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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

   Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes

   That the Kaipātiki Local Board Community Forum:

   a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 2 May 2018, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

5 Leave of Absence

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

6 Acknowledgements

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

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

8  Deputations

Standing Order 7.7 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 Kaipātiki Local Board Community Forum. 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  New Zealand Rugby / North Harbour Rugby / Glenfield Rugby Club Joint Pilot

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. The purpose of this deputation is to address the Kaipātiki Local Board regarding North Harbour Rugby.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Mike Hester Participation Development Manager NZ Rugby (NZR), Denis Henderson North Harbour Rugby (NHRU), and Colin Cooper Glenfield Rugby Club (GRC), will be in attendance to address the local board on the joint NZR / NHRU / GRC pilot.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Kaipātiki Local Board Community Forum:
   a) receive the deputation from North Harbour Rugby, New Zealand Rugby and Glenfield Rugby Club.
   b) thank Mike Hester, Denis Henderson and Colin Cooper for their attendance and presentation.

Attachments
A  Wider Auckland Club Rugby Planning Insights .................................................. 13
B  2018 Wider Auckland Chinese Engagement Pilot.............................................. 21

8.2  Proposal for 33 Salisbury Road

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. The purpose of this deputation is to address the Kaipātiki Local Board regarding a childcare facility proposed at 33 Salisbury Road, Birkdale.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Laura Macmillan, Jaymie Huse and Valery Openshaw, homeowners on Salisbury Road, will be in attendance to address the Kaipātiki Local Board regarding the plans of proposal and key concerns.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Kaipātiki Local Board Community Forum:
   a) receive the deputation from Laura Macmillan, Jaymie Huse and Valery Openshaw.
   b) thank Laura Macmillan, Jaymie Huse and Valery Openshaw for their attendance and
presentation.

**Attachments**
- A Plans of Proposal ........................................................................................................... 33
- B Key Concerns/Points of Proposal .................................................................................. 39

### 8.3 Northart Strategic Plan

**Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report**

1. The purpose of this deputation is to address the Kaipātiki Local Board regarding Northart Strategic Plan.

**Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary**

2. Jacqueline Aust Chair of Northart, will be in attendance to present the strategic plan to the Kaipātiki Local Board.

**Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s**

That the Kaipātiki Local Board Community Forum:

a) receive the deputation from Northart

b) thank Jacqueline Aust and Northart for their attendance and presentation.

### 9 Public Forum

A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from members.

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

### 10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,—
(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

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

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

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

11 Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.
Kaipātiki Local Youth Board update

File No.: CP2018/08296

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. The purpose of this report is to address the Kaipātiki Local Board to provide an update on the activities of the Kaipātiki Local Youth Board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. An opportunity is provided for the Kaipātiki Local Youth Board to update the Kaipātiki Local Board on their activities.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Kaipātiki Local Board Community Forum:

a) receive the Kaipātiki Local Youth Board update.
b) thank the Kaipātiki Local Youth Board for their attendance and presentation.

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories
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Glenfield Rugby Union & Sports Club

A. Scope

The aim of this club snapshot is to provide leadership and stakeholders a high-level overview of:

- recent club participation trends,
- comparison with wider Auckland club participation trends, and
- current and projected ethnic and age trends within the NHRU area.

We hope that this information will help place some perspective around recent participation trends at Glenfield and how the club compares with club rugby generally across wider Auckland.

Glenfield are also encouraged to use this information to help with the longer-term planning and direction of the club, and particularly with understanding the opportunities and challenges which may arise from forecast population changes.

B. Recent Participation Trends

Based on registered players in the NZR National Rugby Database and indicates:

Junior

- Glenfield is a comparatively small junior club with a declining participation trend over the past 5 years although this has levelled out more recently. The trend over the past 5 years has been a -7.3% average annual change.
- Junior boys’ participation has fallen an average of -7.9% each year while junior girls has grown at an average of 5.9% each year albeit off a very low base. Girls comprise 6.3% of all junior participants, marginally below the North Harbour club’s average of 9.1%.
- The median junior club size across North Harbour has grown from 305 to 315 participants between 2012 and 2017 while the average club size has fallen. This indicates a mix of growth and decline across the network of 11 junior clubs, however the decline in some clubs is greater than the growth in others.
- Median club size across the wider Auckland region has fallen from 268 (47 clubs) in 2012 to 235 (49 clubs) in 2017. Average club size has also fallen from 301 to 274 during the same period as participation has fallen and two small junior clubs have been established – Mercer (CMRU) and Puni (CMRU).
- Glenfield junior club comprises 1.8% of all junior club participation across NHRU, down from 2.6% in 2012.
Senior

- Following a significant decline in 2013, overall senior participation has remained relatively steady at Glenfield although the impact of the early decline has resulted in an average -0.9% fall in participation over each of the last 5 years.

- There has been a consistent Woman’s representation at the club over the past six years however the fall in participation has been a blend of both Men’s senior rugby falling an average of -10.3% each year and Woman’s rugby falling at an average of -8.3% each year. Woman comprise 20.9% of all senior player registrations, well above the NHRU and the wider Auckland average of 4.2% and 7.8% respectively.

- The median senior club size across the Auckland region has fallen from 175 (47 clubs) in 2012 to 152 (45 clubs) in 2017. The median size across the 12 NHRU clubs has also fallen from 179 to 143 during the same period indicating that North Harbour clubs are typically mid-range size and the fall in participation has likely been more significant through the smaller clubs.

- Glenfield senior club comprises 6.4% of all senior club participation across the region, down from 9.8% in 2012.

![Glenfield RUBSC - Registered Senior Players](image)

C. Player Retention Trends

The annual club retention rate is based on an analysis of players who register to play at the same club two years in a row. Comparison is made to the weighted average club retention rate across the Auckland region.

Note: players who continue playing but change club or leave club for secondary school (and vice-versa) are not recorded as ‘retained’ within the individual club numbers.

- With the exception of 2015, Glenfield junior club player retention rate has tracked below the weighted average across the Auckland region over the past six years. This will be impacted by a small player base which can result in large variances each year, such as, an entire team leaving after J1/J2 level.

- Measured alongside declining participation, this would indicate a less favourable participant experience.

- The average retention rate across all wider Auckland junior clubs has fallen from 70% to 65% over the past six years. Glenfield junior retention was 56% in 2017.

- Retention rates within senior clubs is often more variable where there are less grade choices, typically smaller player base and team rosters are often required to be considerably larger. If a team or grade is disestablished, this can often impact the retention of many participants.

- Retention within the Glenfield senior club has generally been in-line with or better than the wider Auckland average apart from 2013 when the club experienced a significant fall in participation.

- The average retention rate across all wider Auckland senior clubs has fallen from 55% to 44% over the past four years, trending down alongside falling participation at this level. Glenfield senior retention was 41% in 2017.
D. Registered Coaches

Based on registered club coaches in the National Rugby Database, i.e. have completed the requirements of Rugby Smart and or Small Blacks.

The number of registered coaches and the ratio of players per registered coach can be benchmarked across the region providing the club (or PU) with an indication of how this ratio has moved over recent years and a comparison to wider Auckland averages. Coaches have a strong influence on the overall player experience and there may be a correlation between the player to coach ratio and retention trends.

This ratio is influenced by the grade in which teams are entered, particularly within junior clubs who play either 7, 10 or 15-a-side. Club rugby participation across the region has a reasonably consistently 65% (junior) / 35% (senior) split. This mix may differ between clubs however most clubs deliver both junior and senior rugby.

- The player to coach ratio at Glenfield has generally improved over the past six years and tracks roughly in line with wider Auckland averages.
- This is notable as the Glenfield senior club is larger than the junior club which would normally lead to a weaker player to coach ratio.

E. Player Ethnicity

- The fall in junior participation at Glenfield over the past 5 years has mostly been from NZ European players who have almost halved in number and now comprise approx. 40% of the player base, down from 51% in 2012. Maori participation has also fallen but Pacific Island involvement has held, albeit off a low player base.
A similar trend has been experienced in the senior club with NZ European and Maori participation notably falling by more than 50% in number. Pacific Islanders have become the dominant ethnicity, rising in numbers despite the fall in overall participation and increasing from 23% to 43% of the total player base. Asian participation is minimal across junior and senior levels.

F. Population & Demographic Trends - 2013

The following chart provides a snapshot of population demographics within an approximate 3km radius of the Kaipatiki Park location of Glenfield Rugby based on the 2013 census. The bar chart on the right outlines key demographic trends compared with national averages and indicates:

- Ethnicity mix comprises significantly higher Asian population and lower Maori, Pacific and European when compared with national averages.
- There is a greater portion of Young & Older Families and a lower concentration of Older Adults and Retirees.
- Primary and Secondary age groups are lower than national averages.
- Chinese are particularly prominent within the Asian ethnicity.
G. Population & Demographic Projections - 2013-2038

Statistics NZ has forecast the following population projections to 2038 within the Kaipatiki Local Board boundaries. Notable trends include:

- A 25% increase in total population over the 25-year period, which is well below wider Auckland trends.
- An 107% increase in the Asian population from 20k to 44k during the 25-year period.
- A 10% decrease in the NZ European population during the same period.

These projections can be further analysed within the same 3km geographical radius used above (not the same as the Local Board boundaries). Notable demographic changes to 2038 include:

- Ethnicity of the population is expected to change significantly with the NZ European demographic expected to fall from 61% to 46% of the total population.
- The Asian ethnicity is expected to increase from 20% to 46% of the population, on-par with the NZ European population.
- In terms of life-stages, Young Families are expected to remain above national averages although fall within the local mix.
- Retirees are expected to increase in prominence although remain below national averages.
- Primary and Secondary students are expected to remain close to national averages as a percentage of total population.
- Chinese are expected to increase in prominence and grow significantly faster than national averages.
A clearer picture of the projected changes in life-stage within the Kaipatiki Local Board is outlined below. Notable:

- **Retirees** are projected to grow 83% over the 25 year period.
- **Young people** (0-14 yrs.) are expected to be the slowest growing age group during this time, increase by 1,600 pax over 25 years and actually decrease from 2028 onward.
- There is a similar trend in Young Adults with just an 11% increase over 25 years and falling population from 2028.

**H. Summary / Opportunities / Challenges**

These trends are expected to result in both challenges and opportunities for club rugby with both an aging population and ethnic mix.

The following chart outlines the current ethnic mix of Glenfield club participation next to current and estimated future population mix for both the Junior and Senior club age groups. Briefly these insights show –

- A clear opportunity to engage with the significant and growing Asian population.
- There is expected to be a significant change in ethnic mix across rugby playing age groups in the communities surrounding Glenfield. NZ European population is expected to fall during this time.
- Playing age (junior and senior) population is expected to fall from 2028.
- The gradually aging population may provide more opportunity for social or non-contact versions of the sport at senior level.
- The aging population may provide an opportunity to engage a wider volunteer network if managed well.

**Glenfield RU&SC - Ethnicity Trends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


END.
2018 Wider Auckland Chinese Engagement Pilot
Strategic Context – NZR 2020

More Players and More Communities Participating

Increase participation, appeal and relevancy of all forms of rugby for all New Zealanders and offer different forms of rugby to new and returning participants.
More Players and More Communities Participating

Achieved in partnership with PUs by:

Recognising Auckland Region is pivotal to success of the game by:

- Maintaining focused engagement with Auckland Council’s Long Term Plan for Sport and Recreational Spaces
- Influencing the development and delivery of the valued rugby offering to Emerging Communities
# Measures of success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Coach and Referee Retention    | Ensure the following ratios  
                                   | Coach to player ratio 1:12  
                                   | Referee to player ratio 1:37 |
| Female Player Growth           | YOY 10% increase (2018, 2019, 2020)                                  |
| Teenage Male Player            | YOY increase (2018, 2019, 2020)                                     |
| Wider Auckland                 | Nominated WA Rugby Facilities Plan Short Term Projects initiated and completed |
|                                | Chinese Engagement Programme - 15-20 integrated teams in Rippa Rugby |
Wider Auckland
Where are the Chinese Community

Glenfield
Pinehill
Howick
Mt Roskill
Why the Need for a Trial?

- Lot of unknowns and no template to follow
- Impact is at Club Level - case studies drive uptake
- Experimental marketing approach
- Limited capability to launch wide programme
- Budget
- Game Offerings are inflexible
Key Trial Considerations

– What is important to this Community?
– How do they view living in New Zealand?
– How do they view sport?
– How do they view rugby?
– How do we market to them?
– How do we support their experience?
– How do we support Club environments?
Auckland Market Research Findings

Overlap of values: health and education/personal growth

Football is doing a lot of heavy lifting for sport immersion....but is not valued

Auckland Chinese Parents (8/9 Year Olds) Research says:
• 76% parents understand team sport culture in NZ
• 89% happy that my child is settled at school
• 79% parents worried about contact in rugby
• 91% parents would like children to experience rugby

Auckland Chinese Children Research says:
• 68% children who play soccer want to try rugby
• 83% of children have school friends who play rugby
The Home for the Trial

- Progressive Provincial Union
- Open Minded and Affected Club
- Supportive RST
Population Projections

Kaipatiki Local Board Population Projections
Age Groups

2013 2018 2023 2028 2033 2038

0-14 years: 18,100 19,600 21,800 23,700 23,700 18,400
15-39 years: 37,700 38,700 39,700 40,700 40,700 37,100
40-64 years: 27,700 30,600 33,300 35,500 35,500 35,300
65 years and over: 11,400 14,900 18,100 18,100 18,100 18,100

NO MORE KIDS
Ethnicity Shifts?

Glenfield RU&SC - Ethnicity Trends

- NZ European
- Maori
- Pacific Islander
- Asian
- Other
- Misc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2038</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2038</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment B Item 8.1
Programme Design - 2018

- Appointment of Welcoming Officer
- North Shore Community Group Presentation
- Have a Go Day – 13 May 18
- Holiday Programme – Sep 18
- Programme Evaluation for 2019
Attachment A

Item 8.2

6mm Polycarbonate panels (2.4m wide) incorporated in 2.0m high Timber Fence (palings both sides) along boundaries (perimeter of playground)
Item 8.2

Attachment A

FENCE AND RETAINING WALL DESIGN PERSPECTIVE
Key concerns/points re: Proposal for ECEC, 33 Salisbury Road: Community Forum 23/5/18 6.30pm

As neighbours, we have come together to discuss, and our concerns regarding the proposal we would like to raise to the Board as talking points are:

- Number of children 114 and staff 17 FTE. These numbers seem much higher than other established residential zoned child care centres. This has resulted in flow on effects resulting in the size and scale of proposed building, imposition of a massive volume of earthworks, traffic and parking, boundary fence height and noise pollution from the sheer volume of children. What seems a fair suggestion for number of children?

- Parking: 22 on site parks proposed, with five designated as staff parks and two as disabled. Consent plan suggests that at peak times the maximum number of cars parked on road would be 12; simple maths tells us that this would be the number of staff parked on the road before you even consider the overflow of parking for parents dropping off kids.

- Traffic: The plan suggests that daily traffic flow will rise by 10% based on current assessment. Has there been an assessment based on the impact at peak times? This has been completed independent of the consent now being granted for 48 Salisbury Rd, should this be re-assessed based on the combined impact?

- Impervious Area: This is in excess of the permissible 60%, as per plans at 63%, should we maintain our stance that this is against the current council limits and shouldn’t be allowed?

- Boundary Fence height: At 3.4m, this exceeds the allowable 2m by 1.4m. This will have extremely detrimental effects on both of the neighbouring driveways and in particular on the property at the Eastern border. Negative effects include shadowing, diminished property resale value and the general unsightly look of a fence of those proportions. Should we request a study of shadowing effect based on their proposed boundary height? Should we propose alternative building options that reduce the need for boundary heights of this size?

- Storm water provisions appear to be at the minimum end of the scale, based on the initial council feedback that they didn’t meet required standards. Can we request these be raised to a superior level? Both driveways on Northern and Southern boundaries currently experience major water run-off from the section during any heavy rain fall that has caused significant damage to date.

- Note proposed Entrance/Exit conflicting information on Plan vs Written in proposal; also hours of operation are 7am to 6.30pm on Notice of Application, but 7am to 8pm written in proposal.

- Is Kaipatiki Local Board able to support us by also serving a formal submission to Auckland Council and Applicant?