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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 following are declared interests of elected members of the Henderson-Massey local board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOARD MEMBER</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shane Henderson (Chairman)</td>
<td>Waitakere Licensing Trust</td>
<td>Elected Member</td>
<td>13 December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waitakere Badminton</td>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>2016 April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waitemata Seagulls Rugby League board</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Chan, JP (Deputy Chairman)</td>
<td>Cantonese Opera Society of NZ</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>15 Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian Leaders Forum</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ-Hong Kong Business Association</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ-China Business Association</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Chinese Environment Protection Association (ACEPA)</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whau Coastal Walkway Trust</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Asian Association</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>21 Feb 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Brady, JP</td>
<td>Safer West Community Trust</td>
<td>Trustee / Member</td>
<td>15 Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Licensing Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Grey</td>
<td>Zeal</td>
<td>Employee / CEO</td>
<td>15 Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Bold-Wilson</td>
<td>Community Waitakere</td>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>15 Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson Budgeting Services</td>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>21 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unitec Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Neeson, JP</td>
<td>Village Green Quilters</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>15 Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranui Advisory Group</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>17 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Flaunty, QSM</td>
<td>Westgate Pharmacy</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>15 Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NorSGA Properties</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westgate Pharmacy Ltd</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Trusts Community Foundation Ltd</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life North West Pharmacy</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waitemata District Health Board</td>
<td>Elected Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waitakere Licensing Trust Trust</td>
<td>Elected Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massey Birdwood Settlers Ass.</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taupaki Residents &amp; Ratepayers Ass.</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Flavell</td>
<td>Te Atatū Tennis Club</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>15 Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia New Zealand Leadership Network</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rutherford College</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waitākere Literacy Board</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 20 March 2018 and the extraordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 3 April 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 Ward Councillors’ Update

An opportunity is provided for the Waitakere Ward Councillors to update the board on regional issues they have been involved with since the last meeting.

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 Henderson-Massey Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

8.1 Deputation: A community-led initiative for a pump track in Te Atatu Peninsula

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To request for the local board's support for the initiative.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Pump tracks are playgrounds for people on bikes that suit everyone from 3-year-olds (I know because my 3-years old loves them) to adults (I know because I love them). They’re easy enough for small children (unlike BMX tracks) and challenging enough for experienced riders (unlike learn-to-ride tracks). As well as being fun, they’re a great tool for encouraging people to get on their bikes, which ultimately leads to better health, less congestion and a better environment.

3. At the moment, if Te Atatu Peninsula families want to take their kids to a really good bike facility, they have to get in their cars to get there. We want a pump track in the Peninsula that our kids can ride to, and we’re prepared to do what's necessary to make it happen.

4. To get started, we need the support of the local board.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) Receive deputation from Geoff Leyland presenting from Bike Te Atatu and thank him for his presentation.
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.

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.”

Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.
Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2018/05019

1. The Auckland 10-year Long Term Plan submissions process is all done, and early indications at time of writing suggest narrow support for all Council initiatives.

2. Of course, it also indicates a huge level of support once again for a public pool to service the Northwest. It is simply not good enough to continue our long vigil, we need some sort of hope that this is at least in the long term thinking of the Council. Thanks to all those who submitted, and I will communicate directly with all submitters on the local board specific comments produced.

Local Economic Development Masterclass

3. It was fantastic to attend the Local Economic Development masterclass during the month. Better still, I was invited to be on a panel discussion to talk about the challenges and opportunities inherent in local town centre development away from CBD’s.

4. Inspired by the work we are doing in Henderson town centre and the strong backing from local residents, I discussed the benefits of investment into Henderson. A city is not really a functioning city unless all areas are brought along and receive a fair level of investment and development. The towers that dot the CBD have been built by West and South Aucklanders, and it is about time this city puts more into its suburban centres to benefit our local communities.

5. I was enthralled by a speaker from the Centre for Local Economic Strategies, who questioned the very economic model that is ever-present today. For example, we should not laud the mega-wealthy people who donate to charity like Bill Gates, as they are merely redistributing money that was earned off the back of workers. He advocated for a more progressive approach, where redistribution was encouraged more, and investment into public projects to drive growth. As a representative from Henderson-Massey, it resonated with me and those ideas are worthy of more scrutiny.

Kite Day in Te Atatu Peninsula

6. Hugely successful as always. I think the kite day in Te Atatu was probably the best we have put on, and the Te Atatu residents were delighted. It would have been such a joy to see the kites soaring through the air from all around, and the huge turnout from families having fun. This is what a strong community is all about, getting together and having fun. I'm already excited for the next time.

Resident Enquiries

7. More so than ever, I have been approached by several residents this month, with a wide array of issues and opportunities. I have been particularly touched by the community effort of the residents of Sunnyvale around a walkway that had been used for generations, but blocked off from use by housing developments.

8. Due to an error in the former Waitakere City Council, the consented informal walkway was not discovered when the city signed over land for housing development. Now, we have several hundred residents in Sunnyvale facing a long detour in walking to catch the train, up to 15 minutes in some cases. It is an unacceptable situation, and yet in this time of increased fiscal sacrifices, I doubt the Council has enough funds to fix the problem. At any rate, a fix relies on the cooperation of landowners and different Council departments, a tough ask in itself. So I have promised I will do my best, but I honestly think this may be a sad and instructive case that staff work is crucial to operation of Council core business and needs resourcing to succeed. It really is an awful situation.

Final Word
9. As we go on into winter, we must always think of those less fortunate, struggling to heat their homes, or having no homes at all. If you have ever considered volunteering with a local community group, now would be the time. Stay safe Henderson-Massey, and let's work together to build the future we deserve.

Ngā tūtuhunga / Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) receive the Chairperson’s Report.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Shane Henderson – Chairperson (Henderson-Massey local board)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. The purpose of this report is to respond to resolutions and requests on transport-related matters, provide an update on the current status of the Land Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF), provide a summary of consultation material sent to the board and, provide transport related information on matters of specific application and interest to the Henderson-Massey Local Board and its community.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This report covers:
   i. Progress on the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018
   ii. Current status of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund projects
   iii. Consultation on proposed safety improvements
   iv. Traffic Control Committee (TCC) report

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:
   a) receive the Auckland Transport Update to the Henderson-Massey Local Board – April 2018 report.

Horopaki / Context
Regional Land Transport Plan 2018
3. Consultation on the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) 2018 will begin on Monday 23 April and close on Sunday 6 May 2018.
4. Members from all 21 local boards have been invited to an information, question and answer session on Monday 23 April.
5. Each local board will have an opportunity to give verbal feedback on the plan to representatives of the Regional Transport Committee (Decision makers for RLTP) on Monday 30 April.
6. There will be a number of public information sessions and the Henderson-Massey Local Board will be informed of these as soon as details are confirmed.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
Local Board Issues Being Investigated
7. The Local board have requested the following issues be investigated and they are in the initial investigation stage:
8. Auckland Transport will report to the Local Board on these once the work is completed.

**Local Board Transport Fund (LBTCF) Update**

9. The Henderson-Massey Local Board’s annual funding allocation under the LBTCF is currently $810,647 pa. Future budgets will have an adjustment for inflation added. The following tables note previous decisions and progress since the last update, budgets and financial commitments. The table immediately below is an update of progress on the Board’s current projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raise existing zebra crossing onto a platform at 126 Rathgar Road</td>
<td>It is proposed to raise the existing zebra crossing onto a raised platform for the visibility of this facility to approaching drivers and to reduce vehicle speeds at this location. CURRENTLY IN THE DETAILED DESIGN STAGE. FEBRUARY FOR TRAFFIC RESOLUTION COMMITTEE AND THEN PRICING. AIMING FOR CONSTRUCTION DURING THE SCHOOL HOLIDAYS IN MID APRIL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Vodanovich Road Intersection**

10. Internal consultation has been undertaken resulting in some minor changes to the design. The project is being prepared for external consultation before the end of April this will include consultation with the local board.

**Triangle Road Congestion Issues**

11. Auckland Transport has investigated the congestion and delays experienced on Triangle Road in the vicinity of Waimumu Road to Lincoln Road.

12. Community concerns are acknowledged by Auckland Transport and Police. Police will continue to monitor the site to assist with traffic flow and ensuring vehicles adhere to road user rules.

13. In addition, Auckland Transport are currently investigating medium and long term solutions for this road, and anticipate that further information on options will be available within the next six months.
Consultation documents on proposed improvements

14. Consultation documents for the following proposals have been provided to the Henderson-Massey Local Board for its feedback, and are summarised here for information purposes only.

15. Following consultation, Auckland Transport 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.
   - Road works on Lincoln Road - Abel Tasman to Woodford
   - James Laurie Street, Glendene pavement rehab
   - Rangeview Road - no stopping at all times parking restrictions
   - Ireland Place and around the bends of the intersection of Marinich Drive - broken yellow lines (no stopping at all times parking restrictions)
   - Nirmal Place - extension of broken yellow lines

Auckland Transport’s Traffic Control Committee (TCC) report

16. Decisions of the TCC during the month of March 2018 affecting the Henderson-Massey Local Board area are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Street (Suburb)</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Nature of Restriction</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 March-18</td>
<td>Kirby Street, Great North Road, Glendene</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes combined</td>
<td>Nsaat, bus only parking, bus shelter, lane arrow markings, traffic island, footpath, stop control, flush median, shoulder marking</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

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

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

18. All proposed schemes are subject to prioritisation, funding and consultation.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

19. No significant risks have been identified.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

20. Auckland Transport provides the Henderson-Massey Local Board with the opportunity to comment on transport projects being delivered in the local board area.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Owena Schuster - Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Transport Capital Fund: options for distribution and size of the fund

File No.: CP2018/05344

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. This report seeks formal feedback from the local board on options for the future size and underlying distribution methodology of the local transport capital fund (LTCF) and on the proposal to increase advisory support for the fund from Auckland Transport staff.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. In September 2017, the Governing Body agreed in principle to an increase to the local transport capital fund as an outcome of the governance framework review. Staff were directed to undertake further work with Auckland Transport and local boards on the size of the increase, and the distribution methodology.

3. The LTCF was established in 2012 and currently sits at $10.8 million. It is allocated on a pure population basis. Two options for the size of funding increase have been modelled, an increase of $6 million and an increase of $10 million.

4. Staff have also modelled three different distribution options: the current population model, a model applying the Local Boards Funding Policy, and a model that includes a mix of a fixed level of funding per board, along with a variable rate determined by the Local Boards Funding Policy.

5. Each of the options has been assessed against a set of criteria. The pure population model is not supported by staff, while each of the other two models has merits. On balance, staff recommend that the Local Boards Funding Policy be applied to the distribution of the LTCF, with an additional amount of $10 million being added to the fund. Feedback is sought from local boards on their preferences.

6. It is also recommended that Auckland Transport have funding allocated to provide an increased level of support to local boards in developing and assessing local transport projects.

7. Final decisions will be made by the Governing Body as part of the 10-year budget process in May.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board endorse:

a) an increase to the local transport capital fund of $10 million per annum (inflation adjusted) from 1 July 2018

b) the distribution of the entire local transport capital fund to be made according to Auckland Council’s Local Boards Funding Policy from 1 July 2018

c) Auckland Transport receiving additional funding to provide an increased level of support to local boards in developing and assessing projects for the local transport capital fund.

Horopaki / Context
8. The local transport capital fund (LTCF) was established by resolution of the Strategy and Finance Committee [SF/2012/40] in April 2012, in order to provide local boards with access
to funding for local transport projects that had strong local significance, but which were unlikely to be prioritised through the regional transport planning process.

9. The establishment of the fund is consistent with the government’s original policy intent that local boards would have a role in funding local transport projects out of a dedicated local budget [CAB Minute(09) 30/10] and that “local boards will have an advisory role with respect to transport services and a budget for the transport elements of ‘place shaping’”.

10. The objectives of the fund are to:
   - ensure locally important transport projects are given appropriate priority
   - provide local boards with more direct ability to influence local transport projects.

11. Projects must be deliverable, meet transport safety criteria and not compromise the network. Auckland Transport retains the responsibility for delivering projects delivered through this funding and the budget remains with Auckland Transport. Depreciation and consequential operating expenditure are also the responsibility of Auckland Transport, as is the core administration of the fund.

12. The fund was initially set at $10 million per annum (since adjusted for inflation, and now sitting at $10.8 million) and is currently split between the local boards on the basis of population, excepting Waiheke and Great Barrier Island local boards, which receive two per cent and one per cent of the fund respectively. The population figures that the distribution is based on have remained at 2012 levels.

13. At the Governing Body meeting of 28 September 2017, at which the recommendations of the Governance Framework Review Political Working Party were considered, it was agreed [GB/2017/117] that officers would report back to the governing body through the 10-year budget process on options for significantly increasing the LTCF, as well as providing an assessment of options for allocating the additional funding.

14. This report provides options for the quantum of the proposed increase, the method of allocating the proposed increase among the twenty one local boards and issues relating to the administration of the fund. Workshops have been held with each local board to discuss these proposals and now formal feedback is sought through business meetings. Final recommendations will be made to the Governing Body in May.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

15. Issues with the local transport capital fund identified through the governance framework review were grouped under three key themes:
   - the overall size, or quantum, of the local transport capital fund
   - the methodology underpinning its distribution among local boards
   - the administration and support provided by Auckland Transport to local boards in relation to developing options and projects for consideration.

Quantum of funding

16. When the LTCF was initially established at $10 million, the figure was not based on any specific assessment of need, but more on the recognition that smaller, local projects that had a strong place shaping component were unlikely to be funded according to Auckland Transport and NZTA’s prioritisation formulas.

17. While the fund took some time to get established, it is now delivering valuable transport related outcomes for communities across Auckland. The LTCF spend forecast in 2016-17 financial year was $17 million, as boards have been able to accumulate funding across

\[\text{Cabinet paper: Auckland Governance: Regional Transport Authority Steven Joyce, Minister of Transport 2009}\]
\[\text{Based on Statistics NZ 2011 population estimates}\]
years to put towards more significant projects. It has delivered 286 projects over the five year period.

18. The LTCF contribution to these many local projects has also been complemented through the input of additional funds from Auckland Transport (as well as NZTA subsidy) with the value of the work they have delivered to their communities being substantially leveraged through this additional funding.

19. Staff have modelled the impact of the proposed increase on individual local boards according to a range of distribution models. In doing so, two different levels of increase have been used – the $10 million figure, initially proposed by Auckland Transport, and a lower figure of $6 million.

20. Neither figure is based on specific needs assessment, but Auckland Transport is of the view that a baseline of approximately six hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year is desirable to give individual boards the resources to support significant local projects. This would require an increase of at least $6 million per annum.

21. Boards that have had access to higher levels of funding have generally found it easier to leverage that to attract NZTA subsidies and additional Auckland Transport funding, for example for projects that are being brought forward as a result of LTCF investment. Successful examples include the Half Moon Bay ferry terminal, the Mt Albert Station Bridge and the Māngere Future Streets project.

Distribution methodology

22. This section provides modelling of three distribution options applied to two levels of overall increase (sub-option A being an increase of $6 million, and sub-option B being an increase of $10 million). The options are:

- Option 1: status quo – simple population based distribution of both the existing fund and any additional funding
- Option 2: applying the current Local Boards Funding Policy to the distribution of the fund
- Option 3: a model that provides for a fixed level of baseline funding for all boards, as well as a variable component based on the Local Boards Funding Policy.

Population based distribution

23. In 2012, the governing body elected to distribute the first iteration of the LTCF purely on a population basis, following consultation with local boards\(^3\). The distribution has not been adjusted to account for population distribution changes since the fund was established.

24. We have modelled (Appendix A) the option of applying the population based distribution methodology, based on Statistics NZ 2017 population estimates. As you will see from the modelling, the impact on boards with higher populations is the most significant, in terms of an increase in funding, especially if the additional amount is $10 million.

25. Under this model, however, if the additional amount is $6 million, six boards would still fall short of the $650,000 baseline figure identified by Auckland Transport as being desirable to enable the delivery of viable local transport proposals.

Applying the Local Boards Funding Policy to the LTCF

26. Following the establishment of the LTCF, work was undertaken to develop the current Local Boards Funding Policy, as required under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009. This policy was adopted in 2014, and uses an allocation methodology incorporating three factors: population (90 per cent), deprivation (five per cent) and land area (five per cent). This funding policy is currently applied to locally driven initiatives funding, including the local capital fund, but was not retrospectively applied to the LTCF.

---

\(^3\) There was no formal local board funding policy in place at this time
27. The development of the funding policy involved significant consultation and engagement with local boards prior to final adoption. There are no current plans to review the policy.

28. We have modelled (Appendix B) the option of applying the Local Boards Funding Policy to the distribution of the LTCF. The modelling has been applied to the existing fund and the additional amounts of $6 million and $10 million. The modelling is also based on 2017 population estimates.

Fixed and variable costs distribution

29. As previously noted, Auckland Transport has the view that in order to deliver transport infrastructure of any significance, a certain level of baseline funding is desirable – around $650,000 per annum, based on practical experience.

30. Many local boards have achieved significant results with their local transport projects, but transport infrastructure is inherently costly and costs tend not to vary according to location. For example, a footbridge and walking path in Pukekohe will tend to cost the same as a comparable one in Glenfield.

31. In considering the distribution methodology for the extended fund, Auckland Transport has put forward the following factors as being relevant:
   - the cost of building transport infrastructure is not directly related to the size of the population it serves
   - mature areas with high populations tend to already have higher quality and better developed transport infrastructure
   - the existing Auckland Transport/NZTA criteria for regional transport spending tend to favour, as would be expected, areas of high density and growth
   - the physical size of an area tends to have a correlation with the need for transport infrastructure e.g. the number of settlements, town centres.

32. A distribution model based on a split of fixed and variable costs has also been modelled as an option. The methodology involves fifty per cent of the entire quantum of funding being distributed by an even split (with the exception of Great Barrier and Waiheke Island Boards which receive 1/3 and 2/3 of a single share respectively), thus giving all other local boards the same level of core funding. The other fifty per cent of the funding would be distributed according to the Local Boards Funding Policy.

33. We have modelled (Appendix C) the option of applying this fixed/variable costs model to the distribution of the LTCF.

Assessing the options

34. Each of the three distribution models has elements to recommend it and others that detract from it. In assessing the models, staff applied the following assessment criteria:
   - transparency and ease of understanding for communities and stakeholders
   - equity and fairness of outcomes across the region
   - ensuring delivery of good local transport outcomes
   - recognising the role of local boards as leaders of place shaping with their communities.

35. Staff assessment of the options against these criteria is set out below.

Options 1a and 1b – population based distribution

36. These options have been modelled on 2017 Statistics New Zealand population estimates.

37. A pure population based approach has the benefits of being objective, transparent and straightforward and means that funding received is proportionate to the number of ratepayers. It was, however, recognised at the time that this approach applied to areas of extremely low population (Waiheke and Great Barrier Islands) would result in those boards...
receiving insufficient funding to achieve anything practical, hence the application of the one
and two per cent formula for the island boards. A similar approach is also used in the Local
Boards Funding Policy.

38. The limitations of this approach are that it does not address either the level of need in a
given local board area, or the underlying cost drivers of transport infrastructure. Hence, large
areas of low population density with significant roading networks and multiple population
centres are funded at the same, or lower, level as smaller urban communities of interest with
already well-developed transport infrastructure, but higher population density.

39. The distribution methodology is simple and transparent and easy for communities and
stakeholders to understand. In terms of delivering equity and fairness, this model delivers
the widest differential of funding levels across boards, with the highest funded board
receiving 2.78 times the amount of the lowest funded board (excluding the island boards).

40. Option 1a also results in six boards receiving less than Auckland Transport’s benchmark
identified as desirable for supporting good local transport outcomes in communities. The
model limits the potential for those boards to actively implement their role as local place
shapers and to leverage additional investment into their projects. This model, and therefore
Options 1a and 1b, is not supported by either Auckland Council or Auckland Transport staff.

Options 2a and 2b – Local Boards Funding Policy based distribution

41. This distribution method involves application of the current Local Boards Funding Policy. The
policy is currently applied to distribution of funding for local activities (including local capex)
to local boards and is based on the following factors: ninety per cent population\(^4\), five
percent deprivation\(^5\) and five per cent land area\(^6\).

42. Applying the Local Boards Funding Policy is a simple methodology that has a clear rationale,
is easily described to the community and is consistent with council’s wider approach to
funding local boards. It takes account of multiple factors, delivering a more equitable
distribution of funding, especially to boards with lower populations but very large land areas
and roading networks.

43. Reviewing the projects that have been funded from the LTCF to date, it is clear that much of
the local boards’ focus has been on “people centred” transport projects, for example
pedestrian safety improvements, walkways and cycleways, footpaths and streetscape
improvements. This is consistent with the principles underpinning the Local Boards Funding
Policy i.e. that population is the key driver of need for the funding, but that geography and
deprivation also need to be taken into account.

44. This distribution methodology evens out the increase in funding across the twenty one
boards. The boards with a larger land area receive more funding than under the pure
population model, and all boards receive the proposed level of baseline funding, but only
under the $10 million quantum increase.

45. Under this model, however, the level of funding that accrues to the more populous boards
becomes very substantial in relationship to that for the smaller boards, due to the
compounding impact of the distribution model. For example, the Howick Local Board would
receive over $1.7 million and Henderson-Massey over $1.4 million. Despite these extremes,
this option provides an arguably more equitable and nuanced distribution of funding, as well
as being consistent with current funding policy.

46. Its variation between the lowest and highest level of funding is still high with the highest
funded board receiving 2.57 times the amount of the lowest funded board. Under Option 2a,
five boards still receive less than Auckland Transport’s desirable benchmark for delivering
good local transport outcomes in communities and it limits the potential for those boards to
actively implement their role as local place shapers.

\(^4\) Based on annually revised estimates from Statistics NZ

\(^5\) Based on Index of Deprivation provided by the Ministry of Health

\(^6\) Excluding Great Barrier and Waiheke
47. This is the preferred option on the basis of consistency with the existing funding policy, assessment against the criteria and recognition of the population focus of projects delivered using this fund. The preferred option is for the $10 million quantum as better providing for good local transport outcomes and delivering local place shaping.

Options 3a and 3b – fixed and variable cost distribution

48. This model is more complex and less transparent to communities and stakeholders than the other models. The identification of the benchmark figure is based on Auckland Transport’s experience of administering the fund over the past five years and the learning that has been gained from this, rather than in-depth financial analysis of infrastructure costs.

49. The results of this distribution are similar to those of applying the Local Boards Funding Policy, in that a similar number of local boards benefit under each model. However, it is different local boards that benefit from each model. In terms of equity and fairness, this model reduces the difference between the highest funded and lowest funded boards and also brings all boards above the $650,000 benchmark, even under Option 3a ($6m increase).

50. The model reduces the impact of population on the distribution of funding, however, which is a core component of current funding policy and the focus of the projects delivered using the LTCF. The model performs well against the criteria of enabling the delivery of good local transport outcomes and supporting the role of local boards as place shapers.

Summary of assessment of options

51. Of the three distribution models assessed, the current model of pure population distribution performed the poorest and is not recommended by either Auckland Council or Auckland Transport staff.

52. The other two models deliver mixed results against the criteria. On balance, staff recommend that the Local Boards Funding Policy distribution best meets the criteria and is consistent with current funding policy. The final recommendation to the governing body will also be informed by feedback from local boards through this process.

Administration of the LTCF

53. When the LTCF was established in 2012, it was recognised that there would be an impact on Auckland Transport as the fund administrator. While design costs are capitalised within the cost of a specific project, there are also additional costs in developing options, undertaking feasibility studies, assessing proposals and general administration.

54. It was noted at the time that if each local board proposed 3-4 projects a year that this could place a considerable burden on Auckland Transport and it was recommended that this be reviewed at the time the fund was reviewed. Given the proposed increase to the size of the fund, this issue needs to be revisited.

55. Auckland Transport’s advice on LTCF investment focusses on whether a project put forward by a local board is technically feasible, and whether it is realistic in light of the available funding from the LTCF. During the governance framework review some local board members raised concerns about the nature and quality of advice received from Auckland Transport in relation to LTCF proposals. Boards felt that advice was limited to assessing their proposal against criteria, rather than helping them identify and develop high quality proposals.

56. It is recommended that Auckland Transport be allocated additional opex funding in support of the LTCF to be used to develop a more systematic and responsive work programme with local boards around the application of the LTCF. This will include supporting boards to investigate and develop options for projects for consideration. A sum of $500,000 per annum is recommended to support this deliverable.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

57. Workshops have been held with every local board and a range of initial feedback has been received. Discussion on collective views has also taken place at the Local Board Chairs’ Forum. While some local boards have given early indication of their preferred options, others have reserved the right to engage in further consideration ahead of providing formal feedback.

58. There was general support for an increase to the fund and for additional funding to be provided to Auckland Transport to provide advice on projects and mixed views on options for allocating the fund. As noted in the assessment of options, each of the options for the amount of increase and the distribution methodology affects individual boards differently.

59. Growth was raised by some boards as a factor that should be considered. Staff’s view is that the population element of each of the models addresses this as current population is the only reliable indicator of growth. Population estimates are updated and will be applied to the fund annually.

60. As noted in the assessment of options, each of the options for the amount of increase and the distribution methodology affects individual boards differently. A recent presentation to the Local Board Chairs’ Forum noted that it would be helpful for the Governing Body to have a clear preference signalled by the majority of local boards, in order to facilitate its decision making.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

61. A move away from a pure population based distribution model would take into account other factors, being deprivation and land area. Both options 2 and 3 include a deprivation component, although this is greater in option 2. This would have some positive impact on local board areas where there is a higher Māori population.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

62. The source of the additional funding is not addressed in this report, as it is being considered through the overall budget setting process in the 10-year budget. Essentially, however, there are two options that the governing body will need to consider – that additional funding comes from rates and/or borrowing, or Auckland Transport reprioritises within its existing funding envelope.

63. The proposed size of the increase to the fund (both options) is not significant enough within the overall transport budget to be able to enable transparent trade-offs at a detailed level e.g. which specific transport projects might not be funded in the Regional Land Transport Plan in a given year if the LTCF is increased.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

64. No significant risks have been identified.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

65. Final decisions will be made by the Governing Body as part of the 10-year budget process in May. Any new funding and change to the distribution methodology will be applied from 1 July 2018.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Population based distribution modelling</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Local boards funding policy distribution modelling</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Linda Taylor - Programme Manager Governance Framework Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment A: Population based distribution modelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of local board</th>
<th>Current funding 2016-17</th>
<th>Additional $6m Option 1a</th>
<th>Additional $10m Option 1b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$720,250</td>
<td>$1,080,505</td>
<td>$1,337,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$417,067</td>
<td>$621,441</td>
<td>$769,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$471,158</td>
<td>$739,198</td>
<td>$915,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$135,370</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td>$206,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$810,847</td>
<td>$1,210,227</td>
<td>$1,468,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$649,769</td>
<td>$1,034,085</td>
<td>$1,286,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$944,450</td>
<td>$1,486,313</td>
<td>$1,840,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td>$627,735</td>
<td>$930,182</td>
<td>$1,151,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$590,834</td>
<td>$802,530</td>
<td>$963,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$642,681</td>
<td>$935,130</td>
<td>$1,157,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$535,924</td>
<td>$788,676</td>
<td>$976,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrakei</td>
<td>$595,708</td>
<td>$805,444</td>
<td>$1,121,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Paparoa</td>
<td>$594,966</td>
<td>$668,829</td>
<td>$1,075,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$331,660</td>
<td>$539,308</td>
<td>$667,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukehāpapa</td>
<td>$410,662</td>
<td>$623,420</td>
<td>$771,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$399,966</td>
<td>$636,234</td>
<td>$767,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$385,112</td>
<td>$646,179</td>
<td>$800,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>$210,641</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>$358,706</td>
<td>$536,339</td>
<td>$664,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitāną</td>
<td>$506,878</td>
<td>$1,073,068</td>
<td>$1,329,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$550,834</td>
<td>$838,154</td>
<td>$1,037,714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment B: Local Board Funding Policy distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of local board</th>
<th>Current funding 2016-17</th>
<th>Additional $6m Option 2a</th>
<th>Additional $10m Option 2b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$720,250</td>
<td>$1,013,841</td>
<td>$1,255,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$417,067</td>
<td>$587,208</td>
<td>$727,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$471,158</td>
<td>$896,840</td>
<td>$1,110,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$105,370</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td>$208,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$810,647</td>
<td>$1,146,311</td>
<td>$1,419,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$649,769</td>
<td>$973,716</td>
<td>$1,205,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$944,450</td>
<td>$1,375,550</td>
<td>$1,703,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>$627,735</td>
<td>$876,680</td>
<td>$1,085,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$580,834</td>
<td>$794,642</td>
<td>$983,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$642,681</td>
<td>$901,483</td>
<td>$1,116,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$535,924</td>
<td>$787,842</td>
<td>$980,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrakei</td>
<td>$595,708</td>
<td>$840,058</td>
<td>$1,040,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>$594,906</td>
<td>$649,392</td>
<td>$1,051,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$331,660</td>
<td>$540,785</td>
<td>$669,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>$410,662</td>
<td>$606,154</td>
<td>$750,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$399,986</td>
<td>$867,983</td>
<td>$1,223,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$385,112</td>
<td>$615,035</td>
<td>$761,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitānie</td>
<td>$216,641</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>$358,706</td>
<td>$565,003</td>
<td>$699,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitāneatā</td>
<td>$506,878</td>
<td>$1,008,133</td>
<td>$1,248,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$550,834</td>
<td>$805,670</td>
<td>$967,496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment C: Fixed and variable costs distribution 50/50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of local board</th>
<th>Current funding 2016-17</th>
<th>Additional $6m Option 3a</th>
<th>Additional $10m Option 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$720,259</td>
<td>$832,021</td>
<td>$1,147,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$417,067</td>
<td>$717,591</td>
<td>$883,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$471,158</td>
<td>$901,500</td>
<td>$1,975,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$105,370</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>$277,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$810,647</td>
<td>$1,001,313</td>
<td>$1,229,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$649,799</td>
<td>$913,007</td>
<td>$1,122,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$444,450</td>
<td>$1,113,164</td>
<td>$1,371,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>$627,735</td>
<td>$863,985</td>
<td>$1,062,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$590,834</td>
<td>$827,059</td>
<td>$1,011,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$842,681</td>
<td>$879,294</td>
<td>$1,078,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$535,924</td>
<td>$812,212</td>
<td>$965,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrakei</td>
<td>$595,708</td>
<td>$843,623</td>
<td>$1,040,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetos</td>
<td>$594,666</td>
<td>$854,332</td>
<td>$1,045,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$331,660</td>
<td>$698,308</td>
<td>$854,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>$410,662</td>
<td>$729,517</td>
<td>$865,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$399,986</td>
<td>$973,311</td>
<td>$1,131,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$385,112</td>
<td>$732,300</td>
<td>$900,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>$216,641</td>
<td>$448,000</td>
<td>$554,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>$358,706</td>
<td>$714,259</td>
<td>$860,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheka</td>
<td>$508,878</td>
<td>$930,042</td>
<td>$1,144,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$580,834</td>
<td>$830,188</td>
<td>$1,018,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approval for one new road name in the Ngāti Whātua Orākei Trust subdivision at 73-89 Moire Rd, Massey.

File No.: CP2018/04388

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from Henderson-Massey Local Board to change one previously approved road name for a new private road in the Ngāti Whātua Orākei Trust subdivision at 73-89 Moire Rd, Massey.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the Council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming.
3. The Applicant, Ngāti Whātua Orākei Trust, has submitted the following road name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Alternate 1</th>
<th>Alternate 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOAL 5</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Old Farm</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Muriels View</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. All of the proposed road names are deemed to meet the criteria and are acceptable to Land Information New Zealand (LINZ).

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) approve a changed road name Old Farm Lane for the new private road JOAL 5 with approved name Pereki Lane within the residential subdivision at 73-89 Moire Rd, Massey

Horopaki / Context
5. Henderson-Massey Local Board approved the previous name for JOAL 5 as follows:
   21 March 2017 - Pukio Lane approved with 10 other road names in resolution HM/2017/30.
   15 February 2018 all 11 names approved notified to LINZ as approved.
   15 February 2018 LINZ advise Pukio Lane not acceptable as identical to a lane in Remuera.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
6. According to the Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines, where a new public or private road needs to be named as a result of a subdivision or development, the subdivider / developer shall be given the opportunity of suggesting their preferred new road name for local board approval.
7. Auckland Council's road naming criteria typically requires that road names reflect:
   - a historical or ancestral linkage to an area;
Item 15

- a particular landscape, environmental or biodiversity feature; or
- an existing (or introduced) thematic identity in the area

8. Names need to be easily identifiable and intuitively clear, thus minimising confusion.

9. The one new private road to be renamed services properties within the subdivision and is shown on Attachment A.

10. The Applicant has proposed the road names listed in the table below. All names meet the criteria through historical association with the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed New Road Names</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOAL 5</td>
<td>(existing name Pukio Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Farm Lane</td>
<td>Referencing the McWhirter farm and homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Lane</td>
<td>Referencing the pear orchard at the McWhirter farm and homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriels View Lane</td>
<td>George McWhirter’s wife Muriel May Ella (nee Parker).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The road naming criteria suggests that the road types could be referred to as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Guideline Description</th>
<th>Applicant Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Narrow roadway between walls, buildings or a narrow country roadway.</td>
<td>Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


13. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate impact on the community.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

14. Ngāti Whātua Orākei Trust are a joint venture partner with Fletcher Living for this development. Local iwi were consulted previously during original approvals as two of names were originally submitted as alternates in March 2017 but declined comment as none of the names are Māori in nature.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

15. The cost of processing the approval of the proposed changed road name is not recoverable as the applicant would have previously paid for the original road name approvals in
Approval for one new road name in the Ngāti Whātua Orākei Trust subdivision at 73-89 Moire Rd, Massey.

accordance with Auckland Council’s administrative charges. The need to change the name was because the original road naming process was not completed as LINZ was not notified allowing a similar sounding name to be approved elsewhere.

16. The applicant has responsibility for ensuring that appropriate signage will be installed accordingly once approval is obtained for the new road name.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
17. There are no significant risks to council as road naming is a routine part of the subdivision development process with consultation being a key part of the application.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
18. Approved road names are notified to LINZ who record them on their New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by councils. On completion of the subdivision through meeting all the resource consent conditions, the roads can be legalised and new property titles issued.
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Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report


Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy was implemented on 1 July 2015. The policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.

3. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year.

4. This report presents the Henderson-Massey Community Grants Programme 2018/2019 for adoption (see attachment A).

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:


Horopaki / Context

5. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy was implemented on 1 July 2015. The policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.

6. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year. The local board grants programme guides community groups and individuals when making applications to the local board.

7. The local board community grants programme includes:
   - outcomes as identified in the local board plan
   - specific local board grant priorities
   - which grant types will operate, the number of grant rounds and opening and closing dates
   - any additional criteria or exclusions that will apply
   - other factors the local board consider to be significant to their decision-making.

8. Once the local board community grants programme for the 2018/2019 financial year has been adopted, the types of grants, grant rounds, criteria and eligibility with be advertised through an integrated communication and marketing approach which includes utilising the local board channels.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
9. The new Henderson-Massey Community Grants Programme has been workshopped with the local board and feedback incorporated into the grants programme for 2018/2019.
10. The new grant programme includes:
   • new outcomes and priorities from the Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan 2017
   • the same number of grant rounds for 2018/2019, as are available in 2017/2018.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
11. The Community Grants Programme has been developed by the local board to set the direction of their grants programme. This programme is reviewed on an annual basis.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
12. All grant programmes respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to improving Māori wellbeing by providing grants to organisations delivering positive outcomes for Māori. Applicants are asked how their project aims to increase Māori outcomes in the application process.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
13. The allocation of grants to community groups is within the adopted Long term Plan 2015 - 2025 and local board agreements.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
14. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy and the local board grants programme. Therefore, there is minimal risk associated with the adoption of the grants programme.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
15. An implementation plan is underway and the local board grants programme will be locally advertised through the local board and council channels. Targeted advertising and promotion will be developed for target populations, including migrant and refugee groups, disability groups, Māori and iwi organisations
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Henderson-Massey Grants Programme 2018/2019

Our Grants Programme aims to provide contestable community grants to local communities.

Outcomes sought from the local grants programme

Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the following outcomes, as outlined in our local board plan:

- A network of vibrant and loved urban neighbourhoods
- A thriving local economy that supports quality of life
- Communities know each other and work together on common interests
- Community facilities are vibrant and welcoming places at the heart of our communities
- It is easy to get around without a car
- Natural spaces are valued and restored

Our priorities for grants

These priorities relate to the local board objectives and initiatives as outlined in the local board plan:

- Neighbourhood centres foster a sense of identity and place
- Arts, events and cultural activities reflect our many heritages
- Innovation and enterprise is enabled
- People know each other and feel connected in their neighbourhoods
- Strong community organisations are making a difference
- Diversity and difference is embraced and valued
- Mana whenua and mataawaka rights are acknowledged and their needs and aspirations are widely known
- People are more active
- Our parks and recreational services provide a range of accessible experiences for our diverse community
- Our community facilities are well-used and flexible in meeting community needs
- People are central to maintaining our environment
- The water quality of our streams and tidal areas is improving
- Biodiversity is increasing

Higher Priorities:

A higher priority will be given to:

- locally based events and organisations
- activities that improve Māori outcomes
- activities that improve community connectedness and are inclusive
- events that demonstrate smoke free, waste minimisation and offers healthy food alternatives

Lower Priorities:

The Henderson-Massey Local Board has identified the following activities as lower priorities:

- events that charge an admission fee
- catering
- fundraising events
- travel
In addition to the eligibility criteria outlined in the Community Grants Policy the Henderson-Massey Local Board will not fund:

- groups that have not met previous grant accountability requirements
- salaries or project management fees

**Investment approach**

The Henderson-Massey Local Board has allocated budgets to support the grants programme as follows:

- **Quick Response Grants:**
  - Minimum amount per grant: $500 - Maximum amount per grant: $2,000
- **Local Grants**
  - Generally, the local board will fund local grants between $2,000 and $5,000.

**Application dates**

Grant rounds for 2018/2019 will be as follows:

### Quick Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018/19 grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>18 June 2018</td>
<td>13 July 2018</td>
<td>21 August 2018</td>
<td>1 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>17 September 2018</td>
<td>12 October 2018</td>
<td>20 November 2018</td>
<td>1 December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round three</td>
<td>16 April 2019</td>
<td>17 May 2019</td>
<td>18 June 2019</td>
<td>1 July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018/19 grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>16 July 2018</td>
<td>24 August 2018</td>
<td>16 October 2018</td>
<td>1 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>18 February 2019</td>
<td>29 March 2019</td>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>1 June 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multi-board funding**

The Henderson-Massey Local Board may allocate grants to a project that benefits multiple local board areas on a case-by-case basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018/2019 Multiboard grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>18 June 2018</td>
<td>17 August 2018</td>
<td>16 October 2018</td>
<td>1 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>21 January 2019</td>
<td>22 March 2019</td>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>1 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reallocation of the 2017/2018 Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Plan Budget

File No.: CP2018/02814

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report


Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. At its June 2017 business meeting, the Henderson-Massey Local Board allocated $9,900 for an Environmental Action Plan project as part of their 2017/2018 local environment and development work programme (resolution HM/2017/104).

3. Funding allocated to the Environmental Action Plan project was approved to support the facilitation of key council and community stakeholders to explore the formation of an Eco-City Forum, including its purpose, focus and how it could inform and collaborate with the board to progress five environmental opportunity areas (Unlock Henderson, North West Wildlink, Connected Henderson-Massey, Sustainable Living, and Healthy Streams, Healthy People).

4. Two of the environmental opportunity areas (Unlock Henderson and North West Wildlink) have already developed collaborative stakeholder mechanisms. There is a high risk that the formation of an Eco-City Forum would duplicate these recently established models for collaboration between the council and community.

5. It is recommended to not progress the Eco-City Forum concept, and to reallocate the $9,900 funding to other environmental projects.

6. Environmental project options were discussed at a workshop with the board on 6 March 2018 and feedback from the board was used to identify the following projects recommended for funding:
   • $2,400 for Love Your Streams
   • $5,000 for North West Wildlink – Pest Free Te Atatu
   • $2,500 for Pop Up Bike Hub.

7. This report seeks the board’s approval to reallocate the $9,900 towards these projects for delivery within the 2017/2018 financial year. If approved, the board will receive updates on each of these projects through the quarterly performance reporting process.

8. If the board does not approve the reallocation of budget towards these projects at its April 2018 business meeting, there is a high risk that these projects will not be delivered within the current financial year and budget will not be spent.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) approve the reallocation of $9,900 from the 2017/2018 Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Plan budget towards the environmental projects summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love Your Streams</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Wildlink – Pest Free Te Atatu</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop Up Bike Hub</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Horopaki / Context

9. The previous Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan (2014) included an initiative to “prepare an Environmental Action Plan for our area to help coordinate environmental activities across a diverse range of community, council and government groups.” Total funding of $15,000 was allocated to this project through the board’s 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 local environment work programmes.

### Stocktake summary

10. A 2015/2016 stock take of environmental action in Henderson-Massey identified over 200 individual environmental projects and programmes that were completed, planned or underway at the time of the report. This information was summarised in an Environmental Action Report for Henderson-Massey. A copy of that report has been included as Attachment A. This work was funded by the local board to a value of $10,000.

11. Of the 200 projects and programmes, 160 projects (80 per cent) were being actively delivered during the period when the data was collected. Collectively the projects and programmes aligned well with both regional and local environmental priorities.

12. In 2017, a contractor interviewed key council and community stakeholders to identify environmental focus areas for Henderson-Massey, and how these could be progressed. A presentation to the board on the findings from these interviews has been included as Attachment B. This work was funded by the local board to a value of $5,000.

13. Five key environmental opportunity areas were identified (Unlock Henderson, Sustainable Living, Wildlink Wonders, Connected Henderson-Massey, and Healthy Streams, Healthy People). The work also explored the possible formation of an Eco-City Forum, involving both community and council stakeholders as a way to collectively progress the five opportunity areas.

14. A further $9,900 was allocated for the current 2017/2018 financial year. There has been no expenditure against this budget to date, due to potential scope change as outlined in this report.

### Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

#### Current state

15. In 2017/2018, $9,900 funding was allocated to develop the Eco-City Forum. Funding would support facilitation of key council and community stakeholders to explore the formation of an Eco-City Forum, including its purpose, focus and how it could inform and collaborate with the board to progress the environmental opportunity areas.

16. In the meantime, at least two of the key opportunity areas (Unlock Henderson and North West Wildlink) have advanced considerably and have each developed collaborative stakeholder mechanisms. It is highly likely that the formation of an Eco-City Forum would duplicate these already established models for collaboration between council and community.

17. It is recommended to not progress the Eco-City Forum concept, and to reallocate the $9,900 funding to other environmental projects.
Options for change in scope

18. Four options for investing the funds in high priority environmental action were discussed with the board at a workshop on 6 March 2018. Discussion with the board confirmed that all four project options were aligned with board priorities. One project option, the establishment of a North West Wildlink Henderson-Massey Restoration Network, had a longer lead in time than the other options, and staff could not guarantee delivery and full expenditure of funds within the 2017/2018 financial year. This project will instead be considered by the board for inclusion in their 2018/2019 environmental work programme.

19. Staff have confirmed that the remaining three project options are able to be delivered within the 2017/2018 financial year. These projects are summarised in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love Your Streams (EcoMatters Environment Trust)</td>
<td>Purchase of 565 additional plants to increase streamside restoration in Sunnyvale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Wildlink – Pest Free Te Atatu (Community Waitākere)</td>
<td>Contribution towards purchase of pest animal traps for this initiative which aims to involve 776 households on the peninsula in pest control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop Up Bike Hub (EcoMatters Environment Trust)</td>
<td>Contribution to enable the Henderson Bike Hub to operate four hours every Saturday from April to end of June 2018 in addition to Tuesday and Wednesday operating hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Love Your Streams (EcoMatters Environment Trust)

20. To achieve the key initiatives from the board’s plan ‘we are an eco-city’ and ‘community and business care for local streams and protect our precious coastal environments, the board allocated $24,000 in its 2017/2018 local environment and development work programme to fund the EcoMatters Environment Trust’s Love Your Streams initiative.

21. Love Your Streams engages and supports individuals, businesses, schools and community groups to adopt a proactive approach to pollution prevention of Henderson-Massey waterways.

22. This project enables community streamside weeding bees and planting at priority sites in the local board area, including the Manutewhau Stream and in Sunnyvale. The reallocation of $2,400 towards this project will enable the purchase of 565 additional plants for streamside planting in Sunnyvale in the current financial year.

23. Love Your Streams is also included as one of the EcoMatters initiatives in the board’s 2018/2019 draft local environment and development work programme. The purchase of the 565 plants does not duplicate the work planned for 2018/2019 for this project.

North West Wildlink – Pest Free Te Atatu (Community Waitākere)

24. The North West Wildlink – Pest Free Te Atatu project was developed by Community Waitākere in 2017 in alignment with Pest Free Auckland. The project plan aims to establish pest animal control (rats and mustelids) with 776 private householders (one in five) on the Te Atatu Peninsula. Community Waitākere is leading the initiative in conjunction with other community organisations and council staff.

25. At the December 2017 Environment and Community Committee meeting, the committee approved partial funding towards Community Waitākere’s application for a project coordinator through the Regional Environment and Natural Heritage Grants 2017/2018 funding round, to a value of $20,000 (resolution ENV/2017/190). This project is currently in
progress. The reallocation of $5,000 to this project will contribute to the purchase of pest animal traps to support the implementation of this initiative.

26. The Pest Free Te Atatu project is included in the board’s 2018/2019 draft local environment and development work programme. The purchase of the pest animal traps would not duplicate the funding sought for 2018/2019 for this project, which includes further support for coordinator time for the project, as well as support for the He Tohu Aroha Trust to build wooden trap covers to exclude non-target species from the traps.

**Pop Up Bike Hub (EcoMatters Environment Trust)**

27. EcoMatters Environment Trust and Panuku Development Auckland are collaborating on a Pop Up Bike Hub project to activate a future development site at 6 Henderson Valley Road, Henderson. The project involves establishing a temporary Pop Up Bike Hub to provide free basic bicycle maintenance and a low cost bike hire service using an existing shipping container-style building at the site. The Pop Up Bike Hub will also recommission bikes otherwise destined for landfill and provide maps and information about bike routes, commuting options and other cycling support.

28. Funding already confirmed from Panuku will enable the Pop Up Bike Hub service to operate four hours per day on Tuesdays and Wednesdays from April 2018 until September 2018. On Tuesdays, the Pop Up Bike Hub will operate from 2.00pm until 6.00pm and Henderson High School students will be invited to participate in bike hub activities after school. The reallocation of $2,500 to this project will enable the Pop Up Bike Hub to operate four hours every Saturday from April 2018 until the end of June 2018, in addition to the Tuesday and Wednesday operating hours. The Saturday opening hours would coincide with the operation of a temporary pump cycle track at the site.

29. The Pop Up Bike Hub project is proposed in the board’s 2018/2019 draft local environment and development work programme. The provision of $2,500 of funding for this project in 2017/2018 will not duplicate the funding sought from the board in 2018/2019. Trialling the Saturday opening hours in the current financial year would provide valuable information about how the service could be optimised in 2018/2019.

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

30. Providing support for the Love Your Streams and Pest Free Te Atatu projects would further enable the environmental work of local community organisations to restore natural habitats within the local board area.

31. The Pop Up Bike Hub would promote use of the Project Twin Streams cycle ways in the local board area. The operation of Bike Hubs in other locations, including the Whau Local Board area, has demonstrated that the Pop Up Bike Hub would provide a service that will complement and provide referrals to local bike-related businesses.

32. The projects noted above align with the Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan 2014 outcome ‘A community that values its environment’.

33. The options for reallocating funds from the Environmental Action Plan project were discussed with the board at a workshop on 6 March 2018, and members indicated their support in principle of the three projects outlined in this report.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

34. It is recognised that environmental management, water quality and land management has integral links with the mauri of the environment and concepts of kaitiakitanga.

35. Table 2 below outlines how projects contribute to Māori outcomes.

**Table 2. Māori outcome assessment for proposed projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Māori Outcome Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reallocation of the 2017/2018 Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Plan Budget
### Love Your Streams (EcoMatters Environment Trust)
Restoring streamside habitat will improve the mauri of the waterways, so healthy ecosystems and biodiversity are sustained.

### North West Wildlink – Pest Free Te Atatu (Community Waitākere)
Management of pest animals is of significance to mana whenua in their role as kaitiaki of natural environments. Project collaborators include He Tohu Aroha Trust, who will be making trap covers using wood from surplus pallets donated by local businesses.

### Pop Up Bike Hub (EcoMatters Environment Trust)
Sustainable resource management is core to the concept of kaitiakitanga. Replacing car journeys with active transport modes reduces greenhouse gas emissions and assists with preserving the climate for future generations.

## Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

36. The recommended projects can be delivered within existing budgets, as it would involve the reallocation of $9,900 previously approved for the delivery of the Eco-City Forum.

37. The reallocation of $2,400 towards Love Your Streams will bring the total budget for the project to $26,400 for the 2017/2018 financial year.

38. The funding of the proposed projects in the current financial year will not have financial implications for the projects proposed for funding through the local board’s draft 2018/2019 local environment and development work programme. While all three of the proposed projects are included in the board’s draft 2018/2019 local environment and development work programme, the project components proposed for funding in 2017/2018 are separate to those proposed for funding in 2018/2019. Funding the 2017/2018 components of the projects does not commit the board to further funding of the projects in 2018/2019. The draft 2018/2019 local environment and development work programme will be considered for approval by the board by June 2018.

## Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

39. All of the projects recommended for the reallocation of funds are in progress, have robust implementation plans, and are being led by community organisations with a strong track record of quality delivery. As such, all projects can be successfully delivered within the current financial year, should the budget be reallocated towards these projects at the April 2018 Henderson-Massey Local Board meeting.

40. If the board does not approve the reallocation of budget towards these projects at its April 2018 business meeting, there is a risk that no projects will be delivered against this budget within the financial year, and the budget will be given up as savings.

## Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

41. Subject to approval at the board’s April 2018 business meeting, the funded components of the projects will be completed by 30 June 2018. Regular reporting on project delivery will be provided through the Infrastructure and Environmental Services contribution to the board’s quarterly performance report.

## Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Report 2017</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Presentation Henderson-Massey; Working Together for Environmental and Social Wellbeing</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Robert Sutherland – Low Carbon Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Barry Potter - Director Infrastructure and Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Pratt – Low Carbon Living Team Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gael Ogilvie – General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Report 2017
Acknowledgements

Photographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Page</th>
<th>Restoration planting</th>
<th>Project Twin Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 4</td>
<td>Milly Scott at Te Atatu Peninsula Kite Day</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ella and Caitlin Gillard at Snow in the Park</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 8</td>
<td>Geoff and Dale Leyland planting a tree at a Trees for Babies event at McLeod Park</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 9</td>
<td>Map of Henderson-Massey area</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 16</td>
<td>Volunteer planting trees and shrubs at Corban Reserve</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 18</td>
<td>Classroom scene</td>
<td>Waitakere City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 23</td>
<td>Ladies weaving at Pasifika Mamas’ Weaving Workshop in Catherine Plaza</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 27</td>
<td>Ella and Caitlin Gillard at Snow in the Park</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 28</td>
<td>Great North Road median flower beds</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 29</td>
<td>Olivia Haggio at Te Atatu Peninsula Kite Day</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back page</td>
<td>Oratia Stream</td>
<td>Wikipedia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contributing Organisations

The following eight organisations contributed a total of 175 (87%) of the projects and programmes currently recorded for the Henderson-Massey Local Board area in the database:

- Auckland Council – Henderson-Massey Local Board, ACE, Chief Engineer, Environmental Services, Parks, Regional and Local Planning, Waste Solutions, Healthy Waters
- Auckland Transport
- EcoMatters Environment Trust
- McLaren Park Henderson South (MPHS)
- Weed Free Trust
- Community Waitakere
- Earthsong
- Te Ukaipo

A further 20 organisations have contributed between 1 and 3 projects and programmes each.

Report, database, graphs and tabular information

Mark Essex – Qmex Limited
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Robbie Sutherland - Low Carbon Specialist, Auckland Council
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Executive Summary

The purpose of the Henderson-Massey Local Board Environmental Action Report (HEAR) is to establish a living inventory of environmentally focussed projects and programmes in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area, providing a simple, logical framework for helping the Board determine appropriate levels of support, coordination and involvement. Through this project, the Henderson-Massey Local Board will work more closely with individuals and organisations that are willing to promote and facilitate stewardship of the Henderson-Massey environment.

The objectives of HEAR are to:

- Enable Board funding of environmentally-focussed projects and programmes to be planned and allocated on a more rational basis according to need, catchment location, and benefits.
- Achieve better community collaboration and support for environmental improvement projects.
- Establish a practical framework for coordinating environmentally-related interests in the Board area, which can be progressively refined and expanded, and possibly implemented by other Boards.
- Enable stakeholders within the area to understand and, through the Board, tap into the Council’s ability to provide information, leverage and assistance for their projects.
- Assist Council staff to identify important stakeholders and to maintain an overview of actions affecting the Local Board.

The HEAR database has provided the following summary information, characterising the environmentally-focussed activities occurring in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area:

- 28 contributing organisations
- 8 Council departments involved
- 200 individual projects and programmes relevant to Henderson-Massey
- 80% (160) of activities are currently underway
- 73% (146) of database records are location-specific projects
- 43% (69) of projects currently underway involve physical site improvements
- 10% (20) of projects and programmes are solely Local Board funded

Information relevant to environmentally-focussed projects or programmes being undertaken, planned, or recently completed in the Henderson-Massey area was received from 28 organisations. This raw information was reviewed and assessments of relevance made by Council’s advisory staff. An Excel-based data model, now containing a total of 200 project and programme records covering Henderson-
Massey local board area has been developed to hold this information in a simple, transparent manner that can easily be queried.

Each project and programme record is assessed for its alignment (or relevance) with 51 environmentally-focused measures. These measures are taken from The Auckland Plan (23) and the Henderson-Massey Board Plan (6) and includes a further 22 Tactical Alignments measures that represent important Council areas of concern. All 51 measures have equal weighting, hence the overall alignment of a project or programme with the Local Board’s priorities is a count of the positive (YES) relevancy decisions against each of these measures. The framework is simple, flexible, easy to use and highly transparent.

Although the 51 measures are not numerically weighted in relation to each other, each has been assigned to one of three Groups based on the degree of relevance to the Board’s priorities. The overall degree of relevancy for the 200 Henderson-Massey projects and programmes to the 23 Key Environmental Focus (KEF) measures is 58%, an encouraging outcome.

The data model will be refined and expanded over time as more information becomes available and representatives of each organisation become familiar with the approach and the benefits of contributing to it. This in turn will achieve better community cooperation and reduced duplication of effort and resources, and will enable stakeholders to more-easily tap into the Council’s ability to provide leverage and assistance for their projects.

The purpose of this report is to inform the Local Board about the project and its outcomes, and to explain for future users how the database and assessment process works.
## Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A: Key Environmental Focus (KEF) measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group B: Secondary Benefits measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group C: Other measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEF**

Key Environmental Focus measures – 23 (of the 51) measures that have a direct environmental improvement focus and are therefore considered the key measures for determining the relevance of projects/programmes to the Board’s priorities. KEF measures, also known as Group A measures (see Groups above), provide the first level for sorting the database projects and programmes by relevance.

**Measures**

51 strategic priorities, tactical alignments and operational factors against which each project/programme is assessed for relevance.

**Programme**

Organised activities that usually occur over a wider area such as Henderson-Massey, West Auckland or the entire region, rather than location-specific to the Board area. Programmes can include research, investigation, advice, education and community initiatives, but generally not physical works.

**Project**

Any organised activity that is location-specific and can be plotted on a map. Projects can include investigation, design, education, community work and physical site activities.

**Record(s)**

A single line of information in the database, representing one individual project or programme.

**Relevance**

An indication of each record’s alignment with (degree of relevance to) the local board’s and broader council strategies and tactical outcomes. For example, a project or programme that records a YES decision against all 51 measures has a relevance of 100%

**HEND**

Henderson-Massey Local Board Environmental Action Report

**YES**

For each project or programme record in the database, a ‘Y’ (YES) is recorded against each of the 51 assessment measures for which the project or programme scope is relevant.
1. Overview

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Henderson-Massey Local Board Environmental Action Report is to establish a living inventory of environmentally focussed projects and programmes in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area. This will enhance the Board’s understanding of where and how these activities are occurring and will provide a simple logical framework for helping the Board determine appropriate levels of support, coordination and involvement.

Through this project, the Local Board will work more closely with individuals and organisations - be they council, community or private enterprise - that are willing to promote stewardship of the local environment, and assist potential funders who are seeking information and opportunities for collaboration on environmentally focussed improvements in the area. The data model itself and the updatable Local Board data report will provide a valuable, time-saving resource for managing data from many departments and community organisations, and will make this information available for use in their day-to-day work.

The purpose of this report is to inform the Local Board about the project and its outcomes, and to explain for future users how the database and assessment process works.

1.2 Setting

The Henderson-Massey Local Board (the Board) is one of 21 Local Boards, created as part of the new Auckland Council in November 2010. Local Boards provide a council-community decision-making forum for addressing social, cultural and environmental issues and improvement initiatives in the 21 administrative areas.

The Henderson-Massey Local Board area (Figure 1) stretches from Whenuapai in the north to Giendene and Sunnyvale in the south, and includes Te Atatu, Henderson, Lincoln, Massey, Westgate and West Harbour. The area could not be better located between the foothills of the Waitākere Ranges in the west and the Waiatarua Harbour in the east. The Oriea and Oponuku streams and their tributaries wind their way from the ranges to the sea through the area, offering opportunities for water activities and beautiful parks. The Motu Manawa Marine Reserve at Te Atatu is home to ecologically important saltmarshes and endangered birds such as fernbird and banded rail. Henderson-Massey is fast becoming one of Auckland’s key transportation and population hubs.

Local Boards are responsible for providing leadership and support in building strong communities in their administrative areas. They also provide important input to region-wide strategies and plans including those of the Council-controlled organisations (CCOs). Board activities include prioritising and allocating funding and support for local initiatives.

1.3 Background

Especially in the last 10 years, there has been considerable growth in the number and scope of environmentally focussed activities in the west Auckland area, including riparian and estuarine habitat restoration, planting, stormwater quality improvements, education for sustainability and household sustainability initiatives.

Legacy projects and programmes from the former Auckland and Waitākere City Councils merged in November 2010. Organisations now responsible for these activities include Auckland Council Parks, Stormwater, Environmental and Community Services units, Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) and a growing number of volunteer-based community groups and charitable trusts. In many cases these initiatives share similar objectives but directly compete for available funds.

Through this report, the Board is developing a planning framework and database that provides a comprehensive inventory of past, present and possible future environmentally focussed projects and programmes, and the organisations behind them. The database will help the Board and council staff to coordinate support for these where possible and appropriate, which could include political support, community facilitation, coordination of interests, business community lobbying, and funding support for activities that strongly underpin the Board’s priorities. Future Board investment, involvement and support will thus move progressively toward projects and programmes that address key environmental issues and socio-environmental needs.
Figure 1: Henderson-Massey Local Board Administrative Area
1.4 Scope & objectives

**Objectives**
The objectives of this project are to:

- Enable Board funding of environmentally focussed projects and programmes to be planned and allocated on a rational basis according to need, catchment location, and benefits.
- Achieve better community collaboration and support for environmental improvement projects.
- Establish a practical framework for coordinating and reporting environmentally-related interests in the Board area, which can be progressively refined and expanded, and implemented by other Boards.
- Enable stakeholders within the area to understand and, through the Board, tap into the Council’s ability to provide information, leverage and assistance for their projects.

The project will provide an overview of issues, options, gaps, overlaps and risks, and will enable the Board to identify, prioritise, support and implement environmental improvement opportunities in a fair, rational and cost-effective manner. It will assist operational and project management staff by providing geographic and scope data on request, help to prevent duplication of effort, expand the capabilities of existing programmes where possible rather than starting new ones, and focus available funding in areas of most importance.

**Scope**
The scope of this report is to:

- Provide an overview stocktake of environmentally focussed projects and programmes in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area.
- Aid the Local Board in responding appropriately to issues and areas of environmental concern.
- Assemble a database of past, present and potential future environmentally focussed projects and programmes (records) and their supporting organisation(s), networks, groups, and stakeholders.
- Develop a data model that will assess the alignment (relevancy) of these activities with Council and Board priorities, identifying which projects and programmes are essential and beneficial now, desirable in the near future, or more suitable for consideration at a later time.
- Ensure that available budget and funding is channelled into the activities that achieve most benefit for the Henderson-Massey environment.
- Provide information that will assist in coordination of interests between functions of council and external interests, including water & wastewater, transport and utilities, charitable trusts, and community organisations such as education and local action groups.
- Develop a simple yet robust method of storing, assessing, managing, updating, expanding and reporting on the information gathered during the project.

**Successful Completion Criteria**

- Outcome is rational, practical, and useable for all stakeholders.
- Endorsement and buy-in from the Board, Council and community.
- Council and Community accept and support the framework’s results.
- Community is satisfied there has been effective consultation.
- Projects and programmes are ‘fit-for-purpose’ and able to be completed as planned.
1.5 Strategic setting

The Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Report seeks to guide how and when Council (both Local Board and regional) environmental budgets and third party grant funding is allocated and spent in the area. Given sweeping demographic, social, infrastructural and environmental changes occurring within the region, now and over the next few years, the project has a high priority at Board level. It will also be useful to the council’s governing body and certain departments, particularly as a mechanism for achieving better outcomes for available funds in local community areas. It is hoped that the project outputs will also assist other local boards in a similar way, and also community groups in focussing their efforts and resources to achieve the most benefit.

The project takes account of local and regional strategies, priorities and tactical alignments, drawing on these to measure the alignment of database records with local and regional aims – refer Appendix 3 for details.

The Auckland Plan

The Auckland Plan is “the strategy to make Auckland the world’s most liveable city”, showing how Aucklanders will prepare for an additional one million people and 400,000 new homes by 2040.

The Plan describes the kind of place Aucklanders want and outlines what actions are needed to achieve it. This can only be accomplished by all stakeholders working in partnership with a shared commitment to organised improvement, rather than allowing growth to shape our lives in an unmanaged way.

Two plans are especially critical to Auckland Council’s role in implementing the Auckland Plan over the first 10 years of its life. The Unitary Plan details how we design, develop and grow the city; and the Long Term Plan prioritises the funding needed to deliver The Auckland Plan outcomes on a staged basis.

The Auckland Plan has 13 Strategic Directions and 10 Environmental Principles & Priorities that provide a framework for assessing the alignment of Henderson-Massey database projects and programs with Auckland’s future outcomes.

Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan

Henderson-Massey will play a significant role in Auckland’s future. The Board vision for this area, and Auckland as a whole, is “CREATING THE WORLD’S MOST LIVEABLE CITY AT THE LOCAL LEVEL”; Auckland will be future-looking and resilient to the challenges we face, and “in our communities people will know each other and feel safe.”

There will be many new business opportunities and jobs. Industrial land at Westgate will be home to new large businesses that have relocated there because of its affordability, growth area location and proximity to the motorway network. In Henderson, business opportunities will increase because more people will be living in central Henderson and an international education precinct generating foreign exchange earnings will be in place. Local people will find local jobs with local businesses.

The Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan particularly recognises that there will be more things to do and places to go. Our parks will be venues for relaxing, walking, playing, sports and cycling. We want Corban Estate to revel in its dual roles of heritage treasure and the centre of a thriving arts community. More people living in Henderson will lead to a busy entertainment precinct and an improved shopping experience. There are going to be events that people are excited to get along to every year. We will have strong community organisations and sports clubs that support people in their leisure activities.

Underlying these plans for the Henderson-Massey area are the Board’s six Outcomes, including commitment to local action for the environment. Database records are also assessed for relevancy to these six priority outcomes. This report will inform development of the 2017 Local Board Plan.

Tactical Alignments

The report also uses 22 Tactical Alignments that relate to the beneficial outcomes of each database project and programme. The 22 Tactical Alignments represent important Auckland Council goals and activity streams at a
tactical level, including for example Air Quality, Biodiversity and Biosecurity, Energy Efficiency, Litter Removal, Place-Making, Sustainable Transport, Water Efficiency, Water Quality, and Waste Minimisation.
2. Methodology

2.1 Information gathering

Following initial contact by phone or email from November 2015, a total of 28 organisations supplied information on their environmentally-focussed projects or programmes being undertaken, planned, or recently completed in the Henderson-Massey local board area.

This raw information was reviewed between April and August 2016 by council advisory staff working with the Henderson-Massey Local Board. Information was recorded as it was received, and assessments of relevancy made by advisory staff. Review and updating of data will be ongoing.

2.2 Database

An Excel-based data model\(^1\) was created to hold this information in a simple, transparent manner that can easily be queried. It currently contains a total of 561 records submitted by 46 organisations with activities in the Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges (incomplete) and Whau areas, and covering the following eight Primary Objectives for the Henderson-Massey local board area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Numbers of Proj. &amp; Prog.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>To make an important cultural or heritage feature available for the public.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Awareness</td>
<td>To provide environmentally-focussed community education and awareness programmes</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>To undertake planning or physical works for the improvement of the natural environment</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-making(^2)</td>
<td>To create good public spaces that promote people’s health, happiness, and well-being</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Policy</td>
<td>To provide strategic planning and policy development for environmental improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>To promote and enable sustainable living practices</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>To provide utility services to the community</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>To improve natural water quality and stormwater management practices</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total database records (projects or programmes): 200

It is important to note that many environmental projects and programmes have multiple outcomes, which means categorising by Primary Objective does not express the other outcomes also being achieved. An example of this is streamside planting where the immediate (primary) outcome is often habitat improvement (classed as ‘Natural Environment’ in the database) with ‘Education & Awareness’ and ‘Water’ being secondary outcomes.

\(^1\) MS-Excel (currently Office 365, 2016) was chosen as the most appropriate platform for the database at this time. Excel is commonly used in most offices today and provides simple sorting, querying and graphical functions that most users are able to perform. It is also robust and relatively transparent so that users are able to see and understand the formulae and data structure. The Excel data can be transferred to a relational database at any time in the future, if and when this becomes necessary.

\(^2\) Place-making activities contribute to capitalising on a local community’s assets, inspiration and potential towards creating good public spaces that promote people’s health, happiness, and well-being, thus strengthening a city’s basis for collective memory.
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2.3 Assessment framework

The Auckland Plan and the Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan directions, principles and outcomes together provide 29 of the 51 framework measures for assessing the alignment of each database record with the Board’s environmentally-related priorities. In addition to these strategic elements, the framework uses a set of 22 Tactical Alignments that represent important Council areas of environmental concern and community capacity.

All 51 measures have equal weighting, hence the overall alignment of a project or programme with the Board’s priorities can be viewed as a count of the positive (YES) decisions against each of these measures. The framework is simple, flexible, easy to use and highly transparent, allowing the Board and support staff to view and query the details of each project or programme outcome.

The assessment framework is summarised in Table 2 below and described in detail in Appendix 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Directions</td>
<td>The Auckland Plan</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Principles and</td>
<td>The Auckland Plan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-M Local Board Priorities</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Alignments</td>
<td>Council areas of interest</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total measures in assessment framework:</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each database project or programme is assessed against all 51 measures, as to whether it aligns with (i.e. is relevant to) each measure or not. One of the following 5 answers is recorded against each measure:

- **Yes**
  - aligns (is relevant) to the measure
- **No**
  - does not align (is not relevant) to the measure
- **N/A**
  - not applicable to the measure
- **Has potential to**
  - may align with the measure in future
- **To be confirmed**
  - more information required before an assessment can be made

---

1. This system makes no attempt to compare the value (weight) of one measure against another. So a stormwater project with 10 YES decisions for example may be equally or more valuable to the region than a planting project with 50 YES decisions. However, projects and programmes can be grouped as shown in the next section, for sorting the database by relevancy. 

---
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Reallocation of the 2017/2018 Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Plan Budget
After completing this process for all 561 project and programme records in the database (covering Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges and Whau) a total of over 28,000 assessment decisions are available for recording. Where the entry for a particular measure is other than 'Yes' or 'No', the measure is not counted in the assessment totals for that project or programme.

The Henderson-Massey Local Board Area generated 200 projects and programmes, from which a total of over 10,000 assessment decisions were made, including over 4,500 (45%) ‘YES’ decisions.

Relevance Groups

Although the 51 measures are not numerically weighted in relation to each other, each has been assigned to one of three Groups based on the degree of relevance to the Board’s priorities. The three Groups of measures are:

- **Group A:** Key Environmental Focus measures (KEF)
- **Group B:** Secondary Benefit measures
- **Group C:** Other measures

Group A (KEF) measures have a direct environmental improvement focus and are therefore considered the key measures for determining relevance of projects/programmes to the Board’s environmental priorities. Group B measures are considered to represent important secondary benefits to the Board and Council, and therefore to the community. Group C measures have specific relevance to important issues that are not directly related to the Board’s environmental priorities.

The following table shows the distribution of measures within the 3 relevance Groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Number of Measures</th>
<th>KEF Measures (Group A)</th>
<th>Secondary Benefit Measures (Group B)</th>
<th>Other Measures (Group C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Directions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Principles and Priorities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Priorities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Alignments</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total measures:</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Database sorting by Relevance

These three Groups can be used effectively to sort the database projects and programmes into descending order of relevance to the Board’s priorities. Each database record receives a relevance score in all three Groups, based on the percentage of YES decisions versus the total measures per Group. The sort process takes place in Group order – first by A, then B and finally C.

**Figure 2** illustrates how projects and programmes can be sorted in the database by Relevance Groups A, B and C:
2.4 Development process

Figure 3 overleaf illustrates the overall process followed for initially gathering and verifying the information, the database data model and its reporting functions, and how the data outputs can be used by the Local Board and contributing organisations to develop an agreed Annual Projects Plan.

The initial data was obtained through phone calls and emails to relevant organisations, interviews, web searches and site inspections. This initial data, and new information submitted year-to-year, is inspected and verified by the Environmental Programmes Advisor before being entered to the database. Data summary reports are provided to the Local Board to assist in determining needs, benefits and priorities for the current and future years. Specific information can also be provided to contributors, summarising their project and programme records.

Appendix 1 provides a more detailed process diagram for how the database is seeded and updated, and the data model assessment process used to determine the relevancy percentages for each project and programme against the 51 measures (in the three Relevancy Groups).

Figure 2: Example database sort by Relevance Groups A, B and C:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Relevancy Group A</th>
<th>Relevancy Group B</th>
<th>Relevancy Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Project Twin Streams</td>
<td>Pacific Mamas P15 Involvement</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Enirochools Programme</td>
<td>Ellerslie Road School - Enirochools</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>EcoMatters Environment Trust</td>
<td>Community Planting (Waterways)</td>
<td>Community planting along waterways</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>EcoMatters Environment Trust</td>
<td>Industry Pollution Prevention</td>
<td>Industry Pollution Prevention</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>EcoMatters Environment Trust</td>
<td>Clean Streams Stream Watch</td>
<td>Stream clean-up, fencing awareness</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Forest and Bird</td>
<td>Taiapai Strand Bush Restoration Project</td>
<td>Planting of around 700 natives</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>The NorthWest Wildlink</td>
<td>NorthWest Wildlink Accord</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Outcomes for Henderson-Massey

3.1 Overview

The project data model produced the following summary information, characterising the environmentally-focused activities occurring in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area:

- 28 contributing organisations
- 8 Council departments involved
- 260 individual projects and programmes
- 80% (160) of activities are currently underway
- 73% (146) of database records are location-specific projects
- 43% (69) of projects currently underway involve physical site improvements
- 10% (20) of projects and programmes are solely Local Board funded

Every database project or programme record is assigned one of eight Primary Objectives – the main purpose for undertaking the work. These eight objectives are distributed between the 200 Henderson-Massey records as follows:

Figure 4: Database distribution between the Primary Objectives

This pie chart (Figure 4) shows that 91% of database activities in the Henderson-Massey area are primarily aimed at sustainable living practices or direct improvement of the natural environment and providing education and awareness around these aims. Water-related projects and programmes account for a further 4% and Utilities-related activities account for 3%. Around 2% of records represent place-making activities, and currently 1% each for Cultural & Heritage and Planning & Policy.
Of the 200 Henderson-Massey projects and programmes in the database, 160 (80%) are currently underway and 69 (43%) of these are physical improvement works of various kinds. The geographic distribution of primary objectives for location-specific projects (73% of projects in the database) is shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Primary Objectives by location (projects)
3.2 Assessment framework results

The assessment framework results help the Board to understand the numbers and types of activities occurring in its area, and where available resources may best be directed.

No weighting has been assigned to individual measures and the results are numerical counts only. The framework does however make an interpretation of project and programme relevance and benefits for planning purposes, but the number of records contributed by an organisation carries no direct or implied influence in determining which activities may be supported.

Group A: Key Environmental Focus (KEF) measures

As shown in Table 3, of the 51 assessment measures, the 23 comprising Group A are considered the Key Environmental Focus (KEF) measures against which the Henderson-Massey projects and programmes would be expected to perform well, which is the case. Table 4 provides a summary for the four groups of KEF measures involved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>KEF Measures</th>
<th>Average Data Relevance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Directions</td>
<td>The Auckland Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Principles and Priorities</td>
<td>The Auckland Plan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-M Local Board Outcomes</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Alignments</td>
<td>Council areas of interest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total measures in assessment framework: 23

The assessment results show a strong level of project and programme relevance to eight of the 12 Auckland Plan Strategic Directions, Environmental Principles and Priorities and Henderson-Massey Local Board Outcomes KEF measures (Figure 6 overleaf). The top seven of these, with their degree of relevance, are:

1. Henderson-Massey Local Board’s “Environment” 100.0%
2. “Auckland’s Environment” 99.5%
3. “The Environment Supports Us” 95.5%
4. “Everything is Connected” 95.5%
5. “We need to Consider Environmental Values In All We Do” 80.8%
6. “Sustainably Manage Natural Resources” 74.7%
7. “We Are Environmental Stewards” 73.7%
Figure 6: Group A (KEF) relevancies - Strategic Priorities measures

To some extent the range of relevancies is influenced by the different levels of specificity of the strategic priorities. For example, the relatively broad priority “We Are Environmental Stewards” is likely to be applicable to a broader range of projects in the database than the more specific priority “Treasure Our Coastline, Islands and Marine Areas”. It is also worth noting that projects and programmes vary in size and impact, so a relatively low number of initiatives aligning with a strategic priority may not necessarily indicate low impact for that priority area. The lower relevance of 55.1% for “Auckland’s Response to Climate Change” is not unexpected, as until recently this aim has been primarily tackled at regional level by Council-sponsored programmes. Figure 7 shows the 11 individual Group A KEF relevancies in the Tactical Alignments category.

Figure 7: Group A (KEF) relevancies - Tactical Alignments measures
In Figure 7, while the Henderson-Massey portion of the database currently has a relatively low number of initiatives relating to "Resource Recovery" and "Waste Minimisation", there is high relevancy for "Building and Supporting Capacity and Skills" (84.3%) in the community and encouraging behavioural change through "Education for Sustainability" (84.3%). A similar data profile was seen for the Whau Local Board area. As noted previously the smaller number of initiatives contributing to waste minimisation outcomes does not necessarily indicate that less impact is being made in this priority area.

As a simple summary, Table 4 shows just the overall average data relevancy for each of the four groups. Note however from Figures 6 and 7 that some individual KEF measures have low scores that pull the averages down—although these are key environmental focus measures, some of them are not necessarily expected to receive high scores in this initial snapshot of environmental action in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area. These include:

- "Auckland’s Response to Climate Change"  
  - 55.1%
- "Treasure Our Coastline, Islands and Marine Areas"  
  - 41.4%
- "Air Quality"  
  - 32.8%

From the above assessment framework results for Key Environmental Focus (KEF) measures, the 200 database projects and programmes occurring or planned for the Henderson-Massey Local Board area have, overall, a medium-to-high degree of relevance to the Board’s priorities and to the Council’s strategic and tactical priorities. While the majority of measures scored highly, there may be room for improvement some of the others.

**Group B: Secondary Benefit measures**

This second group of measures is not specifically focussed on environmental improvement but still represents 21 fundamentally important social, cultural and economic aims. Projects and programmes with a high degree of relevance to the Board’s environmental focus and which also record a high relevance for Group B measures, carry significant additional benefits to the Henderson-Massey local board area and the Auckland region. Figure 8 presents the individual relevancies for the 12 Group B Strategic Secondary Benefit measures arising from the Auckland Plan and Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan strategic priorities:

**Figure 8:** Group B relevancies – Strategic Priorities measures
Figure 9 shows the remaining nine individual relevancies for the Tactical measures in Group B:

**Figure 9: Group B relevancies – Tactical Alignments measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactical Alignments</th>
<th>Degree of Relavancy (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WATER EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACE MAKING</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZF ENTERPRISE</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL MAORI OUTCOMES</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD SECURITY</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMENITY VALUE</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should also be noted that the integrated way in which the Local Board and council officers work with the community provides direct and indirect alignments with other local and regional outcomes. These alignments are not necessarily core priorities for the Local Board or council’s Environmental Services Unit, but are nevertheless important secondary benefits from their work.
**Group C: Other measures**

There are six ‘Other’ measures that are important in themselves, but are not highly relevant to the Board’s environmental aims or sphere of influence. The relevancies for these 6 measures are low as expected, but still show that between 5 to 20% of projects and programmes in the database contribute to their aims.

### 3.3 Location, type and timing

In the context of this database, ‘Projects’ are defined as location-specific activities that can be plotted on a map (Figure 5), whereas ‘Programmes’ have a wider, more diffuse scope and usually a regional sphere of influence. While projects are often, but not always, for implementing physical improvement works, programmes almost always involve planning & policy, regulatory, educational or place-making types of activities.

From this standpoint, Figure 10 at right shows that the Henderson-Massey Local Board’s database is made up of 146 (73%) Projects and 54 (27%) Programmes.

**Figure 10: H-M Database Projects vs Programmes**

**Figure 11** shows that, of the 200 environmentally-focussed projects in the Henderson-Massey database, there are 100 (50%) involving various kinds of physical improvement works on site. However, a number of activities that are classed as projects (location-specific) involve planning, education or place-making work. Enviro-schools is one example of this, and while classed as a programme regionally, each school site is its own project that assists students and teachers to create a whole school vision, forming an enviro-group that works with the local community to implement environmentally sustainable improvements.

**Figure 11: Physical improvement works**

---
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Of the 200 recorded programmes and projects for the Henderson-Massey Local Board area, 160 (80%) are currently underway and 9.5% (19) are listed as future (Figure 12).

Future projects are important for the Board to understand in terms of what they involve, where they will occur and what degree of planning and support may be appropriate. This is also important to community groups wishing to plan for future funding applications, and to inform other funding agencies.

![Figure 12: Current and future activities](image)
3.4 Funding

Activities of interest to the Henderson-Massey Local Board are funded in a variety of ways and by a number of different organisations, sometimes alone and at times in combination with others. The database lists the funding organisation’s name where available and recognises seven main types of funding mechanism, as shown in Figure 13:

![Funding mechanisms for environmental activities](image)

Figure 13: Funding mechanisms for environmental activities

The eight funding categories reported above are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC-combined</td>
<td>Auckland Council funding from two or more departments, which may also include the Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC-Local Brd</td>
<td>Local Board funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC-Regional</td>
<td>Auckland Council funding from regional programmes sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-funded</td>
<td>Funded both by Council and the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Community funded, which may include voluntary resourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>Funded by a private sector organisation (including CCOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-funded</td>
<td>Funded by three or more separate organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not currently funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Auckland Council regional budgets are the source of 70% of all funding dollars captured by the database for the Henderson-Massey Local Board area. The Henderson-Massey Local Board currently provides funding for 10% of all projects and programmes in its area, with a similar percentage of activities funded by two separate organisations (Co-funded), or three or more organisations working cooperatively for mutual objectives (Multi-funded). External private sector organisations fund a further 4% of recorded activities. A small percentage of activities are funded by community sources such as charitable funding organisations (Community) or two or more Auckland Council departments working in collaboration (AC-combined).
In Figure 14 at left, there is an approximately 30/20% split between Board-scope (local) activities (83%) versus projects or programmes generally outside the Board’s direct sphere of influence (17%), such as regionally-focused programmes or large projects — in some cases even very large regional projects/programmes may require Local Board oversight and funding support for local elements.

Figure 14: Board-scope (local) activities
4. Conclusions

This first Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Report 2016 has established a progressive inventory of 200 environmentally-focused projects and programmes that are relevant to the Local Board activities, providing a useful tool for understanding where and how these activities are occurring.

The database contains a simple, rational assessment framework based on Council and Board strategic priorities and tactical/operational factors, which will assist in planning appropriate levels of Board support, coordination and involvement in these activities. Development of this report has provided numerous occasions where staff have used the database information to inform other staff members’ work streams and provided programme integration advice.

The assessment framework revealed that the 200 database records have an overall average relevancy of 88% to the seven most important Key Environmental Focus measures, and 45% overall average across all 51 assessment framework measures (excluding the 15 Operational Factors not assessed). This is a very encouraging outcome, particularly in that a number of the measures would not be expected to score highly at Local Board level. The data collection process identified some areas for improvement, including obtaining better information from some Council departments and community organisations.

The database tool will be updated over time as more information becomes available and representatives of each organisation become familiar with the approach and the benefits of contributing to it. This in turn will foster better community cooperation, thus reducing duplication of effort and resources, and will enable stakeholders to more easily tap into the council’s ability to provide information for their projects.

A total of 28 lead organisations have contributed projects and programmes of relevance to Henderson-Massey and which, in a variety of ways, are improving environmental sustainability in the area. Around 80% of these activities are currently underway and half involve physical site improvements. 57% have education & awareness and improvement of the natural environment as their primary objectives.

4.1 Opportunities

Undertaking this project has identified a number of opportunities that could be explored in later revisions and data surveys:

1. Mapping – real-world coordinates are included for each project location in the database. This will enable GIS mapping of the database information and interactive mapping on web platforms such as Microsoft’s PowerBI (Office 365) using Bing tools or Google maps.

2. Local Boards – the information gathering methodology, Excel database structure and report formats are sufficiently generic to allow other Local Boards, in addition to Whau and Henderson-Massey, to undertake the project in their areas without having to repeat the development process.

3. Workshops – the information and outputs from the project provide a useful basis for community planning workshops, where contributing organisations could explore opportunities for collaboration on related projects, thus increasing productivity and outcomes for the available resources.


4.2 Issues

The following issues were identified or encountered during the work, which in some way affect the quality and extent of database records. These issues may be addressed in future revisions of the report:

1. The competitive funding environment has caused some community groups to restrict provision of information such as project values and proposed projects, where funding had not yet been secured.
2. In some locations, two or more organisations have aspirations to the same type of work.
3. A number of past catchment studies and similar reports containing interesting project information were used under the classification of "unplanned" or "old concept", as they had not yet been reviewed and adopted by the current Council. These still provide useful background information for future planning.

4.3 Limitations
The report, database and background material gathered during the project have the following limitations:
1. The veracity of database records is limited to the quality of project/programme information obtained from the organisations, including background material supplied.
2. The database stores and reports only on numbers and percentages of projects & programmes, not their relative size or perceived effectiveness. No weighting has been assigned to individual measures, however the database records have been sorted by assessed alignment with (relevance to) Board and Council priorities. The number of projects or programmes being undertaken by an organisation has no influence on the database or its outcomes, other than as a numerical comparison for statistical reporting purposes.
3. Project/programme value is recorded in the database where provided, or otherwise as a temporary estimate at this stage.
4. For reasons discussed in the report, the database platform used is Microsoft Excel (Office 365, 2016). While Excel is the most suitable format in the immediate future, it is not a proprietary relational database.

4.4 Next steps
The database and summary report of Henderson-Massey environmental action will be used as the basis for a community and council dialogue to identify what council, the community and stakeholders can do to take environmental action to the next level in the local board area.

In parallel to this, the database will continue to be reviewed and updated as new information is obtained. As the extent and depth of information held by the database increases, so may the need for conversion from Excel to Access or similar proprietary relational database software, with the enhanced data management, querying and reporting functions available.

Linking the database information to a spatial GIS platform is also planned to enable production of environmental activity maps.
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Appendix 1: Data model management

Environmental Action Report - Data Model Management

Goverance / Senior Management

- Initiate EAR process

Council Departments and Community Organisations

- Process Initial Information

- New Information During the Year

Environmental Programmes Advisor

- Create EAR Project Concept

- Email, share and web-search

Technical Assistance

- Initial Data Search and Data Model

- Coordimate Information Flow and Data Model Design

Data Model

- Create New Database Records

- Appraise Data Relevancy to Measures

- Set Up Graphical & List Reporting Tools

- Draft reports

- Collect Data

- Review and Update Data Model

- Local Board Reporting Processes

- Annual Data Review and Update

- Data Model Update and Management

- Identify Calculations

- Data Configurations

- Release and Close Calculations

- Release & Confirm Calculations

Electronic and Paper Report Variants

- Project Assessment Process

- Assess relevancy of project or programme against 80 measures contained in:
  - Strategic Directions (15)
  - Environmental Principles & Priorities (15)
  - Local Board Policy (15)
  - Technical Agreements (21)
  - Operational Policies (15)

- YES or NO

- Has Potential To

- To Be Confirmed

- Not Assessable

- List for Future Review

- Seek Data Clarifications

- Revise Database List

- Update Graphs

- Produce Reports (as required)
Appendix 2: Database structure

The database has been developed in Microsoft Excel 2010 as a macro-enabled spreadsheet, currently utilising 1200 rows and 400 columns in the main database, with and overall file size of 2.3 megabytes. It contains text and numerical data with formulae for lookup and statistical functions, pick-lists, validated data columns, filtered indexes and simple macro-enabled navigation buttons.

In addition to the main database worksheet, the file contains other sheets including an instruction guide, graphical results, reports and a front menu page.

The following table describes the 52 data input fields (columns) in the database:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database Fields</th>
<th>Valid Entries</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERVIEW INFORMATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Number</td>
<td>Numeric: 1 to any</td>
<td>Unique project identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Main organisation undertaking the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Primary function of the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Objective</td>
<td>Cultural &amp; Heritage Education &amp; Awareness Funding Natural Environment Place-making Planning &amp; Policy Sustainability Utilities Water</td>
<td>Main objective of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Name of project or programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Project /programme name extension, with location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy_GroupA</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percentage of YES decisions for the 23 Key Environmental measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy_GroupB</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percentage of YES decisions for the 21 Supplementary Benefits measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy_GroupC</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percentage of YES decisions for the 6 remaining measures (excluding the 15 Operational Factor measures).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Status                  | Completed Completed Current Old Concept Planned Unplanned | Whether the project has status with council as a current or planned project, or whether it has no status and thus only useful as background information. Projects with no status are marked as either:  
  - Unplanned: background material originated since formation of Auckland Council (1 Nov 2010), or...  
  - Old Concept: background material originated before 1 Nov 2010. |
<p>| Location                | Any                            | Location of work                                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database Fields</th>
<th>Valid Entries</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catchment</td>
<td>Avondale Stream, Birdwood, Central Park, Glen Eden, Henderson Creek, Herald Island, Huia, Lincoln, Lower Opanuku, Massey, Massey East, Momutu, n/a, New Lynn East, Oakley, Paremuka, Ranui, Redhills, Rewarewa, Scroggy, Te Atatu Greenfields, Te Atatu Peninsula, Te Atatu South, Titirangi-Laingholm, Upper Glen Eden, Upper Kumeu, Upper Opanuku, Upper Oratia, Upper Swanson, Waimoko, Wairau Creek, Waitakere, Waterview, West Coast, West Harbour, Whau, Whenuapai</td>
<td>The main catchment within which the project is located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Albert-Eden, Devonport-Takapuna, Franklin, Great Barrier, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Howick, Kaipātiki, Mengere-Otahuhu, Manurewa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Orākei, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Rodney</td>
<td>Auckland Council Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Fields</td>
<td>Valid Entries</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Whitheke</td>
<td>Text description of the project/programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Whether the project/programme entails physical improvements on site, as opposed to planning or education-type activity for instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiterematā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAMME INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Any</th>
<th>Whether the work is within the Board’s sphere of influence or support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical_improvements</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td>Council Controlled Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council-community co-owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community-owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board_Scope</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td>One or more Council departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Board funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council regional funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council-community/other funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded by community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>CCO</td>
<td>Two or more organisations share funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Third party/private funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>AC-combined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AC-Local Brd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AC-Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding_Agency</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Name of the funding agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project_Value</td>
<td>$1 to $10,000</td>
<td>Incremental ranges of estimated project total value; may equate to current year funding where end dates not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,001 to $20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20,001 to $50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,001 to $100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100,001 to $200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$200,001 to $500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500,001 to $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,001 to $2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000,001 to $5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over $5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value_Category</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Low = $1 to $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM = $20,001 to $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH = $50,001 to $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>MAJOR = $200,001 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value_Status</td>
<td>Guesstimate</td>
<td>Unless specific project value information was supplied, the default is “Guesstimate”; currently 75% of database records. Value Status information will be improved as contributing organisations are able to supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contracted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Database Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database Fields</th>
<th>Valid Entries</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated_Value</td>
<td>Estimated value assigned: $8,000, $18,000, $40,000, $80,000, $180,000, $400,000, $800,000, $1,800,000, $4,000,000, Nil</td>
<td>Where Project_Value is: $1 to $10,000, $10,001 to $20,000, $20,001 to $50,000, $50,001 to $100,000, $100,001 to $200,000, $200,001 to $500,000, $500,001 to $1,000,000, $1,000,001 to $2,000,000, $2,000,001 to $5,000,000, over $5,000,000 (projects of this size not included in Estimated_Value(s))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Timing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing_Context</th>
<th>Any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether the project or programme is planning, currently underway or already completed (recent post projects only)

### Timing_Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing_Context</th>
<th>Any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Text clarifying context of “Timing” field

### End_Date_Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date when funding runs out, if known

### End_Date_Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

End date of the actual project/programme work, if known

### CONTACT DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Name of main organisation contact person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SME_Contact</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Name of the organisation’s “subject matter expert” who could provide technical supporting information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SME Contact’s role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Numeric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SME contact’s phone number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Numeric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SME contact’s mobile number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Hyperlink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SME contact’s email address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Group within the organisation that sponsors the project/programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Department within the Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Unit within the Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub_Unit</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sub-Unit within the Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Team within the Sub-Unit

### DATA CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact_Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date when “Contact” or “SME Contact” were first contacted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info_Method</th>
<th>Any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Method of gaining the information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response_Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date when information first provided
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database Fields</th>
<th>Valid Entries</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last_Update</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date when data was last updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY LOCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location_Specific</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td>Whether the work location can be pinpointed or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street_Number</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>Street number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit_Number</td>
<td>Alpha or Numeric</td>
<td>Unit number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street_Name</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Street name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Suburb name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>A name for the general area, which could be the same as the Suburb or could encompass a larger area for example: West Auckland or Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NorthCoordinate</td>
<td>Degrees Longitude (decimal)</td>
<td>Example: -36.917032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EastCoordinate</td>
<td>Degrees Latitude (decimal)</td>
<td>Example: 174.692295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFERENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Text field for additional notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Docs</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Important documents listed for future reference by users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperlinks</td>
<td>Hyperlink</td>
<td>On-click hyperlinks to stored reference documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3: Assessment measures and outcomes

This table lists the full 51 assessment framework measures and the total number of positive Yes decisions assessed for each measure column in the database, for all 561 Whau, Henderson-Massey and Waitakere Ranges projects and programmes currently in the database. Each Yes represents a project or programme that positively contributes to that measure. Each measure is assigned to an assessment Group as follows:

- **Group A**: Key Environmental Focus measures
- **Group B**: Secondary Benefits measures
- **Group C**: Other measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Positive YES's (Number) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUCKLAND PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(Strategic Directions; Environmental Principles and Priorities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Directions</td>
<td>1. Auckland’s People</td>
<td>Creating a Strong, Inclusive and Equitable Society that Provides Opportunity for All Aucklanders</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>473 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Auckland’s Maori</td>
<td>Enable Maori Aspirations through Recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi and Customary Rights</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>158 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Auckland’s Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Integrate Arts and Culture into Our Everyday Lives</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>69 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Auckland’s Historic Heritage</td>
<td>Protect and Conserve Auckland’s Historic Heritage for the Benefit and Enjoyment of Present and Future Generations</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>69 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Auckland’s Recreation &amp; Sport</td>
<td>Promote Individual and Community Well-being through Participation and Excellence in Recreation and Sport</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>266 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Auckland’s Economy</td>
<td>Develop an Economy that Delivers Opportunity and Prosperity for all Aucklanders and NZ</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>76 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Auckland’s Environment</td>
<td>Acknowledge that Nature and People are Inseparable</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>527 94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Auckland’s Response to Climate Change</td>
<td>Contribute to Tackling Climate Change and Increasing Energy Resilience</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>150 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Rural Auckland</td>
<td>Keep Rural Auckland Productive, Protected and Environmentally Sound</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>78 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Positive YES’s (Number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Urban Auckland</td>
<td>Create a Stunning City Centre,</td>
<td>with Well-connected Quality Towns, Villages and Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Auckland’s Housing</td>
<td>House All Aucklanders in Secure,</td>
<td>Healthy Homes They Can Afford</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Auckland’s Physical &amp; Social</td>
<td>Plan, Deliver and Maintain Quality Infrastructure to make Auckland Liveable and Resilient</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Auckland’s Transport</td>
<td>Create Better Connections and Accessibility</td>
<td>within Auckland, Across NZ and to the World</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Principles**

<p>| Environmental Supports Us                   | The natural resources provided by our environment have limits, and must be protected and restored to ensure our future well-being. | A     | 432                     | 77%     |
| We Need To Consider Environmental Values In All We Do | The interaction between the environment and people is understood and considered in our everyday behaviour and choices. | A     | 514                     | 92%     |
| Everything is Connected                     | Human activities affect the air, sea, land and fresh water systems. Understanding the connections between environments in the way we manage them is critical. | A     | 507                     | 90%     |
| Biodiversity Is Everywhere                  | Our flora and fauna, and their habits, occur on both public and private spaces, and in urban, rural, freshwater and coastal areas. To maintain biodiversity values we must all work together. | A     | 307                     | 55%     |
| Natural Hazards Can Affect Our Well-Being   | We need to ensure that Auckland and its people are resilient to the effects of natural hazards. | C     | 79                      | 14%     |
| We Are Environmental Stewards               | Future generations will depend on how well we manage the natural environment. | A     | 446                     | 80%     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Positive YES's (Number)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Priorities</td>
<td>P1. Value Our Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Refers to biodiversity, landscapes, geological features, natural character, and relationship with public space and private land.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2. Sustainably Manage Natural Resources</td>
<td>Development puts pressure on (natural resources). We must manage and maintain the quality of our natural resources for the long-term health, well-being and prosperity of Aucklanders.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3. Treasure Our Coastline, Islands And Marine Areas</td>
<td>The coast and sea have shaped Auckland’s history and are central to our culture, both for tangata whenua and more recent arrivals.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4. Build Resilience To Natural Hazards</td>
<td>It is important to build resilient and safe communities able to cope with, and adapt to, the effects of hazard events.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL BOARD PLANS (Whau and Henderson-Massey Board Priorities)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL OUTCOMES &amp; PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION (Tactical Alignments, Operational Factors)</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Contributing to tangible improvements in local air quality.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Value</td>
<td>Provides amenity value that is appreciated by the local community.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour Change, Education For Sustainability</td>
<td>Engenders positive behavioural change in the community towards caring for the environment in a more sustainable manner.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Action Report
August 2017

Reallocation of the 2017/2018 Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Plan Budget
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Positive YES’s (Number)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity of native flora and fauna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to maintaining and enhancing biosecurity for native flora and fauna against destructive pests and diseases</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Supporting Capacity &amp; Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to building environmentally focussed capacity and skills within the community</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchment Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to improvement of the catchment’s environmental values</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to mitigating the damaging effects of climate change</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages and contributes to positive engagement with and among the community</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-Linkage &amp; Green Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to increasing areas of green vegetative corridors and eco-linkage opportunities</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to real energy saving initiatives or indirectly engenders savings through community education and capacity building</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to securing natural food sources for this and future generations</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter Removal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Directly removes, or indirectly decreases the amount of litter in the environment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Maori Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to local maori outcomes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFP Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td>The project or programme is a Not For Profit enterprise</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-Making</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to capitalising on a local community’s assets, inspiration and potential, towards creating good public spaces that promote people’s health, happiness, and well-being, thus strengthening a city’s basis for collective memory.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Positive YES’s (Number)</td>
<td>(% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes resource recovery and reuse as an approach for minimisation of waste refuse to dumping</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to minimising the adverse effects of urban stormwater, including flooding, erosion and siltation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes sustainable transport practices</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes the efficient use of water</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to improved natural water quality in natural streams, ponds and estuaries</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Minimisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes more sustainable lifestyles as a way of minimising the amount of waste produced by the community</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Working Together for Transformative Change

In 2016 the first Environmental Action Report for Henderson-Massey was developed. It establishes a detailed inventory of environmentally focused projects and programmes, and a framework for assessing Local Board’s priorities, support and involvement. It also provides a platform from which to have further conversations regarding:

- local environmental and community strengths;
- opportunities to progress environmental outcomes;
- focus areas for collaborative planning and action.

The following presentation builds upon this, bringing together both a high level review of key documentation along with a summary of community/council conversations. This will provide the Local Board with insight into stakeholder views on environmental focus areas, as well as suggest an approach to further collective conversations in identifying the drivers and opportunities for transformative change.
As a part of this process key documents were analysed at a high level, and face to face conversations were had with eight community organisations, eight council teams and a CCO. It is envisaged that this work supports further collaborative conversations where shared priorities and outcomes are identified.
Henderson-Massey Context

Henderson-Massey was formed in 2010 and merged legacy projects and programmes from Waitakere City Council and a number of other legacy councils, including Auckland Regional Council. As the centre of the former Waitakere Eco-City, the area has a strong legacy of environmental action that sets it apart as a hot spot of community activity and collaboration.

Located between the foothills of the Waitakere Ranges and the Waitemata Harbour the population, while being culturally diverse, has a strong identity. There are many locally valued ecological treasures which also contribute to the North West Wildlink. There is significant community leadership and many strong community organisations engaging and supporting local people. There are also many council teams working across the area providing support and expertise.

Continuing to build on this good work is essential in protecting and further enhancing the local environment and contributing to improved outcomes. Water quality continues to be a concern, pests and predators threaten biodiversity, future development could compound issues, and people are unaware or unable to make sustainable choices.

With strong community and council leadership across the many different projects and programmes, and with strong community pride in an Eco-City legacy, there is immense potential to further improve outcomes through collaboration, innovation, and joined up thinking.
Strengths Based Approach
What people interviewed saw as unique and valued

Eco-City Legacy
Cultural shift focused on a common vision
Waitakere City seen as leading the way on environmental issues
Created connections across the landscape

Mountains to the Sea
Gateway to the Waitakere Ranges and a part of the North West Wildlink
Many ‘environmental assets’ green spaces and biodiversity
Streams still intact – not underground

Project Twin Streams
Big picture approach covering a range of issues
High level of community knowledge and engagement
Engendered long term commitment

Active Organisations Engaged Community
Strong relationships and identity – a pride in the west
Strong active community organisations
People choose to live here
## Identified Opportunities

What people interviewed saw as opportunities going forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eco-City Vision</td>
<td>Continue the legacy of an Eco-City vision – connecting local projects and programmes to a bigger narrative. Overall support for Local Board being the champion of the Eco-City Vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships and Collaboration</td>
<td>Build on the good momentum and strong relationships with Local Board and have more impact through collaboration. Take a whole of community approach, grow local leadership, share information and skills, and build community knowledge – engage deeply. Allow for innovation and get buy in from all levels of Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Streams, Healthy People</td>
<td>Support a community led process to review, re-prioritise and re-energise Project Twin Streams or a similar model. Connecting people across the area to further improve water quality, biodiversity, ecological and community linkages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Low Carbon Living</td>
<td>Work with local community leaders, Council, iwi, CCOs and business to more clearly define the drivers and opportunities of low carbon living and develop a plan of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whau Pathway</td>
<td>Take a community centered approach to the development of the Te Whau Pathway integrating it within a wider network of connection across the Henderson-Massey local board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Food Basket</td>
<td>Develop initiatives such as My Backyard Garden Project and community garden initiatives to inspire and teach families to grow their own organic and edible gardens, connecting community and promoting healthy living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Urban Development</td>
<td>Influence the direction of the Red Hills / Massey urban growth, promoting sustainable development including appropriate storm water infrastructure and reserves built into development contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbourview-Orangihina</td>
<td>Support the protection and enhancement of the unique ecology and biodiversity hub of Harbourview – Orangihina and surrounding harbour and coastal area of the Te Atatu Peninsula.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Identified Opportunities Cont..

What people interviewed saw as opportunities going forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Hubs</td>
<td>Continue to support local centers such as EcoMatters and Waitakere Community Recycling Centre as local low carbon living hubs, enabling greater opportunity for community to make choices, and further develop centers including Triangle Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest and Predator Control</td>
<td>Contribute to the regional North West Wildlink encouraging local establishment of pest control initiatives around key biodiversity hubs, linkages and identified Wildlink wonders. Support community led approaches in the development of predator control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Town Centre Upgrade</td>
<td>Support Panuku in the revitalisation of the Henderson Town Centre advocating for an integrated approach that takes into consideration surrounding areas. Establish a local advisory group that can enrich the vision and inform the development. Revisit the identified opportunity for a ‘Skills Sharing Hub’ within the Henderson Town Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Network</td>
<td>Re-invigorate the ‘Green Network’ – a network of ecological functionality and people achieving biodiversity outcomes and green participation which may include projects such as Manutewhau. Explore how this could be a local component of the North West Wildlink.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Waste</td>
<td>Invest in sustainable living locally, connecting more people to the environment and sustainable living choices through neighbourhood hubs; enable Community Recycling Centres to further support social enterprise development around a Zero Waste philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement and Connections</td>
<td>Support for better integration and service improvements for public transport based on user experience including express trains to central city, local shuttle links, bus routes based on resident needs. Find better ways to get people out of their cars – cycling and walking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Healthy Streams, Healthy People

* Support and resource a community led review and re-energisation of Project Twin Streams or a similar model which could:
  - Use a strengths based approach to clarify existing value and success of Project Twin Streams and redefine the scope of the project going forward
  - Identify shared goals and measures, current activities and ongoing opportunities
  - Work with council’s Healthy Waters team to access good quality information relating to stream health, water quality and pollution vectors to make informed decisions about the most effective interventions (such as retrofits for illegal storm water improvements).
  - Identify linkages with other initiatives such as North West Wildlink, Te Whau Pathway, Healthy Waterways programme, Henderson Town Centre Upgrade and community hub projects.
  - Collaborate with Healthy Waters and Panuku to implement ‘quick wins’ including the completion of cycle and walkways along streams, and storm water improvements,
  - Support council and community organisations to explore opportunities to further citizen science initiatives with schools and community, building on the good work previously undertaken by the Wai Care programme
Henderson Town Centre Revitalisation

* Advocate and support the revitalisation of Henderson as an Eco-City Centre and contribute to developing pride of place

* Advocate and support a process that enables key community organisations, business, and council to work alongside Panuku in the design and implementation to:
  - Support the transformational shift ‘Strongly commit to environmental action and green growth’
  - Enhance the vision through a low carbon and restoration lens
  - Integrate the development within the context of the wider environment, local connections and alignment with other initiatives such as Project Twin Streams
  - Revisit the concept of a ‘Skills Sharing Hub’ within the Henderson Town Centre
  - Ensure user perspectives on issues including public spaces, transport and walking and cycling connections are sought and incorporated
  - Promote and engage with the wider community to activate and enhance the project at different stages
Sustainable Living

* Continue to support community hubs such as Waitakere Transfer Station, EcoMatters, and Triangle Park as local centres of sustainable living and innovation, providing choice opportunities, education and skill sharing in:
  - Community and backyard gardens
  - Zero waste and upcycling
  - Energy and water conservation
  - Social enterprise development

* Explore further with key stakeholders the desire for a community-led collaborative Sustainable Living initiative that could:
  - Map current projects and programmes – understanding the value of what currently exists and opportunities to further transform Henderson-Massey into an energy resilient low carbon local board area
  - Engage with diverse local communities to establish drivers of and barriers to making low carbon living choices
  - Develop an action plan that identifies shared outcomes and measures, actions and opportunities to support an Eco-City Vision.
Wildlink Wonders

* Support and be guided by local community approaches that respond to the kaupapa of the North West Wildlink (such as Pest Free Kaipatiki) to protect and enhance bird life and biodiversity in Henderson-Massey. This could evolve into:
  - Predator/pest control and restoration projects focused around specific landforms such as the Te Atatu Peninsula
  - Initiatives focused around wildlink wonders, biodiversity hubs or SEAs – such as Manutewhau and Harbourview-Orangihina Park
  - Neighbourhood predator control networks to buffer stream linkages or reserves and that connect with Project Twin Streams
  - Initiatives that grow community and neighbourhood connectedness and ‘sense of place’ through pest management and restoration activities

* Explore further North West Wildlink ‘missing linkage’ opportunities including the Ngaongaatepa and Bringham Creeks to engage local landowners in stream restoration and address a gap in ecological linkages between Massey and Paeremoremo.
Connected Henderson-Massey Te Whau Pathway

* Advocate for a ‘whole of landscape’ approach to connectivity across the local board area:
  - Support the ‘creation of a connected trail and greenways network’ (Open Space Network Plan) for the Henderson-Massey local board area.
  - Support processes that take a strengths based approach and complete unfinished connections (Henderson Town Centre revitalisation).
  - Advocate for community perspectives to be sought and incorporated in walking and cycling design and implementation.

* Support the ongoing development of an integrated ‘Master Plan’ with a staged programme of detailed design work for the Te Whau Pathway:
  - Map work around the Whau River, Harbourview-Orangihina Park and surrounding estuarine habitats
  - Support and resource continued opportunities to engage diverse local communities and design connections which include local perspectives
Eco-City Vision and Forum

The Local Board were recognised as the champion of the Eco-City vision.

* Strengthen the Eco-City vision by working collaboratively:
  - Explore further the establishment of an Eco-City Forum as an opportunity to collectively drive forward the Eco-City vision including representatives from local community organisations, council, iwi, business and CCOs.
  - Explore further the scope of a forum and how it links to Healthy Streams Healthy People, Henderson Town Centre Revitalisation, Sustainable Living, Wildlink Wonders, and Connected Henderson Massey
  - Support and resource the establishment of an Eco-City Forum if desired by community and stakeholders

* Strengthen and enrich future development of the Local Board Plan as the strategic framework for the Eco-City vision guided by an Eco-City Forum
Champions of an Eco-City Vision

Providing local leadership, holding the vision and long term thinking, and ‘walking with us’, strongly reflecting community need.

**Advocates**
- Be the community advocate - support community led process and a place-based approach across council, advocating for greater communication and coordination and influencing council operations.
- Proactively advocate to Council’s Governing Body and Council Controlled Organisations

**Supporters**
- Share the stories of success and find more opportunities for council and community to tell their stories.
- Continue to courageously support environmental priorities, collaboration, community leadership and innovative solutions that allow for new ways of working.

**Funders**
- Continue to actively invest in local leadership, community organisations and projects.
- Explore alternative funding models including resourcing the facilitation of community process, endorsing community organisations seeking alternative funding, operational support and other innovative mechanisms.
Key Messages

- The community are looking to the Henderson-Massey Local Board to champion and provide strong leadership and advocacy to forward the Eco-City vision.

- Collaboration is well understood and highly desirable within the community sector.

- Continued investment in, and support for local community organisations and leadership enables community empowerment and wider participation and connection.

- Sustainability initiatives are being delivered through a number of community hubs and local partnerships, and opportunity may exist to build on this through collaborative conversations and action.

- Project Twin Streams has a strong legacy, ongoing support and potential to be re-invigorated.

- The revitalisation of Henderson Town Centre provides an opportunity to develop community pride and exemplify ‘green growth’.

- Growing ecological connections and community responses to the North West Wildlink could greatly improve biodiversity outcomes locally and regionally.

- Te Whau Pathway is a significant project with opportunity to enhance community connectivity and low carbon living incorporating local perspectives.
Next Steps

Provide Henderson-Massey Working Together for Environmental and Social Wellbeing report to participants

Advocate for, support and resource a stakeholder workshop with key community groups, council, business groups and CCOs which:

- Is independently facilitated
- Reflects on the five opportunity areas
- Explores further the idea of an Eco-City Forum, its purpose and focus
- Identifies who might be represented on a Forum
- Hold a hui with mana whenua to explore their interest and engagement with an Eco-City vision
Appendix One

Interviews

Community Organisations
Community Waitakere – Charlie Moore, Chris Burton and Belinda Studholme
McLaren Park Henderson South (MPHS) – Katherine Lawlor and Esteban Hevia
Sustainable Asset Management International – Tony Miguel
Forest and Bird Waitakere – Robert Woolf and Annally van de Broeke
EcoMatters Environment Trust – Damon Birchfield
Massey Matters – Laurel Belworthy
Ranui Maori Women’s Welfare League – Emma Frost
Te Ukaipo – Cecily Mantell

Council and CCOs
Biodiversity Team – Ben Paris and Chris Ferkins
Low Carbon Living Team – Robbie Sutherland
Healthy Waters – Shelley Hackett
Waste Solutions – Jenny Chilcott and Megan Beard
Parks Services – Huw Hill-Male, Sinead Brimacombe and Jacki Byrd
Empowered Communities – Betty MacLaren
Local Board Services – Tracy Wsnewski
Environmental Services – Dot Dalziel
Auckland Transport – Simon Vincent
Appendix Two

Documentation

Henderson-Massey Local Board Plan; 2014; Henderson-Massey Local Board
Project Twin Streams Report Card; 2016; Auckland Council
North West Wildlink Prioritisation Report; 2017; Auckland Council
Community Waitakere Annual Report 2015/16
EcoMatters Annual Report 2015/16
Whau Coastal Walkway LTP submission; 2015; Te Whau Walkway and Environment Trust
Becoming a Low Carbon Community – an action plan; 2015; Waitemata Local Board
Waitakere Central – a catalyst for urban enrichment; Mackay, Joyce, Bielby
Henderson Implementation Plan; 2014; Henderson-Massey Local Board
Waitemata Greenways Plan; 2013; Waitemata Local Board
Regional Prioritisation for Local Outcomes; 2016; Auckland Council
Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Report; 2016; Auckland Council
Waitakere Forest and Bird News; March 2016; Waitakere Forest and Bird
Project Twin Streams; Rachael Trotman
The Henderson-Massey Open Spaces Network Plan; 2015; Auckland Council
Skills Sharing Hub – An Opportunity for Henderson; 2016; Community Waitakere
Delegation for formal local board views on notified resource consents, plan changes and notices of requirement

File No.: CP2018/04725

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek that the Henderson-Massey Local Board delegates the responsibility of providing formal views on resource consents, notified plan changes and notices of requirement to a local board member.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Local board feedback can be provided on notified resource consents, plan changes and designations. Written feedback needs to be provided prior to the submission closing date (usually 20 working days after public notification). This feedback is included in the planner’s report verbatim and local boards are also able to speak to their written feedback at the public hearing. Views should be received by the processing planner or reporting consultant by submission closing date to ensure the content can be considered in planning reports.

3. This report explores options to enable local boards to provide their views in a timely way. Local boards normally provide their formal views at business meetings. Because local board reporting timeframes don’t usually align with statutory timeframes, in most instances formal reporting at a business meeting will not allow local feedback to be provided by submission closing date.

4. Providing formal local board views by way of a delegation to a local board member is considered the most efficient way of providing formal local board views. This is because the delegate can provide views within the regulatory timeframes and because no additional reporting is required when new applications of interest are notified.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) delegates the authority to the appointed local board member, to prepare and submit local board views and speak those local board views at any hearings on:
   • Notified resource consents
   • Notified plan changes
   • Notices of requirement.

Horopaki / Context

Notified Resource Consents
5. Local boards are able to provide input into the determination of applications that may be notified. Local boards, via their appointed Resource Consents Leads, input into a wide range of resource consents that are received by the council and that trigger the matters of particular interest to local boards.
6. Local views and preferences are also able to be provided, once a decision of notification is made, and local boards can then submit further feedback to any notified resource consent application within their local board area. This feedback is then included in the planner’s report verbatim for the hearing and for the consideration of the commissioners who determine the outcome of the resource consent application.

7. Local boards are also able to speak to their written feedback at any notified resource consent hearing. Local boards are taking this opportunity up more often and it is considered important to ensure any feedback is authorised by the local board and a delegation is in place for the Resource Consent Lead to authorise them to speak on behalf of the local board at hearings.

Notified Plan Changes and Notices of Requirement

8. The Auckland Unitary Plan was made “Operative in Part” in November 2016. As plan changes and notices of requirement can now be received and processed by council, there are opportunities for local boards to provide their views and give feedback on notified applications.

9. For council-initiated plan changes and notices of requirement, staff will seek local board views prior to notification for proposals where there are issues of local significance. For private plan changes and notices of requirement submitted by non-council requiring authorities, local boards may not have any prior knowledge of the application until notification.

10. Local boards can provide written feedback on notified applications. Written feedback needs to be provided prior to the submission closing date (usually 20 working days after public notification). Local boards can subsequently present their feedback to support their views at any hearing.

11. It is important that options are explored to enable local boards to provide their views in a timely way and a delegation to ensure timely feedback is desirable. At present the local board views must be confirmed formally and statutory timeframes are short and do not always align with local board reporting timeframes.

12. Local boards may want to add the responsibility for plan changes and notices of requirement feedback to the resource consent lead role. This will broaden the responsibilities of the role to enable feedback on notified plan changes and notices of requirement to be provided. Alternatively, local boards may want to develop a separate planning lead role and each local board has the flexibility to make appointments that best suit their needs.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Options considered

13. Options available for local boards to provide their views into the hearings process have been summarised in Table 1.

14. Local boards normally provide their formal views at business meetings (option 2). Because local board reporting timeframes do not usually align with statutory timeframes, in most instances formal reporting at a business meeting will not allow local feedback to be provided by submission closing date. Views must be received by the processing planner or reporting consultant by the submission closing date to ensure the content can be considered in planning reports.

15. Providing formal local board views by way of a delegation to one local board member (option 5) is considered the most efficient way of providing formal views. This is because no additional reporting is required when new applications of interest are notified.
### Table 1: Options for local boards to provide their formal views on notified applications (resource consents, plan changes, notices of requirement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No formal local board views are provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local board views will not be considered by the hearings commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Formal local board views are provided at a business meeting</td>
<td>• All local board members contribute to the local board view</td>
<td>• Local board meeting schedules and agenda deadlines are unlikely to align with statutory deadlines imposed by the planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides transparent decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formal local board views are provided as urgent decisions</td>
<td>• Local boards can provide their views in a timely way that meets statutory deadlines</td>
<td>• Decisions are not made by the full local board • Urgent decisions may not be accompanied by full information and the discussion may be rushed • Not transparent decision-making because the decisions do not become public until after they have been made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formal local board views are provided by separate and specific delegation for each application which the local board wishes to provide their views</td>
<td>• Delegations can be chosen to align with area of interest and/or local board member capacity</td>
<td>• Local board meeting schedules and agenda deadlines required to make each separate delegation are unlikely to align with statutory deadlines imposed by the planning process • Decisions are not made by the full local board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Formal local board views are provided by way of delegation to one local board member (preferred option) for all applications</td>
<td>• Delegate will become subject matter expert for local board on topic they are delegated to • Local boards can provide their views in a timely way that meets statutory deadlines • Any feedback can be regularly reported back to the local board</td>
<td>• Decisions are not made by the full local board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

16. This report seeks a delegation to a local board member for resource consents, plan changes and notices of requirement, to allow local boards to provide feedback in accordance with agreed timeframes on notified resource consents, plan changes and notices of requirement.
17. Any local board members who is delegated responsibilities should ensure that they represent the wider local board views and preferences on each matter before them.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

18. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have a positive or negative impact for Māori.

19. The Resource Management Act 1991 requires that council consult with Mana Whenua of the area who may be affected, through iwi authorities, on draft plan changes prior to their notification. Council must also consider iwi authority advice in evaluations of plan changes.

20. For private plan changes, council seeks that the applicant undertakes suitable engagement with relevant iwi authorities, and where necessary will undertake consultation before deciding whether to accept, reject or adopt a private plan change.

21. For notices of requirement, council serves notice on Mana Whenua of the area who may be affected, through iwi authorities. Requiring authorities must also consult with the relevant iwi as part of the designating process.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications**

22. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have financial implications on Auckland Council.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

23. If local boards choose not to delegate to provide views on notified applications, there is a risk that they will not be able to provide formal views prior to the submission closing date and may miss the opportunity to have their feedback presented and heard at a hearing.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

24. The appointed member of the Henderson-Massey Local Board will operate under the delegations of the Henderson-Massey Local Board once they have been adopted.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Carol Stewart - Senior Policy Advisor, Local Board Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Anna Bray, Policy and Planning Manager, Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louise Mason, General Manager Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kataraina Maki - GM - Community &amp; Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Food Alliance

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek endorsement for the development and implementation of a pilot Auckland Food Alliance with an initial focus on five local board areas including

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Our existing food system is based on mass production and mass consumption, making it hard to access healthy, affordable and locally produced food. This often comes with unsustainable social, economic and environmental side effects including poor farming practices, small local enterprises unable to compete with large multinationals, high rates of non-communicable diseases such as diabetes and obesity, food waste, and high levels of greenhouse gas emissions (19-29% of total emissions globally).

3. Meanwhile our ability to meet future demand is subject to a range of pressures including rapid population growth, a changing climate, and loss of productive soils to land development.

4. There is currently no holistic strategic direction for Auckland’s food system, however, its cross-cutting nature means that it is partially addressed in several council plans (Attachment A). The Chief Sustainability Office and The Southern Initiative have reviewed local, national and international best practice and feedback from internal and external stakeholders to identify options that address policy gaps and improve coordination, across these plans and the wider food system.

5. Based on this analysis, staff propose to develop a pilot Food Policy for council called the Auckland Food Alliance. The Alliance would bring together 10-15 influential stakeholder organisations from across the food system (production, distribution, processing, consumption and waste) to address regional systemic issues and remove the road blocks that can sometimes impede the success and ‘scaling up’ of local initiatives.

6. The Auckland Food Alliance will provide expert strategic advice to council and other stakeholders on inter-related regional food policy development and advocate on national food policy issues.

7. It is proposed that the pilot focus in five local board areas; Waitakere Ranges, Henderson-Massey, Whau, Mangere-Otahuhu and Manurewa. These areas have been chosen to build on existing momentum of communities who are actively engaged in food initiatives, and because they are within the Healthy Families operational boundaries and therefore have a predetermined need.

8. Workshops held in the pilot local board areas in March 2018 have provided valuable feedback that has informed the recommendations proposed and have established further context, needs and barriers for consideration by the Alliance.

9. This top down policy approach will complement the grass-roots movement of local communities by considering systemic issues that are often difficult to address at a local level such as complex regulation, unsustainable business practices and loss of productive land. Local boards in the pilot area would further benefit from the highlighting of local issues.

7 The Annual Review of Environment and Resources - environ.annualreviews.org
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) endorse establishment of a pilot Auckland Food Alliance for a period of two years from August 2018,

b) endorse the approach for Auckland Food Alliance, once established, to focus on Henderson-Massey local board during the pilot phase,

c) request a minimum of six-monthly updates from the Alliance on progress.

Problem definition

10. Research and consultation with local boards had identified significant issues with the food system that cut across economic, environment and social wellbeing.

11. For example, in Auckland we have:

- Poor access to affordable fresh and nutritious foods. Research in New Zealand has found that those who are food insecure (i.e., a lack of access to safe, nutritious and affordable food) report higher levels of psychological distress, as well as wider impacts on nutrition and physical health.

- Loss of productive soils to urbanisation – only one per cent of the Auckland Region’s soils are considered Class 1 (elite) and suitable for vegetable production. Approximately 86 per cent of this is in the Pukekohe area, a renowned powerhouse of outdoor vegetable production for New Zealand. This is also an area under pressure from urban development where 14 per cent of Class 1 soils have been or will be encroached upon by 2040.

- High volumes of food waste (45 per cent of household kerbside collection) representing missed opportunity to feed people, animals and plants, and producing greenhouse gas emissions.

- Health inequality - high rates of obesity (Auckland = 28 per cent; Asian = 13.4 per cent; European/other = 24.6 per cent; Maori = 44 per cent; Pasifika = 68 per cent)\(^\text{10}\), non-communicable diseases such as diabetes (Auckland = 7.5 per cent; Mangere = 17.3 per cent)\(^\text{11}\) and malnutrition.

- Environmental degradation due to non-sustainable production methods, particularly water quality, with elevated levels of nitrates in surface and ground water\(^\text{12}\), and nearly a third of Auckland’s rivers classified as poor on the swimmability scale\(^\text{13}\).

12. There are already a large number of successful, local activities being undertaken across Auckland by council, community groups, non-profit organisations and government agencies with the support of local boards. These activities are predominantly focused around urban production/community gardens, food waste and health education.

13. However, engagement across stakeholders, including the Sustainable Business Network, EcoMatters, Kai Auckland, Auckland Regional Public Health Service, Healthy Families, Gardens4Health and C40’s global cities network, has highlighted a gap at the regional policy

---

\(^8\) Auckland’s Prime and Elite Soils 2013:TP2013/050, Auckland Council

\(^9\) Most recent draft inventory, Waste Solutions, Auckland Council


\(^12\) Elevated Nitrate Concentrations in Franklin Surface and Groundwater: A Review: TP2016/015

\(^13\) LAWA: http://www.mfe.govt.nz/fresh-water/about-freshwater/auckland
level, with missed opportunities to address regional systemic issues and further support local programmes.

14. Additionally, there are significant and complex underlying issues (such as unsustainable business practices, complex regulation, lack of understanding of resilience across the system) that will require collaboration across stakeholders to address.

Food Policy Councils

15. Internationally there is a growing number of successful food governance structures tackling these issues such as the Los Angeles Food Policy Council, Toronto Food Policy Council, Puget Sound Regional Council’s Regional Food Policy Council (Seattle), and Melbourne’s Food City.

16. These Food Policy Councils and others like them have been established to bring together stakeholders to examine how a local food system is functioning and develop opportunities to improve it. The councils review and look at the system as a whole, influencing decision makers and remove the road blocks that can sometimes impede the success and “scaling up” of local initiatives to deliver healthy, equitable and resilient outcomes.

17. Based on this analysis, it is proposed that a Food Policy Council be created for Auckland called the Auckland Food Alliance.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Auckland Food Alliance proposal

18. The Alliance proposal is for an independent advisory group that provides expert, strategic advice to Auckland Council and other stakeholders, and advocates on national policy.

19. It would operate on the following principles:
   - Foster collaboration and innovation among diverse stakeholders.
   - Operate on a strategic level, ensuring a holistic overview of regional issues.
   - Advise on interrelated policy-making to council and other stakeholders and advocate on national policy issues.

20. Membership would comprise 10-15 member organisations representing a cross-section of Auckland’s food system across public, voluntary and private sectors. Member organisations would appoint a suitable senior representative to participate in Alliance activities.

21. The Alliance would be supported by a smaller working group and secretariat services will be provided by Auckland Council through the Chief Sustainability Office and The Southern Initiative.

22. Staff will initially support the Alliance to develop terms of reference, a food charter clearly stating its purpose and objectives to guide its work (in line with international best practice), and a preliminary action plan identifying a small number of discrete actions to focus Alliance efforts.

Pilot areas

23. It is proposed that the initial focus of the Alliance be in five local board areas: Waitakere Ranges; Henderson-Massey; Whau; Mangere-Otahuhu; and Manurewa. These areas were chosen as they are all within the Healthy Families operational boundaries and therefore a predetermined need exists, and because these communities and local boards are actively engaged in local food initiatives.

24. Healthy Families Waitakere is engaged in a programme of community food projects being rolled out across the western local boards including the My Backyard Garden Project, Fresh Choice (recipes and ingredient lists to feed a family of six for under $50), a Food Banks...
Network and are in the process of forming a Local Food Network group. In addition to these, there are a number of location specific projects led by various community stakeholders, for example:

- Waitakere Ranges – Glen Eden Transition Towns Veggie Swap Meet and composting workshops; Hoani Waititi Marae Maara Kai (edible garden and workshops with a focus on Maramataka, the Maori lunar calendar)
- Henderson-Massey – Vision West’s Social enterprise café, food bank and proposed food store; The Kitchen Project in Henderson; Triangle Park and Woodside Road Community Gardens.
- Whau - Ecomatters community garden and educational workshops; Avondale Community Fridge; Generation Ignite Food Bank including cooking and nutrition training.

25. The Southern Initiative in partnership with Healthy Families South are also involved in a programme of food projects across southern local boards including development of Food and Beverage Guidelines for public facilities, The Kitchen Project, a social supermarket and Fresh Choice South (recipes and ingredient lists to feed a family of six for under $50). There are also location specific projects being undertaken by various community stakeholders including:

- Mangere-Otahuhu – Old School Reserve Teaching Gardens; Cook Island Development Agency New Zealand community garden and community food enterprise support; Fale Kofi social enterprise café at Otahuhu Station
- Manurewa – Manurewa Marae Para Kore and community garden; Manurewa Community Teaching Gardens; Clendon Pride Project Community House teaching gardens and Clendon Shopping Centre community fruit orchard.

26. A targeted focus in the first instance will enable clear direction and an opportunity to deliver regional actions of importance to priority local board areas. However, the Alliance will be established with a clear remit for delivery on wider regional issues in the longer term.

27. A short list of priority policy actions will be identified with the assistance of local stakeholders, ensuring a complementary top down approach that could assist the implementation or upscaling of local initiatives.

28. If agreed, it is proposed that the Alliance will report to the Environment and Community Committee and that the committee is represented on the Alliance to maintain a strong link to decision makers.

Proposed method of communication with local boards

29. Based on feedback from local board workshops, 6-monthly updates to local board business meetings are the proposed method of communication between local boards and the Alliance.

Options analysis

30. From analysis of international and local food policy councils, a key learning has been that form and function vary widely but the most defining success factor is the relationship to a local government entity. That is, how structural ties or the level of support provided, bear on the perceived level of independence from decision makers, the ability to influence decision makers, and the sustainability of a food policy council.

31. As many successful food policy councils have some link to a government entity, two of the options explored (2 & 3) have strong links to council with differing levels of independence. Table 1 provides a summary of options considered.
### Table 1: Options Analysis Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options 1</strong>: Do nothing</td>
<td>No costs or staff time required, but regional systemic issues are not addressed leading to reduced resilience, environmental, economic and social outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong>: Establish Auckland Food Alliance following the One Voice: Sports and Recreation model (recommended option)</td>
<td>This is an independent, voluntary group endorsed by council. The Alliance is accountable to the Environment and Community Committee (ECC) and has ECC representation on the group. It is based on an existing model with demonstrated successes. Independence allows greater flexibility in its work programme and potential to apply for external funding in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment B</strong> contains the One Voice terms of reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong>: Establish Auckland Food Alliance as an Auckland Council Advisory Panel</td>
<td>This group is embedded within councils existing structure of advisory panels. As such it has a strong mandate from council and visibility of council work programme. The panel has elected member representation and funding is secured through the LTP from the next LTP review cycle. The work programme is more directed, largely based on council’s work programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Options were assessed against a set of criteria including the flexibility of the work programme, their accountability and reporting requirements, likely funding and administration support, flexibility of operational structure, attractiveness to prospective members and opportunity for community engagement.

33. Option 2, the Auckland Food Alliance based on the One Voice model is recommended because it is independent of council’s structure, enabling more freedom in work plan development (e.g. to advise on regional policy gaps, advocate on national issues and partner with other stakeholders) and is likely to invoke a greater level of trust from the community. This option also includes the key benefits of Option 3 with strong links to decisions makers and support from council staff.

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

34. At the time of writing this report, workshops had been held with Waitakere Ranges, Henderson-Massey, Whau, Mangere-Otahuhu and Manurewa.

35. The purpose of the workshops was to introduce the concept of food systems thinking, introduce the Auckland Food Alliance proposal and obtain feedback on local issues, potential regional of national policy solutions, local stakeholders and preferred method of communication with the Auckland Food Alliance.

36. Feedback has informed this report and learning will also be integrated into the work programme of the Alliance.

### Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

37. At the time of writing this report, no official consultation with Māori had been undertaken, however, consultation is planned.
38. Initial review of available literature indicates that Māori and Pasifika groups are disproportionately impacted by an ill performing Auckland food system and that food is of significant cultural value.

39. In response, the Auckland Food Alliance concept will be piloted in local board areas representative of high Māori and Pasifika occupancy and adverse food system impacts.

40. Council is committed to working through any impacts of the proposal with Māori and involving Māori in development of the Auckland Food Alliance and in the membership.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

41. The estimated cost to council will be met within existing budgets and primarily involve staff time and provision of secretariat support through the Chief Sustainability Office and The Southern Initiative.

42. Ongoing operational costs and staff time will be approximately $1500 per annum and eight hours per month.

43. Additional funds and staff time will be required during the implementation phase of the Alliance (first six months). Estimated costs are $3000 for two facilitated workshops and four days staff time per month.

44. In terms of direct financial implications for local boards, no funding is requested. Broader local board funding decisions with food-related outcomes may benefit from being joined up and aligned with Alliance initiatives to better amplify local impact.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

45. The proposed Alliance is a low risk initiative overall due to the small financial commitment required from council and measures incorporated in the design to support long-term sustainability.

46. The key risk associated with the recommended Option 2 relates to the long-term sustainability of the Alliance due to its independent and largely voluntary structure. It is proposed that this risk be mitigated by adopting best practice and lessons learned from One Voice: Sports and Recreation model (that has been operating for more than 6 years) and analysis of international food policy councils, provision of staff support, and regular ‘fit for purpose’ reviews.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

47. If endorsed, a proposal will be submitted to the Environment and Community Committee in June 2018 and pending approval, implementation will begin in August 2018.
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### Attachment A: Auckland Council Food Related Plans and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans and Strategies</th>
<th>Targets, Directives and Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Auckland Plan 2012 | • **Directive 1.7** Reduce health inequalities and improve health of all Aucklanders  
• **Directive 8.6** Recognise, promote and strengthen the value and contribution of local urban and rural food systems to improve resilience, resource use efficiency and community food security  
• **Directive 9.1** Ensure that the resources and production systems that underpin working rural land are protected, maintained and improved  
• **Directive 9.2** Develop a regulatory framework that accommodates and encourages productive rural uses, changing activities and associated enterprises  
• **Directive 9.5** Proposals for expanding rural towns and villages must achieve a well-planned network of distinct centres, towns and villages, and a productive rural environment with clear breaks between rural settlements (avoid urbanisation of highly productive farmland and versatile soils where possible, and maintain adequate separation between incompatible land uses) |
| Draft Auckland Plan 2050 | • **Outcome: Environment and cultural heritage** Preserve, protect and care for the natural environment for the benefit of present and future generations.  
• **Direction 1:** Ensure the environment is valued and cared for by better understanding and recognising the life-sustaining benefits the environment provides, and the opportunities it provides to diversify and strengthen our economy in sectors like agriculture  
• **Direction 3:** Use Auckland’s growth and development to protect and enhance the environment by embedding sustainable environmental practices in our buildings, infrastructure and places including green infrastructure; Our buildings can be used to generate electricity, food, heat and water, reducing pressure on our already scarce resources.  
• **Focus area 1:** Encourage all Aucklanders to be stewards of the environment, and to make sustainable choices  
• **Focus area 3:** Account fully for the past and future impacts of growth  
• **Focus area 5:** Adapt to a changing water future  
• **Focus area 6:** Use green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes  
• **Outcome: Homes and places** The way we regulate land supply; placemaking recognises that our places foster wellbeing and support the way we live.  
• **Direction 1:** Develop a quality compact urban form to accommodate Auckland’s growth that helps to protect our...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans and Strategies</th>
<th>Targets, Directives and Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>natural environment and maintain Auckland’s rural productivity by limiting urban sprawl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Direction 4: Provide sufficient public places and spaces that are inclusive, accessible and contribute to urban living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus area 5: Create urban spaces for the future, focusing investment in areas of highest population density and greatest need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outcome: Opportunity and prosperity Auckland is prosperous with many opportunities and delivers a better standard of living for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Direction 1: Create the conditions for a resilient economy through innovation, employment growth and raised productivity by having a socially responsible and environmentally sustainable economy that enables increased profit, productivity and resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus area 4: Leverage Auckland’s position to support growth in exports by creating and exporting a wide range of sustainably developed products; encourage export linked sectors such as food and beverage to increase resilience in Auckland’s economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Our Development Strategy: Rural Auckland To ensure that rural production can continue, land fragmentation and reverse sensitivity must be managed to safeguard Auckland’s land and soil resources, particularly elite and prime soils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Auckland</td>
<td>The Auckland Energy Resilience and Low Carbon Action Plan contains 119 actions aimed at creating a low carbon energy future for Auckland. Six actions relate to the food system:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action 8: Support effective ways of reducing carbon emissions by reducing waste in the planning, production, consumption and disposal of food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action 16: Assess Auckland’s local food production and distribution capacity, the potential degree of self-sufficiency, and the associated opportunities and benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action 17: Ensure on-going production of perishable horticultural commodities close to urban markets by preserving high class agricultural soils and setting aside land in new and redeveloped urban areas for garden allotments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action 18: Enhance existing education and outreach programmes to achieve sustainable urban food production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action 19: Assess energy and water use across the agricultural sector against which efficiency improvement measures can be benchmarked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action 20: Introduce incentives and an outreach programme to foster improved energy and water use efficiency within the productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and Strategies</td>
<td>Targets, Directives and Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Waste Management and Minimisation Plan | This plan sets an aspirational goal of Zero Waste by 2040 and 3 sector targets:  
  - Reduce kerbside refuse by 30 percent per capita by 2018  
  - Reduce private sector waste by 30 per cent per capita by 2027  
  - Reduce Auckland Council’s in-house waste by 30 per cent per capita by 2018  
As a significant portion of Auckland’s domestic waste to landfill is food (40% in 2010), a key action is dedicated to addressing it.  
  - provision of consistent domestic waste and recycling services and receptacles across the region from 2015, where practicable, including:  
    - A kerbside collection of organic waste in urban areas  
    - An intensive drive to encourage home composting in all areas |
| Thriving communities – Community and Social Development Action Plan | This action plan seeks to enable community led development and social change to achieve happy, healthy, equitable and resilient communities.  
While all the plan’s focus areas are in general alignment with the desired outcomes of the Auckland Food Alliance, two of the focus areas specifically reference food, acknowledging the role of social innovation and social enterprise in improving food security and includes an action to support social enterprise by assessing opportunities in existing and future community facilities for accessible and affordable commercial kitchen space. |
| Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Plan 2011-2016 | The plan highlights a high dependency on other regions for food and water in Auckland’s risk profile. |
LEADERSHIP
TRANSFORMATION
INDEPENDENCE

Background

OneVoice – Sport & Recreation Auckland (OneVoice) was formed following a recommendation from the Final Report of the Auckland Regional Physical Activity and Sports Strategy (ARPASS).

The success of ARPASS would continue through the work of a new, single, independent voice for sport and recreation to represent the sector, advocate for sport and recreation across the new Auckland Council region, and act as the key consultative body working with the new Council and other agencies.

His Worship the Mayor Len Brown and Auckland Council formally recognised and endorsed the role of OneVoice as the group that would partner, advise and support Auckland Council.

1 ROLE

The role of OneVoice is to provide independent transformational leadership for sport and recreation in Auckland. It has been endorsed by Auckland Council as the key advisory group for sport and recreation. It will act as a source of knowledge and strategic thinking, representing sector-wide views and reflecting its unique stakeholder connections. It will focus primarily on high level, strategic, region-wide issues and may from time to time act on behalf of other groups.

It will act as an independent advocate for the sport and recreation sector.

2 AIM AND PURPOSE

OneVoice will work in collaboration and partnership with Auckland Council and other groups within the sport and recreation sector to:

“Improve the lifestyles of Aucklanders through physical activity and sport”

THE AIMS OF ONEVOICE ARE TO:

- increase participation levels of Aucklanders in recreation, physical activity and sport
- ensure sport and recreation grows its capability to deliver quality sporting and recreation experiences from grass roots through to elite level
- ensure the right facilities are provided to meet current and future needs of all Aucklanders
- encourage collaboration of all those working in sport and recreation to deliver better outcomes.

THE PURPOSE OF ONEVOICE IS TO:

- act as the independent reference group for the Auckland Council, and other sport, recreation and physical activity interest groups
- advocate on and for:
  - Auckland sport and recreation issues
  - the value of sport and recreation to healthy communities and the development of vibrant cities, and therefore its recognition in public policy making and resource allocation.


### TERMS OF REFERENCE

OneVoice is an independent, single voice for the sector in Auckland. As an unfunded group with broad representation from a range of sport, recreation and physical activity entities, OneVoice will:

- raise awareness of strategic issues and make recommendations on the way forward
- develop and monitor a strategic framework for sport, recreation and physical activity across Auckland
- influence and review core strategic documents of Auckland Council and other agencies in relation to sport, recreation and physical activity, where sport and recreation can advance the achievement of outcomes, including but not limited to:
  - the Auckland Plan (Spatial Plan),
  - Auckland Council’s Long Term Plan,
  - the Unitary Plan,
  - key policies and plans such as the Parks and Open Space, Children and Young People, and Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plans
- champion and co-sponsor the implementation and ongoing monitoring of the Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan for Auckland with Auckland Council, including to funding bodies, sponsors and related businesses
- provide input into the Statements of Corporate Intent for relevant CCO’s such as Regional Facilities Auckland, Auckland Transport and Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development in relation to sport, recreation and physical activity
- engage in and drive sport and recreation stakeholder engagement and communication
- access and represent the views of a broad range of sport and recreation stakeholders including the Auckland Sports Coalition and targeted groups such as ethnic, pacific, youth and disability advisory panels
- ensure an overview of regional issues, activities and priorities and any relevant Local Board or sub-regional issues, activity and priorities is maintained
- advocate for the formation of partnerships and joint venture initiatives and approaches with the private sector, appropriate trusts and public sector organisations
- consider options to address the sport and recreation needs of Auckland and its communities
- champion regional sport and recreation projects and initiatives
- ensure national policy is linked to regional and local levels and issues led back up to the national level
- generate ideas and provide a common ground for discussion, acting as a vehicle and champion for collaborative effort
- be a sounding board for Auckland Council.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To update the Henderson-Massey Local Board on Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku) activities within the local board area for the six months from 1 September 2017 to 28 February 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 we continuously review 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 Henderson-Massey Local Board:
a) receive the Panuku Development Auckland Local Board update for 1 September 2017 to 28 February 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 Henderson-Massey Local Board area:
8. Unlock Henderson
9. A high level update on the Unlock Henderson priority location below. Unlock priority locations are areas where Council is not necessarily the major land holder and have been identified as requiring Panuku to be the facilitator by using our relationships to break down
barriers and influencing others including Council family organisations to create development opportunities.

10. Henderson was chosen as an Unlock location as the result of a council-led assessment across the region’s urban centres. These were chosen based on development potential including scale and impact, key land holdings, commercial viability, partnership opportunities, the ability to leverage off previous investment and proximity to public transport.

11. The Unlock Henderson project area is generally aligned to the Metropolitan Centre zoning and is bounded to the north by Tui Glen Reserve, to the west by Waitematā Rugby Park, the south by the Auckland Film Studios site and to the east by Waitakere Mega Centre.

12. Panuku completed a High Level Project Plan (HLPP) for Henderson in May 2017. An HLPP is a project initiation document used to detail the short, medium and long term goals for an area. It seeks to obtain approval for any additional actions to give effect to the HLPP in Henderson, including site disposals, detailed project planning, design and analysis.

13. The HLPP was approved by the Henderson-Massey Local Board, Panuku Board, Planning Committee and Finance and Performance Committee. The next steps for all Unlock and Transform locations is to prepare a Programme Business Case to prioritise the next ten years of work.

Project Update:

14. 2-4 Henderson Valley Road – Subdivision works consent lodgement is imminent. Approval to undertake the proposed onsite road and greenway as part of the Opanuku Link is expected by the end of March.

15. Falls and Alderman car parks – Parking study is complete, AT is assessing to determine upliftment of parking designations. This carpark has been identified as part of the Mayor’s C40 (carbon neutral) initiative.

16. Opanuku Link – This project includes a new path and bridge between Corban Estate and an upgraded playground at Opanuku Reserve. The project funded by the Henderson-Massey local board. Public consultation for this project commences from 14 April for a three week period. Online feedback is sought through the Council, ‘have your say’ website. Feedback from the consultation will inform the final design of the upgraded playground and park layout. The project team is working through initial concept design and geo tech studies. Expression of Interest for artists to join the project team will be sought in April for the pedestrian and cyclist bridge and the upgraded playground.

17. Place Making is a core part of the work we do in Henderson. As part of Place Programme the following initiatives are taking place; The Big Screen Cuisine on 14 April includes an outdoor cinema, food trucks and walking and cycling discovery trail along the Project Twin Streams paths. At 2-4 Henderson Valley Rd in addition to the community gardens there is now a 6 month trial for a Bike Hub managed by Eco Matters Trust and a free to use modular pump track for the month of April.

18. The Commercial Place Making team is working with ATEED and Healthy Families to deliver The Kitchen Project. The project supports food entrepreneurs who are starting out, providing them with affordable commercial kitchen space for product development and mentoring. These businesses will be financially sustainable and bring healthier and diverse food choices to the communities of west Auckland. The first intake closed in March of 2018 and 6 entrepreneurs have begun their mentoring.
Portfolio management

19. 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.

20. 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, cafes, offices, medical centres, and a large portfolio of residential rental homes.

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

22. 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 Henderson-Massey Local Board Area

23. Panuku currently manages 23 commercial and 9 residential interests within the Henderson-Massey Local Board area.

Business interests

24. 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.

25. There are currently no managed business interests in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area.

Portfolio strategy

Optimisation

26. 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 new method of dealing with service property, called optimisation.

27. 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

28. 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, by providing council with an efficient use of capital and prioritisation of funds to achieve its activities and projects.

**Performance**

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

30. 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>$30.25m as at 28 February 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process**

31. 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**

32. Properties currently under review in the Henderson-Massey 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adj. 1/18 Edwin Freeman Place, Ranui</td>
<td>Vacant land that is a local purpose road reserve vested upon subdivision with the former Waitemata City Council in 1985.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT advised it has no strategic requirement for the subject site to be retained. Council’s Parks department also advised there is no requirement to use the subject site for open space purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rationalisation process commenced in July 2017. No alternate service uses were identified during the internal consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panuku attended a workshop with the board in February 2018 regarding the subject site. The board did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj. 18 Parrs Cross Road, Henderson</td>
<td>Vacant land that is road reserve vested upon subdivision with the former County of Waitemata in 1974.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT advised it has no strategic requirement for the subject site to be retained. Council’s Parks department also advised there is no requirement to use the subject site for open space purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rationalisation process commenced in July 2017. No expressions of interest were received during the internal consultation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Panuku attended a workshop with the board in February 2018 regarding the subject site. The board did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed disposal.

**Acquisitions and Disposals**

33. 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**

34. 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.

35. Panuku purchased eight properties for open space across Auckland in this financial year (ending 30 June 2018) at a cost of $19.7m, and also bought six properties for storm water use at a value of $4.2m.

36. No properties were purchased in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area during the reporting period.

**Disposals**

37. 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.

38. No properties were sold in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area.

**Housing for Older People**

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

40. 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.

41. 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.

42. 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.

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

44. 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.

45. The following HfOP villages are located within the Henderson-Massey Local Board area:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Number of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff Court</td>
<td>6 Flagstaff Place, Massey</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Smyth village</td>
<td>14 Royal Road, Massey</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumatua Village</td>
<td>11 Kaumatua Place, Te Atatu</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. **Lots 1 & 2, 21-33 Henderson Valley Road (former Wilsher Village land)** – Panuku will develop Lot 1 (circa 3,000m²) for social housing for older people, and sell Lot 2 (1.3 hectare) to a development partner to be developed for general housing purposes.

47. **Lot 1 - Social Housing for Older People Development** – Building consent is now lodged and a process underway to appoint a contractor for Lot 1, to build 40 housing for older people homes in a four-storey building. Upon completion, the units will be managed by the Auckland Council and the Selwyn Foundation joint venture community housing provider Haumaru Housing. The program provides for works to commence on site in May 2018 with the homes ready for occupation mid-2019. Arrangements are being made for a site blessing at the beginning of May before construction commences on site.

48. **Lot 2 - 1.3ha vacant land sale for residential housing development** – The sale campaign for Lot 2 commenced mid-October 2017 with the tender closing in November 2017. It is the intention that the 1.3 ha. of land is sold to a development partner for the purpose that the site be developed for residential housing. The proceeds of sale will be applied, together with existing funding outlined in the council’s Long Term Plan, to fund the new 40 unit HfOP village on Lot 1. The property sale to housing developer was subject to a conditional contract signed 21 December 2017. The agreement was subject to a vendor due diligence clause which expired beginning of March 2018, however this condition wasn’t satisfied and the contract has subsequently been cancelled. Investigations are now underway as to how the site could be developed as a pilot project for the government’s KiwiBuild initiative.

**Regional Activities**

**Highlights**

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

50. **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.

51. **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.

52. **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

53. 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. All up, 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.

54. ‘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.

55. 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

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

57. In Northcote, we completed a Framework Plan in November 2016 that outlines the initial proposals for the town centre. An information kiosk was also opened by Homes Land
Community in April. The town centre masterplan and the Awataha Greenway masterplan is targeted for completion in December 2017.

58. **Hobsonville** 20ha Airfields site - stage one of construction of 102 standalone and terrace homes is underway. Avanda Group have been announced as the developers that will deliver more than 500 homes in stage two, of which a minimum of 10 per cent will be affordable housing.

59. The opportunity to revitalise **Avondale** has been 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 we will continue to strengthen connections between these activity hubs and the town. A focus for the regeneration of Avondale is working 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.

60. 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.

61. 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**

62. 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 will be built on this new subdivision.

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

63. This report is for the Henderson-Massey Local Board’s information.

64. Panuku requests that all feedback and/or queries you have relating to a property in your Local board area be directed in the first instance to localboard@developmentauckland.co.nz

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

65. Tāmaki Makaurau has the highest Māori population in the world with one in four Māori in Aotearoa living here.

66. Māori make up 12% of the region’s total population who mainly live in Manurewa, Henderson-Massey, Papakura, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Māngere-Ōtahuhu and Franklin. Māori have a youthful demographic with 50% of Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau under the age of 25 years. 5% of the Māori population in the region are currently 65 years and over.

67. There are 19 Mana Whenua in the region, with 13 having indicated an interest in Panuku lead activities within the Henderson-Massey Local Board area.
68. Māori make up 16 percent of the Henderson-Massey Local Board population, and there is three marae located within the local board area.

69. Panuku work collaboratively with Mana Whenua on a range 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.

70. Panuku will continue to partner with Māori on opportunities which enhance Māori social and economic wellbeing.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Sven Mol - Corporate Affairs Advisor, Panuku Development Auckland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers | Marieke Numan – Senior Engagement Advisor, Panuku Development Auckland  
Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau |
Confirmation of Workshop Records

File No.: CP2018/05030

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. This report presents records of workshops held by the Henderson-Massey Local Board on:
   - 6 March 2018
   - 13 March 2018
   - 20 March 2018
   - 27 March 2018

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. At the workshop held on Tuesday, 6 March, the Henderson-Massey Local Board had briefings on:
   - Long Term Plan and Auckland Plan
   - Draft Ferries Futures Strategy
   - Update on various items
   - North West Community Provision Investigation
   - Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy
   - Options for a tree protection grants
   - Maori Naming of Reserves
   - Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Plan

3. At the workshop held on Tuesday, 13 March, the Henderson-Massey Local Board had briefings on:
   - Panuku Update
   - Westgate (Massey) infrastructure programme
   - Ranui Community Centre Inc annual presentation
   - Come and fly a kite event programme
   - Options for tree protection grants
   - Glendene Community Society Inc annual presentation
• Sturges West Community House

4. At the workshop held on Tuesday, 20 March, the Henderson-Massey Local Board had briefings on:
   • Workshop 5 (2018/2019 draft local board work programmes by activity Stormwater outfall - Royal Reserve)
   • Corporate Property building strategy - disposal of assets

5. At the workshop held on Tuesday, 27 March, the Henderson-Massey Local Board had briefings on:
   • Henderson-Massey Signage Audit
   • Community grant review 2018/2019
   • Sports Facilities Investment Plan 2018-2038
   • Open Space Management - present approach to developing draft policies
   • Proposed establishment of Auckland Food Alliance

**Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s**

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) receive the workshop records held on:
   • 6 March 2018
   • 13 March 2018
   • 20 March 2018
   • 27 March 2018

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>HMLB Workshop Records - March 2018</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Busola Martins - Local Board Democracy Advisor (West)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Henderson-Massey Local Board workshop record

Workshop notes of the Henderson-Massey Local Board held in the Council Chamber (level 2) 6 Henderson Valley Road, Henderson on 6 March 2018, 10.00am

PRESENT
Chairperson: Shane Henderson
Members: Peter Chan
          Vanessa Neeson (left at lunch time)
          Warren Flautny
          Brenda Brady
          Paula Bold-Wilson
          Matt Grey
          Will Flavel

Apologies:

Also present: Glenn Boyd, Wendy Kjestrup, Rodica Chelaru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTP and AK Plan (Michelle Hutchinson)</td>
<td>The board received an overview of the engagement process and planned local board engagement activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Ferries Futures Strategy</td>
<td>The board received information about the draft Future Ferries strategy and provided feedback including discussion of potential routes and infrastructure and frequency of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gareth Willis Alison Rust Owena Schuster)</td>
<td><strong>Actions/Outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update on various items</td>
<td>Community awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Services staff</td>
<td><strong>Actions/Outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Community Provision Investigation Antonia Butler</td>
<td>The board were updated on the findings of the North West Community Provision Investigation including the statistical information used to support it and informed of the next steps. Progress report coming to a workshop in June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions/Outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Workshop Records

**Urban Ngahere (forest) Strategy**
- Howell Davies
- Sian Walker

The board were updated on the strategy and its implementation framework, including funding and partnerships and area-specific implementation.

**Options for a tree protection grants**
- Local Board Services staff

The board discussed the possibility of including a contestable tree protection grant in the local board grants programme, in preparation for the grants programme review.

**Maori Naming of Reserves**
- Nikora Wharerua
- Tracey Hodder
- Sian Walker

The local board received an update on research findings of the historical origins of reserve names, draft communications and suggested reserves that could be considered for Trancho 1.

The board gave feedback on which reserves to discuss with mana whenua to identify and agree Māori names and narratives.

**Henderson-Massey Environmental Action Plan**
- Jaimee Maha
- Robbie Sutherland

The board was updated on work completed to date and discussed next steps for this project.

**Actions/Outcomes:**
- Report to April business meeting to agree next steps

The workshop concluded at 3.20pm.
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Henderson-Massey Local Board workshop record

Workshop notes of the Henderson-Massey Local Board held in the Council Chamber (level 2) 6 Henderson Valley Road, Henderson on 13 March 2018, 10.00 am.

**PRESENT**

Chairperson: Shane Henderson  
Members: Peter Chan  
Warren Flaunty  
Matt Grey  
Bronda Brady  
Will Flavel  
Vanessa Neeson  
came at 10.10  
left at 1.30pm  

Apologies: Paula Bold-Wilson  
Will Flavel  
Also present: Wendy Kjestrup  
Tracey Wisnewski  
Rodica Chelaru  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panuku Update</td>
<td>The board received the monthly update on activities in the area including:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Marieke Numan | - Library cafe lease renewal  
- 2-4 Henderson Valley Road  
- C40 cities program  
- Opanuku Reserve upgrade  
- Proposed temporary bike hub & pump track  
- Big screen cuisine  
| Actions/Outcomes: | Panuku to provide further updates on the Library café lease renewal |
| Westgate (Massey) infrastructure programme | The board received an update on progress on the infrastructure projects in the Westgate development area. |
| Nancy Wain  
Bruce Tupp  
Gemma Sandford |  
| Actions/Outcomes: | Updates to be provided quarterly in future  
Report back on walking connectivity development at next quarterly update |
| Ranui Community Centre Inc annual presentation | The board were updated on the challenges and highlights relating to the centre and programmes and activities held there. |
| Lunch |  

Henderson-Massey Local Board
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| **Come and fly a kite event programme**<br>Sammy Johnston | The board were updated on the planning and schedule in advance of the event on 18 March. |
| **Options for tree protection grants**<br>Wendy Kjestrup | The board continued discussion of the option of a tree protection grant. |
| **Glendene Community Society Inc annual presentation** | The board were updated on the challenges and highlights relating to the centre and programmes and activities held there. |
| **Sturges West Community House** | The board were updated on the challenges and highlights relating to the centre and programmes and activities held there. |

The workshop concluded at 3.20pm.
Henderson-Massey Local Board workshop record

Workshop notes of the Henderson-Massey Local Board held in the Council Chamber (level 2) 6 Henderson Valley Road, Henderson on 20 March 2018, 10.00 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Shane Henderson
Members: Peter Chan (came at 10.15)
         Warren Flautny
         Matt Grey
         Brenda Brady
         Paula Bold-Wilson
         Vanessa Neeson

Apologies: Will Flavell

Also present: Wendy Kjestrup
              Tracey Wisnewski
              Rodica Chelaru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.10 am - 12.00pm</td>
<td>The board discussed the 2018/2019 draft local board work programmes by activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Marriot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 - 2.30</td>
<td>The board continued discussion of the 2018/2019 draft local board work programmes by activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Marriot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30 - 3.30</td>
<td>The board gave feedback on the proposed disposal of 8 Henderson Valley Rd. as part of the Corporate Property Portfolio Strategy to be included within the report for the Finance &amp; Performance Committee in April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Property building strategy - disposal of assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Piirit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Aitken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Coombes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leilani Edwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.30.
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Workshop record of the Henderson-Massey Local Board held in the Council Chamber (level 2) 6 Henderson Valley Road, Henderson on 27 March 2018, commencing at 10.00 am.

PRESENT
Shane Henderson (Chairperson)
Brenda Brady
Matt Grey (left at 2.57 pm)
Paula Bold-Wilson
Peter Chan
Vanessa Neeson (Left at 2.00 pm)
Warren Flautny
Will Flavell (From 11.15 am – 1.30 pm)

Also present: Busola Martins, Wendy Kjestrup, Glenn Boyd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Henderson-Massey Signage Audit | - The board discussed the signage audit provided direction on the priority parks for signage works.  
- The signage project undertakes a strategic assessment of existing parks signage and identifies gaps and opportunities to improve signage outcomes for parks in the local board area.  
- Members indicated an interest in way finding signage and signs being bilingual – Maori and English  
- Elected members highlighted the importance of regulatory signs for public places. |
| Tracey Hodder | |
| Community grant review 2018/2019 | - Staff discussed improvements to the community grants programme including simplified grants applications.  
- Staff also discussed the proposed 2018/19 grants round. |
| Marion Davies | |
| Sports Facilities Investment Plan 2018-2038 | - The board discussed key aspects of the investment plan prior to finalisation of a draft  
- The board gave feedback on the funding options |
| Ruth Woodward | |
| Nancy Chu | Actions/Outcomes: Next step is the approval of the draft sports facilities investment plan for consultation by the Environment and Community Committee. |
Item 21
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Open Space Management - present approach to developing draft policies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shyrel Burt</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Staff discussed the scope, development process and focus of open space management guidelines.
- Policies will support timely, effective and consistent decision-making.
- Key issues include alienation of open space, private use of public land, commercial use of public land, allocation of open space and park values.
- Policy will help provide a strong policy direction to restrict private use of public land, to limit/restrict alienation of open space, provide assessment criteria to guide decision making on allocation of open spaces, provide guidance on the process to make a decision for park values.

**Actions/Outcomes:**
Draft guidelines will be further workshopped with local boards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposed establishment of Auckland Food Alliance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|**Mark Allen**
Lauren Simpson
Sarah Anderson |

- Staff presented an overview of the proposed establishment of an Auckland Food Alliance.
- Auckland Food Alliance is supported by Council and would include a group of influential, independent, multi-sectoral group.
- The board provided feedback on the issues and challenges in the board area.

**Actions/Outcomes:**
- Report on April agenda requesting local board feedback and support for the proposal.

The workshop concluded at 3.10 pm.
Governance Forward Work Calendar

File No.: CP2018/05090

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To present to the Henderson-Massey Local Board with their most current governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. This report introduces the governance forward work calendar: a schedule of items that will come before the board at business meetings over the upcoming months. The governance forward work calendar for the board is included in Attachment A.

3. The calendar aims to support local boards’ governance role by:
   - ensuring advice on agendas and workshop material is driven by local board priorities
   - clarifying what advice is required and when
   - clarifying the rationale for reports.

4. The calendar will be updated every month. Each update will be reported back to business meetings and distributed to relevant Council staff. It is recognised that at times items will arise that are not programmed. Board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) note the updated Governance Forward Work Calendar for April 2018. (attachment A).

Horopaki / Context

5. Council’s Quality Advice Programme aims to improve the focus, analysis, presentation and timeliness of staff advice to elected representatives. An initiative under this is to develop forward work calendars for governing body committees and local boards. These provide elected members with better visibility of the types of governance tasks they are being asked to undertake and when they are scheduled.

6. Although the document is new, there are no new projects in the governance forward work calendar. The calendar brings together in one schedule reporting on all of the board’s projects and activities previously approved in the local board plan, long-term plan, departmental work programmes and through other board decisions. It includes governing body policies and initiatives that call for a local board response.

7. This initiative is intended to support the boards’ governance role. It will also help staff to support local boards, as an additional tool to manage workloads and track activities across council departments, and it will allow greater transparency for the public.

8. The calendar is arranged in four columns, “Date”, “Topic”, “Purpose” and “Governance Role”:
   - Topic describes the items and may indicate how they fit in with broader processes such as the annual plan
Governance Forward Work Calendar
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- Purpose indicates the aim of the item, such as formally approving plans or projects, hearing submissions or receiving progress updates
- Governance role is a higher-level categorisation of the work local boards do. Examples of the seven governance categories are tabled on the following page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Capex projects, work programmes, annual plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local initiatives/specific decisions</td>
<td>Grants, road names, alcohol bans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input into regional decision-making</td>
<td>Comments on regional bylaws, policies, plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Local board agreement, quarterly performance reports, review projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Community hui, submissions processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Briefings, cluster workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar. The calendar will be updated and reported back every month to business meetings. Updates will also be distributed to relevant Council staff.

Consideration

Local Board views and implications
10. All local boards are being presented with governance forward work calendars for their consideration.

Māori impact statement
11. The projects and processes referred to in the governance forward work calendar will have a range of implications for Māori which will be considered when the work is reported.

Implementation
12. Staff will review the calendar each month in consultation with board members and will report an updated calendar to the board.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Program - April 2018</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Busola Martins - Local Board Democracy Advisor (West)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Auckland Transport update report - December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation of workshop records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Food Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Paruku 6 monthly report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport update report - December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial decisions that subsequently need to be considered by the governing body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarter 3 reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation of workshop records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of local board agreement 2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Rates remission and postponement policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation review overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Adopt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Board Agreement 2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work programmes by activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fees and charges schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport update report - December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation of workshop records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports Facility Investment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom Camping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td>Item 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>2018: 17 April</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>making</th>
<th>approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport update report - December</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of workshop records</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness review</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities partnerships policy - Draft</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide feedback on policy options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Resilient Recovery Strategy</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport update report - December</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of workshop records</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Auckland</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 4 reporting</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additions to the 2016-2019 Henderson-Massey Local Board meeting schedule

File No.: CP2018/05341

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Seeking approval for two meeting dates to be added to the 2016-2019 Henderson-Massey Local Board meeting schedule in order to accommodate the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 timeframes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
3. At that time the specific times and dates for meetings for local board decision making in relation to the local board agreement as part of the 10-year Budget 2018-28 were unknown.
4. The board is being asked to approve two meeting dates as additions to the Henderson-Massey Local Board meeting schedule so that the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 timeframes can be met.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) approve two meeting dates to be added to the 2016-2019 Henderson-Massey Local Board meeting schedule to accommodate the 10-year Budget 2018-28 timeframes as follows:
   • Tuesday, 9 May 2018, 10.00am
   • Tuesday, 5 June 2018, 10.00am

b) note the venue for both meetings will be in the Council Chamber (level 2) 6 Henderson Valley Road, Henderson.

Horopaki / Context
5. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) have requirements regarding local board meeting schedules.
6. In summary, adopting a meeting schedule helps meet the requirements of:
   • clause 19, Schedule 7 of the LGA on general provisions for meetings, which requires the chief executive to give notice in writing to each local board member of the time and place of meetings. Such notification may be provided by the adoption of a schedule of business meetings.
   • sections 46, 46(A) and 47 in Part 7 of the LGOIMA, which requires that meetings are publicly notified, agendas and reports are available at least two working days before a meeting and that local board meetings are open to the public.
7. The Henderson-Massey Local Board adopted its business meeting schedule at its 23 November 2016 business meeting.
8. The timeframes for local board decision making in relation to the local board agreement which is part of the 10-year Budget 2018-28 were unavailable when the meeting schedule was originally adopted.

9. The board is being asked to make decisions in early May and early June to feed into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 process. These timeframes are outside the board’s normal meeting cycle.

**Tātārītanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice**

10. The board has two choices:
   i) Add the two meetings as additions to the meeting schedule.
   or
   ii) Add the two meetings as extraordinary meetings.

11. For option one, statutory requirements allow enough time for these meetings to be scheduled as additions to the meeting schedule and other topics may be considered as per any other ordinary meeting. However there is a risk that if the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 timeframes change or the information is not ready for the meeting there would need to be an additional extraordinary meeting scheduled anyway.

12. For option two, only the specific topic 10-year Budget 2018-2028 may be considered for which the meeting is being held. There is a risk that no other policies or plans with similar timeframes or running in relation to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 process could be considered at this meeting.

13. Since there is enough time to meet statutory requirements, staff recommend approving these meetings as additions to the meeting schedule as it allows more flexibility for the board to consider a range of issues.

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

14. This report requests the board’s decision to schedule two additional meetings and consider whether to approve them as extraordinary meetings or additions to the meeting schedule.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

15. There is no specific impact for Māori arising from this report. Local boards work with Māori on projects and initiatives of shared interest.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications**

16. There are no financial implications in relation to this report apart from the standard costs associated with servicing a business meeting.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

17. There are no significant risks associated with this report.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

18. Implement the processes associated with preparing for business meetings.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.
### Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Busola Martins - Local Board Democracy Advisor (West)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Te Atatu Peninsula Pump Track

Geoff Levland
Pump Tracks and the Henderson-Massey Plan

• Outcome 1: A network of vibrant and loved urban neighbourhoods

• Outcome 2: A thriving local economy that supports quality of life

• Outcome 3: Communities know each other and work together on common interests

• Outcome 4: Community facilities are vibrant and welcoming places at the heart of our communities

• Outcome 5: It is easy to get around without a car

• Outcome 6: Natural spaces are valued and restored
Where would we put a Pump Track?

- Harbourview/Orangihina ★
  - Very visible
  - Contention with other users
  - Dangerous road crossing

- Kervil Park ★
  - Not visible from road
  - Close proximity to houses

- Taipari Strand ★
  - Likely the best option
Taipari Strand

- Old landfill: the landfills team are open to a pump track on the park
- Work is planned on the park’s drainage: we would have to work in with that
- Last refuge of dog walkers: they would fight any loss of rights. (I walk my dog there!)
- There’s an existing plan for a bike facility from 2014
Key Points

- There are around 3,000 under-15’s in the Peninsula
- There is strong support from the local community and schools
- We’ll raise funds (but contributions from the local board would really help!)
- Cost depends on size, we’re looking to raise about $150k
  Maintenance costs are low.
- We’d like the support of the local board