

## **Auckland City Centre Resident's Group**

### **City Centre Residents' Group**

#### **Submission on Annual Plan/Long Term Plan.**

**March 2018**

**Contact: Noelene Buckland: Chair CCRG : [nbuckland@xtra.co.nz](mailto:nbuckland@xtra.co.nz) : 021 449995**

---

### **Annual Plan**

The CCRG supports the overall structure of the Auckland Plan and the recognition that the outcomes will be delivered by different agencies not just Auckland Council.

We question however, whether council has the capacity to determine what other agencies deliver if they do not have control over those agencies. While we understand the need for broad agreement on outcomes, to make them matter for the ratepayers and residents of Auckland, council needs to separately identify the ones that they do have responsibility for and can therefore be held accountable to deliver.

It is also unclear how the management of growth and development can be achieved through social, economic, environmental and cultural objectives when the primary shortfall is infrastructure. While it is true that adequate infrastructure assists the delivery of the above objectives, building the infrastructure, or reducing demand for additional infrastructure, are the two key questions that will drive Auckland's future.

Unless we reduce the demand for ever expanding transport funding, it is likely that we will never have adequate funding available to spend on other activities thus dooming this plan to the same fate as all previous ones.

We think Auckland can do better than that.

### **Outcomes**

The six outcomes are reasonably well grouped together in a logical collection of activities.

It is though, very difficult to estimate how easy it will be to measure successful delivery of these outcomes given that a lot of words used are highly qualitative. There are few targets and we assume that performance measures will be developed at a later stage.

Without clear targets, timeframes and measures the other statements have diminished meaning which is the same process that has led us into the current infrastructure deficit.

A Plan, by its very nature, needs to be directional about what it wants to achieve, who, when, where and how the programmes/projects will be delivered and the means of determining that the outcomes required have been delivered.

To return to the beginning, the CCRG supports the focus on outcomes for the Auckland Plan but if we are to achieve these, the aspects that council controls, including CCO's, must be measurable and these measures need to be incorporated into this plan so that we all have access to the same contextual information.

It is disappointing to note the lack of interest in the Auckland Plan for heritage, arts and culture as we consider these essential place making activities. Irrespective of whether some of these are to be delivered through the Unitary Plan, or any similar instrument, they should have the same emphasis in the Auckland Plan outcomes as transport, homes or prosperity i.e. are contextual.

The questions as to whether the various focus areas identified under the Outcomes will achieve what we want is impossible to comment on constructively without knowing what the targets are and how success will be measured.

The Development Strategy, while identifying some timeframes, contains few targets/performance measures and even the 2050 date make reference to 'most', 'mainly' and 'significant portion' all of which are generalities rather than clear statements of intent.

Question 7: Shaping our Growth states –

*The Auckland Plan proposes to manage long-term population growth by prioritising development in existing urban areas and establishing new communities and new business land in future urban areas. Investment in Auckland/s infrastructure will need to keep up with the pace and scale of growth.*

What does that mean in terms of effectively providing for Auckland's future?

How can this be described as a strategy when it is business as usual – this is what Auckland has always done so if we continue to do this we will continue to be the same as we are now?

Where is the intervention that will shift Auckland from what we have to what we need?

The CCRG would like to see some editing of the Auckland Plan that clearly identifies measurable directions, focus areas and targets around what is planned, when it will be delivered, where it will be delivered, how it will be delivered and who will deliver it - that is what a Plan is designed to do.

Without this discipline we cannot be confident that the changes needed in Auckland will occur.

## **Long Term Plan**

Introducing a Regional Fuel Tax to pay for improvements to our transport system.

The CCRG supports the regional fuel tax on the proviso that the approach to transport planning and development is based on 50% supply management and 50% demand management practices.

We will never have enough money to pay for ever increasing transport infrastructure if that is the only approach to planning because this is a causal and circular process – the more we build the more people can use it thus the more we need to build – so instead of planning we are panicking!

Demand management processes include a fuel tax, parking fees, limiting parking times, congestion charges, flexi-time and the likes.

Additional demand management planning would also involve the provision of quality, high tech, secure 24/7 work spaces closer to where people live thus reducing the amount of daily travel required. This type of demand management also provides for greater flexibility of working hours, better family time, more community involvement, better spread of demand on recreational/community facilities and less overall office and parking space in the expensive central areas.

This is not to suggest that central offices should be dispersed – they should not as it is this critical mass of people, ideas and thinking that make cities exciting, innovative and interesting. Rather it is that people should have options of which days/times they need to travel but still be able to work as usual without having to travel, and we think this is the future.

We think there is an opportunity here for Auckland to lead the world in work/lifestyle balance which can only be good for our social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes.

Cleaning up our harbours, beaches and streams and paying for it.

We support council striking a targeted rate at a level that will ensure we can complete the necessary programmes of work within ten years - it has to be done so let's get on with it.

Protecting our endangered species (such as kauri) and paying for it.

We support this targeted rate but would like to see a much stronger connection with border control processes as this is where New Zealand is very vulnerable.

Councils approach to rates.

Council must collect enough rates to pay for what Auckland needs today and the developments we need for our future. We do not support the notion of limiting rates to xyz% - if we need it we have to pay for it. No country, city, town or village became great by keeping rates low, rather it is a recipe for delusion and deficiency which, over time, becomes failure and we do not want that for Auckland.

Rating online accommodation providers

While we understand the notion of a level playing field for all accommodation providers, and the impact short term accommodation has on the local rental market, we have real concerns about the impact this rate will have for many apartment body corporates in terms of compliance with Schedule 2 of the Building (Specified Systems, Change the Use, and Earthquake-prone Buildings) Regulations 2005.

We would like to see more research on this as it is clear that council is the body that needs to ensure compliance with these regulations while at the same time they are proposing to recognise an activity that may well be non-compliant once a rate is struck.

Disestablishing ACIL.

We support this initiative on the basis that it will provide more effective strategic alignment between council and its shareholdings in AIAL and POAL.