

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

Date: Wednesday, 19 March 2025
Time: 5:00 pm
Meeting Room: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Office
Venue: Shop 17B
93 Bader Drive
Māngere

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

OPEN AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson	Tauanu'u Nick Bakulich
Deputy Chairperson	Togiatolu Walter Togiamua
Members	Harry Fatu Toleafoa Joe Glassie-Rasmussen Makalita Kolo Christine O'Brien Papaliitele Lafulafu Peo, JP

(Quorum 4 members)

Jacqueline Robinson
Democracy Advisor

13 March 2025

Contact Telephone: (09) 262 5283
Email: jacqui.robinson@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	6
	8.1 Deputation - BreastScreen Kia Ū Ora	6
	8.2 Deputation - Falemasiva driveway project	6
	8.3 Deputation - Ōtāhuhu Youth group, High St, Ōtāhuhu	7
9	Te Matapaki Tūmatanui Public Forum	7
10	Ngā Pakihi Autaia Extraordinary Business	7
11	Governing Body member Update	9
12	Local Board Leads and Appointments Report	11
13	Chairperson's Report	15
14	Feedback on options to address local board operating cost pressures for Annual Budget 2025/2026	17
15	Local Board Transport Capital Fund Projects 2025-2026	47
16	Auckland Transport Kōkiri / Local Board Transport Agreement Quarterly Update - March 2025	63
17	Kōkiri - Setting priorities for Auckland Transport project and programme engagement	75
18	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	81
19	Local board input into Auckland Council's submission on the Term of Parliament (Enabling 4-year Term) Legislation Amendment Bill	89
20	URGENT DECISION: Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy	93
21	Local board resolution responses, feedback and information report	125
22	Hōtaka Kaupapa / Governance Forward Work Calendars	143
23	Record of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Workshop Notes	147
24	Te Whakaaro ki ngā Take Pūtea e Autaia ana Consideration of Extraordinary Items	
PUBLIC EXCLUDED		
25	Te Mōtini ā-Tukanga hei Kaupare i te Marea Procedural Motion to Exclude the Public	157
C1	CONFIDENTIAL: Appointment to the board of Māngere Mountain Education Trust	157

1 Nau mai | Welcome

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 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whakaū / confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 19 February 2025, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

5 He Tamōtanga Motuhake | Leave of Absence

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

6 Te Mihi | Acknowledgements

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

7 Ngā Petihana | Petitions

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

8 Ngā Tono Whakaaturanga | Deputations

Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu 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 - BreastScreen Kia Ū Ora

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. Ruth Choudhary, Community Engagement and Health Promotion Advisor from BreastScreen Kia Ū Ora, BreastScreen Auckland Central, will be in attendance to bring awareness to breast cancer screening, promote the mobile breast screening unit being set up at TOIA 10 March to 4 April and share statistics.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whakamihi / thank Ruth Choudhary from BreastScreen Kia Ū Ora, BreastScreen Auckland Central, for her attendance and presentation.

8.2 Deputation - Falemasiva driveway project

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. Aisake Tava Pouvalu from the Falemasiva driveway project will be in attendance to talk about the pre-school driveway project at Falemasiva Pre School 28 Cardrona Place starting in April.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whakamihi / thank Aisake Tava Pouvalu from the Falemasiva driveway project for her attendance and presentation.

8.3 Deputation - Ōtāhuhu Youth group, High St, Ōtāhuhu

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. Caroline Pili Tufuga-Paepae from the Ōtāhuhu Youth group will be in attendance to present an update from the group at 12-16 High Street, Ōtāhuhu.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whakamihi / thank Caroline Pili Tufuga-Paepae from the Ōtāhuhu Youth group for her attendance and presentation.

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.”

Governing Body member Update

File No.: CP2025/03838

Item 11

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. A period of time (10 minutes) has been set aside for the Manukau Ward Councillors to have an opportunity to update the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on regional matters.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whiwhi / receive the verbal reports from the Manukau Ward Councillors.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Jacqueline Robinson - Democracy Advisor
--------	---

Local Board Leads and Appointments Report

File No.: CP2025/03845

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To allow the local board members an opportunity to present verbal and written updates on their lead roles, such as relevant actions, appointments and meetings.
2. To make any appointments to vacant positions.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

3. Members have an opportunity to update the board on their activities as topic area leads.
4. The table below outlines the current leads and alternates for topic areas of local board business meetings and organisations on which the board is represented through a formal appointment.

Topic Area	Lead	Alternate
Social Impact Fund Allocation Committee Appointments Committee	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	1st half of the term: Harry Fatu Toleafoa 2nd half of the term: Togiatolu Walter Togiamua
Staff consultation over landowner approval applications (excluding applications for filming and events)	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	Joe Glassie-Rasmussen
Staff consultation on applications for filming	Christine O'Brien	Makalita Kolo
Liquor licence matters, to prepare and provide objections, if any, and speak to any local board views at any hearings on applications for liquor licences	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	Joe Glassie-Rasmussen
Resource consent matters to: i) provide the local board views, if any, on whether a resource consent should proceed as a non-notified, limited notified or fully notified application ii) prepare and provide local board's views, if any, on notified resource consents and speak to those views at any hearings if required iii) provide the local board's views on matters relating to or generated by the COVID-19 (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 while this legislation remains in force	1st half of the term: Harry Fatu Toleafoa 2nd half of the term: Togiatolu Walter Togiamua	Christine O'Brien
Local Government New Zealand Auckland Zone	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	1st half of the term: Harry Fatu Toleafoa 2nd half of the term: Togiatolu Walter Togiamua

Topic Area	Lead	Alternate
Select shared representatives to council working groups, working parties and other internal bodies, where there is a limited number of local board representatives to be selected from amongst all 21 or clusters of local boards	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	
Manukau Harbour Forum joint committee	Togiatolu Walter Togiamua	Papaliitele Lafulafu Peo
Ara Kōtui (formerly Māori input into local board decision-making political steering group)	Togiatolu Walter Togiamua	Joe Glassie-Rasmussen
Staff consultation on applications for events and other activities on local parks and local facilities that also require regulatory approval, or may involve reputational, financial, performance or political risk	Christine O'Brien	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich
Approve the local board's input into Auckland Council submissions on formal consultation from government departments, parliament, select committees and other councils, when timeframes do not allow for local board input to be considered and approved at a local board meeting	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	1st half of the term: Harry Fatu Toleafoa 2nd half of the term: Togiatolu Walter Togiamua
Infrastructure and Environmental Services	Togiatolu Walter Togiamua	Harry Fatu Toleafoa
Arts, Community and Events (including libraries)	Christine O'Brien	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich
Parks, Sport and Recreation and Community Facilities	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	Christine O'Brien
Local planning, housing, and heritage – includes responding to resource consent applications on behalf of board	1st half of the term: Harry Fatu Toleafoa 2nd half of the term: Togiatolu Walter Togiamua	1st half of the term: Togiatolu Walter Togiamua 2nd half of the term: Harry Fatu Toleafoa
Transport	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	1st half of the term: Harry Fatu Toleafoa 2nd half of the term: Togiatolu Walter Togiamua
Economic development	Harry Fatu Toleafoa	Makalita Kolo
Youth, Children, Seniors and Uniquely Abled	Harry Fatu Toleafoa	Papaliitele Lafulafu Peo
Water care COMMUNITY	Togiatolu Walter Togiamua	Papaliitele Lafulafu Peo
Auckland Airport Community Trust for Aircraft Noise Community Consultative Group	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	Joe Glassie-Rasmussen
Ambury Park Centre	Papaliitele Lafulafu Peo	Christine O'Brien
Department of Corrections - Community Impact Forum for Kohuora Corrections Facility	Makalita Kolo	Papaliitele Lafulafu Peo

Topic Area	Lead	Alternate
Māngere Bridge Business Association	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	Christine O'Brien
Māngere East Village Business Association	Joe Glassie-Rasmussen	Togiatolu Walter Togiamua
Māngere Mountain Education Trust	Togiatolu Walter Togiamua	Makalita Kolo
Māngere Town Centre Business Association	Makalita Kolo	Papaliitele Lafulafu Peo
Ōtāhuhu Business Association	Christine O'Brien	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich
Ōtāhuhu Portage Project Steering Group	Papaliitele Lafulafu Peo	Christine O'Brien
Ōtāhuhu Town Hall Community Centre Incorporated Society joint committee	Makalita Kolo	Harry Fatu Toleafoa
South Harbour Business Association	Harry Fatu Toleafoa	Papaliitele Lafulafu Peo
Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum	Togiatolu Walter Togiamua	Makalita Kolo
Te Pūkaki Tapu O Poutūkeka Historic Reserve & Associated Lands Co-Management Committee	Togiatolu Walter Togiamua	Joe Glassie-Rasmussen
<p>Te Pūkaki Tapu o Poutūkeka Co-Management Committee. MO/2023/187</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to agree changes of a minor nature to the Te Pūkaki Tapu o Poutūkeka Co-management Agreement in Attachment A of the agenda report, in consultation with Te Ākitai Waiohua / Pūkaki Māori Marae Committee to sign on behalf of Auckland Council the Te Pūkaki Tapu o Poutūkeka Co-management Agreement in Attachment A of the agenda report as an additional member to Te Pūkaki Tapu o Poutūkeka Co-management Committee, to come into effect on agreement with Te Ākitai Waiohua / Pūkaki Māori Marae Committee on a total Co-management committee membership of six 	Tauanu'u Nanai Nick Bakulich	
The Southern Initiative (TSI) Steering Group	Harry Fatu Toleafoa	Joe Glassie-Rasmussen
<p>Emergency Readiness and Response Forum MO/2024/52 To participate in the Emergency</p>	<p>Chairperson Deputy Chairperson Member Harry Fatu Toleafoa</p>	

Topic Area	Lead	Alternate
Readiness and Response Forum		

Item 12

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whiwhi / receive the verbal and written reports from local board members.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Jacqueline Robinson - Democracy Advisor
--------	---

Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2025/03852

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. This item gives the chairperson an opportunity to update the board on any announcements.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whiwhi / receive the chairperson's verbal and written report.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Jacqueline Robinson - Democracy Advisor
--------	---

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

File No.: CP2025/04263

Item 14

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 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu 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

Item 14

LB Cost pressure	Full Facilities scheduled maintenance		Improved libraries rostering	Pools and Leisure revenue shortfall	Venue Hire revenue shortfall	Leasing	Total net OPEX cost pressures
		Utilities					
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)		Fairer Funding \$34.6m OPEX top up	Total net OPEX cost pressures	Additional OPEX available	Remaining cost pressure
	2025/2026 baseline OPEX funding	included in baseline OPEX for 2025/2026				
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:
- Local boards manage within existing local board funding envelopes
 - Recalibration of the \$35 million operating funding increase (for local boards) in 2025/2026
 - 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 existing local board funding envelopes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice not fully ready across local board service portfolio to implement for 2025/2026. • 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.
Option 2: Recalibration of the \$35 million operating funding increase for local boards in 2025/2026	<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.
Option 3: Seeking additional funding to accommodate cost pressures including utilising the Delivering Differently budget	<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)	29
B 	Memorandum: Local Board cost pressures – additional information (2 Dec 2024)	41
C 	Feedback template	45

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Hao Chen - Manager Local Board Financial Advisory
Authorisers	Lou-Ann Ballantyne - General Manager Governance and Engagement Brian Chan - General Manager Financial Advisory Victoria Villaraza - Local Area Manager

Options to address local board operating cost pressures and their impact on Fairer Funding implementation

File No.: CP2025/00589

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To seek feedback from the Joint Governance Working Party (JGWP) on options to support local boards with cost pressures in the context of Fairer Funding.

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 equity¹.
3. Transitioning to an equity-based funding model is a significant shift requiring careful planning, advice and resource. The implementation of this change will be realised progressively over the next four years. In the first year (Annual Budget 2025/2026), the programme and advice required to support fully informed decision making continues to be developed, meaning that some flexibility in approach, particularly in understanding and addressing cost pressures, is required.
4. Under Fairer Funding, local boards are allocated annual funding envelopes for delivering local community services in their local board area. Local boards can set work programmes within these funding envelopes.
5. Through the council's Annual Budget 2025/2026 refresh process, staff have identified that some costs are rising faster than anticipated. This includes costs for delivering local community services and activities, particularly asset-based services such as libraries, pools and leisure centres. These are generally unavoidable cost increases that must be funded to maintain current service levels.
6. Cost pressures identified to date can be themed into:
 - Contractual/inflationary cost increases above assumptions, such as increases in repairs and maintenance costs from full facilities maintenance contracts, and utilities.
 - Implementation of political decisions, such as implementing a living wage for contracted Pools and Leisure sites.
 - Improvements to meet planned levels of service, such as increased staff rostering to reduce the likelihood of unplanned facility closures.
 - Ongoing challenges to revenue, including from pools and leisure facilities.
7. In a memorandum to Budget Committee and local board members on 2 December 2024 (Attachment A), 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.
8. Local boards that were identified as funded below their equitable levels will receive additional funding from 2025/2026 to bring them closer to their equitable funding levels. These local boards could use that funding to manage cost pressures. Local boards that were

¹ Funding distributed based on population, deprivation, and land area at a ratio of 80:15:5 has been adopted as the equitable funding level (GB/2021/138).

2 <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

Joint Governance Working Party

identified as funded near or above their equitable funding levels will receive little or no additional funding and are more likely to be impacted disproportionately by these rising costs due to their larger asset bases.

9. Development of programmes regarding community advice are underway, including the 'Local Board Portfolio Review' and 'Deliver Differently', each of which will identify opportunities to deliver community services differently in future. However, advice from these programmes will not be ready for 2025/2026 to support addressing local board cost pressures.
10. The following package of options have been identified for addressing 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.
 - iii) Additional funding to support cost pressures.
11. A combination of options may be required 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).
12. This report is to inform 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.

Ngā tūhunga Recommendation/s

That the Joint Governance Working Party:

13. Ohia / endorse the three identified options as potential ways to address local board cost pressures in the short term: Local boards manage within existing local board funding envelopes; recalibration of the \$35 million operating funding increase for 2025/2026; and seeking additional funding to accommodate cost pressures.
14. Tono / request that staff seek formal local board feedback on matters relating to local board cost pressures and report back to the Joint Governance Working Party in April 2025, to support a recommendation to the Governing Body for Annual Budget 2025/2026.

Horopaki Context

15. 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.
16. \$84 million opex and \$50 million capex were provided in the first three years of the LTP to progress this transition. 13 local boards were funded below their equitable level and were allocated a share of the new operating funding, totalling \$35 million for 2025/2026, while eight local boards have not been allocated any new funding.
17. Cost pressures can arise when the costs of delivering a service are forecast to increase at a rate greater than that projected in the LTP. These can occur as new information becomes available subsequent to the adoption of an LTP or Annual Plan, and budgeting assumptions are updated.

² <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

Joint Governance Working Party

18. As part of the annual budget review for Annual Budget 2025/2026, staff have - at an initial stage, identified some unavoidable increases to the cost of delivering certain local services, over and above projected levels in the LTP (cost pressures).
19. The initial estimate at November 2024 was \$6.5 million across 21 local boards, however this is expected to change. Further risks for potential cost pressures were signalled at that time and continue to be investigated through the ongoing annual budget refresh process, to be finalised by late February 2025.
20. Operating cost pressures relating to networks of asset-based services (e.g. pools, libraries, open space maintenance) have historically been managed 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.
21. 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.
22. 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.
23. The eight local boards that will not receive 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.
24. Fulsome advice on strategic change options and opportunities across local services that can be implemented in time to address cost pressures will not be ready for the 2025/2026 financial year, and there may be a need for additional options to support local boards in the interim.
25. Increased advice on some significant options around service levels could be provided through the annual planning process for 2026/2027 to help local boards mitigate cost pressures, however a longer-term approach to the provision of more comprehensive strategic advice across the entire local board service portfolio may take up to four years to fully implement as part of the transition to funding equity.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

An initial budget review has identified some cost pressures

26. Early in the annual budget refresh process, a high-level review of assumptions and significant contracts is undertaken to identify potential drivers for cost escalation and risk areas for further investigation. Through this initial review, staff identified some unavoidable increases to the cost of delivering certain local services, over and above projected levels in the Long-term Plan.
27. The cost pressures identified to date can be themed into:
 - Contractual/inflationary cost increases above assumptions, such as increases in repairs and maintenance costs from full facilities maintenance contracts, and utilities.
 - Political decisions, such as implementing a living wage for contracted Pools and Leisure sites.

² <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-by-laws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

Joint Governance Working Party

Item 14

Attachment A

- Improvements to meet expected levels of service, such as increased staff rostering to reduce the likelihood of unplanned facility closures.
 - Ongoing challenges to revenue, including from pools and leisure facilities.
28. A more detailed review of budgets is continuing, with updated forecast cost and budget positions expected to be finalised by the end of February 2025. These will be shared with local boards in March 2025 to consider for their annual budget.

The approach to funding local boards is changing from 1 July 2025

29. Under Section A of the current Local Board Funding Policy (which ceases to apply from 30 June 2025), operating funding for local activities is split into two main parts based on the nature of the service provided and the allocation of decision making between the Governing Body and local boards.
- a) Funding levels for individual local boards were approved by the Governing Body based on the projected requirements to deliver asset-based community services (ABS) (such as libraries, park maintenance, pools and leisure centres) as part of overall council budget decision making. Operating cost increases for these services could be met by a range of financial levers available to the Governing Body, including increased general rates or re-prioritisation of funding to services across the region.
 - b) Funding levels for locally driven initiatives (LDI) were based on a fixed sum, distributed via an equitable formula. Cost increases relating to locally driven initiatives were managed by local boards within fixed funding levels through prioritisation exercises each year.
30. Since 1 July 2022, decisions on service levels and operating funding allocations towards all local services (LDI and ABS) became the responsibility of local boards. From 1 July 2025, Section B of the Local Board Funding Policy 2025² will apply.
31. Under this Fairer Funding approach the operating funding level for all local community services will be set based on an equitable distribution of a Governing Body approved funding envelope. 2025/2026 will be the first year where local boards will need to manage the cost of delivering historical asset-based community services, including cost pressures, within set funding levels by local board.
32. It is an inherent feature of the new model that additional funding will no longer automatically be applied to boards that have a large asset base with rising costs. To do so would perpetuate the past inequities that this new model is attempting to solve.
33. This new approach is a significant change in how community services and assets are funded. It will impact how these will be provided for Aucklanders in the future, and giving effect to this new approach requires careful planning, resourcing and management.
34. While most local boards will receive new operating funding that can support the management of cost pressures, the eight local boards not receiving new funding will need to respond to cost pressures by reviewing service levels and making prioritisation and trade-off decisions to remain within their existing funding levels. This requires appropriate advice from council officers to support local board decisions.

Provision of advice for local board decision making

35. Advice on options and opportunities for local boards to change services to reduce costs in some areas to meet rising costs in others will initially be limited to a part of the overall local board service portfolio.
36. There are also some community advice programmes underway, such as the 'Local Board Portfolio Review' and 'Deliver Differently' programmes, which will provide advice on opportunities to deliver community services differently in future financial years. However,

² <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

Joint Governance Working Party

advice from these programmes will not be ready to support decision making and implementation for the 2025/2026 financial year.

37. There is likely a need to look in further detail at trade-off opportunities for local boards across the entire service portfolio to help mitigate the unavoidable costs of individual services increasing higher than the rate of local boards' funding levels.
38. A need has also been identified for the organisation to give effect to increased local board decision making and Fairer Funding through improvements to budgeting for local services and activities. These are explained in further detail in the section below.
39. Staff expect to provide improved and increased advice on options around service levels to help local boards mitigate cost pressures through the 2026/2027 Annual Planning process, in addition to advice on under-performing service assets and options for delivering differently. However with the intended transition to funding equity over four years, it may take more time for staff to develop a robust, longer-term approach to provide quality advice to elected members that can appropriately support strategic changes to how local services are delivered for Aucklanders into the future.

Principles to support a transition to fairer funding

40. 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.
41. Existing ABS/LDI funding by local board was sufficient to deliver existing service levels in each individual local board area at the time of LTP preparation based on the best available cost and revenue projections at that time.
42. Without additional options it is unlikely that local boards without sufficient new funding to offset the new emerging cost pressures will be able to manage these within existing funding levels in line with the transition principles, particularly in 2025/2026.
43. In developing further options for mitigating emerging cost pressures, staff recommend the following clarified principles help guide decision making on funding for local boards through this transition period
 - No local board is worse off (levels of services and activities) compared to 2024/2025, during the first year of transition to funding equity (2025/2026)
 - Maintain progression towards achieving significant funding equity (per LTP 2024-2034 and Local Board Funding Policy 2025).
 - Minimise impact on ratepayers.
 - Giving effect to increased decision making and Fairer Funding will require improved staff advice to local boards over a four-year transition period.
44. A combination of options may be required 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).

Options analysis for addressing local board cost pressures

45. A combination of options may be required 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).

² <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

Joint Governance Working Party

Item 14

Attachment A

46. The following options have been identified for addressing local board cost pressures in the short-term:
- Local boards manage within existing local board funding envelopes, with support from staff to find efficiencies and enhance revenue for asset-based services.
 - Recalibration of the allocation of the \$35 million operating funding increase for local boards in 2025/2026.
 - Additional funding for local services to accommodate cost pressures to be either funded by higher rates increases or savings for other activities.
47. Analysis of each option is set out below. Staff note that any option where funding is distributed to local boards on a non-equitable basis is a departure from the Local Board Funding Policy 2025, including the provision of additional funding to those boards who may require it. Nevertheless, a minor departure from the policy may be justified in the short-term if it is needed to give effect to the principles set out above.
48. Based on initial estimates of cost pressures it is unlikely any funding changes would be considered significant (per council's Significance and Engagement Policy), and therefore would not require public consultation to implement.
- Option 1: Local boards manage within existing local board funding envelopes, with support from staff to find efficiencies and enhance revenue for asset-based services.*
49. 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.
50. Under this approach local boards would address cost pressures by:
- Utilising new operating funding.
 - 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).
 - 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.
51. Local boards that will not receive any new funding, or 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 full 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, and would not support the principle of no local board being worse off in its levels of services and activities in the first year of transition.
- Option 2: Recalibration of the allocation of the \$35 million operating funding increase for local boards in 2025/2026*
52. 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 no or insufficient new funding to address cost pressures from the \$35 million new funding, then distributing the remainder based on the equitable rankings.

² <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

Joint Governance Working Party

53. Some preliminary modelling based on the initial view of emerging cost pressures indicated that it may be possible to still provide those boards that are due to receive additional funding under the new approach with 90 per cent of that additional funding while fully addressing the emerging cost pressures.
54. This option would be a departure from the adopted Local Board Funding Policy 2025 and would therefore require a Governing Body decision. Progress would still be made towards funding equity, however this 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.
55. This option could be implemented for one or more years until sufficient advice is available and implementable for local boards to manage cost pressures over their full portfolio of services. Should a one-year redistribution be supported, this provides temporary support, however as cost pressures are ongoing local boards will still need to address cost pressures from 2025/2026 when setting their 2026/2027 work programme, in addition to any new cost pressures in that year.

Option 3: Provide additional funding for local services to accommodate cost pressures to be either funded by higher rates increases or savings for other activities

56. 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.
57. Work is currently underway by finance staff across the council group to update budget projections for the 2025/2026 financial year. While there are some emerging cost pressures and risks to be worked through, the overall financial position of the council group is in considerably better shape compared to recent years when it was facing operating funding gaps of around \$200 to \$300 million per year. This means that while it is important to maintain fiscal discipline, there is not the same pressure to make very tough trade-offs, defer investment and reduce services.
58. 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 can't 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/June 2025. However, the current political direction on this is clear, a higher rates increase is very much the last resort.
59. 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.
60. 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.

² <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

Joint Governance Working Party

Item 14

Attachment A

61. The following tables summarise the impact, risks and alignment to the proposed principles for each option.

Option	Risks and/or impacts
Option 1: Manage within existing local board funding envelopes supported by staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advice not fully ready across full local board service portfolio to implement for 2025/2026. 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. Does not support the principle of no local board being worse off in its service levels in the first year of transition.
Option 2: Recalibration of the allocation of the \$35 million operating funding increase for local boards	<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.
Option 3: Provide additional funding for local services to accommodate cost pressures	<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.

Options	No local board worse off in the first year of transition	Progress towards funding equity	Minimise impact on ratepayers	Reduced reliance on improved advice
Option 1: Manage within existing LB funding envelopes supported by staff	✘	✓✓	✓✓	✘
Option 2: Recalibration of the allocation of the \$35 million operating funding increase for local boards	✓	✓	✓✓	✓
Option 3: Provide additional funding for local services to accommodate cost pressures	✓✓	✓	✓	✓

62. A combination of options may be used to resolve the level of cost pressures for local boards in both 2025/2026 and beyond. For example, local boards could make decisions to reduce funding in areas without materially impacting service levels where relevant staff advice is able to be presented. Staff could also seek to find opportunities to manage costs and revenue as part of managing day-to-day operations. Residual cost pressures could then be

² <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

Joint Governance Working Party

managed with additional temporary support, a recalibration of the allocation of the \$35 million additional top-up, or a combination of the two. Alternatively, some additional funding from the Governing Body could be made available in relation to specific items, such as the regional policy decision to implement a living wage for pools and leisure facilities, with the other options used to address the remaining pressures.

Improvements to budget and cost allocation accuracy

63. Prior to the adoption of Fairer Funding, staff had identified a risk with the accuracy of the underlying LTP baseline budget data, by local board, which the Fairer Funding analysis was based on.
64. There are areas where cost allocation and budget improvements are necessary to support advice on the costs of delivering local services, and enable local boards to understand their financial information and the impact of their decisions better.
65. These areas relate to services that are managed across the region (or at a network level), with financials also managed at a regional level. A need has been identified to improve the financial accuracy and update processes to improve accuracy at a local board or facility level, to appropriately inform and support advice for local board decision making. Examples of these services include libraries, pools and leisure, full facilities, ecological and arboriculture contracts, where providing the local view, in addition to the amalgamated regional view requires further work.
66. Staff are working towards improving budgets for some local services this year, however it may take a few years to fully complete reviews across all local services as greater clarity on costs by local board is achieved. For example, improved cost reporting is expected to be available from service providers as significant maintenance contracts are renewed with new contractual terms that focus on local areas and facilities rather than on regional network outcomes. These improvements are intended to better reflect the funding required to deliver local services, and therefore local board budget requirements for different service level choices.
67. As a result of these improvements, some changes to current cost allocations and therefore funding requirements and baseline budgets by local board may be necessary. Changes that impact baseline budgets would impact funding equity analysis and local board rankings, however should not impact the total cost to council or planned service levels as they are a change to how costs and funding is allocated only.
68. 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.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi Climate impact statement

69. The recommendations in this report have no particular impacts on climate. However decisions for local board funding levels influence the level of investment in local services and activities, which may have climate impacts. As further information and advice becomes available to support local board decision making, there will also be a better understanding of the impacts of these decisions on climate change.

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

70. Staff from the Finance and Community divisions will develop further advice, based on the direction from the JGWP, for the 2025/2026 Annual Budget.

² <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

Joint Governance Working Party

Item 14

Attachment A

71. 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.
72. The recommendation in this report has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. 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

73. A memo was distributed on 2 December 2024 to the Budget Committee and local board members regarding local board cost pressures to share initial information. This set out some potential options on how cost pressures could be managed.
74. Finance staff attended the Local Board Chairs Forum on 9 December 2024 to discuss initial information on local cost pressures.
75. Some local boards have voiced concerns on low clarity around their 'asset-based services' and decisions they can make in these areas, and also understanding of the level of local board funding currently allocated to delivering existing planned levels of service.
76. The proposed options to address local board cost pressures may have impacts on the level of activities and services which each local board can deliver for their communities. Paragraphs 45 – 62 identify some local impacts and risks for each option. The specific financial impacts of each option is yet to be determined and only after budget refresh will staff be able to determine local board impacts.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

77. The recommendations in this report have no particular impacts on Māori. However decisions for local board funding levels influence the level of investment in local services and activities, which may have Māori impacts. As further information and advice becomes available to support local board decision making, there will also be a better understanding of the impacts of these decisions on Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

78. Some of the options proposed in this report for further engagement will impact individual 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.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

79. There are risks relating to the final size of unavoidable cost pressures and other categories of cost pressures, which will only be known by late February 2025. Should these exceed the level of new funding or options available to local boards from minor changes to service levels, local boards may not be 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). This report provides some options which could mitigate this risk for individual local boards.
80. There are also risks relating to the timeframe for 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

² <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

Joint Governance Working Party

local services can be more efficiently delivered. Improvements to local board data and staff advice are expected to come for 2026/2027 however a longer-term solution may take the full transition period to funding equity of four years.

81. Some options proposed 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.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

82. Staff will be informing and discussing through workshops with local boards in March 2025 individual local board budget positions, cost pressures, and specific local board impacts of proposed options presented to the Joint Governance Working Party in February 2025.
83. Staff will seek local boards' formal feedback through local board business meeting reports in March 2025 to inform a report seeking recommendations from JGWP to the Governing Body in April 2025.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A	Attachment: Local funding cost pressures	
B	MEMO: Local Board cost pressures – additional information (2 Dec 2024)	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

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

2 <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>



Memorandum

2 December 2024

To: Budget Committee, Local Board Members

Subject: Local Board cost pressures – additional information

From: Brian Chan, General Manager Financial Advisory

Contact information: brian.chan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To provide additional information about an emerging issue relating to Local Board cost pressures.

Summary

2. The move to Fairer Funding means that local board funding will no longer be automatically adjusted to reflect changes to the cost of delivering local services.
3. Early indications suggest known cost pressures for local services of around \$6.5 million compared to a total budget of \$288 million. This equates to pressures of between zero and \$0.75 million for individual local boards, with final forecast costs and advice on options to be provided in March 2025.
4. Staff are not recommending that local boards take urgent action at this point or propose material service changes in their consultation materials based on these early indications.
5. Information on the preliminary quantum of known cost pressures by local board is contained as an attachment to this memo, including a draft process for working with the Joint Governance Working Party (JGWP) next year on additional potential options to manage any cost pressures.

Context

6. Fairer Funding was adopted by the Governing Body through the Long-term Plan (LTP) 2024-2034, as a shift from asset-based funding to an equity formula, with the aim to get local boards closer to their equitable funding levels.
7. An additional \$35 million was provided in 2025/2026, rising to \$50 million from 2026/2027, to support earlier implementation of Fairer Funding without leaving any local boards worse off.
8. There have been early indications of some increases to the cost of delivering existing services. Local boards have expressed concerns at a lack of detail on the potential extent of cost pressures.
9. This memo provides preliminary financial information and a potential process for managing cost pressures to support finalisation of consultation options ahead of staff advice for local board work programmes in March.

Discussion

10. Local boards are expected to make decisions on delivering services within their budget and policy parameters, however, decisions need to be supported by quality staff advice. The

commencement of Fairer Funding in 2025/2026 was to allow the organisation to develop appropriate advice to support local board decision making.

Preliminary cost pressures

11. Through the initial review for the Annual Budget 2025/2026, staff have forecasted the costs to deliver certain local asset-based services rising at a level higher than anticipated in the LTP.
12. Cost pressures currently identified total \$6.5 million across the 21 local boards from:
 - Increased repairs and maintenance costs from full facilities maintenance contracts following an acceleration in capital delivery of community assets.
 - Implementing a living wage for workers at contracted Pools and Leisure sites.
 - Increased utilities costs (e.g. electricity, water, gas, security).
13. Staff are continuing to undergo a review of detailed budgets, with updated forecast cost and budget positions to be shared with local boards in March 2025.
14. Prior to 2025/2026, these cost pressures were managed as part of the Governing Body's overall decisions for the Annual Budget through a range of financial levers. 2025/2026 will be the first time local boards need to consider such cost pressures.
15. A risk has also been identified that advice and options across the entire local board service portfolio are not fully ready for the 2025/2026 financial year to support decisions around trade-offs and service changes, especially on opportunities to reduce funding requirements.
16. While the relative size of the cost pressures is small in terms of the overall local board funding pool (\$288 million for 2025/2026), there could be challenges for some local boards adapting to these changes in the short-term.
17. Eight local boards were allocated little to no funding increase under the new model for 2025/2026, as their existing funding levels were at or above equity levels. These were Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Howick, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Papakura, Upper Harbour, and Waitemata.
18. The initial cost pressure estimate for these local boards ranges between \$290,000 and \$750,000, totalling \$4 million for these 8 local boards (of the \$6.5 million indicative amount for all local boards).
19. Other local boards with a funding increase under Fairer Funding could potentially use part of their increased funding to cover the cost pressures for their board.

Additional options for managing cost pressures

20. A potential option which staff have identified for JGWP consideration is a slightly slower transition to fairer funding for 2025/2026, based on the principle of no local boards being worse off by this transition. This could effectively reset the funding levels to what they would have been if the current cost estimates were known at the time the funding formula was run.
21. If this approach was agreed, this could potentially result in a one-off adjustment to the distribution of the \$35 million provided in the LTP for 2025/2026 to soften the transition to Fairer Funding and provide temporary relief to local boards facing shortfalls to meet cost pressures in 2025/2026.
22. Under this option the \$35 million would be distributed slightly differently so that local boards facing shortfalls would receive additional funding to meet cost pressures in 2025/2026 only, and the remaining distributed to local boards in line with Fairer Funding principles.



23. An adjustment for 2025/2026 would not have an impact on achieving within 1% operating funding equity by 2026/2027. Local boards will still need to find ways to mitigate cost pressures from 2026/2027 onwards but will be supported by additional options and advice across a larger proportion of their total funding.
24. A temporary departure from the Local Board Funding Policy 2025 could be made by Governing Body decision without a need for consultation.
25. Local boards and the JGWP could also advocate for other options such as additional local board funding to support a smoother transition, and in the longer-term other approaches for managing significant asset based services such as on a multi-board or sub-regional basis.

Local board consultation for Annual Plan 2025/2026

26. Staff are not recommending that local boards take urgent action at this point or propose material service changes in their consultation materials based on these early indications of emerging cost pressures.
27. As with previous years, consultation can focus on relative priorities for each board, and any options the board might be considering to reduce cost in lower priority areas to make more capacity for investment in higher priority areas. This approach may be helpful to local boards in making their final budget decisions post consultation.

Next steps

28. Proposed process for next steps.
 - Local boards adopt local consultation material in December 2024.
 - Engagement with local boards in March 2025 with updated information on their funding envelopes, detailed costings including cost pressures, and available options for managing any funding shortfalls. This would include supporting local board submissions on cost pressures to the JGWP.
 - Engagement with the JGWP in April on potential options for addressing local cost pressures relating to asset based services, and to seek a recommendation to the Governing Body on a preferred option.
 - Potential for the JGWP to make a recommendation to the Budget Committee and Governing Body for a decision on additional options for managing local cost pressures (April/May 2025)
 - Local boards adopt their work programme and final budget decisions in June 2025.

Attachments

Local funding cost pressures - additional information

Feedback template

Feedback		Local board feedback
Options to manage local board cost pressures	Support / Do not support	Note: A combination of options could be supported.
Option 1: Local boards manage within existing local board funding envelopes		
Option 2: Recalibration of the \$35 million operating funding increase for local boards in 2025/2026		
Option 3: Seeking additional funding to accommodate cost pressures including utilising the Delivering Differently budget		
Managing local board cost pressures for future years:		
How would the local board like to see cost pressures managed for 2026/2027, until the next LTP, where local funding levels could be reset?		
Is there any other feedback local boards would like to provide around how they would like to see cost increases to provide existing services managed in the future?		
Current areas of local board cost pressures		
Full facilities scheduled maintenance		
Utilities (Electricity, Gas, Security)		
Libraries – to improve staff rostering		
Pools and Leisure revenue shortfall		
Venue hire revenue shortfall		
Leasing revenue		

Local Board Transport Capital Fund Projects 2025-2026

File No.: CP2025/03920

Item 15

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. The purpose of this report is to seek authorisation from Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to allocate new approved funding of \$411,966 which includes cost savings from the completed project from its Local Board Transport Capital Fund for the 2025-2026 financial year to new projects for investigation and delivery.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary

2. At its workshop on 4 February 2025, Auckland Transport informed the local board that it had been allocated additional funding after the finalisation of the 2024-2025 Regional Land Transport Plan.
3. The original budget for the local board was \$1.433m and the board brought forward \$427,000 from the year 2027 to complete the Criterion Square project. Therefore, the total budget for the board was \$1.901m
4. Now that that the budget has been increased to \$2.13m and this resets the local board's budget for financial year 2027 – back to baseline.
5. Together with savings from completed projects, the local board has additional funds of \$411,966 to allocate to new projects.
6. The local board were presented with a list of candidate projects at the 5 February 2025 workshop together with the indicative costs of the projects. The local board are invited to allocate funding to any of these projects.
7. Following the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board meeting on the 19th of February 2025 Auckland Transport engaged with Auckland Council to discuss an approach that allowed Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to apply its LBTCF budget to the Auckland Council Walter Massey shared paths project.
8. Auckland Transport met with the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board in a workshop on 5 March 2025 with accompanying staff from Auckland Council to discuss the projects in Auckland Council reserve land. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board supported funding Walter Massey shared paths projects.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whakaae / approves the allocation of \$411,966 towards stage 2 and 4 of the Walter Massey Park shared walking and cycling paths project
- b) tuhi tīpoka / note that the total cost of stage of 2 and 4 is \$770,000 with the remaining shortfall being covered by Auckland Council Parks & Community Facilities budget
- c) tuhi tīpoka / note that the sum of \$427,591 was brought forward from FY2027 as per resolution number: MO/2023/166. The additional approved budget in November 2024 covers the budget that was brought forward by the local board and resets the FY2027 budget back to the baseline.

Horopaki Context

Item 15

9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. The original budget for the local board was \$1.433m and the board brought forward \$427,591 from the financial year 2027 to complete the Criterion Square project. Therefore, the total budget was \$1.901m.
14. Therefore, the indicative budget for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has been increased from \$1.901m to \$2.132m for the 3-year term. This resets the board's financial year 2027 budget back to baseline. Note that the \$427,591 of the previous budget was allocated to the Criterion Square project.
15. With cost savings from the currently active projects of \$180,000 there is an indicative budget of \$411,966 now available to the local board for to allocate to new projects.
16. Through this report, Auckland Transport is giving the local board an opportunity to allocate \$411,966 to stage 2 and 4 of the Walter Massey Park project. The cost to deliver stage 2 and 4 is \$770,000 which is \$411,966 from LBTCF and \$358,034 from the Auckland Council budget.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

Active projects

17. The following table recaps the status of completed project:

Projects	Resolved Budget + AT Approved budget	Project Status	Cost Savings	Funding required to be resolved to complete the project
Criterion Square project	\$1,901,017.97	Completed	\$180,000.00	-
		Total	\$180,000.00	-

Table 1 – Update on active projects

18. On 5 February 2025 Auckland Transport staff provided advice to the local board that there are no active projects. And the completed project had a cost saving of \$180,000.

New LBTCF Budget

19. Auckland Transport attended a workshop with the local board on 5 February 2025. 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 new LBTCF projects.
20. With this new budget and savings from current active projects, the local board now has an indicative budget of \$411,966.
21. Following this workshop Auckland Transport met with Māngere-Ōtāhuhu on 5 March to present the option for using the LBTCF budget to part fund stage 2 and 4 of the Auckland Council Walter Massey Park project.
22. After discussion, the local board indicated that its priorities lay with the projects in the following table:

Project Name	Project Description	High level cost estimate
Walter Massey Park – Stage 2 and 4.	This project has been a previously preferred project of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board but was not delivered due to budget cuts. The project partly delivers the shared walking and cycling network component of Walter Massey Park Masterplan.	\$770,000 (total) \$358,034 (from AC budget) \$411,966 (met through the LBTCF)

Item 15

23. Other projects considered:

Project Name	Project Description	High level cost estimate
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu bus stop upgrades.	Bus Stop 2390 - 28 Bader Drive, Māngere. Opposite Māngere College, a pedestrian crossing nearby. The request is to provide a new bus shelter at this location.	\$60,000
	Bus Stop 6649 - 41 Thomas Road, Māngere. The request is to provide a new bus shelter at this location.	\$60,000
	Bus Stop 6443 - 21 Buckland Road, Māngere East. The request is to provide a new bus shelter at this location.	\$60,000
	Bus Stop 6445 - 49 Buckland Road, Māngere East. The request is to provide a new bus shelter at this location.	\$60,000
	Bus Stop 2172 - 302 Buckland Road, Māngere East. The request is to provide a new bus shelter at this location, a church in the vicinity.	\$60,000
	Bus Stop 2063 - 293 Buckland Road, Māngere East. The request is to provide a new bus shelter at this location, a church in the vicinity.	\$60,000
	Bus Stop 2468 - 240 Buckland Māngere East. The request is to provide a new bus shelter at this location, school catchment	\$5,000
	4 Millar Road, Māngere Bridge – requiring the addition of a bench.	\$5,000
	50 Thomas Road, Māngere Bridge – requiring the addition of a bench.	\$5,000
Boyd Avenue and House Avenue intersection refuge islands.	Arising from a public request, this project would provide a safer crossing location through the installation of a refuge island and improved pram crossings.	\$300,000
Ashgrove Reserve Shared Path.	Arising from a Local Board / Councillor request, this project would install a new shared path in Ashgrove Reserve. Design work was completed in the previous local board term. Due to budget cuts this project was not prioritized for funding.	\$1,000,000
Westney Road Pedestrian Crossing	Al Madinah School and Zayed College have safety concerns for children crossing on Westney Road. The project will upgrade the existing Kea crossing to a formal crossing.	\$375,000

24. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is invited to allocate funding to any of the above projects - within the restraints of the available budget.
25. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board may wish to consider funding the projects in the above table 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. Auckland Transport met with the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board in a workshop on 5 March 2025 with accompanying staff from Auckland Council to discuss the projects in Auckland Council reserve land. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board supported funding Walter Massey shared paths projects.

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 local board transport capital project decisions in this report do have financial implications, reducing the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Transport Capital Fund by \$411,966.

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

34. The proposed decisions do have some risk, 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% contingency on the projects and historically there are several occasions in 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.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

37. The following activities or actions are planned:
- if the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board resolves to support new projects with its additional funds, Auckland Council will work with the local board to finalise the designs before delivery.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Transport Capital Fund 2023 - 2026	53

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Alex Elton-Farr - Elected Member Relationship Partner
Authorisers	John Gillespie - Head of Stakeholder and Community Engagement Daniel Poe - Senior Local Board Advisor Victoria Villaraza - Local Area Manager

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu
Local Board Transport Capital Fund
2023 - 2026

AT

5th March – Workshop 5

Think before you print

Purpose of today

- Propose alternative project to be delivered by Auckland Council – Walter Massey Shared Paths in Walter Massey Park.
- Direction from the local board for the business meeting – to resolve on the spend of the local board transport capital fund.



Update on Budget for this term

- 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. Now this budget has been increased to **\$48.7m** of which **\$17m** is approved for the current FY25 and **\$20.4m** is endorsed for FY26.
- The original budget for the local board was **\$1.433m** and the board brought forward **\$427k** from the financial year 2027 to complete the Criterion Square project. Therefore, the total budget for the board was **\$1.901m**.
- This means that now an indicative budget for the local board has been increased from **\$1.901m** to **\$2.132m** for the 3-year term. This resets the board's financial year 2027 budget back to normal. Note that the previous budget was already allocated by the board on their current active project.
- Additionally, there are cost savings from the currently active project of **\$180k**.
- Therefore, an indicative additional budget of **\$231k** + **\$180k** (cost savings) = **\$411k** is now available to the board for the remainder of the 3-year term.



PROJECT IDEAS – ALTERNATIVE FINANCING

Project Name	Address	Project origin if known	Project Description/ Comments/ History	Cost estimate including design
Walter Massey Shared Paths Stage 2 and 4	Walter Massey Park	Local board/ Councillor request	In the previous local board term, \$514k was originally resolved for stage 2 of this project, resolution number – MO/2022/75. Due to budget cuts towards the end of that term, this project was deferred till budget became available, resolution number – MO/2022/128. The route in red was delivered (stage 1). The new proposal is for the Stage 2 (Pink area) \$460,000, Stage 3 (Purple area) \$530,000 and Stage 4 (Blue area) \$310,000.	\$1.3m*



*Estimate received from Auckland Council February 2025

#15706 Walter Massey Park - develop walkway and upgrade playground

The project #15706 Walter Massey Park - develop walkway and upgrade playground has currently completed detailed design and resource consent.

- Stage 1 was completed.
- Total estimated cost for Stages 2, 3 and 4 = Approx. \$1.3m inclusive of some contingency. Estimated costs:
 - Stage 2 (Pink area) - \$460,000
 - Stage 3 (Purple area) - \$530,000
 - Stage 4 (Blue area) - \$310,000
- Stages 2 and 4 can be delivered for the budget of \$770,000 which is \$411,966 from LBTCF and \$358,034 from the AC budget. This can be delivered by June 2026.
- Cost for the remaining stage 3 = \$530,000 for future consideration.
- The cost for the playground upgrade is under separate funding and has been allocated through the AC Capex budget. This means that upgrades to playgrounds will happen at the same and be delivered in stages by FY28.



ASHGROVE RESERVE PROJECT UPDATE

Project Name	Address	Project origin if known	Project Description/ Comments/ History	Cost estimate including design
Ashgrove Reserve Shared Path	Ashgrove Reserve	Local board/ Councillor request	Provide a new shared path in Ashgrove Reserve. In the previous local board term, there was some design work done but there was no budget in the past to deliver this project. Due to budget cuts towards the end of that term, this project was not prioritized for funding . Updated construction costs based on previous cost estimates. AC staff are investigating the stormwater issues that are raised by the local board. They will report back to the board.	\$1,000,000



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

File No.: CP2025/03953

Item 16

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide an update on projects in the local board's Kōkiri / Local Board Transport Agreement 2024-2025 (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 report provides an update on projects in the local board's Kōkiri Agreement.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whiwhi / receive the December 2025 quarterly update on the Kōkiri / Local Board Transport Agreement 2024-2025.

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. 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 can influence Auckland Transport's work programme through the annual Kōkiri Agreement process.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

8. Kōkiri Agreements prioritise the projects or programmes that are of most interest to the local board. Clear local board prioritisation provides Auckland Transport 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.

11. Attachment A provides updates about all projects and programmes currently listed in this local board’s Kōkiri Agreement 2024-2025. This report also includes the following attachments:
 - Attachment B is a quarterly update on road maintenance activities.
12. Additionally, AT would like to provide the following updates:
 - a) The Local Board Capital Fund projects are mostly making significant progress so additional updates are being provided via memos and workshop briefings.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi Climate impact statement

13. This report does not have a direct impact on climate, however the projects it refers to will.
14. 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.
15. 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

16. 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."
17. 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.
18. The Kōkiri Agreement was developed working closely with Auckland Council's Governance and Engagement Department.
19. The Kōkiri Agreement is reported to the Local Board Chair's Forum on a regular basis.
20. 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

21. The local board endorsed the Kōkiri Agreement 2024-2025 at their August business meeting. This report provides a quarterly update on projects in the agreement.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

22. 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.
23. 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>
24. 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

25. Generally, this report has limited financial implications for the local board because Auckland Transport funds all projects and programmes. However, local boards do have a transport budget, called the Local Board Transport Capital Fund.
26. Updates about Local Board Transport Capital Fund projects are included in this report, but financial implications are reported separately, in project specific decision reports.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

27. 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.



28. 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.

Item 16

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

29. After local boards receive this report, AT will respond to any additional resolutions.
30. The next quarterly report is planned for June 2025.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Schedule of Kōkiri Agreement updates	67
B 	Road maintenance activities	73

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Alex Elton-Farr - Elected Member Relationship Partner
Authorisers	John Gillespie - Head of Stakeholder and Community Engagement Daniel Poe - Senior Local Board Advisor Victoria Villaraza - Local Area Manager

Kōkiri - Setting priorities for Auckland Transport project and programme engagement

File No.: CP2025/03956

Item 17

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide feedback on Auckland Transport's proposed work programme for 2025-2026.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Auckland Transport has been building a more structured and effective process for local boards to engage with and influence transport projects and programmes.
3. At this stage in the second year of Kōkiri (part of the Local Board Relationship Project), Auckland Transport is seeking formal views on the proposed work programme for 2025-2026.
4. Auckland Transport workshopped the forward works programme with the local board on 9 October 2024 to aid developing views on priorities.
5. After the local board provides formal views, Auckland Transport will provide a response to the local board before delivering a draft local board transport agreement (Kōkiri) to June 2025 business meetings for adoption.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whiwhi / receive the Forward Works Programme brief, consider the information provided and request Auckland Transport to apply the following levels of engagement to these projects:
 - i) Collaborate on the Local Board Transport Capital Fund Project(s).
 - A. Project(s) to be confirmed in the 19 March 2025 business meeting.
 - ii) Consult on the following projects:
 - A. The Māngere East Cycling Focus Area.
 - B. Any network Optimization programme or project in the local board area. This will include a new project design for Walmsley and Favona Road Corridor.
 - C. Any parking changes in the local board area. Either design or function.
 - D. Projects that plan to install traffic lights, speed bumps or other devices that impact traffic flow – in the local board area.
 - E. Any speed related changes that will be instigated by the change in legislation.
 - iii) inform.
 - A. Any disruptive road maintenance or renewals planned in the local board area.
 - B. Road and footpath improvements on Gray Avenue.
 - C. The Māngere West Cycling Improvement project.
 - iv) Advocate.

- A. Māngere West Cycling Improvement project that links Māngere Town Centre and Māngere Bridge.
- B. Trialling of free public transport, specifically a regular free route linking Ōtāhuhu, Middlemore Hospital, Māngere Town Centre and Māngere Bridge.
- b) tuku / provides Auckland Transport with details of any projects or programmes for Auckland Transport to consider for inclusion in future work programmes
- c) tuku / provides any projects or programmes for Auckland Transport to review that are not supported by the local community.

Horopaki Context

Project Kōkiri

6. In mid-2023, Kōkiri was initiated to build a more structured and supportive relationship between local boards and Auckland Transport (AT).
7. The project was in part a response to the *2020 Review of Auckland Council's Council-controlled Organisations* which highlighted the need for local boards and Auckland Transport to work more meaningfully and collaboratively.
8. AT has taken steps to improve information flow and local board decision-making, including:
 - instituting an annual forward works programme briefing for all local boards
 - increasing the number of updates sent to local boards
 - providing local board insights in all project engagement
 - participating in Auckland Council's CCO Engagement Plan reporting.
9. Auckland Transport aims to provide a better basis for communication and understanding of roles, responsibilities, limitations, and opportunities.
10. The overall purpose of this process is to identify local board interest in AT projects and programmes and to clearly express the preferred levels of local board engagement.
11. The levels of engagement are derived from the International Association for Public Participation's (IAP2) doctrine; and are as follows:

Collaboration	AT 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.
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.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice

12. AT first provided quality advice on the forward works programme at a workshop on 9 October 2024.
13. This report seeks to confirm local board feedback on the proposed work programme and seek views on how the local board wants to work together with Auckland Transport.
14. Auckland Transport recommends that the local board prioritises work programme items aligned to transport goals stated in their local board plan.
15. The local board should prioritise a list of projects and programmes for each of the three levels of engagement (collaborate, consult and inform).
16. Auckland Transport resource is limited. Projects in the collaborate and consult require significant staff and elected member time such as:
 - providing quality advice, including technical advice on options and their costs as well as benefit analysis. Often this advice involves written advice and the opportunity to ask experts questions at a workshop.
 - considering the advice, time is required for members to process and understand the advice provided.
 - making a formal decision, i.e. feedback about a project or programme requires a report to be submitted and a resolution made at a public meeting.
17. Auckland Transport recommends the local board reserves categorising projects in collaborate and consult for the projects of highest priority, such as local board transport capital fund projects.
18. Other projects and programmes that may be at the 'collaborate' level include any projects which the local board has delegated financial control over either by AT, council or by another government agency like New Zealand Transport Agency.
19. There may also be projects or programmes that a local board wants to deliver but is not currently identified in AT planning. Local boards may choose to advocate for these projects or programmes.
20. There may be projects or programmes that the local board considers are not supported by the community it represents. This report provides an opportunity for the local board to express its community's concerns about proposed work. AT will consider and may decide not to proceed with these projects based on the local board's feedback.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi Climate impact statement

21. 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.
22. 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

23. In 2022, the mayor provided Auckland Transport with a *Letter of Expectation* which directed AT to improve the relationship with local boards, including providing more opportunity to influence decision-making. Specifically, 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.”

24. AT's '2023-26 Statement of Intent' reflects this direction stating that:
- “We (AT) will engage more meaningfully and transparently with Local Boards, recognising that they represent their communities, and that they should have greater involvement in local transport projects that affect those communities. This means a genuine partnership where we seek to understand the unique and diverse needs of each Local Board at a regional level, not just by project. We will work in partnership to integrate those needs into our planning. We will support Local Boards to communicate integrated local transport planning to their communities.”*
25. Project Kōkiri provides an annual process where local boards prioritise a group of key programmes or projects, identifying them to AT, and setting engagement levels that capture the local board's expectations. This plan forms the basis for regular reporting on key programs and projects. Project Kōkiri will be supported by regular updates to provide transparency.
26. Project Kōkiri was developed working closely with Auckland Council's Governance Division. It has also been reported generally monthly to the Local Board Chair's Forum and discussed with a reference group of local board chairs.
27. Further, this work relies on historical engagement with both Auckland Council and with other CCOs

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

28. The local board had a forward works programme briefing workshop on 9 October 2024 to receive quality advice on the programme. The response from both elected members and staff supporting local boards has been positive. They have been specifically supportive of the large amount and quality of information provided, the detailed discussion with subject matter experts, and attendance at workshops by AT executive leaders.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

29. 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.
30. AT'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>

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

31. This decision has no financial implications for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Local Board because Auckland Transport funds all projects and programmes.
32. Local boards do have a transport budget through the local board transport funds, and these projects are included in this report. However, their financial implications are reported separately.


Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

33. The proposed decision does carry some risk. 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 to AT and therefore the ratepayer.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

34. After receiving this report, AT will review the formal feedback from all local boards.
35. AT may engage with the local board directly after receiving their formal resolutions to clarify positions or to discuss the proposed levels of engagement.
36. By mid-May 2025, AT will provide a memo outlining its response to this report. This memo will provide the basis for future engagement.
37. In June 2025, AT will draft a report with an attached annual 'Kōkiri' (local board transport agreement) stating how AT and the local board will engage over the next 12 months.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	2025-2026 Forward Works Programme Brief (<i>Under Separate Cover</i>)	

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Alex Elton-Farr - Elected Member Relationship Partner
Authorisers	John Gillespie - Head of Stakeholder and Community Engagement Daniel Poe - Senior Local Board Advisor Victoria Villaraza - 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.: CP2025/03824

Item 18

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 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu 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

Plan change overview

Item 18

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	87

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Ruth Andrews - Senior Policy Planner
Authorisers	Lou-Ann Ballantyne - General Manager Governance and Engagement John Duguid - General Manager Planning and Resource Consents Victoria Villaraza - 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.: CP2025/03892

Item 19

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 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu 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 19

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	Maclean Grindell - Senior Advisor Operations and Policy Warwick McNaughton - Principal Advisor Governance
Authorisers	Oliver Roberts - Planning & Operations Manager Victoria Villaraza - Local Area Manager

URGENT DECISION: Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy

File No.: CP2025/03833

Item 20

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To notify the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board of a decision made on 27 February 2025 under the boards urgent decision-making process to provide feedback on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary


2. Local boards had the opportunity to provide input into the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy.
3. An urgent decision was required as the deadline for final feedback was 27 February 2025, for the Policy and Planning committees consideration on the 13 March 2025. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board's next scheduled business meeting was on 19 March 2025.
4. The urgent decision is included in this agenda report as Attachment A.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note the urgent decision made on 27 February 2025 to provide feedback on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy, as outlined in Attachment A of the agenda report.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Urgent Decision: Local Board feedback on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy	95

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Jacqueline Robinson - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Victoria Villaraza - Local Area Manager

Local board resolution responses, feedback and information report

File No.: CP2025/03968

Item 21

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. This report provides a summary of resolution responses and information reports for circulation to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board.

Information reports for the local board

2. Upper Harbour Local Board's February 2025 business meeting requested a copy of the attached resolutions on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy be forwarded to all local boards for their information (Attachment A).
3. Hibiscus & Bays Local Board's February 2025 business meeting requested a copy of the attached resolutions on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy be forwarded to all local boards for their information (Attachment B).
4. Puketāpapa Local Board's February 2025 business meeting requested a copy of the attached resolutions on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy be forwarded to all local boards for their information (Attachment C).
5. Albert Eden Local Board's February 2025 business meeting requested a copy of the attached resolutions on the Fix and Finish Fund be forwarded to all local boards for their information (Attachment D).
6. Albert Eden Local Board's February 2025 business meeting requested a copy of the attached resolutions on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy be forwarded to all local boards for their information (Attachment E)
7. Henderson Massey Local Board's February 2025 business meeting requested a copy of the attached Notice of Motion and resolutions on "Safety in Community Facilities" be forwarded to all local boards for their information (Attachment F).







Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note Upper Harbour Local Board's February 2025 business meeting resolutions on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy (Attachment A)
- b) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note Hibiscus & Bays Local Board's February 2025 business meeting resolutions on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy (Attachment B)
- c) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note Puketāpapa Local Board's February 2025 business meeting resolutions on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy (Attachment C)
- d) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note Albert Eden Local Board's February 2025 business meeting resolutions on the Fix and Finish Fund (Attachment D)
- e) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note Albert Eden Local Board's February 2025 business meeting resolutions on the Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy (Attachment E)
- f) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note Henderson Massey Local Board's February 2025 business meeting Notice of Motion and resolutions on Safety in Community Facilities (Attachment F).

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	A - Upper Harbour Local Board - Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy	127
B 	B - Hibiscus & Bays Local Board - Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy	129
C 	C - Puketāpapa Local Board - Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy	133
D 	D - Albert Eden Local Board - Local Board feedback on Fix and Finish fund	135
E 	E - Albert Eden Local Board - Local Board Feedback on Draft Storm Affected Land Use Policy	137
F 	F - Henderson Massey Local Board - Safety in Community Facilities - Notice of Motion	141

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Jacqueline Robinson - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Victoria Villaraza - Local Area Manager

Hōtaka Kaupapa / Governance Forward Work Calendars

File No.: CP2025/03826

Item 22

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To present the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board with its updated Hōtaka Kaupapa.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary


2. The Hōtaka Kaupapa for March/April 2025 for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is provided in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.
3. The Hōtaka Kaupapa / governance forward work calendar was introduced in 2016 as part of Auckland Council's quality advice programme and aim to support local boards' governance role by:
 - ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
 - clarifying what advice is expected and when
 - clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar also aims to provide guidance for staff supporting local boards and greater transparency for the public.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note the Hōtaka Kaupapa.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Hōtaka Kaupapa / Governance Forward Work Calendar March/April 2025	145

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Jacqueline Robinson - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Victoria Villaraza - Local Area Manager

Record of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Workshop Notes

File No.: CP2025/04020

Item 23

Te take mō te pūrongo Purpose of the report

1. To note the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board workshops held on 5 February 2025, 12 February 2025 and 26 February 2025.

Whakarāpopototanga matua Executive summary




2. In accordance with Standing Order 12.1.4, the local board shall receive a record of the general proceedings of each of its local board workshops held over the past month.
3. Resolutions or decisions are not made at workshops as they are solely for the provision of information and discussion. This report attaches the workshop record for the period stated below.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) tuhi ā-taipitopito / receive the workshop notes from the workshops held on 5 February 2025, 12 February 2025 and 26 February 2025.

Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A 	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Workshop Record - 5 February 2025	149
B 	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Workshop Record - 12 February 2025	151
C 	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Workshop Record - 26 February 2025	153

Ngā kaihaina Signatories

Author	Jacqueline Robinson - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Victoria Villaraza - Local Area Manager

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

That the **Māngere-Ōtāhuhu 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.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

C1 **CONFIDENTIAL: Appointment to the board of Māngere Mountain Education Trust**

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)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person. In particular, the report contains personal information regarding candidates for the Māngere Mountain Education Trust board.	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.