

# Feedback on the Waitematā Local Board draft plan

Submission To: Waitematā Local Board  
Submission From: Auckland City Centre Residents Group CCRG  
Submission On: Waitematā Local Board/Te Poari ā-rohe o Waitematā.  
Submission Date: 13 August 2023

.....  
.....

## Question 1

**How well do you think our plan reflects your needs and aspirations for our community over the next three years.**

CCRG are very supportive of the Boards approach to achieving Māori Outcomes and Climate Action. We would see partnership initiatives as having a high priority for our city centre and likely to deliver the best outcomes for everyone.

## Question 2

**What local facilities and services do you think we could deliver differently?**

**Perhaps that question could best be addressed by focussing on the facilities and services that the WLB is best suited to deliver.**

Facilities and services have traditionally been divided into two categories – property and residents. Property infrastructure includes roads, streets, footpaths, street lighting, water supply, wastewater and stormwater. These should be paid for by the usual property value rates as infrastructure is a key component of property values.

Resident services include community facilities designed to support family life, i.e. parks, gardens, libraries, swimming pools, sports facilities, art galleries, community halls and playgrounds. These should be paid for on a UAGC and/or Targeted Rate basis to reflect the level of services available in each area/community.

The latter are what CCRG would describe as the contribution Local Boards make to the wellbeing of residents living in each of their areas. Of real concern to CCRG is the extent to which central governments expect local governments to not just deliver, but to pay for delivery of a much wider range of resident services that they are simply not equipped to deliver. These include housing, health, education and welfare support all of which have traditionally been paid for by various central government taxes. While they are a major aspect of social wellbeing, there must always be an absolutely clear line between who should deliver what aspects and who should be paying for it. Without that, nobody can hold the appropriate entity to account for the expenditure of public funds.

Perhaps the discussions on this topic are better focussed on identifying exactly who is responsible for which aspects of wellbeing between central and local government to determine who pays for what.

## Question 3

**We are responsible for promoting your social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being. What objectives/key initiatives within each theme is important to you.**

### **Our People**

As noted above, CCRG supports the Boards focus on advocating to the Governing Body and Central Government for a range of services that are outside of the Boards delivery mandate. Similarly, supporting community entities via community grants is an excellent way for the Board to partner for the delivery of community driven initiatives.

### **Our Environment**

The environment is CCRG's highest priority given the levels of pollution residents living in the city centre experience every day. We consider the first step in this process is to focus efforts on what causes the most pollution and, in our city centre, it is transport – both road and sea.

Board members will be aware of CCRG's funding proposal that all vehicles in Auckland should have an annual Parking Permit. With some 1.7m registered vehicles @ (say) \$500 per annum this would raise \$850,000,000.00 per annum for Council. We have suggested that parking meters be made redundant across Auckland, except for time management, so our proposal equates to just \$1.37 per day per vehicle. We would be pleased to see the Board formerly support our proposal and work with Council/AT to ensure the necessary enabling legislation is implemented as soon as possible.

We raise this initiative again because we believe Auckland could achieve all of its Climate Plan objectives, for all of Auckland within 10 years, by focussing the above fund on the initiatives the Board has outlined i.e. developing clean, reliable public transport, utilising shore power for both trade and cruise ships, daylighting streams and riparian planting, living green walls, quality recycling processes, composting and resilient food production systems, (including a city centre Urban farm) zero waste and extensive planting of climate friendly trees.

Our city centre parks are precious. There should be management plans in place for them to ensure they are looked after and enhanced, and protected and used in appropriate ways that support residents' aspirations and needs for green spaces.

### **Our Community**

Maintenance of community assets is an essential aspect of the Boards functions. As noted, many of these assets are aging but, in CCRG's view, that does not mean they should not be maintained to a high standard. Maintaining community facilities and assets has to be affordable as these form a major part of our climate change responsibilities i.e. everyone can walk/cycle/use public transport to use community facilities. Building larger facilities shared with other communities simply increases our carbon emissions so is contrary to the commitments the Board has made re their environmental obligations above. CCRG would suggest that it is not flexibility that the Board needs but more revenue and we have proffered a solution to this above.

### **Our Places**

As noted in the Growth and Development chapter, the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPSUD) requires Auckland Council to intensify housing developments in, and surrounding, city and metropolitan centres. This suggests a huge upcoming need for neighbourhood community assets so the need to retain and maintain existing community assets is likely to be an essential strategy for the future.

CCRG are totally supportive of ensuring that our listed heritage assets are protected for future generations to enjoy as they provide the essential links to our past – for people from all ethnicities. CCRG cannot support the notion that large areas of heavily modified buildings surrounding our city centre can be referred to as heritage unless they meet the requirements for legal heritage listing.

This position is also supported by the Independent Hearing Panel who agree that the requirement for intensification in the NPSUD applies to all land/buildings within, and surrounding the city centre - we refer to relevant sections of the IHP [INTERIM GUIDANCE ON MATTER OF STATUTORY INTERPRETATION AND ISSUES RELATING TO THE SCOPE OF THE RELIEF SOUGHT BY SOME SUBMISSIONS – 12 JUNE 2023.](#)

We also support protecting heritage building facades but permitting new, and higher density construction, inside the facades. The current residential building being constructed on the corner of Rutland and Lorne Street is an excellent example of this strategy. There are many other listed heritage buildings in the city centre and surrounding areas that CCRG have the same concerns for as the Board.

Funding to ensure the restoration and preservation of these facilities could be addressed more assertively. While we support the allocation of public funding to assist with restoration/preservation of heritage assets, CCRG would suggest that this should be connected to a proportional ownership scheme so as to ensure the protection of both the heritage asset and public funds. We would also appreciate the Board advocating for changes to heritage listed owner responsibilities so as to ensure the protection of these buildings/facilities.

We really appreciate the Boards ongoing support for the City Centre Master Plan and how this will deliver the city centre we all aspire to. It is a widely supported delivery document for the Auckland Plan and is a key beneficiary of funding from the City Centre Targeted Rate. CCRG are looking for board support in developing the newer and bigger focus on CCMP outcome 6 -Residential Neighbourhoods.

### **Our Economy**

It is pleasing to note the Board's comments about the economic value of the CRL to our city centre and the need for a wider connectedness with fringe business districts. CCRG are keen supporters of this transformative strategy.

### **Question 4.**

#### **Do you have any feedback on how our proposed Local Board Plan could better meet our climate change goals?**

Yes. Adequate funding is what the Board needs and we believe this can be made available via the implementation of an Annual Parking Permit across Auckland to fund a 10 year climate change programme. We accept that this may require minor changes to existing legislation but understand that this would not be difficult to implement.

Ngā mihi nui for the opportunity to contribute feedback and CCRG looks forward to working with the Board to achieve their Annual Plan targets.

Adam Parkinson  
Deputy Chairperson  
CCRG  
[info@ccrg.org.nz](mailto:info@ccrg.org.nz)  
[ccrg.org.nz](http://ccrg.org.nz)