



Submission of Civic Trust Auckland

Auckland's Climate Action Framework

Full Name: Mrs Audrey van Ryn (Secretary)

Organisation: Civic Trust Auckland

Phone (daytime): 368 1516

Phone (evening): 368 1516

Mobile: 021 035 4431

Email: cta@civictrustauckland.org.nz

Postal address: PO Box 74 049 Greenlane

1. Civic Trust Auckland (CTA) is a non-profit public interest group, incorporated in 1968, with activities and interests throughout the greater Auckland region. The aims of the CTA include encouragement of good planning for the city and region and we have submitted on many of Auckland Council's Plans. Having read Auckland's Climate Action Framework, our comments are as follows.

2. As we are in a climate emergency, as declared by Auckland Council in June 2019, we need to act fast. The thousands of Aucklanders on the climate change march on 27 September this year provided clear evidence that Aucklanders want climate action and they want it now.

3. CTA does not disagree with anything stated in the framework. We agree with the seven climate action outcomes for Aucklanders. We consider that Auckland Council is headed in the right direction to bring about the change that is needed but that it is moving too slowly. The focus should be on action.

4. We note that we found little in Auckland's Climate Action Framework that has not already been covered by previous Auckland Council documents, including the Auckland Unitary Plan, the Urban Forest Plan (Draft): March 2007, Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy, the Strategic Low Carbon Strategic Action Plan (July 2014) the various iterations of the Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan, the Auckland Design Manual and the various iterations of Council's Long-Term Plans.

5. The feedback form states that "the key moves set out actions that every Aucklander – from residents to businesses – need to be involved in." The document disappoints because it does not provide details of how Aucklanders should act and what the Council is going to do. Even the "action" section does not give specific guidance about what individuals, community groups or businesses can do, and it includes only a handful of specific actions that the Council itself is planning to do.

6. The framework is, indeed, merely a starting point (as stated on the feedback form) and we observe that it is aspirational rather than a guide to action.

7. There is no information provided about how the 11 key moves will be achieved. CTA's hope is, indeed, that "Over the coming weeks we will also set detailed targets and indicators against each of the 11 key moves, informed by the consultation feedback" (pg 54). However, we note that there are no specific questions in the feedback form to guide or encourage this. The imperative to deal with climate change is not entirely new and Auckland Council has raised these issues in various planning documents proposed in recent years. For Council's convenience, we draw its attention to some of CTA's previous submissions on these matters. Please see the appendix to this submission for ideas we have previously submitted to Council.

8. We wish to see details on how Council will achieve its proposed actions, including the following: "Support primary industries and small businesses to increase food security and build economic and climate resilience, protect our productive soils and use regenerative management to increase food security and carbon sequestration, reduce wastage, starting with prevention, and maximise the value of surplus food Increase demand for local, seasonal and low carbon food, establish a cross-sector sustainable food policy council to advise policy makers on food policy development, implement kerbside food scraps collection service across urban Auckland" (pg 53), "Make climate compatibility assessments standard for all new developments and infrastructure" (pg 76), and "Address the implications of climate change on our coastline" (pg 79).

9. CTA considers that Auckland already has a good public transport system. We just need people to use it. Incentives to use public transport would help, such as more free transport days, and telling the stories of people who are long-term public transport users and those of people who are new to it.

10. We do think Auckland Council should facilitate action and bring together those who can deliver on the framework, because we elect council members in order to carry out the actions that are needed to sustain and enhance our city and we pay rates so that this can happen. The focus should be on informing individuals and organisations what they can do now with regard to climate change, making this information easily available and constantly in public view, and incentivising people to carry out these actions.

Appendix

Climate change related ideas from some of CTA's previous submissions:

1. Auckland Council Annual Budget 2017/2018, submitted 27 March 2017

3. *Tree Protection* The removal of general tree protection has meant that many of the city's trees can be easily removed. Notwithstanding the mayor's pledge to plant a million trees in Auckland, CTA would like to see more protection for existing trees, and to this end, the Annual Budget should make adequate provision for assessment and scheduling of notable trees.

4. *Transport 4.1* CTA fully supports proceeding with the SkyPath project and making budget provision in the Annual Budget and the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. *4.2* Extending and improving the cycling infrastructure is important to reduce car use. New cycling projects should not require any removal of trees. *4.3* CTA supports further progress towards light rail connection being made to Auckland Airport.

5. *Waste Minimisation* CTA is pleased to see Council's work to establish a network of community recycling centres and supports this work and the KPI of having four resource recovery facilities operational.

2. Tupuna Maunga o Tamaki Makarau Authority Consultation July 2015, submitted 21 July 2017

10. CTA endorses the development of a comprehensive conservation plan for each maunga as a necessary part of any integrated management plans. 11. The conservation plan should set out the iwi ancestral associations and histories for each maunga and include how they are valued as cultural and historical landscapes. 12. In the development of any management plans, groups with an interest should be invited to contribute to the development phase, rather than waiting to make submissions on a draft plan. This would usefully capture the knowledge and experience of the many volunteers and organisations that have been caring for these maunga in their communities.

3. Proposed Variation to the Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan, submitted 5 June, 2015

1. Simplified Zone Fares 1.1 CTA supports the introduction of journey-based fares. This should have the effect of making a journey by public transport more attractive and easier, and thus encourage users to try out different modes of public transport that they may not have considered before. We trust that ferry trips will be included in this type of fare in the near future, in line with AT intentions. 1.2 We support the retention of cash tickets for single trips. As stated in our November 2012 submission, it is our view that "there should always be available on public transport a cash option for payment of fares for the following customers: tourists, those for whom English is not their first language, infrequent users and those who are unable to understand any form of ticketing other than an on-the-spot exchange of cash for a physical ticket". 1.3 We support the ongoing promotion of and adding value to HOP cards. 1.4 CTA supports having different payment options for users, to suit

their needs, such as monthly and day passes, the latter being particularly useful for tourists, whether visitors from other parts of New Zealand, or those from overseas, the latter appreciating a pass that is simple to understand and to use. 1.5 Our previous submission stated that we did not support the intention to increase public transport fares in the near future and so we are pleased to note that "fare increases [are] accorded a lower priority" and that increased revenue will be primarily sought through increased patronage and management of operating costs. 1.6 Low fares for public transport encourage and enable more people to use the services, especially the economically disadvantaged. Furthermore, the cost of transport has an effect on the amount of money spent on retail, entertainment and services.

2. Light Rail 2.1 In CTA's November 2012 submission we made a strong case for the reintroduction of trams/light rail as one of the transport options in Auckland (as did 3many other submitters). We pointed out that the historic tram system in Auckland enjoyed huge patronage. 2.2 We are therefore pleased that AT is investigating the (re)introduction of light rail on some of the busier routes. We look forward to its implementation on these routes and the continued extension of light rail services. 2.3 CTA would like consideration to be given for light rail along the streets used currently by the Inner Link, namely: Queen - Customs St West - Fanshawe - Beaumont - College Hill - Ponsonby - Karangahape - Queen Queen - Customs St East - Beach - Parnell Rise - Parnell - Khyber Pass - Symonds - Anzac - Customs St East - Queen These routes were two of the early tram lines. 2.4 We are pleased that the light rail routes proposed by AT are intended to be closely integrated with the bus, train and ferry routes as a single connected network. The freeing up of a number of buses to be used for more frequent services elsewhere is a positive move. 2.5 As per the Statement of Proposal, light rail has certain advantages as a transport mode, including the important one of not needing to have roads widened. 2.6 We submit that light rail for Auckland should follow international best practice (low floor segmented high capacity vehicles) using world standard gauge, which maximises the number of supply sources 2.7 We note that there can be differing viewpoints on whether tracks for light rail should be on fully separate tracks (i.e. not used by other vehicles) and whether they should be located centrally or at the sides of roads. Overseas examples and their advantages and disadvantages and comparisons with the Auckland environment should be studied in detail in order to find the best solution for our circumstances. 2.8 Location of tracks should take into account other road users: pedestrians, cyclists, private cars, taxis, motorbikes/scooters, buses and emergency vehicles, one prime consideration being the safety of all passengers while alighting from the vehicle and reaching the footpath. 2.9 Potentially the dedicated space for the tram lines could double as a safe route for cyclists, rather than providing for a separate lane for cyclists, or there is the potential for multiple users in the space set aside for light rail. 2.8 An airport connection to Onehunga, could be built cheaply as a dedicated bus way in the first instance. Indeed, most proposed routes could perhaps start that way. We are unsure of the benefit of an airport connection from Dominion Rd. 2. 9 AT should co-ordinate planning for all new routes together with land planners, to consider the following factors (amongst

others): height, density, and mixed usage, particularly around the various stopping points.

3. Ferry Development Plan 3.1 Such a plan is a necessary step to improve and extend the ferry service. 3.2 CTA supports the proposed extensions to the existing ferry network. We are disappointed that additional services are not being considered at this time (due to high infrastructure costs) and trust that these will be considered in the near future. 3.3 We add that it is our view that in comparison to other motorised transport modes, water transport does not require extensive infrastructure and that our harbours and waterways, as part of the infrastructure are currently underutilised.

4. Draft Long-Term Plan 2015 – 2025, submitted 16 March 2015

Key issue 2: Fixing Auckland's transport

2.3 Council has proposed two options for funding transport. CTA considers that a fuel tax and a rates increase are two separate streams of income and for the purpose of funding transport there is no imperative for them to be paired. For example, a fuel tax alone could be used. 2.4 If not enough revenue is gained from one revenue source, e. g. a fuel tax then the level at which that tax is levied could be increased.

2.5 If motorway user charges are adopted, it is assumed that technology monitoring / charging would be effected using technology such as cameras monitoring entry to and exit from the motorway network. Since the technology exists to monitor vehicle occupancy, it may be possible to integrate that technology to impose a higher motorway using levy to single occupants of a private motor car (unless the driver is a person with a disability).

2.6 CTA would certainly support consideration of light rail integrated into Auckland's transport network as being as important as the CRL.

2.7 The ferry network should be greatly extended and include trips from the North Shore to the eastern suburbs and from the CBD to the eastern suburbs.

2.8 With regard to traffic flow at times of low use (e.g. between midnight and 5.00am) CTA proposes funding the investigation and implementation of the use of flashing orange traffic lights (where drivers may proceed through intersections once they have ascertained that no traffic is coming). This system is used in other countries and could be introduced in Auckland on a trial basis. The elimination of such unnecessary waiting times may serve to mitigate waiting during times of congestion when it is necessary to wait.

2.9 CTA supports the implementation of low cost improvements for cycling such as painting white lines on footpaths (to provide a cycle lane on one side and space for pedestrians on the other).

2.10 We do not support funding for "improvements to cycling in the vicinity of the airport" (pg 17) unless there is evidence for potential good use by cyclists in this area.

2.11 Funding should be provided for Council to provide further education about the benefits of public transport use, including the fact that "time lost in congestion is non-productive and comes at a high cost" (11-58) applies less when travelling on public transport than in a private vehicle, as one is able to use such travel time for work purposes, particularly with the use of electronic devices such as mobile phones, tablets and laptops.

2.12 Footpaths are a key part of the infrastructure for walking. As such, funding should be set aside for the enhancement of the amenity and safety of that infrastructure.

2.13 Council should encourage the use of motorbikes and motor scooters, as these vehicles assist in reducing congestion. The financial incentive of free parking for such vehicles should be extended and the regulations about where such vehicles can be parked should be clarified.

2.14 Funding should be provided for adequate seating at all bus stops, with shelter from the weather.

2.15 CTA proposes that Council trial one region-wide free public transport day per month as a means to promote the use of public transport.

2.16 Council should encourage businesses and schools to adopt "glide time" to alleviate problems of congestion and unreliable travel times could be alleviated through more".

Infrastructure • CTA supports the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (pg 27), particularly the implementation of the resource recovery network. • CTA supports education of the public and businesses to reduce water consumption (pg 11). We consider that education in other areas which could result in minimising the need for new infrastructure and services is important and that this should include education about reducing waste. • With regard to vital infrastructure such as the water supply and sewage system, CTA considers that Council should maintain and renew this when necessary rather than waiting to repair it when it fails.

5. Proposed Low Carbon Strategic Action Plan, submitted 7 April, 2014

1.5 CTA considers that more use could have been made of what other cities around the world have been doing to address the issue of climate change. We note that Auckland Conversations over the past few years have included a number of speakers on this topic and that the lessons learnt from these speakers could usefully be incorporated.

1.6 We support Auckland's involvement in the C40 Mayoral alliance for the purpose of sharing ideas with other cities regarding climate change. We note there is no mention of this alliance in the Proposed Low Carbon Strategic Action Plan and suggest that ideas from this alliance be included.

1.7 We note that Waitakere City established itself as an Eco City and that the supercity is well positioned to learn much from the success of this city as regards eco policies and actions.

1.8 We suggest that Council refers to its own Waste Management & Minimisation Plan and Regional Transport Plan to ensure that all relevant ideas from these recent plans have informed the Proposed Low Carbon Strategic Action Plan.

1.9 As “transport and electricity account for around two-thirds of Auckland’s emissions” (pg 4) these are the two areas which should have the most focus in the plan.

1.10 Community Groups and businesses which use low carbon initiatives should be encouraged, supported and promoted by Auckland Council, e.g. Cycle Action Auckland, Walk Auckland, bike hire companies, Cityhop and businesses that recycle products. Council could assist in raising awareness about community and business low carbon initiatives by way of a database and publicity.

1.11 The example of Henderson Valley School as a low carbon environment is inspiring.

1.12 Companies which provide services to Council should be instructed in Council’s low carbon policies (refer photo with explanatory caption in the Appendix).

1.13 CTA welcomes regulation by Council rather than encouragement. Climate change is such an important issue that change is needed sooner rather than later and everyone should play their part in order to make life easier - even possible - for future generations.

1.14 The proposed group of cross-sector leaders, who to “advocate, inspire and influence change in consumer and commercial behaviour” and the second group to “co-ordinate cross-sector action on the plan” should include school children, e.g. from Henderson Valley School. The groups should also include immigrant groups and representatives of groups for whom English is not their first language.

2.1 CTA submits that all new vehicles over which Council has purchase control should be electric or low emission. We further submit that Council increases the proportion of bicycles in its fleet, and include a number of electric bicycles.

2.2 Auckland Council should continue to focus on public transport, and, rather than increasing the roading network, to grow the rail network.

2.3 Auckland Council should include public transport options on all invitations to Council events.

2.4 CTA commends those Councillors and other Council representatives and staff who commute by walking, by bicycle or by public transport. We encourage more of them to use these low carbon transport options.

2.5 We support increasing opportunities for safe and pleasant walking.

2.6 We support Council's commitment to improving cycle facilities. We note that there are increasing sections of cycle paths and cycle lanes throughout the city but many of them are isolated and short, often running out just where they are needed from a safety perspective, such as at intersections. More separate paths will encourage people to cycle who currently feel that on-road cycling is not safe enough.

2.7 There is evidence that considerable numbers of commuters would be encouraged to use bicycles if it were permitted to cycle without wearing a helmet. Council should investigate the feasibility of making cycling a safe commuting option to an extent that not wearing a helmet could be acceptable.

2.8 Council should encourage the already long-existing presence of a bicycle shop at the intersection of Khyber Pass, Symonds St, Newton Road and New North Road, the area due to be enhanced when the proposed CRL station is developed. This is an important location by virtue of its position as the highest topographical point in this part of the city and from where one can glide for one kilometre downhill towards Auckland's waterfront, virtually without turning the pedals.

2.9 Council should give consideration to applying a surface to cycle lanes which have characteristics best utilised by skateboards. In the same way, off-road cycle paths might usefully be given the best surface suited to roller blades and other means of active transport.

2.10 Council should set aside a portion of its budget towards investigating new or emerging technology which could enhance the mutually safe co-existence of motor vehicles with other road users.

2.11 We submit that cyclists should be permitted to cycle through an intersection on a pedestrian green light if they do not exceed normal walking speed. This would increase the speed and safety of their journey and perhaps discourage cyclists from cycling through on a pedestrian green light at a speed which is perceived to be unsafe by some pedestrians.

2.12 All bus stops should have shelters, as having to wait for a bus in the rain is a disincentive to using a bus.

2.13 Public transport services need to be introduced to new urban areas before car habits become established.

2.14 The benefits (both personal and global) of leaving the car at home should be promoted in the public realm by Council, including via OurAuckland.

2.15 Council could promote car sharing amongst neighbours, particularly those who live in apartment buildings, as well as car pooling, by including information about car pooling on its website and Auckland Transport's website, such as a link to <http://www.jayride.co.nz> and by advertising car pooling in OurAuckland and other Council outlets.

2.16 Priority or free parking could be made available for people who use a private vehicle to carpool to places such as The Edge for arts events.

2.17 We strongly support an extended ferry network, being a sustainable means of transport, and consider it important to align pricing of ferries with other public transport modes in order to achieve integration.

2.18 We support the new frequent bus network and electric trains supported by integrated ticketing and fares and the conversion of the public transport fleet to alternative fuels.

2.19 We support the quality, compact urban form but reliance on intensification as a means of reducing the number and length of trips is some years away and other measures need to be put in place in the meantime.

2.20 We support removing minimum parking requirements.

2.21 We commend the initiative of the Personalised Journey Planning projects, as described on pg 31.

2.22 CTA submits that the travel demand management tool of workplace travel planning should include, where feasible, the use of glide time. As referenced to on pg 30, i.e. "The team then scratched their heads to come up with the best option that meant no-one would get detention at school or be in trouble for arriving late at work," the possibility of being late is a major reason for using a car to commute.

2.23 Consideration should be given to allowing car pooling vehicles (identified by e.g. a registration sticker on the windscreen) to stop in bus stops for the purpose of picking up designated passengers.

2.24 More consideration should be given to the proposal of free and frequent public transport, including assessing additional benefits to the reduction of the city's carbon footprint, such as reducing congestion on the roads and enabling more movement of people throughout the city to shops, entertainment and local tourism whilst having more money to spend because they haven't had to pay transport costs.

3.1 Council could support renewable energy generation by making solar energy generation a requirement for all new buildings.

3.2 Action 1 on pg 35 to "Establish a plan to install modern energy efficient technology for street lighting to improve energy efficiency outcomes" should ensure that such lighting is directed at the ground and not the sky.

3.3 Leaf blowers should be replaced by brooms in order to avoid emissions from these unsustainable tools, as in the 20 cities in California, which have banned them.

3.4 Council should both encourage and legislate for the use of lights in corridors - commercial as well as residential - which are activated by sensors.

3.5 We suggest that Council affirm the accomplishments of the Henderson Valley School's Power Rangers by applying low carbon principles to the new extension of the Auckland Art Gallery with regard to its use of internal lighting once the gallery is closed to the public in the evenings. Our built environment and green infrastructure

4.1 CTA supports establishing a Warrant of Fitness programme for rental properties (a point on which we submitted in our Unitary Plan feedback on 31 May 2013).

4.2 The parts of the Auckland Design Manual, which provide "information, case studies and guidance to the public and the development industry on sustainable urban design and building best practice" should be mandatory.

4.3 We support the retrofitting of buildings to improve their Green Star rating, and congratulate the Council on its intention to retrofit 135 Albert Street to Green Star and NABERSNZ rating 5. Concomitant with the move into Albert Street is the necessity of a low carbon solution for the old Civic building.

4.4 We support regulations that will lead to the following (pg 46): "New buildings, precincts and large-scale development will be required to meet standards set to improve sustainable design and baseline performance. This will focus on low-cost, passive design elements, such as orientation, natural ventilation and green infrastructure, over expensive technologies. The new requirements will minimise use of resources by including low impact design, renewable energy, stormwater and wastewater capture and recycling, as well as community-focused designs which encourage sustainable transport and quality compact living."

4.5 We support Action 10 (pg 47): "Develop a package of financial incentives, including development contributions and rates, to accelerate the uptake of sustainable design practices".

4.6 We note that adaptive use of existing buildings is sustainable use of a resource and that the replacement of one building with another needs to take into account the loss of materials from the demolished building and the energy and resources used in its demolition.

4.7 As part of "enhancing local food production" (pg 61) people could be encouraged, where practicable, to establish food plants on their berms. More trees and other vegetation planted by Council could include food-bearing plants, e.g. the grape vines planted by Auckland Council on the north western cyclepath (Kingsland).

Zero Waste 5.1 An example of waste management that Council could assist with is in the provision of a collection point, e.g. adjacent to the Pikes Point Refuse Station, where industrial waste as well as household reusables could be stored and made available for others to collect for their use. This would both reduce the amount that goes into landfill and make better use of finite resources.

5.2 An initiative in Marrickville, Sydney, called Reverse Garbage, is one that could be adopted by Auckland. Reverse Garbage makes available industrial and commercial discards, off-cuts and over-runs by providing high quality, low priced, useful and unusual materials for use in arts, craft, education, small business, home renovation and other activities. (www.reversegarbage.org.au)

5.3 CTA strongly support Council's intention to develop a resource recovery network and suggests that this include smaller centres that can collect materials which are then delivered to larger centres, so that places are accessible for a good part of the community. We propose that Shed 10 become part of this network and that a car boot sale such as the one held in Grey Lynn be held on Queen's Wharf once a month.

5.4 Construction and demolition materials form a huge part of the city's collective waste, therefore we support the inclusion of drop-off of such waste as part of the proposed resource recovery network.

5.5 There should be facility for some "specialist" resource recovery centres, such as the Early Childhood Resource Centre that used to operate in Mt Wellington, providing materials for arts and crafts for preschools.

5.6 We submit that Council address the issue of food waste from restaurants, cafes and supermarkets. Some of this food should be made available for human and/or animal consumption.

5.7 Many convenience store operators automatically reach for a plastic bag to give the customer even if they are selling one item only. Council should raise awareness regarding this aspect of waste.

5.8 We support minimisation leading to prohibition of plastic bags, to be replaced with biodegradable bags. Consumers should be charged for the purchase of plastic bags, in order to encourage them to reuse bags and/or bring their own non-plastic bags with them to a store.

5.9 The Auckland Museum is mentioned in the plan as a place where batteries use in-house are collected for recycling. We would like to see (as per our submission on the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan) batteries taken to libraries for recycling. We note that people living in London can take their household batteries to any of the London libraries and put them in a battery recycling collection box. This would seem to be a good interim way of dealing with used batteries in Auckland until resource recovery centres are in place. Forestry, agriculture and natural carbon assets

6.1 One of the key elements listed on pg 20 is, "Growing the extent of urban and regional forests". To assist with this, Council's new tree rules should be rescinded.

6.2 We quote from Auckland City Council's Draft Urban Forest Plan March 2007 (1.2), "International concern about global warming and its linkage to the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions and its relationship to energy production through fossil fuels, points to the importance of trees in balancing greenhouse gas production. The urban forest provides significant environmental benefits including green house gas mitigation (CO₂ production), stormwater amelioration, particulate removal from the air, heat island reduction and habitat for birds and other fauna. The role that trees play in greenhouse gas mitigation is viewed internationally as a service to communities. The Kyoto Agreement sets targets to achieve for signatory countries like New Zealand. Auckland City contributes through the Cities for Climate Protection programme and there is a need to improve our understanding of the contribution of the urban forest within this wider context."

6.3 We submit that input from the Cities for Climate Protection programme be included in the Proposed Low Carbon Strategic Action Plan.

6. Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, submitted 31 January, 2012

Q3. (a) Council states its goal is "to create an integrated suite of waste services across the region in order to significantly reduce waste in the medium term, with the long term aspirational goal of Zero Waste" (Executive Summary, pg 5). CTA is of the view that waste can be significantly reduced without waste services being standardized. Parts of Auckland City already have waste systems that work well and there does not seem to be good reason to change them. (b) We suggest that different options may suit different households. This draft plan provides a means of consultation on this matter, and the needs and wishes of different groups need to be considered. Efficiencies from the disposer's point of view also need to be considered. For example, wheelie bins, especially when full, are difficult to manoeuvre for less able people or on sections that are not flat. (c) Those who provide the collection services, including those who do the actual pick-up, also need to have their views considered, not only as regards efficiency but also hazards and other matters. (d) We do not think it necessary for efficiency for all the bins in the Auckland region to be the same. It would seem sufficient that the collector knows which bin is which. With different sizes bins proposed, not all bins will be the same, in any case. (e) We consider it wasteful for current bins to be recalled and remade for the purpose of what would seem to be unnecessary standardisation. Existing bins should be reused. Otherwise Council itself cannot be seen to "walk the talk" by demonstrating good 'waste wise' practice" (page 10). (f) We oppose giving households the choice of rubbish bins up to 240 litres, as this encourages the idea that large amounts of waste are acceptable as long as its disposal is paid for. However, we suggest that households that consider they need a large bin due to special circumstances, e.g. long-term disposal of adult-sized nappies, are able to apply for a large bin. Q4. Organic waste makes up approximately 50 per cent

by weight (around 40 per cent food waste and 10 per cent green waste) of the contents of the average kerbside refuse bin or bag.

The council proposes to provide a separate organic waste collection to divert this material from landfill to beneficial use (for example, to compost). The service would be rates-funded and, if refuse is disposer-pays, this would reduce what householders pay for refuse. Do you agree or disagree with the council's proposal to provide every household that needs one with a small bin for organic waste collection? (a) We support diverting more organic material from going to landfill. We are of the view that, as each household is different, each should be given the choice of whether it has a separate food waste bin plus separate green waste bin. (b) However, in the first instance, we support community education in order to reduce the food waste from each household. It is unacceptable that one-third of all bought fruit and vegetables are thrown away. (c) We would also like Council to address the issue of food waste from places that sell food, such as restaurants, cafes and supermarkets. Some of this should be made available for human and / or animal consumption. Q5. Different types (and frequencies) of inorganic collection services are currently provided across Auckland.

The council proposes to provide a rates-funded inorganic collection every one or two years. Do you agree or disagree with the council's proposal? (a) We disagree as we would like to see the inorganic collection replaced by the facility of a resource recovery network. The inorganic collections provide an opportunity for people to dispose of excessive amounts of material without taking any responsibility. Many of these items can be repaired, reused or recycled and thus continue to have a life, or, at the least, have components extracted and sorted so that parts can be reused or recycled. (b) Some of these items present a hazard, especially to young children, when left on the street, aside from causing neighbourhoods to be unsightly for a week or more during the time of the collection. (c) There should be a service available for pick-up of items from individual households (for a small fee) and neighbours should be encouraged to assist each other to take materials to the resource recovery centre, e.g. by an informal roster where one person per month takes a carload from the street to the centre.

The council proposes advocating to Central Government to introduce mandatory product stewardship schemes for packaging (such as cans and bottles for drinks) to increase recycling rates and transfer costs away from ratepayers and onto producers and consumers. It also proposes encouraging development of product stewardship schemes for products such as electronic waste, tyres and batteries. Do you agree or disagree with this proposal and why? 4(a) We strongly agree with this proposal because it will encourage producers and consumers to be more environmentally responsible. (b) Container deposit legislation would transfer costs to producers and consumers and at the same time enable groups such as schools to raise funds by collecting recyclable items (as they have in the past), as well as individuals who do not have adequate means of supporting themselves. (c) We note that people living in London can take their household batteries to any of the London libraries and put them in a battery recycling collection box. This would seem to be a good interim way of dealing with used batteries in

Auckland until resource recovery centres are in place. Libraries could, at the same time, be part of the community programme (as per Q7).

The council proposes to implement a comprehensive communications, community engagement and community development programme to help householders adapt to changes in waste and recycling services and to help businesses and the wider community reduce waste to landfill. Do you agree or disagree with this proposal and why? (a) We strongly agree with this proposal, and, as a community organisation concerned about sustainability, including protecting the environment and education amongst our aims, we see that community engagement is paramount in terms of educating Aucklanders about changes in services and how they can play their part. (b) One area in which people need more education is on how to separate out their rubbish. One place to provide this information could be at bin locations, such as those in multi-unit dwellings (whether the waste is collected by a private contractor or not), for example, whether or not it is necessary to remove labels from tins and jars and whether tetra paks go in the cardboard bin or the plastics bin. (c) The main focus of education should be on reduction and reuse, being the top two facets of the pyramid in the waste hierarchy. We need to learn to regard waste as a resource, not something to be thrown away. (d) Education should include awareness of the Visy recycling site is open to the public to visit. (e) We need to be made aware of the importance of choosing products carefully in terms of what our needs are, what value the product is offering and what its expected lifetime is. (f) "Support and undertaking further research into how best to incentivise and encourage business waste reduction" is included in the plan but we would like to see more detail about this in the planned actions.

Q8.(a) (i) CTA strongly supports a resource recovery network throughout the Auckland region. We note that Waitakere City had a good model for this and that the Waitemata Local Board included a resource recovery centre in their local board plan. (ii) Such centres can provide local jobs and keep more "waste" within communities instead of transporting it over what can be long distances. (iii) Smaller centres can collect materials which are then delivered to larger centres, so that places are accessible for all the community. (iv) Construction and demolition materials form a huge part of the city's collective waste, therefore we support the inclusion of drop-off of such waste in the proposed resource recovery network. (v) There could be facility for some "specialist" resource recovery centres, such as the Early Childhood Resource Centre that used to operate in Mt Wellington, providing materials for arts and crafts for preschools. (b) CTA supports amending the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 so that industry has the same waste minimisation obligations as local authorities, as well as Council gaining more influence over the waste stream. We believe that Council should have more than the current 17% control over waste management. (c) Page 10 of the plan proposes "Developing waste and recycling services for multi-unit dwellings" but there is no further detail about this. 35,000-plus Auckland CBD residents live in multi-unit dwellings and they currently need not take any responsibility for the amount and type of rubbish they put into the communal bins. We note that space requirements for bins needs to be taken into consideration, particularly with regard to new builds, and regulations should be considered for inclusion in the Unitary Plan. (d) There is similarly no real mention in the plan of waste and recycling services

for office blocks. (e) The issue of commercial waste in general does not seem to have adequate emphasis in the plan. For example, there should be a requirement of every contract that full disclosure on waste volumes, waste operation costs and progress towards reduction targets be disclosed to the public. (f) CTA strongly supports expanding the range of recyclables that are collected. (g) Recycling should be carried out according to internationally accepted standards of best practice: •separation at source •producing high quality products that can be sold at their highest value •employing local staff to process materials before they are transported •processing and packaging the materials to their highest density. (h) The way urban trees are disposed of needs to be addressed in terms of ecology, energy and use of wood. (i) There should be a “bring in bring-out” policy regarding rubbish in all parks, with recycling bins at key points if necessary. (j) Auckland Council should support community initiatives that are working towards reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, rather than leaving this to volunteers. Council could actively work towards partnerships with community groups. (k) Some schools have given long-term support for recycling and it seems that more schools could be encouraged to do the same. Benefits of schools being recycling centres include: (i) the natural flow-on as regards education around recycling for children - and their families (ii) the space usually available on school grounds that can accommodate bins (iii) families being able to drop off their recyclables when they deliver or collect their children from school. (l) CTA trusts that resource consents considered for fast tracking if they demonstrate good waste minimisation practice (pg 10) would be scrutinised in the normal manner as regards all other aspects of the resource consent application. (n) Council should advocate to central government for legislation which requires that all take-away food products carry within their branded packaging a bar code specific to that supplier or manufacturer so that when recovered as litter the cost of collection is charged to the supplier or manufacturer. (o) Similarly, Council should advocate to central government for legislation which requires that all tobacco products carry within their branded packaging and products micro-dots so that when recovered as litter the cost of collection is charged to the supplier or manufacturer. (p) Spot fines for littering of any product by the consumer (as per the Litter Act) should be publicised and enforced and regularly highlighted in the media and / or Council publications. (q) The “Sell on behalf of” concept needs to be kept simple and able to accommodate people who do not use computers. (r) The social marketing campaign proposed in the plan could include libraries and garages where a pamphlet is offered to a customer and / or posters are visible at point of sale / issue. (s) Even if Council is not in direct control of waste management services, it can surely make a huge difference in the area of education of all waste producers and in legislation that affects these services. Due to these factors, we do not accept the statement that there is “limited Council influence” (Executive Summary, pg 5). (t) Civic Trust Auckland encourages Auckland Council to continue to research best practice in other countries and to trial such processes as would seem to work well in the Auckland environment.

Date of submission: 30 September, 2019

Signature:



Audrey van Ryn

Audrey van Ryn
Secretary, Civic Trust Auckland