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1  Welcome

2  Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

3  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.

The Auckland Council Code of Conduct for Elected Members (the Code) requires elected members to fully acquaint themselves with, and strictly adhere to, the provisions of Auckland Council’s Conflicts of Interest Policy. The policy covers two classes of conflict of interest:

i)  A financial conflict of interest, which is one where a decision or act of the local board could reasonably give rise to an expectation of financial gain or loss to an elected member; and

ii) A non-financial conflict interest, which does not have a direct personal financial component. It may arise, for example, from a personal relationship, or involvement with a non-profit organisation, or from conduct that indicates prejudice or predetermination.

The Office of the Auditor General has produced guidelines to help elected members understand the requirements of the Local Authority (Member’s Interest) Act 1968. The guidelines discuss both types of conflicts in more detail, and provide elected members with practical examples and advice around when they may (or may not) have a conflict of interest.

Copies of both the Auckland Council Code of Conduct for Elected Members and the Office of the Auditor General guidelines are available for inspection by members upon request.

Any questions relating to the Code or the guidelines may be directed to the Relationship Manager in the first instance.

4  Confirmation of Minutes

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 15 February 2018, as a true and correct record.

5  Leave of Absence

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

6  Acknowledgements

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

7  Petitions

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

Standing Order 3.20 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 Upper Harbour 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.

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

9 **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 3 minutes per item 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 **Extraordinary Business**

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

"An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting."

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

"Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."
11 Notices of Motion

Under Standing Order 2.5.1 (LBS 3.11.1) or Standing Order 1.9.1 (LBS 3.10.17) (revoke or alter a previous resolution) a Notice of Motion has been received from Member N Mayne for consideration under item 13.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. The open unconfirmed minutes and minute attachments of the Upper Harbour Local Board ordinary meeting held on Thursday, 15 February 2018, are attached at item 12 of the agenda for the information of the board only.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) note that the open unconfirmed minutes and minute attachments of the Upper Harbour Local Board meeting held on Thursday, 15 February 2018, are attached at item 12 of the agenda for the information of the board only, and will be confirmed under item 4 of the agenda.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
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<tr>
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<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
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<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories
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<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Cindy Lynch - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upper Harbour Local Board

Minutes of the Upper Harbour Local Board meeting held Thursday, 15 February 2018

Minutes of a meeting of the Upper Harbour Local Board held in the Upper Harbour Local Board Office, 30 Kell Drive, Albany on Thursday, 15 February 2018 at 9.32am

**PRESENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Lisa Whyte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chairperson</td>
<td>Margaret Miles, QSM, JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Uzra Casuri Batouch, JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Mayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John McLean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From 9.43am [Item 8.1] Until 12.48pm [Item 23]*

**ABSENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Brian Noeson, JP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment A
Welcome

Apologies
Resolution number UH/2018/1
MOVED by Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Member U Balouch:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
a) accept the apology from Member Brian Neeson for absence.
b) accept the apology from Member John McLean for lateness.
CARRIED

Declaration of Interest
There were no declarations of interest.

Confirmation of Minutes
Resolution number UH/2018/2
MOVED by Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Member N Mayne:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 14 December 2017, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.
CARRIED

Leave of Absence
There were no leaves of absence.

Acknowledgements

6.1 Acknowledgement - Bill Plunkett
Resolution number UH/2018/3
MOVED by Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Deputy Chairperson M Miles:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
a) acknowledge the recent passing of Bill Plunkett, a prominent member of the Birkenhead community who served on the Birkenhead Licensing Trust for 19 years. The trust distributed significant funding to many community trusts and associations across the region during his time as Chairperson and President. Although Bill was not an Upper Harbour resident, his involvement over many, many years in Foundation North, and the Community Response Forum has resulted in many positive outcomes for our community. He will be missed, and we acknowledge his great contribution to our community.
CARRIED

Petitions
There were no petitions.
8 Deputations

8.1 Harbour Sport update
Resolution number UH/2018/4
MOVED by Deputy Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member N Mayne:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the deputation from Toni-Maree Carmie from Harbour Sport, and thank her for her attendance and presentation.

CARRIED

8.2 Greenhithe Community Trust update
Resolution number UH/2018/5
MOVED by Member N Mayne, seconded by Member U Balouch:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) thank Amanda Mitchell, Chair of the Greenhithe Community Trust, and Richard Chambers, facilitator for the Oruamo/Hellyers Escarpment Pest Control Project, for their attendance and presentation.

CARRIED

8.3 Albany United Football Club resourcing challenges
A PowerPoint presentation was provided. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number UH/2018/6
MOVED by Member J McLean, seconded by Member N Mayne:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the deputation from Andrea Harold and Kieron Henare from Albany United Football Club, and thank them for their attendance and presentation.

CARRIED

Attachments
A Albany United Football Club presentation

9 Public Forum
There was no public forum.

10 Extraordinary Business
There was no extraordinary business.

11 Notices of Motion
There were no notices of motion.
12 Minutes of the Upper Harbour Local Board meeting held Thursday, 14 December 2017

That the Upper Harbour Local Board note that the open unconfirmed minutes and minute attachments of the Upper Harbour Local Board meeting held on Thursday, 14 December 2017, are attached at item 12 of the agenda for the information of the board only, and will be confirmed under item 4 of the agenda.

Secretarial note: Item 10 was considered at this time.

Secretarial note: Item 14 was considered after Item 16.

13 Landowner approvals: Northern Corridor Improvements project

The Principal Property Advisor and the Senior Parks Planner were in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2018/7

MOVED by Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Deputy Chairperson M Miles:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) support the divestment of approximately 3.8ha of reserve land (being portions of land at Rosedale Landfill, Tawa, Arrenway, Centorion, Meadowood, Alexandra Stream, Rock, Omega and Bluebird Reserves) to the New Zealand Transport Agency, for motorway improvements at Upper Harbour, by transfer pursuant to Sections 50 and 52 of the Public Works Act 1981.

b) request that the Finance and Performance Committee direct the net receipts of sale towards an agreed local board work programme, which delivers local park improvements in the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

c) delegate a working group consisting of Members N Mayne and U Casuri Balouch, and the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson, the authority to work with relevant parties to develop principles and design options for the mitigation of works in the reserve, noting that final decisions regarding the design will be brought to a full meeting of the local board for decision-making.

d) grant landowner approval for the temporary occupation of reserve land for construction and mitigation purposes, to the New Zealand Transport Agency (and their contractors) for up to 36 months within (and around) the reserve areas affected by the project, subject to:

i. the staged, detailed design and maintenance arrangements of shared user path, vegetation removal, re-vegetation, retaining walls, landscaping and concept plans, and other mitigation requirements being approved by the General Manager Parks, in consultation with the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Upper Harbour Local Board

ii. the final terms and conditions of all temporary occupation arrangements being approved by the General Manager Community Facilities and the General Manager Parks, in consultation with the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Upper Harbour Local Board, as part of the compensation agreement for reserve land.

CARRIED
14 Application for a licence for dining and cafe at Hobsonville Landing

The Principal Property Advisor and the Senior Parks Planner were in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2018/8

MOVED by Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Deputy Chairperson M Miles:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve the public notification of a licence for Catalina Bay Holdings Limited Partnership, and its tenant to occupy part of the deck constructed over a strip of reserve (to be vested on subdivision) and partly in the Coastal Marine Area at The Landing, Hobsonville, by Homes Land Community (2017) Limited (formerly Hobsonville Land Company Limited), for a term of 10 years for outdoor dining, noting that the timing is subject to the vesting process.

b) approve granting of the licence on terms and conditions to be approved by the head of Stakeholder and Land Advisory, Community Facilities, if there are no objections, or no objections of significance to the granting of the licence, or no objections that cannot be resolved with the submitter.

c) approve occupation of the deck, commencing under an agreement to grant a licence, prior to the public notification period due to the previous arrangements made between Hobsonville Land Company Limited and the proposed licensee, but with termination or suspension provisions if notification results in an adverse reaction from the public, and otherwise on terms and conditions to be approved by the head of Stakeholder and Land Advisory, Community Facilities.

d) support the vesting of the reserve beneath the deck and the transfer of the Coastal Marine Permit for the deck.

CARRIED

15 Scott Point Sustainable Sports Park

The Principal Sports Parks Advisor and a representative from Opus were in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2018/9

MOVED by Member J McLean, seconded by Chairperson L Whyte:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) adopt the Scott Point Sustainable Sports Park Master Plan December 2017.

b) support the allocation of funds to the development of the Scott Point Sustainable Sports Park.

c) request that detailed design works commence to allow physical works to start on Scott Point Sustainable Sports Park in November 2019.

d) note that further budget allocation is required to deliver the full Scott Point Sustainable Sports Park Master Plan December 2017, and implementation may need to be staged as resources allow and, for that reason, be brought back to the Upper Harbour Local Board to set priorities for staging.

CARRIED
16 Upper Harbour Open Space Network Plan - key moves

The Principal Policy Analyst was in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2018/10

MOVED by Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Member J McLean:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve the following key moves to guide the development of the Upper Harbour Open Space Network Plan:
   i. growth – responding to our growing community
   ii. sport and recreation – providing a range of formal and informal play opportunities
   iii. connections – developing connections for the community
   iv. healthy environment – improving water and biodiversity quality.

CARRIED

17 Auckland Council’s Quarterly Performance Report: Upper Harbour Local Board for quarter two, 1 October - 31 December 2017

The Senior Advisor Local Board Services was in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2018/11

MOVED by Member J McLean, seconded by Chairperson L Whyte:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the performance report for the financial quarter ending 31 December 2017.

b) allocate $45,000 from its locally driven initiatives capital expenditure budget towards the installation of an International Basketball Federation (FIBA) standard basketball half-court at Unsworth Reserve.

c) approve delegated authority to the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson to allocate up to $15,000 locally driven initiatives capital expenditure as contingency funding to cover any unexpected overruns encountered during construction.

d) advise the Community Facilities Manager Project Delivery that funding is committed and request that the project be expedited for tender and construction to ensure this is completed in the current earthworks season.

CARRIED

Secretarial note: Item 19 was considered at this time.

Secretarial note: Item 18 was considered after Item 22.

18 Engaging Red Frogs Support Network at Movies in the Park

Due to unavailability of the supplier, a board decision regarding the allocation of funding was not required.
19 Governance and management model for the Headquarters building, Hobsonville Point

The Team Leader Community Led Deliveries was in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2016/12

MOVED by Member J McLean, seconded by Deputy Chairperson M Miles:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) agree that the Headquarters building, and the Sunderland Lounge, be operated and are considered as one combined entity (precinct).

b) approve the interim council management model for the Headquarters building for an initial establishment period of six months, to facilitate transition to a community-led model.

c) approve a governance model for the Headquarters building, and a change of operating model for the Sunderland Lounge, from council-managed to community-led, subject to a suitable operator being identified through the expressions of interest process.

d) note that a report regarding the expression of interest, proposed selection criteria and transition process for the Headquarters building and the Sunderland Lounge, to operate under a combined community-led management model, will be presented to the board in March/April 2018.

CARRIED

Secretarial note: A brief adjournment was agreed at 11.53am and the meeting reconvened at 12.02pm. Deputy Chairperson Miles was not present.

Deputy Chairperson M Miles left the meeting at 11.53pm.
Deputy Chairperson M Miles returned to the meeting at 12.14pm.

20 Revising the local board Standing Orders

The Relationship Manager was in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2018/13

MOVED by Member N Mayne, seconded by Member U Balouch:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) adopt the Standing Orders detailed in Attachment A to the agenda report, entitled ‘Auckland Council Standing Orders of the Local Board’, in replacement of its current Standing Orders, subject to the following addition:

i. inclusion of clause d) under Standing Item 3.3.3 (Conditions for attending by electronic link) the wording ‘or in any other circumstances the local board deems appropriate’.

CARRIED
21  Governance forward work calendar - March 2018 to February 2019
Resolution number UH/2018/14
MOVED by Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Member U Balouch:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
a) receive the Upper Harbour Local Board governance forward work calendar for the period March 2018 to February 2019, as set out in Attachment A to this agenda report.
CARRIED

22  Record of the Upper Harbour Local Board workshops held on Thursday 7 December 2017 and 1 February 2018
Resolution number UH/2018/15
MOVED by Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Member N Mayne:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
a) receive the record of the Upper Harbour Local Board workshops held on Thursday 7 December 2017 and 1 February 2018 (refer to Attachments A and B to this agenda report).
CARRIED

Secretarial note: Item 18 was considered at this time.

23  Board Members’ reports - February 2018
Resolution number UH/2018/16
MOVED by Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Deputy Chairperson M Miles:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
a) receive the verbal board members’ reports.
CARRIED

Member J McLean left the meeting at 12.46pm.

24  Consideration of Extraordinary Items
There was no consideration of extraordinary items.

12.57 pm
The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

CONFRMIED A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE UPPER HARBOUR LOCAL BOARD HELD ON

DATE:............................................................................

CHAIRPERSON:.................................................................
### OPEN MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS

<table>
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<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Albany United Football Club resourcing challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Albany United Football Club presentation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The attachments contained within this document are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. Should Councillors require further information relating to any reports, please contact the relevant manager, Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson.
Item 12

63 teams (approx 1150 players) at Albany United requiring LIT training fields across 11 months
Add 38 junior teams requiring practice fields without lights
Community engagement - Ethnic groups

- The Auckland Chinese Association Football League plays at Rosedale Park on a Sunday and engages ethnic people from Asia, Africa and also Europe.
Community Focus - eg Special Olympics

Attachment B

Item 12
Community Engagement - Schools

Northern Football Federation shared Albany United Football Club's post.
August 15, 2017
A great day at Albany United Football today! Well done and thanks from the NFF team to Andrea from Albany United for all her hard work. Good luck to all the teams from our region at ASICS.

Albany United Football
Published by Andrea Yared
August 15, 2017
A joint venture with Northern Football Federation today is bringing a Pre-ASICS competition to North Harbour for schools to gain experience in preparation for next month's tournament in Taumaru. Our local lady (and a north Auckland) and assess all girls teams in sport in sport against other schools, on a stunning day at Rosedale Park, in support of the Mares' (NFF Community Development Officer) and Ena's (NFF Women's Development Officer) work to get Albany United Football Club and helping make today the success that it was.
### How Albany United compares in resource:

#### Table: Resource Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Albany United</th>
<th>Other Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Graph: Resource Efficiency

- Albany United: 80%
- Other Region: 70%
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**Upper Harbour Local Board**
Focus on Football for Family, Fun, Future
Notice of Motion - Member Nicholas Mayne - Community Recycling Centre

File No.: CP2018/03106

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
1. Member Nicholas Mayne has given notice of a motion that they wish to propose.
2. The notice, signed by Member Nicholas Mayne and Chairperson Lisa Whyte as seconder, is appended as Attachment A.
3. Supporting information is appended as Attachment A.

Motion
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) support the development of Community Recycling Centres as part of a Resource Recovery Centre; as proposed in the Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

b) advocate for the development of a Community Recycling Centre in Albany to meet the demands of the growing communities in Upper Harbour and East Coast Bays.

c) propose the investigation of siting a Community Recycling Centre at 62 Greville Road (closed Rosedale Landfill site), opposite 117 Rosedale Road (present Waste Management Transfer Station), once the site is deemed safe for use.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Title</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Notice of Motion - N Mayne - community recycling centre</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

| Authors | Cindy Lynch - Democracy Advisor |
| Authorisers | Eric Perry - Relationship Manager |
Notice of Motion – Support for Community Recycling Centre situated in Upper Harbour

Submitted on 07/03/2018 for Upper Harbour Local Board Meeting on the 15/03/2018

Attention: Eric Perry – Relationships Manager, Local Board Services

In accordance with Standing Order 2.5.1, I hereby give notice that I intend to move the following motion at the 15th March 2018 meeting of the Upper Harbour Local Board.

Recommendations:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) Supports the development of Community Recycling Centres as part of a Resource Recovery Centre; as proposed in the Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.
b) Advocates for the development of a Community Recycling Centre in Albany to meet the demands of the growing communities in Upper Harbour and East Coast Bays.
c) Proposes the investigation of siting a Community Recycling Centre at 62 Greville Road (closed Rosedale Landfill site), opposite 117 Rosedale Road (present Waste Management Transfer Station), once the site is deemed safe for use.

Background:

2. The draft plan proposes the development of 7 new Community Recycling Centres, which will be in addition to centres presently located at Waiuku, Helensville, Devonport, Henderson and Whangaparaoa.
3. The draft strategy along with consultation documents can be found at: https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/have-your-say/topics-you-can-have-your-say-on/waste-minimisation-management-plan/Pages/default.aspx
4. The Local Board will give formal feedback on the whole plan once to the Environment and Community Committee of Auckland Council’s Governing Body after the period of public consultation.
5. It is the request of Upper Harbour Local Board member, Nicholas Mayne, that the board indicate their support for Community Recycling Centres prior to formal feedback. There is anecdotal support for Community Recycling Centres from Upper Harbour residents, but concern that such a service will be slow to reach into Upper Harbour. Early feedback may give local Upper Harbour and East Coast Bays residents cause to consult on the draft strategy.
6. The closed Rosedale Landfill is presently being managed to monitor containment of buried waste material before eventual return of this site to the governance of the Local Board as a publicly accessible site.
Signed:

Date: 06/03/18

Mover:
Nicholas Mayne
Upper Harbour Local Board Member

Date: 5/3/18

Seconded:
Lisa Whyte
Chair Upper Harbour Local Board

Notice of Motion - Member Nicholas Mayne - Community Recycling Centre
Development of open space land: Coastal boardwalk at Hobsonville Point

File No.: CP2017/26949

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek a decision from the Upper Harbour Local Board on whether to accept the coastal boardwalk, which runs between the proposed Sunderland Gully Reserve to the public deck at Catalina Bay, adjacent to the ferry terminal in Hobsonville Point, as a council asset.
2. The views of the Upper Harbour Local Board are also sought on whether to accept the already completed public deck as a council asset within Hobsonville Point.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
3. Homes, Land and Community (HLC) has recently finished a coastal boardwalk and public deck between the Sunderland Gully Reserve and Catalina Bay (originally known as The Landing) that completes a 5km coastal walkway loop at Hobsonville Point. For an overview and context of the full coastal walkway, see Attachment A.
4. Due to the challenging topography of this reserve, the coastal boardwalk has been installed over the coastal marine area (CMA). This asset is intended to be accepted as part of the infrastructure agreement for parks infrastructure at Hobsonville Point. The assets adjoin land that is included in the Reserves Plan, despite the assets being located over the coastal marine area.
5. Willis Bond have expressed a desire to own the public deck. Auckland Council owns the section of the public deck over the recreation reserve which was recently vested to council. It is recommended that Auckland Council take over ownership of the entire public deck.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) accept the coastal boardwalk as an Auckland Council asset and take on the obligations of the coastal permit upon practical completion.

b) accept the public deck as an Auckland Council asset and take on the obligations of the coastal permit upon practical completion.

Horopaki / Context
6. On 28 October 2010, an Infrastructure Funding Agreement (IFA) between Waitakere City Council and Homes, Land and Community (HLC) (formerly Hobsonville Land Company Limited) was signed. The parties agreed that the reserves be vested by HLC within the Hobsonville Land, as shown on the reserves plan attached to the IFA, to fully satisfy the reserve requirements of the development.

7. While the proposed assets are outside the Hobsonville Land (land subject to the IFA), and not on reserve land to be vested in council under the IFA, they are located adjoining that land. Clause 5 of the IFA states that development of The Landing (now Catalina Bay) will be the subject of a separate agreement. This agreement has not been drafted. The assets that this report is in relation to totals $1.6m, plus GST.

8. HLC have confirmed that Willis Bond would like to obtain ownership of the public deck.
9. HLC have confirmed that the boardwalk is intended to be provided as development of reserves, in accordance with schedule 10 of the IFA. It is recommended that the coastal boardwalk should be considered as an asset and be accepted in accordance with the IFA, as it provides a continuation of the footpath/cycleway that extends from the Sunderland Gully Reserve (a reserve within the accepted reserves plan).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

10. The coastal boardwalk and public deck connects Catalina Bay with the Marine Parade/Sunderland Gully Reserve, forming another link in the Hobsonville Point coastal walkway. For more information and background, refer to Attachment B, which shows the developed design report prepared by Isthmus for the coastal boardwalk and public deck. Detailed drawings are also provided at Attachment C.

Coastal boardwalk

11. The coastal boardwalk has been constructed by HLC and is 400m in length and 3-5m in width. It connects the already constructed public deck at Catalina Bay with the coastal walkway at the Sunderland Gully Reserve, opposite the Sunderland Lounge. The total budget for the project, including fees, is $1.1m. The design life of the boardwalk is 50 years.

12. The topography of the Esplanade Reserve where the coastal boardwalk is located is too challenging to enable a land-based walkway connection, hence the reason for developing the boardwalk over the water.

13. HLC opened the coastal boardwalk to the public in early March 2018, after obtaining a certificate of public acceptance. Until the Sunderland Gully Reserve is completed, the boardwalk will be an out-and-back route from Catalina Bay.

14. The coastal boardwalk has been completed (utilising the already approved coastal consent). HLC now intends to hand the ownership of the structures to council as part of the coastal walkway (with a 5-year HLC maintenance responsibility). Taking over ownership of the structure would also require confirmation that council would take over the permit obligations associated with the coastal structure.

Public deck

15. HLC have completed the public deck at Catalina Bay, which is built over a small recreation reserve that has already been vested to council (Lot 10). This deck directly abuts the Fabric Bay building, which is currently being refurbished.

16. A portion of the public deck will be used for the public walkway and has bench seating for public use. It has been designed to connect seamlessly with the coastal boardwalk and to provide direct access from the boardwalk to Catalina Bay, as well as the pedestrian promenade that will extend the length of Catalina Bay. This provides a link to the Esplanade Reserve owned by council that extends the full boundary of Te Onekiritea (Bomb Point).

17. The coastal permit (number CST60065897) granting approval for outdoor dining within a portion of the public deck, was approved on the basis that public access to the coastal boardwalk on the lower portion of the deck would be unencumbered.

18. Because the recreation reserve (Lot 10) has been vested to council, the portion of the deck (108m²) that covers the reserve now falls within council ownership.

19. Should Willis Bond take ownership of the public deck, the facilitation of public access across the public deck to the boardwalk, and to the coastal marine area, is protected under Section 6 of the Reserves Management Act 1991 (RMA). This is also reflected in the objectives and policies of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part. The coastal permit (number 36489) for the coastal boardwalk also anticipates that there will be no exclusion of the public from using and accessing the coastal boardwalk, or any of the other coastal structures. The coastal permit anticipates public access unless there is a very good reason to exclude them.
20. The public deck has been constructed by HLC at a total capital cost, including fees, of $500,000. The design life of the proposed public deck is 50 years. Should Auckland Council retain ownership of the deck, a licence to occupy would be required to be progressed with Willis Bond for the occupation of the portion of the public deck over the recreation reserve, for the purposes of restaurant outdoor seating and dining.

Next steps
21. If support is given by the Upper Harbour Local Board to accept the coastal boardwalk and public deck, both Auckland Council and HLC will need to sign and approve the transfer of the coastal permits, in accordance with Section 135 of the RMA (Transferability of Coastal Permits).

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

Local board views
22. The local board has decision making responsibility for the development of local parks within the Upper Harbour Local Board area. The board’s views and approval are sought on the proposed development of local parks within Hobsonville Point, in order to agree on council’s minimum standard for each reserve on a case by case basis.

23. The local board’s views were sought at the business meeting on 15 February 2018, through a report regarding the public notification and granting of a commercial licence to occupy the part of the public deck over the recreation reserve. At this meeting, the local board resolved (resolution number UH/2018/8) to:

   a) approve the public notification of a licence for Catalina Bay Holdings Limited Partnership, and its tenant to occupy part of the deck constructed over a strip of reserve (to be vested on subdivision) and partly in the Coastal Marine Area at The Landing, Hobsonville, by Homes Land Community (2017) Limited (formerly Hobsonville Land Company Limited), for a term of 10 years for outdoor dining, noting that the timing is subject to the vesting process.

   b) approve granting of the licence on terms and conditions to be approved by the head of Stakeholder and Land Advisory, Community Facilities, if there are no objections, or no objections of significance to the granting of the licence, or no objections that cannot be resolved with the submitter.

   c) approve occupation of the deck, commencing under an agreement to grant a licence, prior to the public notification period due to the previous arrangements made between Hobsonville Land Company Limited and the proposed licensee, but with termination or suspension provisions if notification results in an adverse reaction from the public, and otherwise on terms and conditions to be approved by the head of Stakeholder and Land Advisory, Community Facilities.

   d) support the vesting of the reserve beneath the deck and the transfer of the Coastal Marine Permit for the deck.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
24. HLC is a wholly owned subsidiary of Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC). As such, they are a Crown-owned entity and their relationship with mana whenua is guided by the relationship of the Crown with local iwi.

25. In July 2011, HLC entered into a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with HNZC, HLC, Ngati Whata o Kaipara and Te Kawerau a Maki. At this time, neither iwi had settled its treaty claim with the Crown, but it was acknowledged that both iwi had specific historical and cultural associations with the land at Hobsonville Point. One purpose of the MoU was to ensure that HLC was able to engage and reflect mana whenua’s spiritual, cultural and
historical significance/relationship with the Hobsonville area, while the treaty settlement process was underway. This undertaking went beyond the statutory consultation requirements in the RMA.

26. Since the signing of the MoU, both iwi have been represented on HLC’s Placemaking Advisory Committee and formal governance-level relationship meetings with both iwi are held at regular intervals.

27. The Placemaking Advisory Committee has been kept up to date with the plans for the various Hobsonville Point reserves, including the coastal walkway.

28. The governance level meetings discuss several matters, one key item being how HLC would best work with iwi on the design of the coastal walkway. It was decided that HLC would involve both iwi in the early concept design for the coastal walkway, to ensure that iwi aspirations helped shape the overall project.

29. HLC held several design workshops with design representatives from both iwi. Council officers also participated in these workshops. The outcome was that mana whenua helped shape the design approach taken to the project by HLC’s designers: Nelson Byrd Woltz and Isthmus. Both iwi were involved but agreed that Bernard Makoare from Ngati Whatua o Kaipara would lead this work.

30. Bernard Makoare worked closely with the Isthmus team and from this work, several documents resulted that guided the work, including:
   - a document on Hobsonville outlining key concepts and approaches relevant to the project
   - Mata and Whakarare Hobsonville – from this document specific design elements were developed
   - Nga Tae Colours and Textures for the Hobsonville Project.

31. HLC have reported that both Te Kawerau a Maki and Ngati Whatua o Kaipara were pleased with the outcomes reflected in the final designs.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

32. The range of annual operational costs for maintaining the coastal boardwalk is between $625 and $11,249, with a median of $1,375.

33. The range of annual operation costs for maintaining the public deck is between $94 and $1,687, with a median of $206.

34. The total cost at the high end of the scale for both is $12,936, which will be drawn from the asset based services budget. This is a high-level assessment based on the concept plans and is based on the full facility contract. Maintenance for all Hobsonville Point park assets is expected to begin five years following completion of all landscaped and hard structure elements. However, playgrounds and toilet blocks are normally handed across immediately upon practical completion to council for health and safety reasons.

35. It is anticipated that the five-year maintenance clause in the IFA allows council sufficient time to build in consequential operating expenses for the Hobsonville Point park developments into the Long-term Plan (LTP) process.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

36. There is a risk to public expectations if the assets are not transferred or accepted by council. The assets are already built and open to the public. Willis Bond have expressed interest in owning the public deck, which would involve its management and maintenance. It is not known what type of ownership or management arrangements would be in place for the boardwalk if it were not owned by council. It is also recommended that Auckland Council owns all of the public deck, as it already owns the portion of the deck over the recreation reserve directly adjacent to Fabric Bay.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

37. Consequential operating expenses, resulting from the acceptance of the above assets, will need to be allocated during the LTP and annual plan processes from the asset based services budget.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
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<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Hobsonville Point Coastal Walkway is a 4km walkway that forms a circuit around one third of the Hobsonville Point site and features opportunities for play, integrated art, resting places, and visual reminders of the area’s history. It is designed to make the most of the coast for residents and visitors, and the majority of the walkway hugs the coastal edge. In order to form a loop there is also an inland section which crosses the site at Hobsonville Point Park.

**WHAT IS IT?**

When it is finished it will provide residents and visitors with a wide, walkable path from which they can enjoy a diverse range of sights and experiences, including:

- close to the harbour
- amongst native bush
- up high in the treetops
- on a waterfront promenade
- connected to the area’s history
- part of the community

**HOW MUCH OF IT IS BUILT?**

The inland section of the walkway is already built. You can follow the path by finding Tiaotaiwate, the sculptural charred poles, that chart a line through Hobsonville Point Park on Buckley Avenue.

**WHEN WILL IT BE FINISHED?**

The Coastal Walkway is being built in stages. On the back page of this brochure you can see the expected completion dates for each stage.

**WHAT WILL IT BE LIKE?**

The Coastal Walkway has been designed to provide a range of experiences that people of every age can enjoy, including art, cultural and heritage features and play opportunities. The south and eastern half will feel wide and open with expansive views of the harbour whereas the north and western half will be narrower and have the character of an elevated bushwalk with framed views through the trees.

The walkway is designed to link the site’s parks and areas of open space, and to be easily accessed from multiple points in all neighbourhoods.

**WHO IS DESIGNING IT?**

Local designers Ishmus Group are working alongside New York based Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects. Ishmus has been heavily involved in Hobsonville Point’s planning from its inception in 2007.

They’re also responsible for projects like Wellington’s waterfront space, Kumutoto; the rejuvenation of Oriental Bay; the Coastal Walk/ Cycleway and city centre revitalisation in New Plymouth; and the one hundred hectare Barry Curtis Park in Manukau. Nelson Byrd Woltz completed the landscape architecture for the 135-hectare National Arboretum of New Zealand near Custome and the Orongo Station Stewardship Rari in Poverty Bay.
Development of open space land: Coastal boardwalk at Hobsonville Point

Attachment A

Item 14
Some of the Highlights

HARRIER POINT
Harrier Point provides a high vantage point with wonderful views over the harbour back to the city. This area will include picnic/barbecue facilities, flying fox, room to fly a kite and bucket swing.

THE RIFLE RANGE
The Rifle Range will be modified to include a stage and grased terraces from which to watch a performance. We envisage this space being used by schools and community groups. Existing buildings will be repurposed to provide a play pod for children and a lounge pod for youth. Public toilets will also be installed.

THE BRIDGES
Two bridges will be built, one over Kitti Gully at the edge of the site closest to the retirement village, the other is over Cochrane Gully near Mill House. Both have a curving steel and timber structure which will be high above ground, raising users into the tree canopy. The bridges will be completed September 2016 and both bridges will span approximately 50m each.

CHICHESTER COTTAGE
Chichester Cottage provides a public gathering space in a garden setting, the cottage has historic value in that it was stayed in by Sir Francis Chichester who was knighted by Queen Elizabeth II for sailing single-handed around the world.

All images conceptual only. The Coastal Walkway will continue to evolve as it goes through the design process.
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HOBSONVILLE POINT
COASTAL BOARDWALK
& PUBLIC DECK

Developed Design Report
Prepared for Hobsonville Land Company
10.07.2015

isthmus
Urban Design & Site Context

The Landing area is home to some of the most prominent and significant built heritage within Hobsonville Point, including the Fabric Bay Building and Seaplane hangar now used for the Hobsonville Farmer’s Markets. These buildings and others including the Sunderland Hangar and Workshop building contribute to the rich maritime and industrial character of the site.

Several new structures within the Landing and along the main path of travel from Launch Road provide a contemporary design overlay to the character of the site.

Specifically, the North-South site axis established by the Seaplane Hangar is reinforced by the Ferry Wharf (Architectus, 2013), both through its projection into Catalina Bay, and the use of a rigorous design language of horizontal and vertical natural timber batters.

The recently completed stairway from Launch Road to the Landing (by Boffa Miskell, 2014) provides a high level of design quality along the main pedestrian route to the Landing, while also reinforcing the site axis. The materiality of this design compliments the wharf structure, with seats clad in natural timber batters, and natural coloured concrete retaining ‘blocks’.

The steel plate clad retaining wall alongside the stairs (with feature stainless steel lites) and the large steel planters along Launch Road reference the site’s historical connections with the Royal New Zealand Air Force and the former use of the landing for storage and maintenance of the Sunderland seaplane.

Public Deck & Coastal Boardwalk Urban Design & Landscape Objectives

The Coastal Boardwalk and Public Deck are projects of high value to the Hobsonville Point Community, providing a unique experience close to (and over) the water edge not available elsewhere at Hobsonville Point.

Key objectives for the Public Deck include:

- Integration and flexible interface with the existing Fabric Bay Building (proposed as a future cafe/grocer).
- Presentation and function as a publicly accessible destination, although a portion of the upper deck will be utilised by cafe patrons.
- Design coherence with the existing built form character of the Landing, including the Ferry Wharf and heritage buildings.
- Maintain circulation and ease of access between the Landing and Coastal Boardwalk.
- Reinforce the coastal context through a respectful interface with the existing landform and heritage seawall.
- Retain key views into the bay.

Key objectives for the Boardwalk include:

- Integration of layout and journey with existing topography and mangrove vegetation to minimise environmental impact during construction and throughout the lifespan of the structure.
- Reinforce and frame key views to the bay.
- Facilitate safe opportunities to access the water and tidal mudflats from the viewing platforms and end nodes.
- Be visually non-intrusive within the coastal setting.
- Be of suitable width and grade to enable safe use by pedestrians, recreational cyclists, and users of wheelchairs, gopher vehicles and prams.
Key Design Moves

The Developed Design of the Public Deck is underpinned by the following 3 design moves.

**REDUCE**

Overall deck area reduced to bring the experience of water closer to the building edge and reduce material requirements.

Upper deck oriented parallel with Fabric Bay to reinforce building form and character.

**INVITE**

Eastern end of the deck is linked to invite people around the corner of the Fabric Bay, open the deck to NW views up and across the bay, and provide separation from the Ferry Wharf structure.

**BLUR**

The interface between the deck levels is blurred to facilitate formal and informal access, seating and play opportunities.
Access & Function

The Public Deck has been designed to maximise the flexibility of movement and access between the deck levels and alongside the edge of the Fabric Bay Building.

The layout of the lower deck maintains the 3.0m minimum width of the Boardwalk along the front edge of the deck, opening out into a more generous area at the eastern end, to facilitate movement at the arrival point to the deck from the Landing, and standing/sitting at the edge.

Circulation has also been maintained along the building edge. A ‘seam’ detail (referencing the seawall below) subtly denotes the change from ‘seating area’ to circulation space.

Similarly, the alignment of the timber seat battens perpendicular to the typical decking direction visually indicates the change in level and function along this transition edge.

Materiality & Maintenance

Pine decking boards are proposed for the lower deck, as a materially consistent continuation of the Coastal Boardwalk.

Hardwood timber is proposed for the upper deck areas and seating, as a resilient and hard wearing material suitable for the marine conditions and likely high pedestrian traffic and furniture movement the cafe deck will experience.

The steel plate framing required for the seating elements and balustrade is proposed to be hot-dip galvanised, with a matte painted finish. More detail regarding these structures is provided later in this document.

Modular design principles have been used for ease of construction, maintenance and any necessary replacement of fixings or timber members over the lifespan of the deck.
Developed Design

Indicative 3D render of the Public Deck
The Coastal Boardwalk provides a unique journey through the mangrove environment adjacent the Catalina Channel. The boardwalk follows the existing coastal edge, set against the backdrop of the heavily vegetated coastal embankment.

As part of the coastal trail, the Boardwalk links Marine Parade with Hobsonville Point Landing, and is therefore expected to be used frequently by the broader Hobsonville Point Community.

The Boardwalk also provides opportunities to access the tidal mudflats and mangroves, via two viewing platforms. An additional stair access (refer “G” above) is provided to enable access to the back edge of the mangrove cove.

Coastal Boardwalk
Plan & Features
Developed Design - Viewing Platforms and Boardwalk Balustrade

The two viewing decks along the boardwalk offer an opportunity for more immediate interaction with the water.

The proposed designed for these deck areas carries through the design language of the Public Deck, whereby boxed steel plate forms create seating and steps along the edge of the platform. Changes in the direction of the timber battens denote the transition to the viewing platform and associated level change.

The inclusion of mooring devices for kayaks is to be investigated further in the detailed design of these structures.

The standard balustrade design also relates to the design of the Public Deck/ Landing barrier, utilising a flat bar steel frame at a finished height of 1100. A proposed infill of vertical steel flats at 100mm centres is proposed, in order to meet fall from height standards.

This steel balustrade design has been proposed in order to maintain a higher level of permeability along and through the boardwalk. The charcoal grey paint finish has been selected so that the balustrade is visually recessive against the backdrop of the mangrove vegetation/ mudflats.
1. Main boardwalk path of travel (140W pine decking boards)
2. 1100 high balustrade (steel flat bar frame with flat bar verticals at 100mm centres)
3. Viewing Platform (0.5m below typical deck level)
4. Seating and step access (2 x 600mm bench module type 1 as per Public Deck design and 1 x custom module 1400L x 1600W positioned at the same level as the main deck)
5. Custom module to extend into decking as a design feature and visual indication of the platform change of condition from the main boardwalk.
6. Lower step to enable water/ mud flat access (500mm lower than viewing platform level and measuring 750 wide x 800 nominal length)
7. Horizontal steel channel balustrade (as per Public Deck) with handrail, at end section & return panel on platform side
8. Main boardwalk circulation path (3.0m wide)
9. Unlined resting/viewing areas and water access
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Mangrove Stair Access: Elevation
Scale: 1:100 1:1 ( welcomes)

Mangrove Stair Access: Setout Plan
Scale: 1:100 (1:1 (welcome))

Lookout Node- Bench Setout Plan
Scale: 1:100 (1:1 (welcome))

isthmus
Client: HLC

Scale: 1:50

Drawing Title: Mangrove Stairs & Lookout Node
Job No.: 3528
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Hobsonville Coastal Boardwalk and Public Deck

For use only by company on site unless otherwise stated. COPYRIGHT ISTMUS GROUP LIMITED
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1. Balustrade junction - Typical Plan Detail
   Scale: 1:100 A3 | 1:200 A4

2. Balustrade 90deg junction - Plan Detail
   Scale: 1:100 A3 | 1:200 A4

3. Balustrade Setout - Plan Detail
   Scale: 1:100 A3 | 1:200 A4

4. Boardwalk timber decking - Plan Detail
   Scale: 1:100 A3 | 1:200 A4
Development of open space land: Coastal boardwalk at Hobsonville Point

Boardwalk Balustrade - Typical Ramp Elevation

Boardwalk Balustrade - Typical 1:12 Ramp Module - Elevation

Boardwalk Balustrade - Typical 1:35 'Walkway' Grade Module

Note: Modular section of 1:35-grade boardwalk section adjacent Public Deck.
The purpose of this report is to:

- respond to resolutions and requests on transport-related matters
- provide an update on the status of the Land Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF)
- request approval for new LBTCF projects
- provide a summary of consultation material sent to the board
- provide transport-related information on matters of specific application and interest to the Upper Harbour Local Board and its community.

This report covers:

- progress on the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018
- Albany projects
- Auckland Transport’s (AT) quarterly report for the October to December 2017 quarter
- status of the LBTCF projects
- consultation on proposed safety improvements
- Traffic Control Committee (TCC) report.

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the Auckland Transport update for March 2018.

b) approve option (1, 2 or 3) based on the rough order of costs for Rame Road:

i. Option 1 - upgrade the two bends, plus 81-99 Rame Road – rough order of cost $1.24m

ii. Option 2 - upgrade of two bends, plus the straight section in between the bends, leaving the end section numbering 81 to 99 Rame Road – rough order of cost $1.04m

iii. Option 3 - full upgrade of Rame Road – rough order of cost $1.54m.
2. The original intention was to consult on the plan in conjunction with Auckland Council’s Long-term Plan. However, the consultation has been moved to April to ensure it is informed by and aligned with Government’s soon to be released Policy Statement on Transport, and a refreshed Auckland Transport Alignment Programme.

Albany projects update

Dairy Flat Highway

3. The project team is still investigating options and AT will update the local board at its workshop in mid-March. Options will then be presented to the public and stakeholders for information. The local board will be hosting one of the planned public information days, the date for which is still to be confirmed.

Gills Road link

4. The local board has agreed with plans to systematically close off the Hooton Reserve parking area during construction. AT will tidy up the trees on the road frontage of the reserve to optimise the parking spaces.

5. The project team will update the local board and the parks department on confirmed timelines shortly. It is anticipated that AT will lodge applications for resource consent and outline plan of works with Auckland Council by June 2018.

6. AT aims to undertake wider public notification of this in late March/April 2018.

Medallion Drive link

7. A professional services contract was awarded to a consultant to develop detailed design for the project. The consultant will prepare the necessary applications for resource consent and outline plan of works, which should be lodged with Auckland Council by June 2018.

8. AT have met, and are in ongoing negotiations with, landowners and the Fairview Retirement Village. AT intends to undertake wider public notification in late March/April 2018.

Greenhithe footpaths and various issues

9. AT can advise that the cracks in Austin Road have been programmed for repair.

10. Regarding the pedestrian safety issues raised, AT will assess installing additional signage to highlight these issues to pedestrians in this area. A site meeting will be arranged.

11. Regarding the request for a convex mirror for visibility, AT no longer installs these mirrors. While useful in a limited type of location, they have been found to be generally ineffective and sometimes unsafe. The mirror can give a false sense of distance and speed of an oncoming vehicle. In the past, drivers have misinterpreted what they see in the convex mirror, putting themselves and other road users at risk. Convex mirrors are also commonly subject to vandalism and can be costly to install and maintain.

12. The board has been requested to install footpaths on Austin Road, Rahui Road, Remu Place, and Marae Road. AT supports walking and invests in footpaths to make Auckland a more desirable place to live. Encouraging more people to walk is a key part of AT’s transport strategy.

13. AT’s focus has been on constructing footpaths that improve safety near busy roads and that connect to key local facilities, such as schools, transport hubs, and town centres. There is also a desire to complete important missing links between footpaths. Given budget constraints, AT must prioritise its investment. The total cost of a project and the number of prospective users are key considerations on whether a project proceeds.

14. This request has been added to the new footpaths candidate list and will be reviewed if funding is identified for new footpath construction. The 2017/2018 programme has already been determined and there is no funding currently allocated for new footpaths in the financial year 2018/2019, beginning 1 July 2018. There is a proposition for funding priorities to be re-evaluated in May 2018, so this may change.
Quarterly report for October-December 2017

15. The following quarterly report material is attached to this monthly report:

- Attachment A – report from AT departments on their activities in the Upper Harbour Local Board area and regionally over the last quarter
- Attachment B – report on Travelwise Schools activities in the Upper Harbour Local Board area over the last quarter.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) update

16. Following the board’s resolution in December for rough orders of cost (ROCs) for Rame Road, below are the estimates for three further options:

- Option 1 – upgrade the two bends, plus 81-99 Rame Road (as per the board’s resolution of December 2017)
  - ROC is $1.24m
  - includes a 30 per cent contingency, which is standard at pre-design stage
  - allows for widening to 8m, new kerbing and footpath both sides, new stormwater, retaining walls and landscaping
  - does not allow for any services relocations or upgrades as these are unknown at this stage
  - does not allow for any stormwater treatment that may be a requirement of consenting.

- Option 2 – Upgrade of two bends, plus the straight section in between the bends and leaving the end section, 81-99 Rame Road
  - ROC is $1.04m
  - includes a 30 per cent contingency, which is standard at pre-design stage
  - allows for widening to 8m, new kerbing and footpath both sides, new stormwater, and landscaping
  - does not allow for any services relocations or upgrades as these are unknown at this stage
  - does not allow for any stormwater treatment that may be a requirement of consenting
  - kerbing of these two bends will provide improved refinement of the road edges around these difficult bends, which provide the highest risk sections of the road
  - option 2 allows for a continuous upgrade from Tauhinu Road to 81 Rame Road and would benefit a greater number of residents than option 1 above at a lower cost. This is because 81-99 Rame Road has the most difficult topography and therefore, is the costlier section to upgrade.

- Option 3 - full upgrade of Rame Road
  - ROC is $1.54m
  - includes a 30 per cent contingency, which is standard at pre-design stage
  - allows for widening to 8m, new kerbing and footpath both sides, new stormwater, retaining walls and landscaping
  - does not allow for any services relocations or upgrades as these are unknown at this stage
o does not allow for any stormwater treatment that may be a requirement of consenting.

17. AT requests that the Upper Harbour Local Board consider and approve their preferred option.

Status of projects

18. The following table provides an update of the board’s current projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gills Road footpath and pedestrian bridge</td>
<td>To construct a footpath along Gills Road, between the Living Stream intersection and the one-way bridge</td>
<td>Construction of the Gills Road footbridge is underway and scheduled to be completed by April 2018. The Gills Road footpath construction tender was advertised at the end of February. Project time frames are listed below. The construction contract award will be subject to the project securing the budget shortfall of $350,000. A budget change request has been submitted and is awaiting approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date for completion</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publish date</td>
<td>23 Feb 2018</td>
<td>In two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for tenders</td>
<td>10.00am 16 March 2018</td>
<td>Three weeks open tender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderer review</td>
<td>30 March 2018</td>
<td>Two-week tender review period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award of contract</td>
<td>6 April 2018</td>
<td>One week for paper work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish onsite</td>
<td>Mid to late April</td>
<td>Two weeks mobilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract period</td>
<td>Two + months</td>
<td>Two + months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project scheme extents have been revised

The new Gills Road link project, which will connect housing developments in the Gills Road area towards Albany Town Centre (Oteha Valley Road), is being developed and scheduled to start construction in October 2018. For the Gills Road link project to successfully tie in to the existing Gills Road network, vertical realignment is required approximately 170m down Gills Road towards the one-way bridge, and approximately 200m up Gills Road, towards Living Stream Road.

To protect AT’s reputation (and to avoid follow up work in just a couple of months), a mutually acceptable ‘extent of works’ for both projects has been defined and agreed. The initial footpath project extended 652m in length, between the one-way bridge and Living Stream Road. The footpath project scheme extents
Item 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'School's Stay-put' signs</th>
<th>The board approved $45,000 to consult with schools and install these signs in seven schools in the local board area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared path at 8 Chester Ave to 170 Albany Highway</td>
<td>The board approved $56,000 ROC to implement a new shared path at this location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The board approved $45,000 to consult with schools and install these signs in seven schools in the local board area.

AT is in the process of confirming the ‘School Stay-put’ sign locations and will update the local board once consultation has taken place and location has been decided.

This project is in the design phase and AT will update again when there is progress to report on.

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

Consultation documents on proposed improvements

19. Consultation documents for the following proposals have been provided to the Upper Harbour Local Board for feedback and are summarised here for information purposes only.

20. Following consultation, AT considers the feedback received and determines whether to proceed further with the proposal as consulted on, or proceed with an amended proposal if changes are considered necessary:

- Northcross Safer Community package of projects – Oteha Valley Road
- Scott Road, Hobsonville - road marking changes
- Meter traffic on the roundabout at Tawa Drive, Rosedale Road and Cowley Place in Albany
- Remove a section of broken yellow lines (no stopping at all times restrictions) on Teal Way in Hobsonville
- Install a section of broken yellow lines (no stopping at all times restrictions) at the cul-de-sac head on Namsan Close in Fairview Heights
- Install broken yellow lines in Medallion Drive, Oteha.

Auckland Transport's Traffic Control Committee (TCC) report

21. Decisions of the TCC during the month of November 2017 to January 2018 affecting the Upper Harbour Local Board area are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Street (suburb)</th>
<th>Report type</th>
<th>Nature of restriction</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov 17</td>
<td>Constellation Drive, Home Place, Apollo Drive, East Coast Road, Vega Place, Atlas Place, Ascension Place, Parkway Drive, Centoriant Drive, Whetu</td>
<td>Permanent traffic and parking changes combined</td>
<td>No right turn, lane arrow markings, transit lane, cycle lane, no stopping at all times (NSAAT), clearway, bus stop, bus</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>shelter, traffic island, traffic signal control, give-way, flush median</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>carried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov 17 Totara Road, McCaw Avenue, Lilley Terrace, Kopuru Road, Wicket Lane, Bomber Lane, Camp X Place, Dale Road, Maramara Road, Timbermill Road, Nils Anderson Road, Hangar Lane</td>
<td>Permanent traffic and parking changes combined</td>
<td>Lane arrow markings, cycle lane, NSAAT, bus stop, bus shelter, traffic island, delineators, give-way, road hump, pedestrian crossing, flush median</td>
<td>Carried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec 17 Roland Road, Greenhithe Road, Tauhinu Road, Siloh Way</td>
<td>Temporary traffic and parking changes (event)</td>
<td>Temporary traffic and parking restrictions</td>
<td>Carried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec 17 Oteha Valley Road, Fairview Avenue, Rising Parade, Fields Parade, Harrowglen Drive, Mayfair Drive, East Coast Road, Carlisle Road, Canyon Drive, Medallion Drive, State Highway 1</td>
<td>Permanent traffic and parking changes combined</td>
<td>NSAAT, bus stop, lane arrow markings, traffic island, footpath, traffic signal control, give-way, roundabout, flush median</td>
<td>Carried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec 17 Penihana Road, Waka Moana Drive, Glidepath Road, Hobsonville Point Road</td>
<td>Permanent traffic and parking changes combined</td>
<td>NSAAT, give-way</td>
<td>Carried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 18 Rose Garden Lane, Don McKinnon Drive</td>
<td>Permanent traffic and parking changes combined</td>
<td>NSAAT, mobility parking, p120, motorcycles only parking, loading zone only, no right turn, shared cycle path, give-way</td>
<td>Carried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 18 Buckley Avenue, Hobsonville Point Road</td>
<td>Permanent traffic and parking changes combined</td>
<td>NSAAT, give-way, speed table</td>
<td>Carried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional and sub-regional projects and activities

**Bus, train and ferry fares changing**

22. AT reviews fares annually to ensure they keep pace with operating costs and the portion of costs recovered from fares. As a result of the latest review, many bus, train and ferry fares have changed. These changes took effect from 11 February 2018.

23. The changes for bus and train fares included increases to 1-zone, 2-zone, 4-zone and 5-zone fares of between 5c and 15c. There was a decrease to 3-zone fares of 5c for adults and 8c for children.

24. There was also an increase of 7c to 10c for tertiary fares to ensure concession consistency across zones. The changes are listed in the following tables:
25. AT has a target to recover 50 per cent of the cost of public transport from fares. This is currently at 46.2 per cent, with the balance subsidised by ratepayers and taxpayers.

26. In the year to the end of December 2017, 91.1 million trips were taken on public transport in Auckland, an increase of 7.4 per cent on the previous year.

### Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

27. No specific issues with regard to impacts on Māori are triggered by this report. Any engagement with Māori will be carried out on an individual project basis.

### Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications


28. The following table outlines the current balance available to the board in its Local Board Transport Capital Fund. The option chosen for the upgrade of Rame Road will impact the local board’s remaining budget.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bus &amp; Train Fares</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Fares</strong></td>
<td>From 11 February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Zone AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>+5 cents to $1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zones AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>+15 cents to $3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zones AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>-5 cents to $4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zones AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>+10 cents to $6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 Zones AT HOP &amp; all cash fares</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Child Fares</strong></th>
<th>From 11 February 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Zone AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>$0.99 (no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zones AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>+14 cents to $1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zones AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>-8 cents to $2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zones AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>+10 cents to $3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Zones AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>+5 cents to $4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 Zones AT HOP &amp; all cash fares</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tertiary Fares</strong></th>
<th>From 11 February 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Zone AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>+7 cents to $1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zones AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>+10 cents to $2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zones AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>+10 cents to $3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zones AT HOP fare:</td>
<td>+10 cents to $4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 Zones AT HOP &amp; all cash fares</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monthly Pass**

| AT HOP Bus & Train All Zones Monthly Pass: | +$5 to $215. |

---
Upper Harbour Local Board Transport Capital Fund financial summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total funds available in current political term</td>
<td>$1,835,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount committed to date on projects approved for design and/or construction</td>
<td>297,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining budget</td>
<td>$1,537,858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

29. No significant risks have been identified.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
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Upper Harbour Local Board

This report provides a picture of Auckland Transport activities over the October - December 2017 Quarter.

The report is in two sections:
(a) Information on AT projects that are located within the Upper Harbour Local Board area;
(b) Information on Regional Projects.

The numbering used in the report has no meaning other than as a reference to facilitate subsequent discussion.

The report has been compiled by Auckland Transport’s Elected Member Relationship Unit from data supplied by the Operations Division, Capital Development Division and Strategy and Planning Department.
## Attachment A  
### Item 15

### Upper Harbour

#### Major Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1274</td>
<td>Dairy Flat Highway Upgrade</td>
<td>C.001169</td>
<td>Aug 15</td>
<td>Jun 21</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>In addition to the investigation work carried out in 2012 and 2015 AT developed long list and short list of options. An enhanced concept design is underway for the shortlisted options. Public consultation is planned to start end of February 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1275</td>
<td>Gills Road Link</td>
<td>C.001211</td>
<td>Nov 10</td>
<td>Jan 21</td>
<td>Detailed Design</td>
<td>The professional services contract for specimen design was awarded mid-November. The specimen design including consenting is expected to be completed by May 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1276</td>
<td>Medallion Drive Link</td>
<td>C.100181</td>
<td>Jul 11</td>
<td>Jan 21</td>
<td>Detailed Design</td>
<td>Development of detailed design is underway. Construction will commence in October 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1277</td>
<td>New Northern Busway Station &amp; Park Ride</td>
<td>C.100624</td>
<td>Jul 13</td>
<td>Jun 22</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>The Auckland Transport Board approved the delivery of Rosedale Busway Station as part of the extension of the Northern Busway. Aurecon undertake the design and NoR phase of the Rosedale Busway Station next year. Media Announcement by the Minister of Transport was on 8 December. Public consultation to start end of January 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Monday, 12 February 2018*
## Network Management and Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Improvements Programme</td>
<td>CARRROVER: Fernhill Way/medallion, Oteha speed humps, Installation of speed humps</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>Jan 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>On track for delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lonley Track Road speed Camming Treatment. Ten loss of control crashes: 65km/h 85th percentile. Recent resurfacing did not solve the speeding. To provide speed calming devices to reduce speed of traffic on this road.</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>Jan 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>On track for delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacity Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Improvements Programme</td>
<td>Alban Street/Hosseolate Rd capacity improvement.</td>
<td>Jul 18</td>
<td>Jul 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Investigation Phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cycling Safety and Promotional Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Education and Events</td>
<td>Supported training for community ride leaders</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrian Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Improvements programme</td>
<td>Gillies Road pedestrian improvements.</td>
<td>Sep 18</td>
<td>Jul 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Detail Design Phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Road Safety Campaigns, Education and Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Road Safety Programme</th>
<th>Road Safety Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community and safety</td>
<td>Community and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday, 12 February 2018</td>
<td>Monday, 12 February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>Finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered a motorcycle promotion at a motorcycle club-led event.</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered a motorcycle safety campaign on bus backs.</td>
<td>Mar 17</td>
<td>Jan 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver a young driver safety presentation to high-risk young drivers and their parents in Albany. Deliver a learner licence programme to at-risk young drivers in Albany. Deliver a regional red light running campaign.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Traffic calming

| Programme                | Item                                                                 | ID     | Start | Finish | Status          | Notes                                                                 |
|--------------------------|                                                                     |        |       |        |                 |                                                                       |
| Minor Improvements       | Fernhill Way / Otahuhu Rd CARRYSVPR installation of speed humps.   | 34076  | Oct 17| Mar 18 | Procurement     | On track for delivery                                                  |
| Improvements Programme   |                                                                      |        |       |        |                 |                                                                       |
| Minor Improvements       | Lonely Track Road Speed Calming Treatment - 10 loss of control     | 34077  | Jan 18| Mar 18 | In Detail Phase | Construction completed, minor                                           |
| Programme                | crashes, 65km/h 85 tile speed (recent reseal did not solve the    |        |       |        | Design Phase    | line marking changes proposed.                                         |
|                          | speeding). To provide speed calming devices to reduce speed of     |        |       |        |                 |                                                                       |
|                          | traffic on this road.                                              |        |       |        |                 |                                                                       |
| Minor Improvements       | Fernhill Way Otahuhu Local Area Traffic Management (LATM)          | 34079  | Jul 18| Jun 19 | Procurement     | Completed via reactive works brief                                    |
| Programme                | introduction of speed humps along the road to reduce current       |        |       |        |                 |                                                                       |
|                          | speeds.                                                             |        |       |        |                 |                                                                       |
| Minor Improvements       | Lonely Track Rd speed calming treatment.                           | 34330  | Jul 18| Jun 19 |                 | Construction completed, minor                                          |
| Programme                |                                                                      |        |       |        |                 | line marking changes proposed.                                         |

## Parking Services

| Programme                | Item                                                                 | ID     | Start | Finish | Status          | Notes                                                                 |
|--------------------------|                                                                     |        |       |        |                 |                                                                       |
| Albany Paid Parking Zone | AT has made a decision that to introduce a paid parking zone for   | 34294  | Dec 16| Nov 18 | Implementation  | To address wider issues AT is investigating options for a local       |
|                          | Albany in late 2018 after the New Network for bus services takes    | C-001812|      |        |                 | shutdown service to improve local connections within Albany. They are  |
|                          | effect and brings better bus connections to the Northern Busway at  |        |      |        |                 | seeking funding to increase the capacity of the park and ride and      |
|                          | Albany. Public feedback report was released in Dec 2018 and public   |        |      |        |                 | considering opportunities to maximise on-street parking.               |
|                          | notified about AT's decision through print and digital mediums.     |        |      |        |                 |                                                                       |
### Public Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferry Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34123</td>
<td>Works/activities completed in the last quarter: commencement of the review and development of a new Ferry Futures Strategy for incorporation into the Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP); progression of design for shelter options for pier 3 area at Downtown Ferry Terminal; assessment of service improvement options to increase capacity on the Holonville service; establishment of a project group to investigate the partial redevelopment of the Downtown Ferry Terminal to support America’s Cup 36 Downtown works. Work activities planned for completion in the next quarter include: continuation of the review and development of a new Ferry Futures Strategy for incorporation into the Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP); contract award for the installation of shelter for customers in the pier 3 area at Downtown Ferry Terminal; continued assessment of service improvement options to increase capacity on the Holonville service; continued investigation of the partial redevelopment of the Downtown Ferry Terminal to support America’s Cup 36 Downtown works.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul 15</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RCD North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavement Rehabilitation Programme 2017/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brookdale Road - Target Length (m) 181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constellation Drive (eastbound) - Target Length (m) 401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension: Rosedale Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norther Dunvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new Duway Station at Rosedale was announced by the Mayor in Monday, 12 February 2018.
### Item 15

#### December

- Work is underway with NZTA on design and consenting matters, to co-ordinate its deliver with the Northern Corridor Improvements project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North West Rapid Transit Corridor
Indicative Business Case - Proposed North-western Busway

An Indicative Business Case (IBC) has been completed which assesses options to support the development of the North West strategic public transport network. The IBC recommends the staged delivery of a busway alongside SH16 between Brigham Creek Interchange and the City Centre, with bus shoulder lanes alongside SH18 from Greenhithe Bridge to Westgate, supported by more ferry services from Hobsonville/West Harbour and feeder bus services. However, central government policy direction is expected to indicate that light rail transit should be investigated further during the upcoming Detailed Business Case phase. Public engagement on the emerging alignment has been delayed and is expected to be complete and reported in the New Year.

Supporting Growth: Transport Networks for Growth

Early work has commenced on the Detailed Business Cases for the arterials identified for further investigation and potential funding through the Housing Infrastructure Fund. The arterials identified in the initial application to Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) included arterials in Redhill and Whenuapai. This project includes working with Watercare to provide key A map of these arterials can be found http://ourauckland.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/media/13501/housing-infrastructure-fund_north-west_map.pdf

Streetlighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34272</td>
<td>LED Retrofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Local roads completion end June 2018, Main roads begin Oct/Nov 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional

#### Assets and Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double decker network mitigation works</td>
<td>Mitigation works on identified risks for double decker buses such as building verandas, street furniture &amp; signage, low hanging power/phone lines, service poles, overhanging trees, low bridge structures to allow the passage of double decker buses.</td>
<td>C.100553</td>
<td>Jul 14</td>
<td>Jun 24</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Manukau Road route - progressing well. Remuera Road - finalising Project brief which will be sent to consultants for quoting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Infrastructure Improvement Programme</td>
<td>Bus Infrastructure Improvements Programme to deliver Bus related infrastructure improvements. Programme transferred from COO Sept 14. Orig COO Project C.001014 PT Bus Stop Improvements.</td>
<td>C.100744</td>
<td>Mar 16</td>
<td>Mar 18</td>
<td>Detailed Design</td>
<td>Central Advanced design still underway - additional sites have been awarded. Physical works for east sites completed. Central and north sites to be accelerated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Lane Improvement</td>
<td>Delivery of a network of bus and transit lanes throughout the Auckland Region.</td>
<td>C.100565</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>Jun 18</td>
<td>Detailed Design</td>
<td>Inner Link, Parnell Rd bus lane - going out for external consultation in February. Fart Road bus lane - Design underway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT Safety Security &amp; Amenity</td>
<td>Enhancing station safety, security and amenity. Current projects include electronic ticket gating at Henderson, Manurewa, Middlemore, Papatoetoe and Papakura in addition to the trail and installation of gap filler at Fruitvale Road, Baldwin Ave and Sunnyvale stations.</td>
<td>C.100206</td>
<td>Jul 13</td>
<td>Jun 19</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Manurewa ticket gates went operational in January 2018, with Papatoetoe and Middlemore to follow. Enabling works underway at Papatoetoe and design work on Papakura, Grafton, Ranui and Papamoa gating in progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Network Management and Safety

#### Cycle-Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Cycling Transport Planning</td>
<td>StreetTrading licence granted to ONZO Cycle-Share scheme on a trial basis until the end of February 2018. The licence will then be reviewed, ONZO is providing data of usage to allow evaluation of the scheme.</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>Feb 18</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cycling Safety and Promotional Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Education and Events</td>
<td>Delivered the Bike Safe Cycle Skills Education Programme in schools across Auckland</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Travel Choice Travel Planning Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Travel NZ Programme</td>
<td>More than 1,100 Aucklanders actively using the Smart Travel NZ app and website since it’s launch in May 2017. The app is a tool that users can utilise to find carpool matches with like-minded commuters travelling to and from their place of work and free to download from the Apple and Google Play stores. An ‘always-on’ campaign is being launched early October 2017 to end of June 2018 to promote carpooling to Aucklanders on social media, Google Display ads, YouTube videos, AdShelf advertising in transit lane bus shelters and lightbox posters in Auckland car park buildings.</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>On-going promotion to businesses and as part of the October 2017 to June 2018 campaign.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Travel NZ Programme</td>
<td>Priority carpool car parks implemented in Downtown and Victoria Street Car Parks in September 2017. These car parks are being promoted to businesses and commuters carpooling to the CBD via social media, posters and business events and expos. Spaces are available to be leased to three or more people sharing a ride at a 30% discount off the existing reserved unallocated parking rate, these priority car parks are located in prime spots close to exits and lifts and leased on a ‘first come, first served’ basis.</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>On-going promotion to businesses and as part of the October 2017 to June 2018 campaign.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Parking Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34253</td>
<td>Pay by Plate parking</td>
<td>R.005163.01</td>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>Mar 18</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Public response to change from Pay and Display to Pay by Plate has been positive and the roll out has been smooth so far. Work is expected to be completed by late March 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Transport

#### Bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34:00</td>
<td>Bus - Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:01</td>
<td>Bus - Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:10</td>
<td>Bus - Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Network Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34:01</td>
<td>New Network</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep 17</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34:12</td>
<td>Rail Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>Rail Improvements</td>
<td>34/33</td>
<td>In the last Quarter (October - December), we ran over 86,000 Train Services. Punctuality for the Quarter was 96.6%, and Reliability 98.3%</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Monday, 12 February 2018
34154 Rail Improvements  The Right Time departure KPI, introduced in July 2017 is currently tracking above the agreed threshold. The introduction of this KPI has also had a demonstrable benefit across the Network. (Right Time is defined as the number of services that depart between 0-59 seconds of the scheduled departure time).  Dec 17 Complete

34155 Rail Improvements  Customer Satisfaction decreased by 0.3% to 91.8% in the latest Customer Satisfaction survey. The slight decrease ends the previous seven quarterly increases that had been recorded by the Train Services team.  Dec 17 Complete

34156 Rail Improvements  31 SA/SD carriages sold to NZ based company (Completion due 30 November).  On-going

34157 Rail Improvements  Following an increase in Vandalism on our Train Fleet, we have engaged an external consultancy to review the security arrangements at our platform facilities.  On-going

34158 Rail Improvements  Approval received for the purchase of 15 new DMUs  On-going

34159 Rail Improvements  Our proposed Train Timetable, for introduction in July 2018, has been submitted to KiwiRail for modelling and further analysis. The submission includes: Improved journey times across the Southern, Eastern & Western Lines. An increase to 3 Trains per Hour, from 0700-1900, across the Southern, Eastern & Western Lines at Weekends, and Public Holidays. Pukekohe Shuttle services would continue to operate 3 Trains per Hour during the Morning and Afternoon peaks, with an increase to 2 Trains per Hour during inter-peak periods and at Weekends. Later night services on Friday evening’s.  On-going
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Item 34.20 | Rail Improvements | For the 2017 Christmas and New Year timetable we have increased the number of services on offer, following last year’s success. Also, on the Southern, Eastern and Onehunga Lines, where there are limited Block of Lines, we are running later services on New Year’s Eve. From Wednesday 27th December, Block of Lines will be in place across a large part of the Auckland Metro Network, with a reduced or altered service pattern operating across a number of lines. In addition to longer routine maintenance window’s, KiwiRail have a full programme of woks that includes replacing Rails and installing new Sleepers at various locations across the Southern and Western Lines. This year’s Block of Line will also be used to advance a number of key projects: Sarwa Street Level Crossing closure, Paerau Tumut replacement, Pukekohe Station upgrade, Automatic Pedestrian Level Crossing Gates (Glenview Road & Meteal Road). Penrose Platform 3 Extension. NZTA Takapuna Motorway widening project. Eastern Line: No Line Closures, and operates to the Holiday Timetable throughout. The last Eastern Line service will depart Britomart at 0214 on New Year’s morning. Western Line: Closed from 27th December to 7th January. Southern Line: Operates from Manukau – Newmarket – Manukau, from 27th December to 7th January. Onehunga Line: Operates Onehunga – Newmarket – Onehunga, from 27th December to 5th January. Closed on 6th & 7th January. |
| Item 34.21 | Rail Improvements | CRL enabling works are continuing at Britomart. Work has commenced on the installation of temporary Train Crew accommodation at the end of Platform 5. |
| Item 34.25 | Rail Improvements | Train Station Public Information Displays (PID) have been successfully updated across the network, and will shortly be introduced to the EMU fleet. |
| Item 34.26 | Rail Improvements | Wi-Fi has been installed at all AT Metro Train Stabling Yards, Wiri Depot and Manukau Station. This will enhance our ability to analyse Train performance data from the onboard systems, and will lead to further performance and reliability improvements. Dec 17 Complete |
| Item 34.27 | Rail Improvements | Additional Station Platform Shelters being introduced at a number of Stations across the Network. On-going |
| Item 34.28 | Rail Improvements | Further analysis is underway to determine the proposed Train Timetable for the introduction of CRL, this work would also include future Train fleet, Stabling and Maintenance requirements. On-going |

Monday, 12 February 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Bus</td>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td><strong>3492</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rail Improvements</strong></td>
<td>A Network wide review of Trespass hot spots is underway, with a key objective of reducing the risk to members of the Public.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail/Bus/Ferry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3493</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Transport Operating Model (PTOM)</strong></td>
<td>Bus: Eastern PTOM agreements signed and the services were implemented on 16 December 2017. Central PTOM agreements are currently in process of signing. NZ Bus have signed contract for 5 units; Pavlovich has signed their agreement for their one central unit. North Shore negotiations concluded for negotiated PTOM contracts and tenders announced. Contract execution progressing. - Transit has signed their one Northern Unit. NZ Bus have signed their agreements for 3 units. - Bayes and Go Bus have signed their agreements. - Ritchies have signed agreements for their 6 units. - Birkenhead have signed agreement for one unit, with one still to be signed. Ferry: Due diligence discussions continued through December with the proposed preferred tenderers, and will continue in early 2018. Written authorisation was received from NZTA to extend current contracts through to 31 July 2019 to coincide with planned new ferry PTOM contract commencement. This will be progressed to completion during January. An interim contract was entered by A1 with Fullers for the Stanley Bay ferry from 2018 service commencement on 15 January 2018, following hand-back of the exempt service by Fullers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail/Pedestrian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3494</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rail Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Pedestrian level crossings – A 3-year programme to install automatic pedestrian gates at every crossing in the Auckland Metro has started with work on the Western Line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail/Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3495</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rail Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Road level crossings &amp; Rail Overbridges - Working with A1 Roading to implement improvements to signage, medians, road markings, etc to improve safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monday, 12 February 2018
On-going
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.308</td>
<td>Supporting Growth: Transport Networks for Growth</td>
<td>AT and NZTA commenced negotiations in November 2017 with the preferred proponents to deliver Supporting Growth Planning Alliance that will undertake business case and route protection for the Future Urban Zones transport network. The preferred proponents are AECOM and Beca for planning and engineering services and Bell Gully and Buddle Findlay for legal services. The Alliance will be tasked with securing route protection for the network by 2022. Information on the supporting growth programme can be found at <a href="https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/supporting-growth-delivering-transport-networks">https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/supporting-growth-delivering-transport-networks</a>.</td>
<td>Nov 15</td>
<td>Dec 22</td>
<td>DBC/In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.309</td>
<td>North Shore Rapid Transit Network Study</td>
<td>This work is being undertaken to provide an updated view on public transport requirements for achieving strategic growth and the most appropriate transport options to meet the needs of the North Shore. The Programme Business Case (PBC) was finalised in December but has yet to be approved. This PBC investigates appropriate transport options and outlines strategic staging relating to anticipated growth. The business case will seek funding for future work into the next steps for the strategic public transport network development, which in the first instance will include enhancements to the Northern Busway.</td>
<td>Dec 15</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>Study/In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Upper Harbour Local Board Report – AT School Community Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Travelwise status</th>
<th>Total WSB routes</th>
<th>WSB event/ route audit</th>
<th>Active mode promotion events (e.g. cycle follow up, WOW event, park and ride, walking promotion)</th>
<th>Speed event</th>
<th>Young drivers event (e.g. driver licensing training)</th>
<th>Safety at the school gate</th>
<th>Other safety promotion event (e.g. Kea crossing, crossing training, roads and road sides, ball talks)</th>
<th>PT promotion event (e.g. railsafe week)</th>
<th>Meetings/workshops</th>
<th>Engineering info (where relevant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany School</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhithe School</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobsonville Point Primary School</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobsonville School</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin School</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oteha Valley School</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineshill School</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitoto College</td>
<td>Non-Travelwise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKKM o te Rangi FeaWhenua</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour Primary School</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Christian School</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenuapai School</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 Introduction

This report provides the Upper Harbour Local Board with highlights of ATEED’s activities in the Upper Harbour Local Board area for the six months 1 July to 31 December 2017.

This report should be read in conjunction with ATEED’s Quarter 1 report to Auckland Council (available at www.aucklandnz.com). Additional information will be also available in the forthcoming Quarter 2 report to the Auckland Council CCO Finance and Performance Committee (available 12 March). Although these reports focus primarily on the breadth of ATEED’s work at a regional level, much of the work highlighted has significant local impact.

ATEED’s Strategic Framework

ATEED’s Strategic Framework (Figure 1 below), clearly articulates ATEED’s role in enabling Auckland to be a world-class city where talent wants to live, by focusing on five key priorities:

1. Grow the visitor economy
2. Build a culture of innovation and entrepreneurship
3. Attract business and investment
4. Grow and attract skilled talent
5. Build Auckland’s global identity.

Through these objectives, we can connect Auckland-wide strategies (the Auckland Plan and Economic Development Strategy) and ATEED’s ongoing strategic interventions, growth programmes and projects. The framework below provides the organisation with focus on those areas of our role that will make a difference to Auckland both regionally and locally. The strategic objectives are supported by more detailed action plans, investment proposals and delivery partnerships.

![ATEED's Strategic Framework](image)

Figure 1 – ATEED’s Strategic Framework

---

1 As per ATEED’s Statement of Intent 2017-20
ATEED works with local boards, Council and CCOs to support decision-making on local economic growth and facilitates or co-ordinates the delivery of local economic development activity. ATEED ensures that the regional activities that ATEED leads or delivers are fully leveraged to support local economic growth and employment. This includes ATEED’s support for sub-regional tourism promotion activity and sponsorship, facilitation or delivery of a range of events that, although regional in their reach, have local level impacts.

In addition, ATEED’s dedicated Local Economic Development (LED) team works with local boards that have allocated Local Development Initiative (LDI) budget to economic development activities. The LED team delivers a range of services\(^2\) such as the development of proposals, including feasibility studies that enable local boards to directly fund or otherwise advocate for the implementation of local initiatives.

ATEED delivers its services at the local level through business hubs based in the north, west and south of the region, as well as its central office at 139 Quay Street.

ATEED’s hub in north Auckland is located at 81 Constellation Drive, Rosedale, Auckland.

Additional information about ATEED’s role and activities can be found at [www.aucklandnz.com/ateed](http://www.aucklandnz.com/ateed)

---

\(^2\) This activity is subject to local boards prioritising local economic development, and subsequently allocating funding to local economic development through annual local board agreements.
2.0 Upper Harbour Local Board priority economic growth initiatives

ATEED’s Local Economic Development team is responsible for managing the delivery of the Local Board’s locally-driven initiatives (LDI) budget allocation. This includes the following projects:

1. Lion Foundation Young Enterprise Scheme (YES) - funding contribution
Kick Start days (formerly known as E-days) are being delivered by ATEED with support from the Auckland Chamber of Commerce. ATEED’s role includes management of the funds provided by Local Boards for the 2018 Kick Start days. As in previous years, there will be five sub-regional events delivered across the region. The new Auckland Chamber of Commerce team will be inviting Local Board members to participate either as student mentors or as observers on the day. More detail about the YES programme is listed under section 5.1 of this report.

2. Support for international education providers
The Upper Harbour Local Board has pledged support for the sector in its LED action plan (3.2) Support for international education providers in Upper Harbour, including primary, secondary and tertiary. This project will assist international education providers to promote their campus and the area’s sports facilities to targeted overseas markets through marketing material, and develop channels to get the message in market. ATEED’s Study Auckland team has been in contact with the international education providers. Subsequent discussions have been had with Massey University and Business North Harbour. Further work will be carried out during the next reporting period, with a view to developing a detailed proposal for the Local Board to consider.

Progress on the delivery of these projects is reported via the quarterly local board work programme report, generated by Local Board Services.

2.1 ATEED engagement with Upper Harbour Local Board

During the period, ATEED provided a range of advice and information to local boards covering local economic development and tourism initiatives to support their preparations and planning for the Long Term Plan. Councillors have been working through the Long Term Plan, particularly gaining agreement on key items that will be included in the public consultation. ATEED introduced the Destination Strategy to Councillors at an Environment and Community Committee workshop during the end of Q2, and to local board chairs at the Local Board Chair Forum. Individual councillors have met ATEED’s GM Destination, and GM Business Attraction and Investment for various ward-based interests.

The primary point of contact for the Upper Harbour Local Board is Michael Goudie, Senior Advisor External Relations. Michael works from the Local Board office once a month, and can be contacted at any time on Michael.Goudie@aucklandnz.com.
3.0 Build a culture of innovation and entrepreneurship

3.1 Supporting business growth by facilitating connections to experts, resources and co-funding

ATEED’s business support teams are based in each of the local business hubs to support the growth of Auckland’s key internationally-competitive sectors and the city’s infrastructure, by assisting local small to medium companies to grow and innovate. A key programme in achieving this is the Regional Business Partnership Network (RBPN) delivered by ATEED’s Business and Innovation Advisors, whose role is to connect local businesses to experts and mentors in innovation, R&D and business growth and management. The RBPN allows ATEED to facilitate government funding to qualifying businesses, in the form of Callaghan Innovation R&D grants and RPB business capability vouchers on behalf of NZTE. Every year, these advisors meet approximately 1100 local Auckland companies to understand the opportunities and challenges faced by each company, and connect them to opportunities and support from the business support ecosystem, in conjunction with ATEED and Auckland Council initiatives.

3.2 Business capability building

ATEED focuses on supporting the development of the capability of small businesses by improving business management skills. This is done by carrying out a discovery meeting, assessing the areas of need, and referring the business owner to experts to build their knowledge of business growth. If applicable, the business may be issued a RBPN training/capability development voucher of up to $5,000 per annum to co-fund eligible business training via registered service providers. Priority is given to businesses accessing this expert advice for the first time.

There were 22 vouchers issued to businesses in the Upper Harbour Local Board area to assist with business capability training.

3.3 Innovation and research and development (R&D) advice and assistance to access co-funding

Seven businesses met to discuss their innovation and/or R&D plans with one of the ATEED team and were connected to experts, programmes and/or assisted to apply for Callaghan Innovation project or student grants.
Two companies received Callaghan Innovation grants, and nine companies were referred to Callaghan Innovation services during the reporting period.

3.4 Connecting businesses

During this period, ATEED’s Business and innovation Advisors connected businesses to the following opportunities or organisations to assist their growth and development:

- Business Mentors New Zealand - 15
- Service providers - 93
- ATEED staff or initiatives - 31
- Callaghan Innovation services - 9
- NZTE - 7
- Other - 74

3.5 Other support for new businesses

During this period, seven new business owners from the Upper Harbour Local Board area attended a *Starting off Right* workshop. These workshops are part of ATEED’s programme of business support, and offers free expert advice on how to establish a new business.

Business clinics offering advice on business challenges and/or ideas are available for those who don’t initially wish to register for RBPN services. Eight businesses from the Upper Harbour Local Board area attended a business clinic.

*Running Your Business Workshop Series* is an ATEED and NZTE initiative. The programme is designed to support building capability development in SME’s by providing a pathway to transition from running their business to the growth phase. Tools and methods taught through this programme support business owners to run their business sustainably by identifying the key challenges faced, and providing support in the form of capability development workshops. During the period, three businesses from the Upper Harbour Local Board area attended a workshop.
3.6 Business and networking events

ATEED supports and runs a number of business and networking events to support and grow businesses. During the period 1 July to 31 December 2017, approximately 1260 attendees from across the Auckland region attended networking events.

3.7 Business awards

Following a full review of the Local Economic Growth, and Business and Enterprise ‘teams’ engagement in the Westpac Auckland Business Awards programme, ATEED has formally agreed a revised agreement for the 2018 programme with the Auckland Chamber of Commerce. ATEED will continue to partner with the Chamber to deliver the programme, however under the new arrangements, the chamber will deliver the awards using its own resource (not ATEED resources), including all workshops, business coaching, marketing material and all associated administrative support. ATEED will nominate companies that are considered to be suitable for the programme. ATEED will continue to be recognised as a delivery partner, maintain an equal branding presence, nominate a guest speaker at the event dinners, and will continue to receive an allocation of two tables at the regional gala dinners and four tables at the ‘Best of the Best’ dinner each year.

A full schedule of upcoming events can be found on [www.aucklandnz.com/business](http://www.aucklandnz.com/business) (search keyword: business events).

4.0 Attract business and investment

4.1 Filming activity within the Upper Harbour Local Board area

ATEED’s Screen Auckland team provides film facilitation services as part of ATEED’s support for the screen and digital sector of Auckland’s economy. Screen Auckland facilitates, processes and issues film permits for filming activity in public open space. The team follows robust operational processes, managing filming requests and facilitating liaison with key stakeholders and local boards.

Between 1 July and 31 December 2017, a total of seven film permits\(^2\) were issued in the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

At a regional level during the same period, 319 film permits were issued in the Auckland region.

\(^2\) A film permit may be issued for filming at multiple locations.

[www.aucklandnz.com/ateed](http://www.aucklandnz.com/ateed)
5.0 Grow and attract skilled talent

5.1 Growing youth entrepreneurship

Lion Foundation Young Enterprise Scheme (YES)

There are four schools in the Upper Harbour Local Board area currently participating in the YES programme.

The schools include: Albany Senior High School, Pinehurst School, Hobsonville Point Secondary School, and Rangitoto College.

Non-participating schools are: Albany School (Home School), Kristin School, City Impact Church School (Secondary), TKKM o Te Raki Pāwhenua, and Vanguard Military School.

ATEED has delivered the Lion Foundation Young Enterprise Scheme (YES) across Auckland on behalf of the Young Enterprise Trust. The scheme encourages year 12 and 13 students to embrace innovation and business by forming a legal company to produce and sell real-life goods and services.

A total of 1299 students from 55 schools completed the 2017 YES programme. Ten teams went to the National Awards in Wellington on 6 December, where six Auckland YES companies competed for the top three national places. Two Auckland teams placed and won awards, Otelei from Henderson High School winning first place, followed by Clearfree from Rangitoto College in second place. The other four teams who did not compete for the National title received National Excellence awards, continuing Auckland’s great record in the national awards.

On 1 January 2018, the Auckland Chamber of Commerce became the new delivery partner for the 2018 YES programme. ATEED will maintain a strategic sponsorship role for three years.

5.2 Youth Employment

Youth Employer Pledge

Through the Youth Employer Pledge, leading Auckland employers formally commit to increasing youth employment and developing their future workforce.

By 30 October, 69 Auckland employers formally committed to the Youth Employer Pledge. The Statement of Intent target requires ATEED to maintain a pool of 50 signatories. These commitments represent approximately 265 youth employment and employability opportunities across key Auckland industries.

*Note: this data is only available at a regional level*
including hospitality, construction / infrastructure, digital / ICT, and services industries.

## BuildAKL campaign

In the six months to 31 December, 265 youth had been helped into employment by ATEED-supported programmes, including 140 youth recruited by the 70 employers who participated in JobFest (West) held in October 2017.

#BuildAKL campaign results showed that an estimated 1500 young Aucklanders gained employment, and 3000 into direct study/training pathways as a result of campaign exposure. These results were well-received by campaign partners during a presentation to them on 6 December.

### JobFest – 11 October 2017

JobFest ([www.jobfest.co.nz](http://www.jobfest.co.nz)) brings together young Auckland job seekers aged 18-24 years and potential employers and job opportunities.

The event is developed and managed by the ATEED Skills team, and delivered by ATEED’s Major Events team in partnership with Auckland Council Youth Connections, the Ministry of Social Development ( MSD), Careers New Zealand, The Tindall Foundation, and Auckland employers.

On 11 October, approximately 845 young people from across Auckland attended JobFest at The Trusts Arena in West Auckland. Although the number of attendees is lower than previous JobFest events, this JobFest had a specific focus on NEET (not in employment, education or training) youth and attracting youth attendees. About 69 per cent of attendees were aged 16-24, and 65 per cent of these were NEET. This is the highest percentage of NEET youth to have ever attended JobFest (about twice as many as the May event).

The top three ethnicity selections of attendees were:

1. New Zealand European
2. Māori and Pacific Peoples communities
3. Indian.
About 70 employers exhibited at the October JobFest event. Employers were divided into zones of construction (#Build AKL), west and local job zone, hospitality zone, health sector zone, recruitment agencies, ICT job zone, MSD zone, and miscellaneous zone.

Based on feedback received from employers to date, the following outcomes can be estimated:

- About 4550 CVs were received in total. This is an average of 65 CVs received per JobFest employer.
- Approximately 1,260 CVs were short-listed for jobs and followed up by employers. This is an average of 18 short-listed candidates per employer.
- There were 420 in-person interviews in total either on the day or in person following JobFest. This is an average of six in-person interviews per employer.
- A total of 280 job offers were made following the event. This is an average of three job offers per employer.
- Approximately 140 people were employed directly as a result of this event. This is an average of two employed people per employer.

Of the 845 JobFest attendees, approximately 198 were in receipt of a Work and Income benefit prior to the event. About 30 of these are no longer receiving a benefit six weeks after JobFest.

---

* Please note that many of the attendees who handed in CVs were short-listed and interviewed with more than one employer from the event, hence the numbers appear higher than the number of attendees on the day.

* It is yet to be determined if this result is directly due to JobFest, or whether these young people are reflected in the statistics provided by the employers above.
6.0 Grow the Visitor Economy

Visitor spend $8b – up 6.5 per cent compared to the previous year
Satisfaction with ATEED delivered events - 89 per cent for the 2016/17 year
Business event bid win/loss ratio (based on results received in financial year) – 53 per cent (target is 60 per cent)
83,809 international students in Auckland annually, worth $2.2b to economy – 63 per cent of New Zealand's market share

6.1 Delivering on the Auckland Visitor Plan

The Auckland Visitor Plan 2021 is one of ATEED’s key strategic pillars. The visitor economy continues to grow as the Auckland Visitor Plan, launched by ATEED in 2011, and other related strategies, continue to deliver great results. ATEED’s Tourism, Major Events, Auckland Convention Bureau, and Study Auckland teams all contribute to Auckland’s visitor economy through the work that the teams deliver.

In the year to October 2017, total tourism spend in Auckland was $8b, up 6.5 per cent on the previous year. International spend was $4.3b, up 8.1 per cent for the year. Domestic spend was $3.7b, and had increased by 4.7 per cent. The year to October 2017 saw 2.64m international visitor arrivals, an increase of 8.6 per cent compared to the previous year. There were 196,064 international visitors in October, up 4.3 per cent compared to October 2016. Holiday visitor arrivals contributed the most to the annual growth, numbers were up 9.5 per cent on the previous 12 months. The latest visitor statistics are due at the end of February.

The 2017 Spring campaign, ‘Love Your Weekend’ featuring proud Auckland, Sir John Kirwan was in market from 1 September until 31 November 2017. The campaign targeted local Aucklanders with the objective of growing awareness, local knowledge, pride and the propensity to recommend Auckland as a holiday destination to visiting friends and relatives (VFR). VFR makes up a large portion of visitation to Auckland, with 30 per cent of domestic visitors and over 43 per cent Australian visitors here for the purpose of visiting friends and family. As hosts, this makes Aucklanders huge influencers on what their guests choose to do and how much they spend while here, in turn shaping the impression these visiting friends and family leave with and the Auckland story they have to tell.

The campaign used the following media channels; TVC, online videos (OnDemand, pre-roll, social), online banners and adshels. There were six regional videos (shown in the table below) featuring Sir John Kirwan, each one showcasing the region and highlighting some of the locations and attractions in the region as well as one TVC which ran on TV1.

---

5 Source: ITM data, Statistics NZ
6 Source: VP Programme
7 Source: Statistics NZ

Aucklandnz.com/ateed
Table 1 – Regional locations highlighted in the Spring campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Auckland</td>
<td>Goat Island - Clearyaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tawharanui Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leigh Sawmill Brewery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devonport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Auckland</td>
<td>Ambury Regional Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otara Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rainbows End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butterfly Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauraki Gulf &amp; Islands</td>
<td>Kauri Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotoroa Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Barrier Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Auckland</td>
<td>Horse Riding - Woodhill Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muriwai Beach/Clifftops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunting Lodge Winery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Auckland</td>
<td>Omana Regional Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clevedon Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howick Historical Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McNicoll Historic Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Auckland</td>
<td>Pah Homestead (Hillsborough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Bay (Herne Bay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt Eden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Tree Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campaign evaluation research results\(^{10}\) show that perceptions of the Auckland region amongst the target audience are favourable overall, and that local residents see Auckland as being a place that offers lots to see and do, and it is a region that they are proud of. The campaign motivated 27 per cent of the audience to get out to the regions, which is considered to be a very positive result.

When promoting the Auckland region, the key motivation factors for audiences include the food and beverage scene, beaches, scenery and range of experiences and attractions available.

ATEED also administers Auckland’s official visitor information website. The website contains pages focused on destinations in the Upper Harbour Local Board area, and provides visitors with information about where to go, what to do, and where to stay.

### 6.2 Delivering on Auckland’s Major Events Strategy

ATEED is responsible for the attraction and delivery of major events that align with Auckland’s Major Events Strategy (MES). The MES identifies four key outcomes which are sought from major events - the ability to expand Auckland’s economy, increase visitor nights, enhance Auckland’s liveability, and increase Auckland’s international profile. ATEED’s role in major events differs for each event, however can include attraction, delivery, facilitation and business leverage activities.

**Delivered, sponsored and facilitated events**

ATEED delivered the Auckland Diwali Festival during Q2. Total unique attendance across the whole weekend of Diwali was 54,700 and a gross attendance of 68,100 (some people attended both event...
days), which was higher than estimates from previous years. A new and more advanced counting methodology was used, and aligns with the methodology applied to other ATEED delivered events (Tāmaki Herenga Waka Festival, Auckland Lantern Festival and Pasifika Festival). Prior to this, counts were based on photos taken at regular intervals.

Residents in the Upper Harbour Local Board area were also able to enjoy events sponsored by ATEED, including the New Zealand International Film Festival, Matilda the Musical, Rugby League World Cup, the ASB Auckland Marathon, ITM Auckland SuperSprint, and the Farmers Santa Parade to name a few.

A full schedule of major events is available on ATEED’s website, aucklandnz.com

### 6.3 Delivering on Auckland’s Business Events Plan

*Auckland’s Business Events Plan* sets a target of growing the business events sector’s contribution to the Auckland economy from $238m in 2013 to $430m in 2023, and increasing the total number of delegate days to Auckland from 1.98m to 2.55m over the same 10-year period. The *Business Events Plan* works in tandem with the *Auckland Visitor Plan* and *Major Events Strategy* to develop our city as a global events destination.

There were 23 international business event bids submitted or supported as at 31 December (target being 30). Some key highlights include:

- Convention of the International Confederation of Principals 2021 – 1000 delegates, 4000 visitor nights and estimated spend of $1.4m.
- International Society for Microbial Ecology Symposium 2022 – 1600 delegates, 12,000 visitor nights and estimated tourism spend of $4.2m.
- AAID Global Conference 2018 – 400 delegates, 1550 visitor nights and estimated tourism spend of $554,590.
- The value of business event bids won in financial year stood at $8.9m as at 31 December. The three conferences above bring ATEED closer to achieving the annual SOI target of $22m.
6.4 Delivering on Study Auckland’s initiatives

International student enrolments in New Zealand increased by 6 per cent, to 131,609 enrolments in the 2016 academic year. The economic value of New Zealand’s international education industry in 2016 is now estimated to be $4.5b (including $4.2b onshore and $242m offshore), an increase of $200m compared to the 2015 student numbers. Auckland’s contribution of this figure is estimated at $2.25b\(^{11}\), with more than 83,000 international students in Auckland, contributing to 63 per cent market share of New Zealand. The 2016/17 results are expected in August 2018.

The Study Auckland team is partnering with tertiary partners and Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei to pilot a ‘Global Citizen’ youth leadership programme for tertiary students. The purpose of the pilot is to increase the cultural understanding, social inclusion and leadership potential of international students living in Auckland. This work will build on the innovative values-based international leadership programmes developed by Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei with leading companies including Air New Zealand, Fonterra, Auckland Airport, Westpac and Microsoft. The vision of the leadership programme is that Auckland will be regarded as a progressive education city that appeals to globally connected youth and emerging talent. ATEED’s Study Auckland team has received ministerial confirmation from the Ministry of Education regarding a funding application to deliver this project. Planning for the project will commence in early 2018, to attract international students arriving for the semester one intake.

The Study Auckland team is also currently in discussion with the Centre Manager of the Ellen Melville Community Centre to co-design a specialised student engagement programme targeted at international students living and studying in the CBD. This programme design will commence during Q3 of the financial year.

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek endorsement of the Lucas Creek Sedimentation report and request the Upper Harbour Local Board appoint two local board members to work with staff to plan implementation actions.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. In 2014, the Upper Harbour Local Board commissioned a study to model the loads, sources and deposition of sediment in the upper Waitematā Harbour. This study was undertaken in collaboration with the Research, Investigation and Monitoring Unit (RIMU) and resulted in the Upper Waitematā Harbour – Hydrodynamic and Sediment Transport Modelling report.
3. Model results from this report indicated that approximately 575 tonnes of sediment is being delivered to the central or outer Waitematā Harbour during rainfall events.
4. The Upper Waitematā Harbour – Hydrodynamic and Sediment Transport Modelling report established the need for further work to identify the origins of sediment discharge, and to inform changes to land-based activities that would reduce sediment loads. One of the most influential catchments identified in the modelling report is the Lucas Creek catchment.
5. A proposal was approved and funded by the Upper Harbour Local Board in February 2016 to deliver an extended modelling tool, to identify the origins of sediment discharging from surrounding land, and how differing activities may reduce sediment loads in the Lucas Creek catchment.
6. The Lucas Creek Catchment Sedimentation report is attached (Attachment A). It contains results of the modelling and recommendations for remedial action. These were presented to the local board at a workshop on 1 February 2018.
7. The Lucas Creek Catchment Sedimentation report identifies areas in the Lucas Creek catchment with elevated sediment generation.
8. To enable the local board to support immediate action to reduce sediment yield, 10 locations administered by council where sediment yields are elevated, have been identified and provided as maps in Attachment B.
9. It is recommended that the local board support catchment planting initiatives within the 10 selected sub-catchments, and that planting efforts concentrate on the highest sediment yield areas in the first instance.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
   a) endorse the Lucas Creek Sedimentation report.
   b) appoint two local board members to work with council staff to implement recommendations for riparian restoration contained within the report.

Horopaki / Context
10. The Upper Harbour Local Board commissioned a study in the 2014/2015 financial year to model the sources and deposition of sediment loads in the Upper Waitematā Harbour. The objectives of this study were to establish a high resolution Upper Waitematā Harbour model,
to identify the sediment transport characteristics of the harbour. The findings from the model are used to inform decisions relating to sediment discharges into the harbour.

11. The resulting Upper Waitematā Harbour – Hydrodynamic and Sediment Transport Modelling report indicated that around 15 per cent of the total sediment deposited following rainfall is left behind in either the central or outer Waitematā Harbour and that, on average, around 25 per cent of sediment remains in the water column. This implies that around 575 tonnes of sediment is being delivered to the central or outer Waitematā Harbour during rainfall events.

12. The modelling results show one of the most influential catchments in the Upper Waitematā Harbour is the Lucas Creek catchment. Sediments from this catchment deposit, either directly into Lucas Creek or within the lower parts of the harbour.

13. As a result, the local board resolved to fund a further project in the 2015/2016 financial year for the Lucas Creek catchment to:
   - refine the existing catchment generation model for the Lucas Creek catchment, to allow an assessment of sediment generation at a smaller spatial scale
   - re-run the harbour model based on the Lucas Creek catchment and stream network, and the daily time-series of sediment and freshwater delivery to the harbour
   - define depositional zones and rates within the Upper Waitematā for the existing land use (based on the refined catchment model)
   - provide information about changes in sediment delivery with four land use changes and management options relating to sediment control within the Lucas Creek catchment
   - write a technical memo and presentation to the local board outlining the methodologies used, and key findings from the land use and management options being considered.

14. The resulting Lucas Creek Sedimentation report includes recommendations to the Upper Harbour Local Board about actions and locations to reduce sediment discharges from land to the harbour from the Lucas Creek catchment.

15. The locations to reduce sediment discharges from land to the harbour from the Lucas Creek catchment are represented in 10 maps attached to this report as Attachment B.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

16. The Lucas Creek Sedimentation report builds on an earlier project which quantified linkages between all the catchments of the Upper Waitematā Harbour and areas of deposition within the whole of the Upper Waitematā Harbour.

17. Outputs from a high-resolution catchment model, hydrological model, and hydrodynamic and sediment transport model of Lucas Creek were used to highlight areas of high sediment generation in the catchment that are under management by council.

18. The range of models employed in this study estimated the total sediment yield for the Lucas Creek catchment to be 5054 tonnes per year. Of this total, 1198 tonnes of sediment per year is generated from areas of the catchment under council management.

19. Attachment B of the report contains maps produced using the model data identifying 10 areas of highest sediment yield within the catchment, and can be used to guide the planning of future planting within the Lucas Creek catchment. The order of the maps does not signify a priority ranking. The local board can determine which areas best align with local board and community priorities.

20. The 10 areas identified where planting would produce a direct benefit in reducing sediment to the Lucas Creek and estuary are:
   - Rosedale Park to Unsworth Heights
   - Bushlands Park Reserve to Parkhead Reserve
• North Bushlands Park Reserve
• Albany Domain to Kell Park
• Oteha Valley Road
• Lucas Point
• Lucas Creek Landing Drive
• Greenhithe – Upper Harbour Motorway
• Roland Road, Greenhithe
• Oratau Reserve to Colin Park.

21. In total, the sediment yield from these areas is approximately 300 tonnes per year.

22. Identifying council owned land allows the Upper Harbour Local Board to provide advice to community-led planting projects and to implement planting programmes. The management of these areas are under the local board’s delegation.

23. It is recommended that the local board concentrate on planting programmes for areas with the highest sediment yield (typically the yellow to red coloured areas on the appended maps in Attachment B). This approach is recommended as these areas are discrete and are of a size that is manageable.

24. Planting programmes in these areas will provide a reduction in sedimentation for the lowest cost and will return a sediment reduction of between 30 to 80 per cent. This reduction will depend on the spacing of plants, the range of species and the soil stabilising properties of these species. Staff from biodiversity and community services departments of council will provide advice to ensure the correct species and methodology are used.

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

25. The Upper Harbour Local Board Plan identifies improving the quality of creeks, streams and harbours as important, and commits to working to improve the ecological health of waterways and other natural areas through targeted restoration and conservation efforts.

26. To inform the local board’s efforts to improve the health of the waterways, the board commissioned a report to identify the source of sedimentation in the Lucas Creek catchment.

27. The attached Lucas Creek Catchment Sediment report (Attachment A) provides advice to the local board on how to manage sediment discharge into the upper Waitematā Harbour to improve the health of the harbour.

28. The Lucas Creek Catchment Sediment report and its recommendations were workshopped with the local board on 1 February 2018. At that workshop, the local board requested that staff work with local board members to identify priority areas for implementation of the report’s findings. To facilitate this, the board suggested that two local board members be appointed to liaise with staff.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

29. The environmental information provided in the Lucas Creek Catchment Sediment report will be of interest to and empower mana whenua in their kaitiaki role. It provides information about actions that can be taken to reduce sediment generation from land and improve water quality in the Upper Waitematā Harbour.

30. Opportunities to work with mana whenua in the work programmes resulting from the Lucas Creek sedimentation report will be explored.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

31. The actions recommended in the Lucas Creek Catchment Sediment report all require funding and resource to be implemented. The Upper Harbour Local Board has budget available from its locally driven initiatives operational expenses (LDI opex) budget for environmental restoration programmes, which is suitable for use in the implementation of planting and community-led restoration projects.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

32. The endorsement of the Lucas Creek Sedimentation report has no inherent risks attached.

33. Recommendations for riparian restoration in the report within the Lucas Creek catchment are intended to reduce sedimentation in the Upper Waitematā Harbour. If the recommendations are not actioned, sedimentation will continue.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

34. The Lucas Creek Sedimentation report will inform future work programme development for the Upper Harbour Local Board LDI opex budget allocation.

35. The recommendations from the Lucas Creek Catchment Sediment report will be used to guide and facilitate community-led environmental restoration within the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

36. The report will be provided to the Upper Harbour Ecology Network and to other stakeholders working within the Lucas Creek catchment.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
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The generation and fate of sediment in the Lucas Creek catchment
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Executive summary

This report provides details of the results from work carried out in the Lucas Creek catchment to assess sources of sediment within the catchment and how they relate to observed and predicted sediment deposition within Lucas Creek and adjoining estuary.

The work builds on an earlier project which quantified linkages between all the catchments of the Upper Waitematā Harbour and areas of deposition within the whole of the Upper Waitematā Harbour.

Outputs from a high resolution catchment model, hydrological model and hydrodynamic and sediment transport model of Lucas Creek are used to identify areas of high sediment yield in the catchment that are under the jurisdiction of Council. Linkages between sediment sources and areas of sediment deposition within Lucas Creek are quantified.

The total sediment yield for the Luca Creek catchment was estimated to be 5054 tonnes per year. Of this total, 1198 tonnes of sediment per year is generated from areas of the catchment under Council jurisdiction.

Model outputs are used to identify ten areas where non-engineered mitigation measures could be put in place to produce a benefit to Lucas Creek in terms of sediment reduction. In total, the sediment yield from these areas is just less than 300 tonnes per year.

Maps identifying areas of highest yield within these ten areas are provided within the report which can be used to guide the planning of future planting within the Lucas Creek catchment. In addition to the information provided in the report other factors need to be considered in the planning exercise including:

- Areas that currently of interests to both the Local board and community groups
- Identifying future planned land use change within areas currently identified as having high sediment yield,
- Confirming areas of recent planting campaigns within the catchment,
- Establishing the benefit of planting areas for aesthetics and/or recreational use rather than sediment reduction,
- Considering ease of access to areas identified as having high sediment yield, and
- Effectiveness of planting specific areas of the catchment based on presence of existing mitigation measures and/or stormwater systems.
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1.0 Introduction

The delivery of elevated levels of land derived sediment to aquatic environments is recognised as a global issue, with local investigations showing that many of Auckland’s aquatic environments, particularly marine, have been degraded by elevated levels of sedimentation resulting from land use change.

The effect of sediments on aquatic environments can be grouped into two broad categories: suspended (in the water column) and deposited (on the bed) also referred to as sedimentation. The mechanisms of effect are similar in marine and freshwater environments, however, the effects are of greater significance in the marine environment as it is the ultimate receiving environment. Suspended sediment degrades the quality and quantity of light penetrating the water column which limits the growth of algal and plant species; this affects the entire food chain and reduces the productivity of the environment. Suspended sediment reduces the efficiency of visual predators (e.g. juvenile snapper and may lead to reduced growth), and the fertilisation success of invertebrates (i.e. effectively lowering overall abundance of kina and paua), as well as interfering with the feeding structures of filter feeders.

Sediment deposition directly affects many aquatic species via smothering and/or burial and also changes the substrate composition making it unsuitable for some species leading to loss of habitats, changes in ecological communities, and reductions in biological diversity.

Land based activities generate physical discharges, for example, sediment, contaminants or nutrients, but also modify natural conditions, for example, temperatures, salinity and flow regimes. These effects are pervasive throughout aquatic environments, impacting on rivers, lakes, groundwater, estuaries and marine systems.

The effects of sediment in aquatic systems have been recognised internationally as a significant environmental problem. These effects generally arise through two modes of action;

- Suspended sediment, which increases turbidity and reduces light penetration, and
- Sedimentation, which alters the surface and sub-surface conditions

The generation of sediment, its transport and deposition in aquatic environments is a natural process dependant on climate, geology, topography and hydrology. The intervention of humans through land use change has modified this natural process, in
particular accelerating the delivery of sediment to aquatic systems and increasing the quantity of smaller particles.

The effect of increasing development (e.g. catchment deforestation, conversion to pasture and rapid urbanisation), along with the recognition of sedimentation as a strong and complex disturbance force, have given rise to global concern for the biodiversity and health of many aquatic environments. In Auckland, sediment accumulation rates (SAR) in marine receiving environments have increased during the last 150 years due to human activities and there is no compelling evidence that sedimentation in Auckland’s estuaries is reducing.

The Upper Harbour Local Board commissioned a modelling study to understand sediment loads, sources and deposition in the upper Waitemata Harbour (Auckland Council TR2016/019). The 2016 study was undertaken by DHI Limited in collaboration with RIMU and was complete in 2015 and was published in 2016. The objectives of the 2016 study were to establish a high resolution Upper Waitemata Harbour model, calibrate the model against existing field data, and quantify the flushing and sediment transport characteristics of the harbour (Auckland Council TR2016/019). The findings from this model were to then be used to inform decisions relating to sediment discharges into the harbour.

The 2016 modelling results show that Rangitopuni is the most significant subcatchment in terms of deposition of sediments in the harbour, not only because of the high rates of deposition within the Rangitopuni Creek itself, but also because of the strong connection between the Rangitopuni Creek and other depositional areas in the upper Waitemata harbour (Auckland Council TR2016/019).

Deposition in the upper and middle sections of the upper Waitemata Harbour can be almost solely attributed to sediments derived from the Rangitopuni catchment. In other areas of the harbour up to 50% of the predicted deposition can be attributed to sediments emanating from the Rangitopuni catchment (Auckland Council TR2016/019).

The second most influential catchment in the upper Waitemata Harbour is the Lucas Creek catchment. Sediments from this catchment deposit either directly in Lucas Creek or within the lower parts of the harbour (Auckland Council TR2016/019).

Most of the sediments from the Paremoremo Creek catchment deposit within the Paremoremo Creek itself with very little connectivity with other parts of the harbour (Auckland Council TR2016/019).

Model results indicate that around 15% of the total sediment deposited following rainfall are deposited either in the central or outer Waitemata Harbour and that, on
average, around 25% of sediment remains in the water column. This implies that around 575 tonnes of sediment are being delivered to the central or outer Waitemata Harbour during rainfall events (Auckland Council TR2016/019).

The 2016 modelling work established the need for further investigations to identify the origins of sediment discharge to inform changes to land-based activities that would reduce sediment loads.

1.1 This current report

The Upper Harbour Local Board commissioned a second modelling study in 2016 to assess how a range of sediment mitigation actions in the catchment surrounding Lucas creek may reduce sediment loads into the harbour. In order to assist the Local Board prioritise funding contributions to community-based planting initiatives this current modelling work centred on catchment planting activities.

This current report builds on the 2016 (Auckland Council TR2016/019) report commissioned by the Upper Harbour Local Board used annual catchment sediment load data derived from the Catchment Land Use for Environment Sustainability (CLUES) model and a calibrated harbour model to quantify linkages between catchment sources and areas of deposition within the Upper Waitemata Harbour.

Delivery of the annual sediment load to the harbour was achieved by specifying two catchment outlets (one in the upper reaches of Lucas Creek and the other in the headwaters of Te Wharaunui Creek). CLUES does not provide estimates of sediment yield for urban areas, which makeup 60% of the catchment area for the Lucas catchment. For the previous study estimates of sediment yield from other similar catchments in the Auckland areas were used to provide the estimated total sediment yield for the Lucas Creek catchment.

This current report provides a more refined delineation of Lucas catchment, a more realistic number of catchment outlets, improved estimates of the spatial variations in sediment yield within the catchment (for both urban and rural parts of the catchment) and provides improved temporal estimates of the variation in hydrograph (and sediment loading) needed for input to the harbour model.

1.2 The Scope

This current modelling program uses the existing sediment transport model of the Upper Waitemata Harbour and improves on the catchment sediment generation
aspects of the previous study. Daily estimates of sediment generation at a sub-catchment level using the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equations would be implemented and the sediment generated would be routed through the Lucas catchment using MIKE11 (a one-dimensional stream model with built capability to model the transport of sediments within channels). This approach is an improvement of the CLUES approach which only provides annual load estimates and deposition within the stream network is modelled as a loss term rather than a separate sediment transport process. The generation of sediments using the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation approach (RUSLE) has already been implemented for a number of catchments in the Auckland Region.

This report provides details of the results from work carried out in the Lucas Creek catchment to assess sources of sediment within the catchment and how they relate to observed and predicted sediment deposition within Lucas Creek.

The work builds on a project funded by the Upper Harbour Local Board (Auckland Council, 2015) which used annual catchment sediment load data and a calibrated Waitematā Harbour model to quantify linkages between catchment sources and areas of deposition within the whole of the Upper Waitematā Harbour.

One of the key outputs of this initial work was the quantification of the contribution that individual catchments make to the overall deposition patterns predicted to occur within the Upper Waitematā Harbour for existing land use.

This earlier work used estimated annual sediment load data and a schematised hydrograph to deliver the total annual sediment load to the harbour during a typical 10-day storm event.

The work presented in this report improves on that methodology by providing estimates of both sediment loads and freshwater inflows for 135 individual sub-catchments within Lucas Creek at sub-hourly time steps.

The study uses the RUSLE catchment model (Renard et al. 1997) a derivative of the original USLE model (Wischmeier and Smith, 1965) which is regularly used to assess effects of changes in land use and climate on runoff and sediment yields (e.g. Zuo et al. 2016). Outputs from the RUSLE model are integrated with the existing MIKE21 hydrodynamic and sediment transport model of the Upper Waitematā Harbour (Auckland Council, 2015) to provide estimates of deposition within Lucas Creek. Such an integrated approach is now commonly used to estimate the response of coastal catchments to land use change (e.g. Simms et al. 2003, Santhi et al., 2005, Yang and Chapman, 2006).
This report provides details of the implementation of the RUSLE model, input data used, assumptions made to provide predictions of sediment yields within the 135 sub-catchments of Lucas Creek and how sediment is delivered to Lucas Creek (Figure 1). The calibrated harbour model provides estimates of how these sediments are transported within Lucas Creek and where within the Creek deposition occurs. Details of the calibration of the MIKE21 harbour model are provided in the earlier report (Auckland Council, 2015).
2.0 Modelling methodology

Detailed methods of the modelling approach are located in Appendix A and C and are summarised below.

2.1 Sediment yield model

2.1.1 RUSLE

The Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) is a widely used mathematical model that describes soil erosion processes. RUSEL is based on the original Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) (USLE, Wischmeier et al 1965) but has several improvements in its determining factors. Both RULSE and USLE are process-based (physically based) models that mathematically describe the erosion processes of detachment, transport, and deposition and through the equations describing these processes provide estimates of soil loss and sediment yields from specified land surface areas.

The Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE, Wischmeier and Smith, 1978) computes sediment yield based on the following equation:

\[ A = R \times K \times LS \times C \times P \]

where

- **A** = computed spatial sediment yield.
- **R** = rainfall erosivity factor

The rainfall erosivity factor (R) reflects the effect of rainfall intensity on soil erosion. Based on high temporal resolution rainfall data it provides quantification of the two most important characteristics of a storm – the amount of rainfall and peak intensity as shown in the following equation. Data in Table 1 shows how the factor R is derived from rainfall time-series and Figure A-1 in Appendix A shows the spatial variation in erosivity for one particular rainfall event.

\[ R = 0.29 \times (1 - 0.72 \times e^{-0.05 \times \text{intensity}}) \times \text{rainfall} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Time</th>
<th>Rainfall (mm)</th>
<th>Intensity (mm/h)</th>
<th>R (MJ/ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/06/2001 09:50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/2001 10:00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/2001 10:10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Example of derivation of rainfall erosivity (R).
The soil erodibility factor (K) represents the susceptibility of soil to erosion, transportability of the sediment, and the amount and rate of runoff given a particular rainfall. Table 2 shows the factor for the various soil types identified in the Lucas Creek catchment as shown in Figure A-2 and Figure A-3 in Appendix A respectively.

Table 2. Soil erodibility factors for Lucas Creek soils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Types</th>
<th>K Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay loam</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine sandy loam</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light brown clay loam</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silt loam</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To derive the Topographic factor (LS) both slope steepness and slope length are derived from digital terrain data (Figure A-4 in Appendix A). The slope length is defined as the distance from the point being considered in the catchment and the point where runoff enters a defined channel. The slope steepness is derived directly from the digital terrain data. In combination these define the topographic factor (LS) and represents a ratio of soil loss under a given condition to that at a site with a standard slope steepness and slope length.

Factor C represent the dimensionless impacts (i.e. values between 0 and 1) for cropping and management systems (Figure A-5 in Appendix A) and factor P represents the dimensionless impacts (i.e. values between 0 and 1) of existing erosion control practices (Figure A-6 in Appendix A). Based on the above mapping of the RUSLE factors the sediment yield model was calibrated against previous estimates of annual sediment yield.
Figure 1. Sub catchments of Lucas Creek. Map shows Lucas Creek catchment boundary and Council owned areas of the catchment.
2.1.2 Calibration

Limited field data were available to calibrate the RUSLE model. Ideally, long-term measurements of flow and suspended sediment concentrations would be used to derive high temporal-scale-resolution estimates of sediment load. Outputs from RUSLE would then be compared to such data to determine how well the model predicts sediment yield under a range of rainfall events and freshwater discharges. Only monthly sampling of suspended sediment is carried out in the upper part of Lucas Creek (Figure 2. Time-series of observed high water total suspended sediment concentrations in Lucas Creek).

This sampling is done at high water and gives little more than an estimate background (i.e. non rainfall event) levels of suspended sediment concentrations.

![Time-series of observed high water total suspended sediment concentrations in Lucas Creek.](image)

Figure 2. Time-series of observed high water total suspended sediment concentrations in Lucas Creek.

In the absence of observed load data the calibration of the RUSLE model relies on a comparison with previous estimates and observation of annual sediment yield (Table 3) from the earlier work carried out in the Upper Waitemata (Green et al., 2004a-e). Using the 2012 Land use data the total annual sediment yield for the Lucas Catchment from the RUSLE model is 5,480 tonnes per year. Based on available data approximately 22% of the catchment load will be captured by existing sediment retention ponds. The predicted annual sediment load from the RUSLE model is therefore 5,054 tonnes which is in good agreement with the latest estimates from the GiLEAMS model (Green et al., 2004a-e).

RUSLE model is therefore 5,054 tonnes which is in good agreement with estimates from the GiLEAMS model (Green et al., 2004a-e).
Table 3. Previous estimates and observations of annual sediment yield for the Lucas Creek catchment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Sediment (tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980 (Observed)</td>
<td>2,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEAMS (1980)</td>
<td>3,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEAMS (Mean 1966-1992)</td>
<td>4,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEAMS Scenario C (22 events in 27 years)</td>
<td>4,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Spatial variation in sediment yield from the calibrated RUSLE model. Also shown are the 135 individual sub-catchments.
2.2 Catchment hydrology

Having quantified the sediment yield characteristics of the whole catchment it was then necessary to route sediments from the 135 individual sub catchments into the harbour model. Limited cross-sectional stream data were available, however based on catchment topography a series of one-dimensional streams were created to link relevant sub catchments to the 19 catchment outlets shown in Figure 4. Catchment outlets used to link the river networks to the catchment modelling.

Where insufficient data was available to create the stream network sediment yield estimates were linked directly to the nearest stream node for delivery to the harbour model.

The hydrology model uses a non-linear kinematic-wave method (suited to small urban catchment). This method tends to produce a peak hydrograph just as heavy rainfall ceases. A series of model runs were carried out and the parameters in the hydrological model adjusted to provide a good match between the observed Gill Road flows and predicted values (Figure 5). The focus of the calibration process was to provide good estimates of peak flows (when the majority of sediment is delivered to the catchment).

Using the calibrated hydrological model flows at each of the identified catchment outlets (Figure 4) were then synthesised based on the observed rainfall data within the catchment.
Figure 4. Catchment outlets used to link the river networks to the catchment modelling
Figure 5. Calibration of observed flows at Gill's Road across five separate time periods.
2.3 Harbour models

Using the calibrated harbour model and inputs from the RUSLE and hydrological models, time-series of flow and sediment delivery (Figure 6. Hydrograph used in this study (black line) compared to previous schematised hydrograph (green line) and tide level (blue) relative to mean sea level (top panel). Bottom panel shows total sediment delivery (kg) for September 2011 (Black line, right axis in kg) along with hydrograph.) at each of the catchment outlets (Figure 4) were created.

This particular sequence of flows was chosen as it provides a range of peak flow conditions and in total more than 6500 tonnes of sediment were delivered to the harbour.

For this study no wave modelling was carried out (as was the case for the NIWA study) The finite-element grid used was based on a combination of the NIWA grid (Error! Reference source not found.), chart bathymetry data and field survey data collected during the 2004 NIWA study (Green et al., 2004a).

In order to provide an understanding of the event-based dynamics of sediments in the Upper Waiatamā Harbour, it was firstly necessary to quantify the hydrodynamics of the harbour at a relatively high resolution. This was done using the MIKE 21 Finite-Mesh Flow model which is a two-dimensional hydrodynamic model that predicts water level variations and flows in response to tides, winds and freshwater inflows. The model solves the depth-integrated equations for continuity and momentum using an unstructured grid which can be a combination of triangles and quadrilateral elements. Output from this model is used as input to the MIKE 21 Sediment Transport model which predicts the transport, settling and re-suspension of catchment-derived fine-grained sediments. Further details are provided in Appendix B and can be found in TR2016/019.

A number of previous reports have been used to provide calibration and model input data for both the 2016 modelling study (Auckland Council TR2016/019) and this present study including Hume (1983), Williams and Rutherford (1983), Hicks et al. (2009), Reod and Gadd (2009), Swales et al. (2008), Samadoni-Davies et al. (2013) and the series of NIWA reports from the 2004 study (Green et al., 2004a-e). The main sources of input data (hydrographic, bathymetric and wind) are summarized in the previous modelling report for the Upper Waiatamā Harbour (Auckland Council TR2016/019).

In addition to the above datasets and their sources model development included the refinement of the model grid using the collated bathymetric data within the Upper Waiatamā Harbour. Model forcing was applied by freshwater inflows from the Lucas creek catchment, with wider harbour circulation generated by regional scale barometric pressure and winds and offshore tidal forcing from a Pacific scale tidal model (Egbert and Erofeeva, 2002).
Figure 6. Hydrograph used in this study (black line) compared to previous schematised hydrograph (green line) and tide level (blue) relative to mean sea level (top panel). Bottom panel shows total sediment delivery (kg) for September 2011 (Black line, right axis in kg) along with hydrograph.
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3.0 Results

3.1 Harbour model

The time-series of predicted flows and suspended sediment concentrations for each of the catchment outlets were input to the harbour model from which suspended sediment and deposition was predicted.

Using the same approach used in the earlier work (DHI, 2015), Lucas Creek was subdivided into distinct areas (Figure 7. Subdivision of Lucas Creek into separate depositional zones).

For each of these areas the predicted mass deposited and mean rate of deposition was extracted from the model simulations as shown in Table 4.

Such data can be used to determine the linkages between each of the individual catchment sources and the depositional zones as shown in Table 5 and Table 6. These tables can be used to identify the areas within Lucas Creek most impacted and which of the catchment sources contribute to the predicted deposition within each zone.

For example, Zone 11 is impacted by local catchment outlets (7-10, Figure 4. Catchment outlets used to link the river networks to the catchment modelling) as well as the Lucas catchment outlet and catchment outlet 14 in the upper parts of Lucas Creek (Table 4, first column).

Zone 16 is the most impacted in terms of highest mass of sediment deposited and highest deposition rate (Table 4) the majority of sediment deposited within this zone is derived from the Lucas Creek catchment outlet (Table 6) although some is delivered from catchment outlets 1 and 14.

Zone 18 is the next most impacted in terms of total mass deposited and mean deposition rate (Table 4) and that the majority of sediment deposited within this zone is derived from the Lucas Creek catchment outlet (Table 6) although some is delivered from catchment outlet 14.

The Lucas Creek catchment outlet impacts on all the harbour receiving zones as does catchment outlet (Table 5 and Table 6).
Figure 7. Subdivision of Lucas Creek into separate depositional zones.
### Table 4 Proportion of sediment delivered to each of the catchment outlets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lucas Creek Zone Number</th>
<th>Area of zone (ha)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Mass</th>
<th>Average Deposition (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>44.85%</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>22.65%</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.68</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>599.95</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 Linkages between catchment outlets (Figure 7) and depositional zones (Figure 4.1). Table show percentage of total deposition that occurs in each depositional zone and catchment outlets that contribute the majority of the sediment. Significant contributors are highlighted and colour coded by value with red shading indicating high values and graduated orange shading for lower contributors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment Outlet</th>
<th>Zone 1</th>
<th>Zone 2</th>
<th>Zone 3</th>
<th>Zone 4</th>
<th>Zone 5</th>
<th>Zone 6</th>
<th>Zone 7</th>
<th>Zone 8</th>
<th>Zone 9</th>
<th>Zone 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAKAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 0</td>
<td>0.06106</td>
<td>0.01148</td>
<td>1.00037</td>
<td>0.00079</td>
<td>0.00025</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>0.00004</td>
<td>0.00086</td>
<td>0.00101</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 1</td>
<td>0.00007</td>
<td>0.00061</td>
<td>0.00070</td>
<td>0.00123</td>
<td>0.00042</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00047</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 2</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>0.00151</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>0.00194</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 3</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 4</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 5</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 6</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 7</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 8</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 9</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR 10</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 8: Linkages between catchment outlets (Figure 7) and depositional zones (Figure 4.1). Table shows proportion of total deposition that occurs in each depositional zone and catchment outlets that contribute the majority of the sediment. Significant contributors are highlighted and colour coded by value with red shading indicating high values and graduated orange shading for lower contributors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment Outlet</th>
<th>Zone 11</th>
<th>Zone 12</th>
<th>Zone 13</th>
<th>Zone 14</th>
<th>Zone 15</th>
<th>Zone 16</th>
<th>Zone 17</th>
<th>Zone 18</th>
<th>Zone 19</th>
<th>Zone 20</th>
<th>Zone 21</th>
<th>Zone 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>0.005129</td>
<td>0.000087</td>
<td>0.000133</td>
<td>0.000140</td>
<td>0.000025</td>
<td>0.000076</td>
<td>0.000076</td>
<td>0.000200</td>
<td>0.000079</td>
<td>0.000257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour 1</td>
<td>0.000079</td>
<td>0.000053</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour 2</td>
<td>0.000079</td>
<td>0.000053</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour 3</td>
<td>0.000079</td>
<td>0.000053</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour 4</td>
<td>0.000079</td>
<td>0.000053</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour 5</td>
<td>0.000079</td>
<td>0.000053</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour 6</td>
<td>0.000079</td>
<td>0.000053</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
<td>0.000052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 RUSLE results

Figure 8: Predicted sediment yield across the whole of the Lucas Creek catchment. Also displayed are catchment boundaries and known water bodies.

shows the spatial variation in sediment yield across the whole of the Lucas Creek catchment. In total 6,480 tonnes of sediment are generated each year within the catchment. Of this 81% is on Private Land and 19% on Council owned Land.

Figure 9: Predicted sediment yield for Council Owned land within the Lucas Creek catchment. Also displayed are catchment boundaries and known water bodies.

shows the area of the catchment under Council ownership and the predicted sediment yield estimates for those areas. In total the annual sediment yield for these parts of the catchment is 1,198 tonnes.
Of this, 370 tonnes per year of sediment is derived from areas of Council owned land currently planted\(^1\).

\(^1\) Defined from LCDB classes.
Figure 8. Predicted sediment yield across the whole of the Lucas Creek catchment. Also displayed are catchment boundaries and known water bodies.
Figure 9. Predicted sediment yield for Council Owned land within the Lucas Creek catchment. Also displayed are catchment boundaries and known water bodies.
The remaining 828 tonnes of sediment generated within the catchment is from Council owned, non-planted areas of the catchment (Figure 9) as defined from the Land Cover Data Base (LCDB v4) classes.

In total there are 26 distinct areas within the catchment where planting could be applied to reduced sediment yield and potentially benefit the Lucas Creek receiving environment as shown in Figure 10 and summarised in Table 7.

The following provides a brief description of each of these areas and if there would potentially be any direct benefit to Lucas Creek in terms of decreasing sediment inputs.
Figure 10. Non-planted areas of the catchment owned by the Council.
# Table 7. Summary of non-planted, council owned areas within the catchment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub catchment Area (Council Owned, Not Planted)</th>
<th>Catchment Outlet</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Mean Yield (kg/m²)</th>
<th>Total Yield (tonnes/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>140452</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>42.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>448591</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>167.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>241534</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>53.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>754537</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>73.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>229221</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>62.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>33321</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>16.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harbour9</td>
<td>3404</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Harbour12</td>
<td>53654</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Harbour12</td>
<td>21344</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Harbour10</td>
<td>19002</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Harbour9</td>
<td>306932</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>32.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Harbour7-6</td>
<td>96426</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>45.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Harbour15-17</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>3594</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Harbour4</td>
<td>264333</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>51.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Harbour3</td>
<td>72478</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Harbour2</td>
<td>15614</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>9382</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Harbour0</td>
<td>79479</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>15.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>129046</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>41.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>67124</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>36.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>86560</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>18.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>177591</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>48.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>LucasCreek</td>
<td>409493</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>73.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This provides some guidance in terms which areas could be targeted for planting to reduce sediment inputs to Lucas Creek.

A. This area consists of a number of isolated pockets of non-planted land in the very north-east of the catchment. Potentially area for new development plus its remoteness means direct benefit may not be evident for some time. Discussions with Auckland Council indicate there may be unmapped mitigation measures downstream of this area and stream network.

B. This area sites just to the south of Greville Road. This site has potentially been developed since the LCDB v4 database was created.

C. This site east of the Rosedale oxidation ponds and is under Watercare ownership and drains directly to Rosedale ponds so there would be no direct benefit to Lucas Creek.

D. This area is mostly under Watercare control but some areas to the west drain to Otuha Stream. Relatively low yields in this area mean there is very little benefit in planting out this area.

E. This area straddles the Alexander Stream corridor. Some areas close to the stream banks have relatively high yields but areas currently planted would need to be investigated as would the presence of existing mitigation measures.

F. Very isolated areas amongst built up area.

G. Very isolated areas amongst built up area.

H. Direct Benefit to embayment where catchment outlet delivers sediment.

I. Isolated pocket of relatively low yield.

J. Direct Benefit to embayment where catchment outlet delivers sediment.

K. Direct Benefit to embayment but relatively low yields over a large area.

L. Pockets of relatively high yield areas with may produce a direct benefit to embayment.

M. Direct benefit to lower section of Lucas Creek but limited access with steep gradients.

N. Isolated pocket of catchment.

O. Isolated pocket of catchment.

P. Direct Benefit to embayment but relatively low yields over a large area.

Q. Some areas in the upper part of this area have relatively high yields but there may be unmapped mitigation measures downstream of these points which would mean little direct benefit.
R. Isolated area to the east of the golf club so probably no direct benefit to Lucas Creek.

S. Maybe parts of this area where planting could directly benefit Lucas Creek.

T. Relatively large yield for this area with a corridor of potential sites with direct benefit to Lucas Creek.

U. Relatively high mean yield for this area with direct benefit to Lucas Creek.

V. Relatively high mean yield for this area with direct benefit to upper part of Oteha Stream.

W. Relatively isolated area part of a developed area so unsure of actual land use here.

X. Direct benefit but actual land use would need to be checked.

Y. Mix of very low yield areas and some high (currently unsure of land use).

Z. Existing drainage and stormwater measures around the stadium are likely to provide certain degree of mitigation. Unlikely to have any real benefit.

3.3 Sub Areas where targeted planted may have a direct benefit.

Based on the above analysis, the areas in Table 8 should be considered for future planting within the Lucas Creek catchment. In total, these areas contribute 296 tonnes per year of sediment to Lucas Creek. This represents around 5% of the total sediment yield for the catchment. Appendix C (Figures C-1 through to C-10) show the predicted sediment yield estimates for each of the ten areas. The colour coding in these figures provides an indication of the areas of high (> 5 kg/m²), medium (2-5 kg/m²) and low (< 2 kg/m²) sediment yields.

Typically, mitigation measures can reduce sediment yields by between 30 and 85% depending on the type of mitigation used (Appendix D).
Table 3 Sub catchment areas within the Lucas Creek catchment which should be considered for future planting. Table shows sub catchment area labelling (consistent with Figure 10) and predicted current level of sediment yield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub catchment Area (Council Owned, Not Planted)</th>
<th>Area of Direct Benefit</th>
<th>Total Existing Sediment Yield (tonnes/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Alexander Stream</td>
<td>62.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Otaha Stream</td>
<td>41.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Otaha Stream</td>
<td>36.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Otaha Stream</td>
<td>18.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Otaha Stream</td>
<td>46.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Lucas Creek downstream of Kel Park</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Lucas Creek downstream of Kel Park</td>
<td>15.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Te Whara Creek</td>
<td>45.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Greenhithe Embayment</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Oratai Reserve embayment</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>296.72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors that need to be considered when planning which areas of the catchment to plant would include:

- future planned land use change within areas currently identified as having high sediment yield,
- areas already planted not identified in the LCDB v4 database,
- benefit of planting areas for aesthetics rather than sediment reduction,
- ease of access to areas,
- effectiveness of planting based on presence of existing mitigation measures and/or stormwater systems that have not been mapped, and
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Ground truthing of areas identified as non-planted within the LCDB v4 database.
4.0 Conclusions and recommendations

Catchment modelling applied to the Lucas creek catchments have identified a range of sediment hotspots and defined direct linkages with the marine receiving environment.

This is the first time a high resolution catchment model has been implemented for this area and has identified a number of locations were sediment yields are elevated.

As part of this project, areas of the catchment which are currently administered by Council were used to identify locations to assist the Upper Harbour local board to inform where in the catchment planting may reduce sediment yield and provide biodiversity gains via supporting community lead planting initiatives. To facilitate planting initiatives Auckland Council’s Biodiversity team are available to help provide planting costings and guidance of on appropriate plant species that are best suited to the local ecological eniron, provide suitable sediment erosion control and will promote public use and amenity.

Identifying Council owned land will allow the Upper Harbour local board to implement these planting programs faster as the management of these areas are part of the local board’s mandate.

Maps of the top ten areas are included in Appendix C. The order of the maps do not signify a priority ranking as this is left to the local board to determine which areas best align with local board and community priorities.

It is advised that the local board concentrate on areas with the highest sediment yield (typically the yellow to red coloured areas on the appended maps (Appendix C). We recommend this approach as these areas are discrete, are of a size that are manageable therefore planting programs can be complete and are not extremely onerous and costly to undertake. Planting these areas will return a sediment reduction of between 30 - 80% (see Appendix D – for mitigation measures) and will depend on the spacing of plants, the range of species and the soil stabilising properties of these species.

In addition, it should be noted that for any given catchment (e.g. any map within Appendix C) the lower sediment yield areas (from 0 to approximately 30 kg/m²) have a greater area (i.e. there are more of these low yield areas). Therefore, for any given map/catchment the total amount of sediment yield from all low yield areas will be greater than the sum of all the high yield areas due to the combined size and total number of areas with a low sediment yield. Addressing this issue will require a longer term strategy that will need to balance the need to reduce sediment but also provide for open grassed recreational areas for Aucklanders to enjoy.
Appendix C

Maps of the 10 priority catchments identified for planting activities

Figure C-1 Zone E – Rosedale Park to Unsworth Heights. Sediment yields are presented as annual averages.
Figure C-2 Zone U Bushlands Park Reserve to Parkhead Reserve. Sediment yields are presented as annual averages.
Figure C-3 Zone V North Bushlands Park Reserve. Sediment yields are presented as annual averages.
Attachment B

Figure C-4 Zone X Albany Domain to Kell Park. Sediment yields are presented as annual averages.
Figure C-5 Zone Y Oteha Valley Road. Sediment yields are presented as annual averages.
Figure C-6 Zone S Lucas Point. Sediment yields are presented as annual averages.
Figure C-7 Zone T Lucas creek – Landing Drive. Sediment yields are presented as annual averages.
Figure C-8 Zone L Greenhithe – Upper Harbour Motorway.
Sediment yields are presented as annual averages.
Figure C-9 Zone J Roland Road, Greenhithe. Sediment yields are presented as annual averages.
Figure C-10 Zone H Oratau Reserve to Colin Park. Sediment yields are presented as annual averages.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To update the Upper Harbour Local Board on Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku) activities within the local board area for the six months from 1 August 2017 to 31 January 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Panuku was established in September 2015 due to the merger of two Council Controlled Organisations, Waterfront Auckland and Auckland Council Property Limited (ACPL).
3. Panuku helps to rejuvenate parts of Auckland, from small projects that refresh a site or building, to major transformations of town centres or neighbourhoods.
4. Panuku manages around $2 billion of council’s property portfolio, which is continuously reviewed to find smart ways to generate income for the region, grow the portfolio, or release land or property that can be better used by others.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
a) receive the Panuku Development Auckland Local Board update for 1 August 2017 to 31 January 2018.

Horopaki / Context
Local Activities
Development
5. Panuku is contributing commercial input into approximately 50 region-wide council-driven renewal and housing supply initiatives.
6. Panuku works with partners and stakeholders over the course of a project. It also champions best practice project delivery, to achieve best value outcomes within defined cost, time and quality parameters.
7. Below is a high-level update on development activities in the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

Unlock Hobsonville
8. In November 2015, the Auckland Development Committee resolved that the 14/6 Masterplan be adopted, and Panuku be allowed to proceed immediately with the development of the Airfields in Hobsonville.
9. Megalot 1 – AV Jennings was confirmed in April 2016 as the development partner for the first stage of the Airfields precinct, which focuses on 1.95ha towards the southern edge of the site. The first of 102 homes has been completed by AV Jennings and designed and built by GJ Gardner. This milestone was celebrated with a tour of the property in December 2017,
and was attended by Councillor Wayne Walker, Panuku Chief Executive Roger MacDonald, and representatives from GJ Gardner and AV Jennings.

10. **Megalots 2, 3 and 4** – 9.9ha of residential land was settled with Top Garden Property Development Limited (TGPD) on 13 November 2017. They will be delivering 510 dwellings, which will include a minimum of 10 per cent affordable housing. Civil infrastructure works commenced in late November 2017 to construct Waka Moana Drive, Commanders Avenue and the balance of Wallace Road.

11. **Megalots 5 and 6** – are envisaged to be developed as a mixed-use area. Following consultation with key stakeholders, it is intended to create employment, and a minimum of 278 new homes via a go-to-market exercise later this year.

**Portfolio management**

12. Panuku manages ‘non-service’ properties owned by council and Auckland Transport (AT). Non-service properties are those that are not currently needed for service or infrastructure purposes. These properties are generally being held for planned future projects, such as road construction, park expansion or development of future town centres.

13. As at 31 January 2018, the property portfolio comprises 1437 properties, containing 1119 leases. The current portfolio includes vacant land, industrial buildings, warehouses, retail shops, cafés, offices, medical centres, and a large portfolio of residential rental homes.

14. The return on the property portfolio for the period ending 31 January 2018 exceeded the budget, with a net surplus to council and AT shareholders of $1.1m above budget.

15. The average monthly tenantable occupancy rate, for the six-month period is more than 98 per cent, which is above the Statement of Intent target of 95 per cent.

**Properties managed in the Upper Harbour Local Board Area**

16. Panuku currently manages 25 commercial and three residential properties within the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

**Business interests**

17. Panuku also optimises the commercial return from business interests it manages on council’s behalf. This includes two forestry enterprises, two landfills and four quarries.

18. There are currently no managed business interests in the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

**Portfolio strategy**

**Optimisation**

19. The Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2015-2025 reflects a desire of council to materially reduce or slow down expenditure, and unlock value from assets no longer required, or which are sub-optimal for service purposes. In response to this, prior to the establishment of Panuku, ACPL developed a method of dealing with service property, called optimisation.

20. Asset optimisation deals with ‘service property’. It is self-funding, maximises efficiencies from service assets, and maintains levels of service while releasing property for sale or development. A key element of optimisation is that the sale proceeds are locally reinvested to advance approved projects and activities on a cost-neutral basis. It does not include the AT portfolio. Panuku continues to advance this programme of work, which includes the development of a cross-council project to coordinate and execute asset sales and optimisation.
**Portfolio review and rationalisation**

**Overview**

21. Panuku is required to undertake ongoing rationalisation of council’s non-service assets. This includes identifying properties from within council's portfolio that may be suitable for potential sale and development if appropriate. Panuku has a focus on achieving housing and urban regeneration outcomes. Identifying potential sale properties contributes to the Auckland Plan focus of accommodating the significant growth projected for the region over the coming decades. This provides council with an efficient use of capital and prioritisation of funds to achieve its activities and projects.

**Performance**

22. Panuku works closely with council and AT to identify potential surplus properties to help achieve disposal targets.

23. **Target for July 2017 to June 2018:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review</td>
<td>$60m disposal recommendations</td>
<td>$28.3m as at 31 January 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process**

24. Once identified as a potential sale candidate, a property is taken through a multi-stage ‘rationalisation’ process. The agreed process includes engagement with council, council-controlled organisations (CCOs), the local board and mana whenua. This is followed by Panuku board approval, engagement with local ward councillors and the Independent Māori Statutory Board, and finally, a Governing Body decision.

**Under review**

25. Properties currently under review in the Upper Harbour Local Board area are listed below. This list includes any properties that may have recently been approved for sale, or development and sale by the Governing Body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposed Lot 14, 61-117 Clark Road, Hobsonville | Vacant land that Parks and Recreation Policy have advised is no longer required for open space purposes.  
The internal consultation commenced in October 2017. No alternative service uses were identified.  
The Upper Harbour Local Board resolved at its December 2017 meeting that it is opposed to a disposal of the subject site, due to concerns regarding the loss of open space in an area where residential intensification is planned.  
Panuku will recommend a proposed disposal to the Finance and Performance Committee’s February 2018 meeting. |
| 131 Clark Road, Hobsonville     | Large site with multiple zones under the Unitary Plan. The portions zoned Neighbourhood Centre and Mixed Housing Urban are being rationalised with a view to implementing the planned neighbourhood centre and housing. Most of the site will be retained by council for open space and roading |
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purposes.
Panuku are working with Parks, Sports and Recreation regarding Scott Point Sustainable Park master plan open space requirements and with Auckland Transport regarding infrastructure requirements. Once design requirements are confirmed, Panuku will engage with the board regarding the site.

Clearwater Cove – Westpark Marina

Following an approach from the lessee to acquire the freehold of all the council owned sites, ACPL/Panuku undertook a consultation process with council departments, CCOs and the board about the future of the marina.

Initial feedback supported a partial disposal of the site in principle, provided community access to the marina is not jeopardised, improved public car parking facilities are provided, and boat hard standing is retained.

In October 2017, the board resolved that it could not endorse Panuku’s proposal for Westpark Marina given the information available, and that any decision on the proposed disposal by the Finance and Performance Committee be deferred, pending receipt of further information about council’s obligations to preserve public access to the site, including the Waitemata City Council (West Harbour) Empowering Act 1979 (the West Harbour Act).

The board further resolved in December 2017 that it opposes any sale, and that the marina remain in council ownership. The board does not support the proposed development plan and stated the proposed plan is not in the best interests of the community.

Panuku will attend a workshop with the board on 8 February 2018 to provide responses to questions raised by the board, and to receive further feedback. Panuku will further report to the board in April 2018 with a project update.

Acquisitions and Disposals

26. Panuku manages the acquisition and disposal of property on behalf of Auckland Council. Panuku purchases property for development, roads, infrastructure projects and other service needs, and manages the sale of properties surplus to council requirements. These properties may be sold with or without contractual requirements for development.

Acquisitions

27. Panuku does not decide which properties to buy in a local board area. Instead, it is asked to negotiate the terms and conditions of a purchase on behalf of council.

28. Panuku purchased seven properties for open space across Auckland in this financial year (ending 30 June 2018), at a cost of $18.2m, and also bought five properties for storm water use, at a value of $4.2m.
29. Two properties were purchased in the Upper Harbour Local Board area during the reporting period.

30. All land acquisition committee resolutions contain a confidentiality clause due to the commercially sensitive nature of ongoing transactions, and thus cannot be reported on while in process.

**Disposals**

31. The disposal team sold eight properties for a total of $10.7m this financial year. The team's 2017/2018 target is $8.0m for the year. The target is agreed with the council and is reviewed on an annual basis.

32. No properties were sold in the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

**Housing for Older People**

33. The council owns 1412 units located in 62 villages across Auckland, which provides rental housing to low income older people in Auckland.

34. The Housing for Older People (HfOP) project involved the council partnering with a third-party organisation, The Selwyn Foundation, to deliver social rental housing services for older people across Auckland.

35. The joint venture business, named Haumaru Housing, took over the tenancy, facilities and asset management of the portfolio, under a long-term lease arrangement from 1 July 2017.

36. Haumaru Housing was granted Community Housing Provider (CHP) status in April 2017. Having CHP registration enables Haumaru to access the government’s Income Related Rent Subsidy (IRRS) scheme.

37. Auckland Council has delegated Panuku to lead a new multi-year residential development programme.

38. The first new development project is a 40-unit apartment building on the former Wilsher Village site on Henderson Valley Road, Henderson. Once completed in mid-2019, this development will increase the council's portfolio to 1452 units.

39. The following HfOP villages are located within the Upper Harbour Local Board area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Court</td>
<td>480A East Coast Road, Windsor Park</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional activities**

**Highlights**

40. Over the year, Panuku achieved key project milestones and performance results in our priority development locations. Panuku categorises three types of priority locations:

- Transform locations – Panuku ‘transforms’ locations by creating change through urban regeneration. Panuku leads the transformation of select parts of the Auckland region; working alongside others and using the custodianship of land and planning expertise. The catalytic work Waterfront Auckland led at Wynyard Quarter is a great example of the transformation of urban locations.
Unlock locations – Panuku also ‘unlocks’ development potential for others. By acting as a facilitator; using relationships to break down barriers and influence others, including the council family, to create development opportunities

Support locations – Panuku plays a ‘support’ role to ensure council is making the most of what it already has. Intensification is a key driver in the Auckland Plan. Panuku will support housing demands by enabling development of council-owned land.

Transform locations

41. The Wynyard Quarter is undergoing rapid change both commercially and residentially, with thousands of Aucklanders using this space every week.

   - The first three phases of structural steel have been installed at the Park Hyatt Hotel. In total, approximately 2000 tonnes of primary structural steel will be used to construct the luxury five-star hotel, which will span a total area of 37,000sqm.
   - In April 2017, Mayor Phil Goff officially opened the Mason Bros. building, a former industrial warehouse that has been redeveloped into a three-level office space, bringing together a community of entrepreneurs and businesses. It is the centrepiece of Wynyard Quarter’s innovation precinct.
   - The innovation precinct in Wynyard Quarter has expanded with the newly opened five-floor building at 12 Madden Street. The purpose-built home for entrepreneurs offers the latest in flexible co-working spaces. This milestone marks two years since the GridAKL initiative was launched by Auckland Tourism, Events, and Economic Development (ATEED), partnering with Panuku and Precinct Properties, to develop the commercial space to house ambitious companies and connecting technologists, designers, digital content makers, product designers and start-ups.
   - Developer Willis Bond is constructing 500-600 apartments, of various types and sizes, that are set to house around 1100 people. There are two developments currently under construction; Wynyard Central and 132 Halsey. The first residents moved in during September 2017.

42. ‘Transform Manukau’ was the first location to have a Framework Plan completed, outlining the five key moves for the project and the vision for Manukau in 2040. Over the past six months, the emphasis has been on confirming the delivery of an affordable housing development on 5ha of land at 20 Barrowcliffe Place. This project will be Panuku’s largest development of affordable housing, and involves the first partnership arrangement with mana whenua in a property development role. Earthworks on the development of over 200 homes will commence soon. Work is also about to commence on the street-scape upgrade of Putney Way, in conjunction with the bus station process led by AT.

43. The high-level plan to ‘Transform Onehunga’, on a similar scale to Wynyard Quarter and Manukau, was approved in March 2017. The plan was completed involving significant consultation with the community. Panuku is leading the redevelopment of strategic council-owned land, and works in partnership with government and others, to deliver positive outcomes for the local community. The East-West link, which affects the wharf and southern parts of the area, is currently being reassessed by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA). The final board of inquiry decision approving the East-West link was given in January 2018. Panuku is however, expecting amended plans later this year. Working with the local board and key stakeholders, Panuku has advanced plans on the town centre and the Onehunga wharf precinct where possible. The Framework Plan that will guide the transformation is due for completion in April 2018.
Unlock locations

44. In Takapuna, Auckland Council owns nearly four hectares of land focused around the Anzac Street carpark and the Gasometer site. Consultation on redevelopment of these sites has commenced.

45. In Northcote, a masterplan and design guide for the new Awataha Greenway project has been completed. Work is well advanced on the masterplanning and reference design for the town centre regeneration. Works are also progressing well on the redevelopment of the Housing New Zealand stock by Homes, Land, Community (HLC).

46. The Council’s Planning Committee approved the over-arching plans to redevelop Old Papatoetoe, in June 2017. Panuku is leading the redevelopment of the mall, a 2.5ha block of land, which will see the area opened up with a new plaza space, reconfigured shops, upgraded carpark and a revamped New World supermarket. In addition to the upgrade of the mall, which is expected to be completed early next year, approximately 110 new homes are planned to be developed in the surrounding area.

47. With the overall plan for Henderson being approved in May 2017, the vision is for it to grow into an urban eco-centre. This vision will guide planning and development with an outcome towards ‘liveable growth’ by creating a safe, attractive and vibrant mixed-use environment with a uniquely west Auckland identity.

48. The opportunity to revitalise Avondale was given the green light in November 2017, with the approval of the over-arching plan for its regeneration by the Planning Committee. The vision for Avondale will be enabled through a number of key moves. Panuku will work closely with the local board and community to implement a retail strategy that attracts new businesses, increasing diversity of products and services. The train station, upgraded bus network, and new cycleways, offer great transport options, and Panuku will continue to strengthen connections between these activity hubs and the town. A focus for the regeneration of Avondale is to work with developers to build quality residential neighbourhoods that offer a mix of housing types, including terraces and apartments. A number of significant developments are already underway in the area.

49. A development agreement was signed with Todd Property for the delivery of more than 350 homes in Flat Bush, Ormiston. In December 2016, Panuku sold a site at 187 Flat Bush School Road for a 30-lot subdivision.

Support locations

50. The Mariner Rise subdivision at 20 Link Crescent, Whangaparaoa, has been completed by Panuku’s development partner, McConnell Property, along with the delivery of a 2700sqm park and playground. Sixty new homes have been built on this new subdivision.

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

51. This report is for the Upper Harbour Local Board’s information.

52. Panuku requests that all feedback and/or queries the local board has relating to a property in Upper Harbour be directed in the first instance to localboard@developmentauckland.co.nz.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

53. Tāmaki Makaurau has the highest Māori population in the world, with one in four Māori in Aotearoa living here.
54. Māori make up 12 per cent of the region’s total population, and mainly live in Manurewa, Henderson-Massey, Papakura, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Māngere-Ōtahuhu and Franklin. Māori have a youthful demographic, with 50 per cent of those living in Tāmaki Makaurau being under the age of 25 years. Five per cent of Māori in the region are currently 65 years and over.

55. There are 19 mana whenua in the region, with 14 having indicated an interest in Panuku’s lead activities within the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

56. Māori make up five per cent of the Upper Harbour Local Board population. There is no marae located within the local board area.

57. Panuku works collaboratively with mana whenua on a range of projects, including potential property disposals, development sites in the area, and commercial opportunities. Engagement can be on specific individual properties and projects at an operational level, with kaitiaki representatives, or with the Panuku Mana Whenua Governance Forum, who have a broader mandate.

58. Panuku will continue to partner with Māori on opportunities which enhance Māori social and economic wellbeing.
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Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present the updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Upper Harbour Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.
3. The governance forward work calendars were 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 Upper Harbour Local Board:
a) receive the Upper Harbour Local Board governance forward work calendar for the period April 2018 to March 2019, as set out in Attachment A to this agenda report.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Governance forward work calendar - April 2018 to March 2019</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Cindy Lynch - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>Governance forward work calendar - April 2018 to March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Watercare Services Ltd and 2 Buckley Avenue, Hobsonville Point</strong></td>
<td>Confirm board position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport monthly update</strong></td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quick Response Grants: Round Two</strong></td>
<td>Review community grant applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities Partnership</strong></td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headquarters building / Sunderland Lounge - EOI process and selection criteria</strong></td>
<td>Confirm board position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Performance Report: January to March 2018</strong></td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport monthly update</strong></td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albany Community Hub EOI process - approve the decision criteria</strong></td>
<td>Confirm board position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport monthly update</strong></td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts, Culture &amp; Events work programme 2018/19</strong></td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure &amp; Environmental Services work programme 2018/19</strong></td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks, Sport &amp; Recreation work programme 2018/19</strong></td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries work programme 2018/19</strong></td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities work programme 2018/19</strong></td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Economic Development work programme 2018/19</strong></td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quick Response Grants: Round Three</strong></td>
<td>Review community grant applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RFA quarterly report</strong></td>
<td>Check in on performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopt Long-term Plan</strong></td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopt Local Board Agreement, Fees &amp; Charges Schedule, Work Programmes</strong></td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport monthly update</strong></td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Defence and Emergency Management public alert framework</strong></td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Performance Report: April to June 2018</strong></td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport monthly update</strong></td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport monthly update</strong></td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance forward work calendar - April 2018 to March 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFA quarterly report</th>
<th>Check in on performance</th>
<th>Keeping informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany Community House - approve licence to manage and occupy / funding agreement for community management</td>
<td>Confirm board position</td>
<td>Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Local Board Plan</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
<td>Accountability to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Performance Report: July to September 2018</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA quarterly report</td>
<td>Check in on performance</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Performance Report: October to December 2017</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku Auckland six-monthly update</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATEED six-monthly update</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

1. The Upper Harbour Local Board workshops were held on Thursday 8 February, 22 February, and 1 March 2018. Copies of the workshop records are attached.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the record of the Upper Harbour Local Board workshops held on Thursday 8 February, 22 February, and 1 March 2018 (refer to Attachments A, B, and C to this agenda report).

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>Upper Harbour Local Board workshop record - 8 February 2018</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
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<td>B</td>
<td>Upper Harbour Local Board workshop record - 22 February 2018</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
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<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Upper Harbour Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Upper Harbour Local Board held in the Upper Harbour Local Board office, Kell Drive, Albany Village, on 8 February 2018, commencing at 9:30 am

**Chairperson:** Lisa Whyte  
**Deputy Chairperson:** Margaret Miles  
**Members:** Uzra Gasuri Balouch, Nicholas Mayne (until 1.40pm), John McLean (until 1pm), Brian Neeson (until 12pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities work programme</td>
<td>• Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
<td>The Business Performance Manager was in attendance to socialise the new ‘Monthly Update’ with members, which will replace the previous monthly Snapshot. The first of these will be distributed to the local board within the next week. The Maintenance Delivery Coordinator was in attendance to discuss current operations matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters:</td>
<td>• Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cherie Veza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Steve Luketina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Delivery Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chantelle Subritzky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Performance Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries work programme</td>
<td>• Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
<td>The Community Library Manager was unable to attend due to illness and provided a written update to members for their information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters:</td>
<td>• Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fiona Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Library Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATEED work programme</td>
<td>• Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
<td>The Local Economic Development Advisor was in attendance to update members on the international students’ programme and the work being done to explore employment opportunities in the local board area for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters:</td>
<td>• Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jonathan Sudworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Economic Development Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimmmability targets for rivers and</td>
<td>• To seek feedback from the local board on</td>
<td>The Wai Ora Partnerships Team Manager was in attendance to gather informal feedback on the draft swimmability targets to be set across the region, which will align with national targets. Members were happy with the proposed targets, so long as there was better classification of the fourth order streams in the area. Further information around the modelling outputs will be brought back to the board towards the middle of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lakes in Auckland</td>
<td>draft targets for improving the swimmability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters:</td>
<td>of rivers in the local board area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jonathan Benge</td>
<td>• Under the National Policy Statement for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Ora Partnerships Team Manager</td>
<td>Freshwater Management, council is required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to set draft targets for the swimmability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of our major (fourth order) rivers and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lakes by 31 March 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NC1 project: walking and cycling network and urban design showcase

**Presenters:**
- Aimee Brock
  Communications and Engagement Team Manager
- Alex Elton-Farr
  Walking and Cycling Engagement Advisor
- Mark Marshall
  Design Manager, Walking and Cycling
- Grant Bailey
  Urban Design Manager

- To inform the board about the full range of walking and cycling connections being investigated by the Northern Corridor Improvements team, and the timelines for detailed design and stakeholder consultation
- To inform the board about the Northern Corridor’s urban design plans, as peer reviewed by council’s urban design panel

Representatives from the Northern Corridor Improvements Alliance team were in attendance to provide members with a further update on walking/cycling connections, along with urban design plans.

The Communications and Engagement Team Manager will send through a memo in a few weeks when final decisions have been made about the Constellation Drive connection.

Updates will continue on a quarterly basis.

### Westpark marina update

**Presenters:**
- Letita Edwards
  Team Leader Portfolio Review
- John Carter
  Senior Project Planning Leader
- Carlos Rahman
  Senior Engagement Advisor

- Discuss proposal to prepare a High-Level Project Plan
- Undertake additional community engagement

Panuku staff were in attendance to provide clarification on various queries raised by members at the board’s October business meeting.

Panuku will be organising public engagement on the proposed changes and potential outcomes as part of a High-level Project Plan for the Westpark Marina.

Members asked to be kept apprised of upcoming consultation events.

### AT – update on major projects

**Presenters:**
- Biserka Stetic
  Project Manager
- Sharleen Pihema
  Communications Advisor
- Owen Schuster
  Relationship Manager

- Present draft design for the Medallion Drive Link project
- Present proposed specimen design, proposed land take, temporary occupation for the Gilles Road link project

The Project Manager was in attendance to update the board on the latest design options for both the Medallion Drive and Gilles Road link projects.

Both projects are due to begin construction later in the year, with public notification starting this month.

The Project Manager will continue to provide regular updates to the local board at future workshops.

The workshop concluded at 2.37pm
## Workshop Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Facilities work programme update – (renewals / project delivery)</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenters:</td>
<td>• Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The Renewals Coordinator was in attendance to update the board on the results of the Fernhill Escarpment track network assessment. Members discussed their priorities for staging of the improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cherie Veza Stakeholder Advisor</td>
<td>• Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The Manager and Project Manager from Project Delivery were in attendance to update the board on the current state of projects on the work programme. Members asked the Project Manager and the Stakeholder Advisor to provide email updates on the Sunderland Lounge upgrade, the basketball hoop installations, and equipment signage in Bill Moir Reserve, rather than waiting until the next workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oliver Kunzendorff Manager Project Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kaitlyn White Renewals Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shelly Ataallah Project Manager Project Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Places work programme update</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenters:</td>
<td>• Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The Programmes and Partnerships Advisor was in attendance to provide an update on the activities and usage of Meadowood House and Albany Hub. She also gave members an overview of the visions for the Albany Hub over the next five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marilyn Kelly Programmes &amp; Partnerships Advisor</td>
<td>• Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Members requested some more detailed statistics on the users of the Albany Hub. The Programmes and Partnerships Advisor will ask that the Hub Manager put together a briefing note for future workshops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Leasing work programme update</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenters:</td>
<td>• Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The Community Lease Advisor, supported by the Senior Community Lease Advisor, was in attendance to give an update on the current state of several leases in the local board area. Direction was also sought from the board on whether to pursue an expression of interest process for three of the leases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wendy Zaparz Community Lease Advisor</td>
<td>• Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ron Johnson Senior Community Lease Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development of new grants programme for 2018/2019

**Presenters:**
- Erin Shin
  Community Grants Adviser
- Frances Hayton
  Environmental Grants
  Grants & Incentives
  Manager
- Marion Davies
  Community Grants
  Operations Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of new grants programme for 2018/2019</th>
<th>Review and develop the Grants Programme for 2018/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Grants staff were in attendance to gather feedback on suggested changes to the Grants Programme for 2018/2019. Members requested a few small changes to some of the wording and to one of the Quick Response round dates. Community Grants staff will draft the new programme with these changes and circulate it to the local board. A report will then be scheduled for the April/May business meeting agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Transport Capital Fund

**Presenters:**
- Jonathan Anyon
  Elected Member
  Relationship Team
  Manager, Auckland
  Transport
- Christine Quirk
  Principal Local Board
  Advisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Transport Capital Fund</th>
<th>To seek local board informal input into the options for increasing the Local Transport Capital Fund, the methods of allocation, and the criteria used to assess these</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Elected Member Relationship Team Manager from Auckland Transport was in attendance to gauge feedback from the board on the review of the distribution methodology of the Local Transport Capital Fund. The Principal Local Board Advisor will use the board’s feedback to inform an upcoming formal business meeting report. A final decision will be made by the Governing Body in May 2018 as part of the Long-term Plan process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 12.44pm
### Upper Harbour Local Board Workshop Record

**Workshop record of the Upper Harbour Local Board held in the Upper Harbour Local Board office, Kell Drive, Albany Village, on 1 March 2018, commencing at 9.30am**

**Chairperson:** Lisa Whyte  
**Deputy Chairperson:** Margaret Miles  
**Members:** Uzra Casuri Balouch, Nicholas Mayne, Brian Neeson (until 1.28pm)  
**Apologies:** Member John McLean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosedale Bus Station update</td>
<td>To provide an update on the Rosedale Bus Station project, a joint AT and NZTA project</td>
<td>Representatives from the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and Aurecon were in attendance to update members on the Rosedale Bus Station project. Auckland Transport and NZTA are currently running community engagement sessions, closing on Friday 16 March 2018. Members were given the opportunity to attend these if available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucie Timmers</td>
<td>Communications &amp; Stakeholder Manager, NZTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameer Bahho</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager, NZTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Rajaiz</td>
<td>Project Manager, AT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahri Salim</td>
<td>Senior Communications Advisor, AT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip de Wet</td>
<td>Aurecon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE work programme update</td>
<td>Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
<td>The Strategic Broker was in attendance to provide members with an update on the Arts, Community and Events work programme. A further update will be brought back to the board in April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter:</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Howard-Smith</td>
<td>Strategic Broker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position papers on key open space issues</td>
<td>To discuss position papers developed for key open space issues and the local board ombibus open space management plan template. This will inform a report to the Environment &amp; Community Committee seeking their endorsement of the new approach to open space management planning</td>
<td>The Service and Asset Manager and Service and Asset Planner were in attendance to give members an overview of the process to develop the open space management guidelines. Informal feedback was sought to inform the draft guidelines which will be workshoped with the board in May 2018. The guidelines will then be formally reported to the board’s business meeting in July 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters:</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defydd Pettigrew</td>
<td>Service &amp; Asset Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Hodder</td>
<td>Service &amp; Asset Planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Facilities Auckland (RFA) update</strong></td>
<td><strong>To provide the local board with an update on RFA’s Venue Development Strategy with an emphasis on initiatives related to QBE Stadium</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presenters:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Representatives from Regional Facilities Auckland were in attendance to give members an overview of their plans and their organisation’s high-level focus to further develop the QBE Stadium site.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • James Parkinson  
Head of Strategy  
Auckland Stadiums |  |
| • Judy Lawley  
Manager Local Board Engagement |  |
| **Homes, Land and Community (HLC) vesting of assets** | **Clarification around timing and process of vesting of assets to council** |
| **Presenter:** | **The Precinct Director for Hobsonville Point was in attendance to give members an update on vesting of assets within the Hobsonville Point development. She is currently working on a schedule of assets for the area and hopes to have this ready for distribution to members within the next two months. This will provide clarity around ownership regarding maintenance requests.** |
| • Caroline McDowall  
Precinct Director,  
Hobsonville Point – Homes, Land, Community |  |
| **Community Places venue hire** | **To discuss:** |
| **Presenters:** | • utilisation and other narratives |
| • Rosetta Mamea  
Service Delivery Team Leader | • priority rates |
|  | • fees and charges |
|  | **The Service Delivery Team Leader was in attendance to discuss the current fees and charges structure. No changes to the structure have been proposed. However, members asked if the wording for the community organisation discount could be more visible on the website.** |

The workshop concluded at 1.47pm
Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

1. An opportunity is provided for members to update the Upper Harbour Local Board on projects and issues they have been involved with since the last meeting.

   [Note: This is an information item and if the board wishes any action to be taken under this item, a written report must be provided for inclusion on the agenda.]

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the verbal board members’ reports.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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