pressures to solve in the next year. • Continued application would slow progress to significant funding equity in subsequent years. • Perceived retreat on historical commitments made through the LTP for individual local boards.
<p>Option 3: Seeking additional funding to accommodate cost pressures including utilising the Delivering Differently budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could impact on other services, including regional services, as a result of funding reallocation. • Inequitably allocating additional funding to local boards departs from funding policy and slows progress towards equitable funding.

Improvements to budget and cost allocation accuracy

46. Through the Annual Budget 2025/2026 budget refresh process, staff identified over \$25 million of costs and budget held in regional community services but are related to the delivery of existing levels of local community services. These relate to services that are managed across the region (or at a network level), with financials also historically being managed at a regional level.
47. Implementing these cost allocation changes through Annual Budget reviews will impact local funding envelopes and funding equity. While changes to baseline budgets are typically made when the Fairer Funding model is refreshed in the next LTP to align with the frequency of review specified in the Local Board Funding Policy 2025, some necessary improvements to the accuracy of budgets may be required to support effective management and local board governance.
48. Allocation of these costs and funding will not be based on an equitable distribution as these are considered adjustments to baseline budgets, instead of new local funding. An example would be where there are Pools and Leisure centralised costs to be allocated to local boards, only those local boards with Pools and Leisure sites will receive an allocation of costs and funding. Changes that impact baseline budgets would impact funding equity analysis and local board rankings, however should not impact the total cost to the council or planned service levels, as they are a change to how costs and funding is allocated only.
49. There will be no cost pressures for 2025/2026 associated with these cost and funding transfers for local boards, nor any impacts on the existing levels of service being delivered in each local board.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

50. Local board feedback through this report will inform the Joint Governance Working Party on a recommendation to the Governing Body on decisions for local board funding levels. This

may have varying impacts on individual local board level of investments in local services and activities, which may have climate impacts.

51. In particular, local boards contribute to climate outcomes through their local environmental work programmes (currently funded through their LDI operating funding) and therefore the scale of cost reductions required to fund the cost pressures could result in significant impacts to local environmental work programmes. The decision for local board funding will have a direct impact on the level of funding that can be allocated towards local environmental work programmes. This includes reductions, but also the scale of new initiatives contributing towards climate outcomes.

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

52. Staff from the Finance and Community divisions provided input into the report for the Joint Governance Working Party and have developed the list of local community cost pressures for the 2025/2026 Annual Budget through reviewing the costs of delivering existing levels of services.
53. Staff will continue to improve the quality and range of advice for local boards over the four years transitioning to significant funding equity. This could have impacts on the operations of the Community Division which may need to adapt to the new funding structure of local community services, and improvements to how local services are being budgeted.
54. Some options for feedback in this report require Governing Body decisions on funding and may need to be considered together with the entire council group financial position and budget updates. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report's advice.

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

55. In a memorandum to Budget Committee and local board members on 2 December 2024 (Attachment B), staff provided an update on this emerging issue but did not recommend local boards take urgent action at that point or propose material service changes in their consultation materials based on these early indications. Seven local boards have consulted broadly on priorities but not specific cost reduction initiatives.
56. Finance staff workshopped the updated budget position and options to manage the collective cost pressures with local boards between 4 and 6 March 2025. This report seeks local board feedback on the options presented and is an opportunity for local boards to provide their views to the Joint Governance Working Party.
57. The identified \$13.9 million net operating cost pressures is over a third of the \$34.6 million additional operating funding provided to local boards to progress towards funding equity. Individual local board impacts were workshopped with local boards, based on the \$18 million cost pressures identified at that time. However subsequently staff identified through a detailed review, updates to the budgets presented, which has reduced the total net operating cost pressures to \$13.9 million (Table 1 in this report).
58. Under Fairer Funding, 13 local boards are able to cover their individual cost pressures using new operating funding allocated to achieve funding equity purposes, however this will reduce the level of new operating available to these local boards to improve community outcomes. The proportion of new operating funding required to cover cost pressures for individual local boards can be up to 61 per cent of their allocated new operating funding.
59. Eight local boards would be unable to address their individual cost pressures without making reductions to existing services, and there is unlikely to be sufficient cost reduction or revenue generating options available for local boards which can be implemented for 2025/2026 to offset the entirety of their cost pressures.

60. The options provided intend to assist all local boards in transitioning to funding equity over time, and depending on the combination of options may change individual local board funding envelopes compared to the LTP.
61. A feedback template has been provided (Attachment C) to assist local boards in providing feedback to this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

62. Local board feedback through this report will inform the Joint Governance Working Party on a recommendation to the Governing Body on decisions for local board funding levels. This may have varying impacts on individual local board level of investments in local services and activities, which may have Māori impacts depending on each local board's specific community.
63. The decision for local board funding will have a direct impact on local board work programming which is the process where local boards prioritise their available funding towards achieving local board plan outcomes for their community, including impacts to their Māori community. This includes reductions, but also the scale of new initiatives contributing towards Māori outcomes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

64. Some of the options proposed in this report for further engagement will impact local board funding decisions and council's overall funding levels for this Annual Budget 2025/2026, but would be subject to further Governing Body decision making. Full detail on risks, mitigation and implications are outlined in the earlier sections of this report, and in more detail below.
65. Feedback on this report informs the Joint Governance Working Party and inputs into Governing Body Annual Budget decision making.
66. Some options for managing cost pressures would have no impact to rates by requiring these to be managed within existing local board funding envelopes or the wider Auckland Council Group (subject to Governing Body decision making). However, there may be a risk that an increase in rates is required to fund cost pressures, and this would only be clear once the Governing Body is presented with a budget update for the Auckland Council Group.
67. The final decisions to manage local cost pressures may have a direct impact on the level of funding each local board is allocated and may vary the funding levels set out in the LTP.
68. Options where the level of funding to local boards are set on a non-equitable distribution, including any targeted operating funding support provided, requires the decision maker, which is Governing Body, to agree to a temporary departure from the Local Board Funding Policy 2025 adopted through the LTP.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

69. There are significant risks identified with the uncertainty of local board annual funding envelopes and available funding, which has resulted in challenges for staff to plan for and engage with local boards to participate effectively in work programme discussions and to meet key annual budget timelines with sufficient levels of clarity and understanding. This is because options which alter local board funding require Governing Body decision-making, and based on the current timeline, Annual Budget decisions are set to be made on 28 May 2025. A mitigation being confirmed is for a recommendation from the JGWP to be presented to the Budget Committee on 16 April 2025, seeking indicative support for later formal decision-making by the Governing Body.

70. There is a risk should the Governing Body not decide to provide additional support to local boards. Given the updated size of local cost pressures it is unlikely that options with a minor impact to service levels could fully mitigate these for local boards not receiving top-up funding. Eight local boards are therefore at risk of not being able to approve a balanced budget by June 2025 without additional support or further consultation in a short timeframe on further reductions which are considered significant (under council's Significance and Engagement Policy).
71. Some proposed options will have financial and reputational risks to council as these could be perceived as changes to the commitments made in the LTP, such as changing the allocation of funding levels for individual local boards.
72. There are also risks relating to the timeframe for the council to develop the necessary improvements to financial budget data and process improvements, and to develop the capability to provide local boards with advice on options for changing service levels and how local services can be more efficiently delivered. Some improvements to local board data and increased staff advice are expected from 2026/2027, however these will not be across the full portfolio of services. A longer-term solution is anticipated to require the full transition period to funding equity of four years.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

73. Staff will collate local board feedback and report back to the Joint Governance Working Party on 11 April 2025 to seek recommendations from JGWP to the Governing Body for Annual Budget decision making.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A⇒	Options to address local board operating cost pressures and their impact on Fairer Funding implementation – (14 February 2025 JGWP)	
B⇒	Memorandum: Local Board cost pressures – additional information (2 Dec 2024)	
C⇒	Feedback template	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Authors	Hao Chen - Manager Local Board Financial Advisory
Authorisers	Lou-Ann Ballantyne - General Manager Governance and Engagement Brian Chan - General Manager Financial Advisory Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Local board views on draft plan change to add trees and groups of trees to the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part and to the Notable Trees overlay

File No.: CP2025/03748

Item 17

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To invite local board views on a draft plan change which seeks to add trees and groups of trees to Schedule 10 of the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Decision-makers on a plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) must consider local boards' views on the plan change if local boards provide their views.
3. The purpose of the draft plan change is to add approximately 169 trees and 27 groups of trees across the region to the AUP Schedule of Notable Trees ('Schedule 10'), and to the Notable Trees Overlay in the AUP maps. The proposed additions are derived from nominations received from the public over the course of the last decade, and which have been held in council's database. The 169 trees and 27 groups affect approximately 160 properties.
4. Any additional analysis necessary will be undertaken following receipt of local board views. The final draft plan change, including local board views, will be reported to committee seeking authorisation to notify the plan change for submissions. If authorisation is given by the committee, it is anticipated that the plan change will be notified in May 2025.
5. The local board will have a second opportunity to express its views on the plan change after the period for submissions is complete

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) tuku / provide local board views on draft plan change to add approximately 169 trees and 27 groups of trees across the region to Schedule 10, and to the Notable Trees Overlay in the AUP maps.

Horopaki

Context

Decision-making authority

6. Each local board is responsible for communicating the interests and preferences of people in its area regarding the content of Auckland Council's strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws. Local boards provide their views on these documents' contents. Decision-makers must consider local boards' views when deciding the content of these policy documents (sections 15-16 [Local Government \(Auckland Council\) Act 2009](#)). Accordingly, local boards' views are relevant to finalising a draft plan change (to be notified for submissions). A plan change will be included in the AUP if it is later approved.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

Item 17

Plan change overview

7. The purpose of the draft plan change is to address all of the nominations for notable trees that council has held in its database over the last 10-12 years. All nominations have been progressively evaluated, with a view to adding them to Schedule 10, and the corresponding mapped overlay which spatially sets out the locations of all notable trees and notable groups found in the schedule.
8. Schedule 10 currently contains approximately 3000 'line items' representing thousands of trees and groups of trees. It is a very large and dynamic schedule, which undergoes constant change through consenting activities such as subdivision, resource consent processes and other changes as a result of emergency works (in the case of dangerous or storm-affected trees, for example). Schedule 10 is an amalgam of all the legacy councils' similar schedules which contained lists of specially protected trees. These were 'rolled over' into the Proposed AUP prior to the AUP being made partially operative in November 2016.
9. Schedule 10 is managed by the AUP through a policy and rule framework. The Regional Policy Statement (RPS) in the AUP (Chapter B4.5. Notable Trees) contains the objectives and policies (including the criteria for scheduling), while Chapter D13. Notable Trees overlay contains the district-level objectives and policies, and sets out the rules framework for how activities affecting notable trees are treated. Schedule 10 itself is found in Chapter L Schedules. The AUP maps contain the Notable Trees overlay which spatially sets out the locations of all notable trees and groups throughout the region, using specific symbology.
10. A number of plan changes have been undertaken in the last 5 years relating to Schedule 10 and Chapter D13 of the AUP. However, there has not been a comprehensive plan change that has attempted to evaluate and address all of the nominations received by council. These nominations have been sporadic but regular, and also include those trees which were requested to be included at the time of the PAUP through the public submission process.
11. All nominations that seek to add trees and groups to the Schedule are triaged to ensure they are 'eligible' to progress through to the site evaluation stage. Those that are found to already be included in Schedule 10, or which are duplicate nominations, or those which nominate trees that are no longer present on the site, for example, are not added to the on-site application which council and consultant arborists use to assess trees.
12. The evaluation process is a detailed exercise based on the criteria as set out in the RPS. Each tree, and group of trees, is evaluated against each criterion and provided with a score. The criteria are based on the following:
 - a) heritage or historical association;
 - b) scientific importance or rarity;
 - c) ecosystem service or environmental function;
 - d) cultural association and accessibility
 - e) intrinsic value: the trees are intrinsically notable because of a combination of factors including size, age, vigour and vitality, stature and form or visual contribution.
13. Approximately 160 new 'line items' representing 169 trees and 27 groups have been found to meet the criteria and are proposed to be put forward to the plan change with a view to adding them to Schedule 10 and the corresponding Notable Trees overlay maps.
14. The plan change addresses the nominations only, and does not seek to alter any of the objectives and policies, or any part of the rules framework relating to Notable Trees.

15. A summary of the numbers of trees and groups of trees according to Local Board area that are proposed to be added to Schedule 10 is included at Attachment A. The table also includes the districts within the Local Board areas that will be affected by the addition of trees and group of trees.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi Climate impact statement

Context

16. Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan sets out Auckland's climate goals:
- to adapt to the impacts of climate change by planning for the changes we will face (**climate adaptation**)
 - to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 50 per cent by 2030 and achieve net zero emissions by 2050 (**climate mitigation**).
17. Both council's climate goals (climate adaptation and climate mitigation) are relevant and align with the requirement for Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) decision-makers to:
- have particular regard to the effects of climate change (section 7(i) RMA), and
 - to have regard to any emissions reduction plan and any national adaptation plan prepared under the Climate Change Response Act 2002 (section 74(2) RMA) when preparing or changing a district plan.
18. It is considered that the draft plan change has positive climate considerations. The proposed formal protection through scheduling of 169 trees and 27 groups of trees across the region will contribute positively to carbon sequestration and therefore is beneficial to mitigating the effects of climate change.

Local board views – climate

19. It is not considered that the plan change will affect any local board in particular in terms of climate change. Across local board areas, the collective addition of approximately 169 trees and 27 groups of trees will be beneficial in terms of their contribution to climate change mitigation by ensuring the retention of and formal protection of a number of trees.

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

20. Many of the trees and groups of trees are located on council reserves and also on road reserves which are the domain of Auckland Transport. All owners of land upon which a nominated tree or group is located were notified as part of a mail-out to advise of an upcoming site visit by a council or consultant arborist. As part of the notification process, they will again be contacted if a tree or group is one of those included in the qualifying number for inclusion to the plan change. All owners and affected parties (including council departments and Auckland Transport) will have the opportunity to participate in the submission process.

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

21. The purpose of the draft plan change is to add approximately 160 new 'line items' to Schedule 10 of the AUP, representing 169 trees and 27 groups of trees.
22. This draft plan change affects all local boards, except for Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board and Waiheke Local Board.
23. There are no funding impacts on Local Boards as a result of the plan change.

24. This report is the mechanism for obtaining local board views. The committee will be provided with the local board's resolution when considering whether to authorise notification of the draft plan change.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

25. If the local board chooses to provide its views on the plan change it includes the opportunity to comment on matters that may be of interest or importance to Māori well-being of Māori communities or Te Ao Māori (Māori worldview).
26. Council is required to consult with iwi authorities when preparing a plan change. Consultation is currently underway simultaneously with all iwi authorities. Feedback will be incorporated into the plan change.
27. Later in the plan-making process, the planner will analyse Part 2 of the RMA which requires that all persons exercising RMA functions take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi/Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The plan change does not trigger an issue of significance as identified in the Schedule of Issues of Significance (2021) and Māori Plan (2017, Houkura Independent Māori Statutory Board).

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

28. The plan change does not pose any financial implications for the local board's assets or operations.
29. Costs from undertaking the plan change are met by existing council budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

30. The local board will be unable to provide its views and preferences on the draft plan change, if it does not pass a resolution. This report provides the mechanism for the local board to express its views and preferences in contributing to formulation of the draft plan change.
31. If the local board chooses not to pass a resolution at this business meeting, the opportunity to influence policy prior to public notification is forgone. (There is a later opportunity to comment on the plan change, following the close of submissions).
32. The power to provide local board views regarding the content of a plan change cannot be delegated to individual local board member(s) (Local Government Act 2002, Sch 7, cls 36D). This report enables the whole local board to decide whether to provide its views and, if so, to determine what matters those views should include.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

33. Local boards will provide feedback at the March business meetings.
34. Any additional analysis necessary will be undertaken following receipt of local board views. The final draft plan change, including local board views, will be reported to committee in May 2025 seeking authorisation to notify the plan change for submissions.
35. After submissions close, a second report will provide an opportunity for views and preferences of the local board, which will then be included in a hearing report for the decision-makers on the plan change. The local board may appoint a local board member to speak to the local board's views at the plan change hearing.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A →	Attachment A: Proposed additions of trees and groups by Local Board, and areas within each Local Board	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Authors	Ruth Andrews – Senior Policy Planner
Authorisers	Lou-Ann Ballantyne - General Manager Governance and Engagement John Duguid – General Manager, Planning & Resource Consents Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Local board input into Auckland Council's submission on the Term of Parliament (Enabling 4-year Term) Legislation Amendment Bill

File No.: CP2025/03882

Item 18

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To seek feedback from the local board on the Term of Parliament (Enabling 4-year Term) Legislation Amendment Bill.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. The [Term of Parliament \(Enabling 4-year Term\) Legislation Amendment Bill](#) proposes a mechanism for extending New Zealand's parliamentary term from three to four years, subject to a binding referendum.
3. Rather than mandating an automatic change, this would allow Parliament to extend its term only if select committees reflect proportional representation – meaning the number of MPs from each party on committees matches their share of seats in Parliament.
4. Supporters argue a four-year term enables better policymaking and project delivery, while opponents highlight reduced electoral accountability. New Zealand's three-year term is rare globally, and past referendums have opposed extending it, though recent reviews suggest shifting public sentiment.
5. A key consideration for Auckland Council is the potential impact on local election cycles. There could be years where local and central elections coincide, which could impact voter engagement. Fixed parliamentary terms would benefit the alignment of local election timing.
6. In December 2024, the council submitted feedback on the [LGNZ Electoral Reform Working Group Issues Paper](#), supporting a four-year electoral cycle for local government. The submission acknowledged potential benefits of aligning local and central elections if local elections shift to booth voting but recommended keeping them two years apart otherwise. While most local boards supported a four-year term, views varied on election timing—some favoured aligning with central elections, while others preferred a two-year gap.
7. The Policy and Planning Committee will consider the council's submission on 10 April. The submission closing date is 17 April.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) tuku / provide feedback to Auckland Council's submission on the Term of Parliament (Enabling 4-year Term) Legislation Amendment Bill.

Horopaki Context

Overview of the Bill

8. The Term of Parliament (Enabling 4-year Term) Legislation Amendment Bill ("the Bill") proposes a mechanism to extend the current three-year Parliamentary term to four years, subject to a binding referendum.

9. The Bill doesn't automatically change the term to four years. Instead, Parliament can choose to extend its term from three to four years if select committees are structured in a way that fairly reflects the makeup of Parliament. To make this happen, Parliament must pass a resolution within the first three months of a new term stating that the proportionality requirement has been met, and the Governor-General must then issue a proclamation.

Key Considerations

10. Arguments in favour of a four-year term include allowing for a more deliberate and considered legislative process, reducing the frequency of election cycles, and providing governments with a longer timeframe to implement policy.
11. Arguments against a four-year term highlight concerns around democratic accountability. A longer term would mean elected representatives face elections less frequently, shifting accountability from a three-year to a four-year cycle.
12. Additionally, New Zealand's constitutional framework differs from jurisdictions with stronger checks and balances, such as an upper and lower house or a clearer separation of executive and legislative powers. In New Zealand, the executive is formed from the majority party in Parliament and drives the legislative agenda.
13. To address concerns around accountability, the Bill strengthens the role of select committees by requiring their composition to more accurately reflect the proportionality of Parliament.

History of New Zealand Parliamentary terms

14. New Zealand originally had a five-year parliamentary term, in line with [Britain](#). In 1879, it was reduced to three years following the abolition of provincial governments, as there were concerns about the concentration of power at the central level. Reducing the term ensured more frequent electoral accountability.
15. Two non-binding referendums on extending the term—held in 1967 and 1990—both resulted in strong opposition. Both referendums saw large majorities opposed to extending the term to four years.
16. Recent reviews, including the 2013 Constitutional Advisory Panel and the [2023 Independent Electoral Review](#), suggest public opinion may be shifting towards a four-year term.
17. A key change since the last referendum was the introduction of the Mixed-Member Proportional (MMP) system in 1993, which increased proportional representation and strengthened the role of smaller parties in governance. While MMP has enhanced legislative scrutiny, concerns remain about reduced accountability if the term is extended.
18. The Constitutional Advisory Panel in 2013 found that public support for a four-year term was contingent on improved legislative scrutiny and accountability measures, such as more referenda, better human rights assessments, and the introduction of an upper house. The panel emphasised that any extension should be decided by referendum.
19. The Independent Electoral Review (IER), set up in 2022, also assessed the term length and found arguments for and against a four-year term to be finely balanced.

International context

20. New Zealand's three-year parliamentary term is rare internationally. In 183 countries with elected lower houses or unicameral parliaments, only eight have a term of three years or less, 72 have a four-year term, 99 have a five-year term and four have a six-year term.
21. In general, parliaments (whether unicameral or bicameral) have a four-year or five-year term including both the United Kingdom (with Westminster-style of Parliament and Executive, headed by a sovereign) and Germany (with an MMP electoral system), from which New Zealand's system is based.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

22. The last referendum on the parliamentary term took place in 1990 in which 69 per cent of voters rejected extending the term from three to four years. It is timely to revisit the topic again with communities.
23. A key concern for local government is the uncertainty around whether Parliament will adopt a three-year or four-year term. If local government maintains its three-year term while Parliament alternates between three and four years, there is likely to be occasional overlap, where parliamentary and local elections occur in the same year. However, this would likely happen inconsistently.
24. If local elections remain the responsibility of councils (rather than the Electoral Commission), the concurrent timing of parliamentary and local elections could lead to voter confusion.
25. Auckland Council, in its submission to the Electoral Reform Working Group, acknowledged that there could be potential benefits if local elections were conducted by the Electoral Commission, using the booth voting method, alongside parliamentary elections. This could capitalise on the higher voter turnout for parliamentary elections to boost participation in local elections. However, it remains uncertain whether this will occur.
26. As a result, the council's draft submission on the bill would consider requesting that parliamentary terms be fixed, and that the legislation governing local elections be amended to align with parliamentary terms.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi Climate impact statement

27. The Bill does not have any direct climate impacts.
28. However, a four-year term could provide a longer, uninterrupted timeframe for planning and implementing climate-related initiatives.
29. If both local and central government terms are fixed at four years, this could lead to a reduction in postal voting for local government elections. This change may result in environmental benefits, such as reduced paper usage and a decrease in transport requirements for the delivery and collection of voting papers.

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

30. The council group is not directly affected by the proposed change. However, if local and central elections were to coincide, further analysis of the potential impacts would be necessary.

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

31. In February 2023, nine local boards provided feedback on the introduction of a four-year electoral term for local government in the [draft submission](#) of the *Future for Local Government* paper. Most supported a four-year term, though views on election sequencing varied. One board opposed aligning local and central elections, emphasising the importance of maintaining local focus.
32. In November 2024, local boards provided further feedback to inform the council's submission on the [LGNZ Electoral Reform Working Group Issues Paper](#) (Issue Five), which also addressed the four-year term. While most local boards supported the shift, there were

differing views on election timing—some favored aligning local and central elections, while others preferred a two-year gap. Local board views are compiled [here](#).

Item 18

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

33. Māori views were not sought in the preparation of this report. A four-year term could allow more time to build relationships and ensure continuity in key initiatives, without disruptions from frequent election cycles.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

34. The Bill does not impose any direct costs. Potential cost efficiencies could arise if central and local elections coincide.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

35. The council's position on this matter presents minimal risk.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

36. The Policy and Planning Committee will consider approving the council's submission at its meeting on 10 April.
37. Submissions close on Thursday, 17 April.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Authors	Macleon Grindell - Senior Advisor Operations and Policy Warwick McNaughton - Principal Advisor Governance
Authorisers	Oliver Roberts - Planning & Operations Manager Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Urgent decision noting report - Waitematā Local Board's input to Auckland Council submission on the Local Government (Water Services) Bill

File No.: CP2025/03701

Item 19

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To note the Waitematā Local Board's (the local board) use of its urgent decision delegation and feedback provided on Auckland Council's submission on the Local Government (Water Services) Bill.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. Last year, the first two bills dis-established the previous Government's Three Waters reform, set up the framework for Local Water Done Well, enabled Watercare to become financially separate from Auckland Council so that they can borrow under their own name, and finalised the requirements for Watercare to be subject to interim economic regulation from 1 July 2025.
3. On 10 December 2024, the Government introduced the third and final piece of legislation, the [Local Government \(Water Services\) Bill](#), to advance its Local Water Done Well policy reform.
4. The third bill introduces an economic regulation and consumer protection regime for water services, incorporating information disclosure requirements into the Commerce Act 1986.
5. This bill also reforms the water quality regulatory framework and updates parts of the Water Services Act 2021, which established the Water Services Authority - Taumata Arowai.
6. Even though Watercare and Auckland Council are more advanced in term of its water services delivery standards than the rest of the country,
7. There are some provisions in this third bill that are relevant and important to Watercare and Auckland Council, particularly in relation to how tax is treated, planning and accountability changes, and land access arrangements.
8. Auckland Council provided feedback on this bill and the local boards' feedback was due on 21 February 2025 to be incorporated into the council submission.
9. An urgent decision was required as the final deadline for feedback input for inclusion in the council's submission was 21 February 2025, and the Waitematā Local Board's February scheduled business meeting was on 18 February 2025. The local board provided its feedback (Attachment A) through the urgent decision process on 21 February 2025 (Attachment B).
10. The local board members were provided with a briefing paper on 19 February 2025. The local board members were also provided with a report, incorporated into the Board's February Business Meeting Agenda as Item 18.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) note the Waitematā Local Board provided input to Auckland Council submission on the Local Government (Water Services) Bill on 21 February 2025.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

Item 19

No.	Title	Page
A⇒	Waitematā Local Board feedback on the Local Government (Water Services) Bill	
B⇒	Urgent Decision of the Waitematā Local Board	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Authors	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authorisers	Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2025/03704

Item 20

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 she 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 covering the period 6th February 2025 to 7th March 2025.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A⇒	Chair G Sage Report March 2025	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Authors	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authorisers	Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Board Members' Reports

File No.: CP2025/03705

Item 21

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To provide an opportunity for Waitematā Local Board members to update the public and other local board members on the activities and events they have attended or undertaken throughout the month.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. At each business meeting local board members have the opportunity to provide a written report to inform the public and other local board members on the activities and events they have attended or undertaken throughout the month.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the written reports from Member A Bonham and Member R Northey for March 2025, and any verbal reports.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A⇒	Member A Bonham Report March 2025	
B⇒	Member R Northey Report March 2025	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Authors	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authorisers	Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Ward Councillor's Update

File No.: CP2025/03700

Item 22

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide the Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor Mike Lee, Deputy Mayor and Ōrākei Ward Councillor Desley Simpson, Albert-Eden-Puketāpapa Ward Councillors Christine Fletcher and Julie Fairey with an opportunity to update the Waitematā Local Board on Governing Body issues.
2. A verbal update can 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 any verbal update from Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor Mike Lee, Deputy Mayor and Ōrākei Ward Councillor Desley Simpson, Albert-Eden-Puketāpapa Ward Councillors Christine Fletcher and Julie Fairey, for March 2025.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Authors	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authorisers	Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Waitematā Local Board Workshop Records

File No.: CP2025/03898

Item 23

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. For the Waitematā Local Board (the local board) to receive the records of its recent workshops held since the previous local board business meeting. Attached is the proceeding record taken from the workshops held on 11 February 2025, 25 February 2025 and 4 March 2025.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. 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:

- a) receive the Waitematā Local Board workshop record for the workshops held on 11 February 2025, 25 February 2025 and 4 March 2025.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A⇒	11 February 2025 Waitematā Local Board Workshop Proceeding	
B⇒	25 February 2025 Waitematā Local Board Workshop Proceeding	
C⇒	4 March 2025 Waitematā Local Board Workshop Proceeding	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Authors	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
Authorisers	Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager

Hōtaka kaupapa / Governance forward work calendar for business meeting and workshop agenda items

File No.: CP2025/03708

Item 24

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To present the Waitematā Local Board (the local board) with the updated Hōtaka Kaupapa / Governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. This report contains the Hōtaka Kaupapa / 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 Hōtaka kaupapa 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 provides an opportunity for interested residents to see a forward schedule of business meetings and workshop items noting there is an opportunity to observe open workshops and an ability to speak at business meetings on local board business via pre-booked public deputation or public forum slots.
6. The schedule 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 or dates will be adjusted.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the March 2025 Hōtaka Kaupapa / Governance forward work calendar (Attachment A) for business meeting and workshop agenda items.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A⇒	March Hōtaka kaupapa / Governance forward work calendar for business meeting and workshop agenda items	

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Authors	Katherine Kang - Democracy Advisor
---------	------------------------------------

Authorisers	Tristan Coulson - Local Area Manager
-------------	--------------------------------------

Item 24

Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the **Waitematā Local Board**

- a) whakaae / agree to exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

15 Waitematā Local Board Digital Heritage Initiative 2024/2025 - Attachment A - Supplier Brief

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	s7(2)(b)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information. In particular, withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely to unreasonably prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is a subject of the information..	s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.

15 Waitematā Local Board Digital Heritage Initiative 2024/2025 - Attachment B - Supplier Presentation

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	s7(2)(b)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information. In particular, the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely to unreasonably prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is a subject of the information..	s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.