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Local Board Meeting – Tuesday June 19th

Item 12 – Future Use Assessment – 3 Victoria Rd and 2 the Strand

I would like to comment on the reports tabled in regard to 3 Victoria Rd in particular, and basically endorse the consultant recommendation that the property be retained in Council/community ownership and it not be sold, with further investigation into forming a partnership to bring the building up to the appropriate seismic standard and carry out the building restoration.

The report also puts forward the option of a community trust as the partner, and my recommendation is that the further analysis called for by Tattico includes studying this option as a strong alternative preference as well.

Key points to add to the report are.

1. The reports set out well the heritage values and Council responsibilities of the Category A heritage listing, and the building’s strong connection with the Devonport community, and its siting in the heritage streetscape of the village.

2. However it has an over stress on the commercial economic return/financial sustainability of the building use, and an associated negative aspect on the cost and value of the heritage restoration. It does not adequately acknowledge the primary responsibility under The Auckland Plan to value and protect the heritage of the city as an integral part of the Council core policy.

3. It mentions the development value of the rear vacant area of the building site to provide a potential offset to complement the heritage values.

   It does not recognise the broader development option of including the Council leased Devonport Senior Citizens Harmony Hall property adjoin the rear of the building and running through to Wynyard St. which in itself has no built heritage value as such.

4. The report comments that there are no identifiable budgets in the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 for the seismic upgrade or heritage restoration of Victoria Rd. The word “identifiable” is the key as there are a lot of unidentified budget issues in the LTP, but the comment is basically incorrect as the Council has a primary obligation to maintain its heritage buildings in good order in the normal course of the building maintenance programme, and heritage responsibilities.

   Specifically the Budget includes the Built Heritage Acquisition Fund under the aegis of the Heritage Department which has several millions of funding to finance such
heritage building restoration and preservation projects, all of which to date have been in the CBD.

The 3 Victoria Rd restoration is exactly what the BHA Fund was established for, and a very sound case could be made for funding from this source. The primary seismic upgrading cost in particular of $5-606,000 is a relatively minor amount in the context of Council expenditure and should not be regarded as a significant hurdle.

I would also point out that there is a legacy amount of $3 million from North Shore City Council that was held over from the Yachting NZ Takapuna Camping Ground project dispute which Grey Power was instrumental in saving to be used on a North Shore community project. It would be prudent to ask the whereabouts in the Council finances that amount is sitting as it is a potential funding source for Victoria Rd restoration.

5. There is the consultant’s comment that Victoria Rd was significantly under utilised – we are all very aware at the Papuki lack of effective management of the usage of the building over the past six years with the saga of the i-Site highlighting this, together with the Local Board rep perched in a corner of the Library with no facilities or signage to advise she is there having been moved out of Victoria Rd, some community groups effectively squating upstairs, and Devonport Heritage and Grey Power both requesting temporary office space repeatedly over five years with no success.

The report puts forward the concept of a partnership/community trust as options, with the Council retaining the ownership of the building which is the correct basic approach.

This concept of a partnership/community trust should be further fully explored as recommended noting the additional factors that:

1. there are funding options within the Council Budget framework.

2. The inclusion of the Devonport Senior Citizens Association and their adjacent Harmony Hall site provides significant and convenient development options, with the proviso that the development would include a modern upgraded Seniors Centre which in itself is a critical need and would give rise to additional funding options. Support for senior community facilities is also a key Council policy.

3. There are currently serious Council stresses related to the disposal of Council community assets which should be fully recognised, and a cautionary conservative approach should be taken to any direct or indirect disposal of Council/community properties in the current climate.

4. In this context there are further steps to be taken to ensure an optimum outcome for this critical and sensitive Devonport heritage property, particularly a close look at the community trust option.

The report does recommend that further analysis take place with a view to developing a partnership approach, and I would recommend, and ask you to expand this recommendation to specifically include a close look at a community trust option, including involvement of the Devonport Senior Citizens Association with their Harmony Hall property as a key party.

As a point of interest I was a trustee of the Lopdell House Gallery for several years and was very closely involved with the planning of the con-current heritage restoration of Lopdell House and development of the new gallery extension mentioned by the consultant. As noted they did have the advantage of significant funding from the local licensing trusts and a very supportive Council.
I would appreciate personally being included in the ongoing discussion of the development/restoration planning of Victoria Rd. as I am also on the executive of the Devonport Senior Citizens Association, as well as being a member of the Auckland Council Heritage Advisory Panel.

Bill Rayner
President
Grey Power North Shore
From: Norma Bott <botthouse@outlook.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, 18 June 2018 7:29 PM
To: George Wood (Devonport - Takapuna Local Board)
<George.Wood@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Cc: Debbie Dunsford <debbie@cslnz.co.nz>; Tristan Coulson
<Tristan.Coulson@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>; Mike Cohen (Devonport - Takapuna Local Board) <Mike.Cohen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: Local Board Agenda 19th June 2018 - Inga Road Bus Stop

Hello George

My apologies, I have just sent this email off to Tristan and Miko, but I sent it off before adding your name to the recipients.

I think it is all self explanatory, but I am happy to discuss the issue with you, the Local Board or AT at any time.

Regards
Norma Bott.
Milford Residents Assoc.

From: Norma Bott
Sent: Monday, 18 June 2018 7:27 p.m.
To: Mike.cohen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz <Mike.cohen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>; Tristan Coulson <Tristan.Coulson@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Cc: Debbie Dunsford <debbie@cslnz.co.nz>
Subject: Local Board Agenda 19th June 2018 - Inga Road Bus Stop

Hello

It has been brought to our attention that Auckland Transport are considering shifting a bus stop from Omana Road to Inga Road.

This idea was raised a couple of years ago, and we made comments to AT at that time.

Could you please raise the following points at the Local Board meeting when this topic is discussed.

1. The anticipated removal of the bus stop from Omana Road to Inga Road would cause great safety issues. The proposed bus stop would be in the vicinity of a very busy roundabout, where vehicles have been known to spin out. One such event happened in the last two months.

2. If passengers were to get off in Inga Road at the proposed point, and had to cross the road, to get to Craig Road, Omana Road, Milford Road, they would be crossing a very busy road, with a "Blind Corner". This is a very dangerous point in the road to cross. Night time crossing / heavy rain etc., would put bus passengers in jeopardy.
There is no crossing or place given for pedestrians to cross safely.

3. Any buses stopped at this point in Inga Road, would also cause a traffic nuisance to cars coming down Omana Road from the Milford Shops and around the "Roundabout" into Inga Road. Cars do not travel at a safe speed at all times around this corner. (it maybe prudent to have some traffic incident reports sourced as there have been numerous incidents on or in the vicinity of this roundabout)

4. The bus stop would be safer and of better use to passengers if it was to be retained in Omana Road, and maybe the one already in Inga Road, shifted to Omana Road.

5. It was also brought up in past discussions that buses would pass down Omana Road from Milford Road, Ilumata Road and then travel up Beach Road. We previously pointed out that Omana Road is a narrow street at the shopping centre end. It’s narrowness already hinders the flow of traffic if cars are parked on the side of the road.

6. Our other concern is the design of the Milford/Wairau Boardwalk. Our initial plans are for the boardwalk to commence/end on Inga Road by the inga Road Bridge. Until we have the plans finalised the exit/entrance is a grey area. One of these points is where the bus stop would be situated. It would not be a good design idea to have a bus shelter in this position.

We do not intend to come to the meeting tomorrow night, but we hope our views and ideas can be introduced and voiced to Auckland Transport. We are happy to discuss our concerns at any time.

Regards
Norma Bott
Co Chair
Milford Residents Assoc. Inc.
### Attachment A

#### Item 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>The ReserveFLI</th>
<th>Any other part of the Reserve not protected in accordance with the Reserve Management Plan and Reserve Zoning</th>
<th>Firefighting hydrants and fire hydrants</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Required parking area</th>
<th>heavenly parking area</th>
<th>fenced parking area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ReserveFLI</td>
<td>any other part of the Reserve not protected in accordance with the Reserve Management Plan and Reserve Zoning</td>
<td>Firefighting hydrants and fire hydrants</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Required parking area</td>
<td>heavenly parking area</td>
<td>fenced parking area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>The ReserveFLI</td>
<td>any other part of the Reserve not protected in accordance with the Reserve Management Plan and Reserve Zoning</td>
<td>Firefighting hydrants and fire hydrants</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Required parking area</td>
<td>heavenly parking area</td>
<td>fenced parking area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Specific Restrictions to Limit Number and Location:**

- The Special Reserve Committee 3 restrictions are limited to the Reserve.

**Evidence base for Preliminary Development:**

- The evidence base for preliminary development includes:
  - Site plan
  - Zoning area
  - Environmental impact assessment

**Address:**

- The address is recommended to the Regulatory Committee 3 restrictions (certified self-contained only).
The specific restrictions to be recommended to the Regulatory Committee are restricted (contacted self-contained only).

Waitemata Esury Reserve
Report Name: Board Chairman George Wood

Report Period: From 16/May/2018 – To 19/June/2018

1. Milford Coastal Walkway: Section from Oceanview Rd to Black Rock in need of repairs. See photographs showing how the reinforcing steel has been exposed by the constant battering from the sea. This walkway is a popular place for people walking the beach. The damage to the concrete was mentioned at the recent Milford Residents annual general meeting. Watercare says this isn’t their responsibility as they are only worried about the pipe beneath the walkway. See copy of the Watercare reply. Watercare say to take the issue up with Community Facilities. Matter referred to CF and reply awaited as to how this will be actioned.

Figure 1 Hole in the concrete. Concrete has collapsed slightly at this point and needs replaced.

Figure 2 Exposed reinforcing and eroded concrete along the seawall cap
Figure 3: Stairs at the bottom of Muritai Rd giving access to the beach. Concrete has eroded and reinforcing steel now exposed and rusting.

Watercare email reply:

From: Evans (Brent) <Brent.Evans@water.co.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 22 May 2018 9:40 AM
To: George Wood (Devonport - Takapuna Local Board) <George.Wood@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Cc: Tristan Coulson <Tristan.Coulson@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: Watercare wastewater pipeline Oceanview Rd to Blackrock, Milford

Dear George,

Following my last email I note that you had also contacted our faults team on this matter with some associated pictures.

We note that the promenade and the steps are public amenities that have been subject to degradation over long periods of time through many storms. These are more cosmetic factors related to the amenity of the walkway rather than being related to the integrity of our infrastructure and as such we do not believe they fall within our operational remit. The wastewater pipeline in many cases runs back from the seawall as evidenced by the manholes along the route. We will undertake repairs where the integrity of the pipeline is at risk but do not believe this to be the case with the current structure. These matters related to the operation and maintenance of the promenade should probably be discussed with community facilities.

Kind regards

Brent Evans | Manager Local Board and Stakeholder Liaison

2. Introduction to the new Ventia general manager: Grant Muir, the TaH1 area manager for Ventia brought Matt Cotterall, the new NZ manager for Ventia, to meet with me. Matt was formerly the GM of the Auckland Council owned City Park. I mentioned that the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board has not been happy with the earlier performance of Ventia but things are now improving. We want to work to see continual improvement.
3. **Takapuna Metro Centre – car parks:** I have raised questions in relation to the need to rationalise the management of the car parks in Takapuna. One meeting held with the various departments of Auckland Council.

Meetings attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>Meeting with Inspector Sunny Pariel, North Shore Police area commander, at North Shore Policing Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>Presented the D-T LB QLI to the Finance &amp; Planning committee with other members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 May</td>
<td>Attended meeting with Takapuna Beach Business Association joint meeting with D-T LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 May</td>
<td>Public meeting with the Maunga Authority at Devonport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>AGM Sunnynook Resident's Association AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 June</td>
<td>Local Board chairs meeting held at Auckland Town Hall – agenda herewith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June</td>
<td>AGM Sunnynook Community Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatories

| Author | George Wood – Chairman, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board |
Memo

To: Local Board Chairs Forum
From: Josie McKay, Quality Advice Senior Advisor

Subject: Quality Advice decision-makers survey (2018)

Purpose

1. To brief local board chairs on the results of a recent decision-maker survey on the quality of advice from Council employees and Auckland Transport.

2. To seek your further views on identified quality issues.

Context

Quality Advice Programme

3. The quality advice programme aims to lift the quality of advice provided to decision makers, both elected and appointed. It is a critical component of Council’s organisational strategy and performance plan (2017-2019).

4. The programme is anchored by a set of quality advice standards and includes a range of activities to set and communicate expectations; train and support staff to meet the standards; provide staff with tools and guidance to meet the standards; and to measure progress.

5. Overarching drivers and performance measures for the programme are set by:

   - the elected member survey – the quality of advice is a key driver of elected members’ overall satisfaction with the support they receive. Overall satisfaction in the last survey (2017) was 53%.

   - assessment of reports by New Zealand Institute of Economic Research (NZIER) against the quality advice standards. Council’s performance plan (2017-2019) has a target for NZIER assessments of ‘good or better’ (8 out of 10) by 2019. We are currently assessed as ‘adequate’ (7.11 out of 10).

6. With input from the Political Advisory Group, the programme last year developed a set of secondary measures to give us a more nuanced picture of quality advice performance as the programme continues. This included interim surveying of elected and appointed decision-makers, between elected member surveys, which occur every 18 months.

Decision-makers survey

7. During May, you were asked to complete the first interim survey about the quality of advice you receive from council employees and Auckland Transport. The survey was sent to all members of local boards, Governing Body and the Independent Māori Statutory Board.

8. The main purposes of the survey were to:
• ensure the programme's ongoing quality improvement priorities are appropriate and responsive to current issues

• measure the effectiveness of Council's quality interventions, on an interim basis, between the elected member surveys

• gauge whether the introduction of the new political report template, and its supporting guidance, has had any effect on the quality of reports in the eyes of decision-makers.

9. The survey asked decision-makers for any general comments on the quality of advice, and to rate (on a scale) their:

• knowledge of council's quality advice standards
• overall satisfaction with the quality of agenda reports, advice at formal meetings, advice for workshops and with the timeliness of advice
• satisfaction with specific areas of reports, for example, with consideration of options, risks, financial implications (etc), based on their most recent set of reports
• perception of improvement (or not) since the new political report template
• satisfaction with aspects of advice and reporting by Auckland Transport (local board members only)
• satisfaction with advice to particular committees (governing body members only)
• satisfaction with verbal advice at workshops or formal meetings, based on their most recent interactions.

Discussion

Response rate and reliability

10. Thirty-four decision-makers responded to the survey – six members of Governing Body (29% response rate) and 28 local board members (19% response rate). No IMSB members responded.

11. The survey's low response means we must treat any findings with caution. The findings cannot be considered representative of decision-makers in general. This includes that we are unable to compare results reliably to the elected member survey, in order to draw conclusions about any trends in satisfaction.

12. However, we can regard the survey as providing useful feedback from those members who were able to respond. It has indicated some areas of concern which we will test further with decision-makers including local board chairs at the forum.

Survey feedback and themes

13. Judith Webster, Quality Advice Programme Lead will give a short presentation on some key issues emerging from the results.

14. The following key themes are apparent in the survey results:

• Many didn't know content of the quality advice standards in any detail

More than 40% of local board members who responded said they did not know the quality advice standards at all, or in any detail. This is significant as most of Council's quality improvement efforts are aimed at improving our performance against the standards.
Most were satisfied with the overall quality of advice, but not its timeliness

The majority of local board member respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of agenda reports (56% satisfied or very satisfied), verbal advice to formal meetings (80%) and advice to or for workshops (57%).

This trend was more pronounced in the combined results as local board members were more likely to be neutral or dissatisfied than governing body respondents.

Timeliness of advice remains a key concern, with only 36% of local board members (and 47% of all respondents) satisfied, and 25% dissatisfied.

There was agreement on the most important parts of reports, and in the strongest areas of reports.

Over half of local board member (and combined) respondents indicated financial implications and consideration of options were in their ‘top 3’ most important areas. Local board member respondents then chose local board views (43% selected in their ‘top 3’), clear recommendations (36%) and use of evidence (32%).

The areas of reports all respondents (and local board members alone) were most satisfied with were clear recommendations and financial implications. For local board member respondents, 56% and 54% were satisfied or very satisfied with these areas. However, these were generally the only areas of reports that the majority of respondents were satisfied with – for most areas of reports, only between 30 and 50% of respondents were satisfied.

The areas of reports local board respondents were most dissatisfied with were local board views (32% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), definition of problem/opportunity (25%), use of evidence (29%) and consideration of options (22%).

However, there was also considerable variability in board members’ experiences across the areas, with most areas exhibiting a larger spread/distribution of answers than was the case with the governing body responses.

Local board member respondents observed a good deal of inconsistency

A continuing theme in the feedback/comments that is also reflected in the data from the survey is the high variation in quality that local board members (in particular) observe in the advice they receive. One comment representing this was:

“Some departments are doing very very well, but others are poor and that makes it difficult to answer. [D]In balance I have indicated [I am] satisfied but there are outliers where I am very satisfied or dissatisfied”.

The report template has had some encouraging initial effects

The survey data has shown some encouraging signs of improvement in key areas since the new political report template was introduced. Many respondents felt the template has improved or very much improved the overall quality of reports (44% of all respondents and 36% of local board member respondents).

Most of the areas of reports signalled with a new heading (which have new supporting guidance for staff) were felt to have improved by 33-38% of respondents (21-29% of local board members), with most others neutral.
• **Satisfaction with verbal advice was reasonably high**

A strong majority of survey respondents were satisfied with the verbal advice they received (based on their most recent interactions), with 68% of local board respondents (and 73% of all respondents) satisfied or very satisfied at both workshops and formal meetings.

This is in contrast with previous feedback, in which elected members have sometimes raised concerns about advice that is more like advocacy.

• **There was dissatisfaction with Auckland Transport’s engagement**

Local board members who responded to the survey were generally dissatisfied with Auckland Transport (AT) engagement with their board (43% net dissatisfied vs 39% satisfied). Members were more satisfied with AT’s reporting (64% satisfied), advice to support Transport Capital Fund (TCF) decisions (50% satisfied) and quality of verbal advice at meetings and workshops (57%). However, each of these areas had a strong ‘tail’ of dissatisfaction (25-29%).

These results will be shared with AT. The programme is currently working with AT to improve the quality of their reporting to local boards, both on monthly updates and TCF.

Further feedback

15. Following the presentation, we are seeking comments from chairs on any current quality issues. We are generally interested in whether the themes identified above are common across other local board members and/or whether there are any that may not be representative.

16. We would also like to explore some specific results that need further clarification for us to understand more fully. Specific issues we will invite feedback on will include:

- timeliness – whether the issue is deadlines not being met (if so, which) or where the main issues occur
- variation in quality of report areas – for us to better understand the ‘tail’ of poor advice so we can target our initiatives
- workshops – any issues with advice (written or verbal)
- the political report template – to support our review of the template.

17. Given the low response rate to the survey, we are also interested in any views about how we might better seek your feedback or evaluation of the quality of advice you receive.

Next steps

18. We will record your feedback today to supplement the high level results in the survey. Later this month, we will hold a parallel discussion session with the mayor and deputy-mayor and chairs and deputies of committees of the whole.

19. A final report on the survey, incorporating the feedback from the discussion sessions, will be provided to decision-makers in July. The programme will review programme and organisational priority improvement areas in the course of finalising the survey report.

20. Specific feedback in the survey relevant to particular departments or committees will also be communicated to relevant staff.
Agenda

What: Local Board Chairs Forum
Where: Reception Lounge, Town Hall
When: 11 June 2018, 12:00 – 2:05 pm
Who: All local board chairs (or their delegates)
Meeting chair: George Wood, Chair Devonport-Takapuna Local Board
Apologies: Pippa Coom (Shaie Chambers attending), Lotu Full, Lydia Sosene (Walter Togiamua attending)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome from the chair and previous action points</td>
<td>George Wood, Chair Devonport-Takapuna Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Auckland Transport update with Shane Ellison, Chief Executive AT</td>
<td>Shane Ellison, Chief Executive AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Decision-makers quality advice survey</td>
<td>Judith Webster, Quality Advice Programme manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Community Facilities update</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan, General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent changes of chairs

Some local boards rotate the role of chair around local board members over the course of the term.

The Upper Harbour Local Board Chair swapped from Lisa Whyte to Margaret Miles on 1 June.
Memo

7 June 2017

To: Local Board Chairs
From: Louise Mason, General Manager, Local Board Services

Subject: Action Points from Local Board Chairs Forum on 10 July 2017

Item 1: Welcome from the Chair
Pippa Coom, Chair Waiatemata Local Board, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Pippa welcomed the three chairs who had recently taken on the role of chair for their boards - George Wood, Chair Devonport-Takapuna Local Board, Chris Makore, Chair Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, Cath Handley, Chair Waheke Local Board.

Report on action points from previous meeting
Louise Mason, General Manager, Local Board Services, gave a status update on the action points from the 9 April 2018 Chairs' Forum.

- Panuku will be attending the next Chairs' Forum meeting to discuss the topic of service/non-service assets.
- Lisa Tocker, Head of Service Strategy and Integration is preparing a memo for local boards on the timeframe for the work being undertaken to determine existing levels of service.
- Individual local board workshops are being set up to discuss the changes to the mobile library service.

Item 2: Local board feedback on the 10-year budget
Adam Milina, Policy and Planning Manager discussed with the chairs the themes identified in the feedback received from the local board on 10-year budget. Also, the process for local board advocacy discussions with the governing body.

Key themes identified in the feedback received from the local board on 10-year budget:
- transport – general support for introducing the regional fuel tax
- general support for introducing a water quality targeted rate
- general support for option B (the higher of the two options) of the natural environment targeted rates
- Council-controlled Organisations' Accountability Policy – 11 local boards seeking genuine engagement with CCOs and CCOs being cognisant of local board plans.

The following points were raised in discussion

- Did any local board provide feedback that they would like a higher targeted rate for the natural environment than the options provided? No.
- A detailed report of local board feedback is being prepared for the governing body to consider at its 31 May meeting. In addition, the governing body will receive an analysis of themes plus all local board resolutions tomorrow. If there are any key points a local board wants to stress with the governing body they should do so at their advocacy discussion with the governing body.

Page 2
Beth Houlbrooke, Peter Haynes and Angela Fulljames were nominated to speak at the governing body/local board advocacy discussions. This is to present key themes from local board feedback on behalf of all local boards. Staff will provide detailed analysis to those to support them in this role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Points</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff to provide Beth Houlbrooke, Peter Haynes and Angela Fulljames</td>
<td>LBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the analysis of local board feedback on the 10-year budget prior to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the governing body/local board advocacy discussions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 3: Lessons learnt on the 10-year budget consultation process

Warren Marshall, Auckland Insights Manager, Dean McIntosh, Senior Consultation Specialist and Angeline Barlow, Citizen Engagement and Insights Manager gave the chairs high-level statistics on participation by the public in the 10-year budget consultation process. They also sought the chairs feedback on the process.

High-level statistics on participation by the public in the 10-year budget consultation process
- 26,656 written submissions
- 5,374 participants across 100 events provided verbal feedback
- 114 comments received on social media
- Maori and Asian nearly tripled on their number of submissions, still need to improve on Pasifika and youth.

The following points were raised in discussion
- Concern was raised on the number of social media comments. This was felt to be very low. Lots of community groups used the hashtag, some local boards developed videos that had wide-spread workings on social media. Social media comments probably represented Pasifika and youth participants. Social media comments were only counted if they were made on the Auckland Council website, not on the local board page or elsewhere. Not capturing this feedback is a real gap of knowledge for local boards.
- The chairs provided the following key points as their feedback on the 10-year budget consultation process.
  o Respondents were required to know their local board area in order for their submission to be reported to the local board, not all respondents know this information.
  o Local boards didn’t get analysis of submissions from respondents in their area with regards to regional priorities.
  o Local board members were under huge time pressures to receive submissions, digest them and discuss them. This is an important job and more time was needed for it.
  o There were too many topics packed into the consultation process.
  o The community was already feeling over-consulted having only just been through the local board plan consultation process.
  o Engagement events worked best if they were organised with the community, not the generic Have-your-say events.
  o Need to up our game on engaging with those who do not speak English.
Concern that the questions that were asked didn’t touch on all necessary topics of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Points</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local board members to be advised on how their feedback on the 10-year budget consultation process will be considered</td>
<td>LBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 4: Local Government New Zealand update

Pippa Coom, Chair Waitakere Local Board provided an update on LGNZ in the context of her role as an ex-officio member on the National Council.

The local government/central government forum was held recently. This is an annual event and this year was the first time there was local board representation at it. The key themes for discussion were: climate change, water, regional development and housing.

The meeting was positive with enthusiasm for greater working together of central and local government. The Local Government Minister offered to meet with local boards. Pippa will share a summary of the discussion at the forum around the local board chairs.

An issue has been identified that LGNZ is primarily communicating with the mayor’s office and information does not get cascaded to local boards. For example, the process for getting remits on the LGNZ annual general meeting conference and the LGNZ excellence awards.

Pippa will circulate the AGM remits among all chairs so they are aware of them and can provide any comments to her on them prior to the conference.

The following points were raised in discussion.

- Pippa was asked to keep the chairs abreast of any discussions held about freedom camping.
- There was a sense that Auckland is missing out on some sources of information from LGNZ, for example a recent symposium in Nelson on freedom camping.
- LGNZ invites should be going to the mayor and all local board chairs.
- If timing permits the chairs will catch-up to discuss the remits prior to the conference.

Item 5: Update on our response to the Local Government Commission report ‘Enhancing local government for Auckland’

Linda Taylor, Programme Manager Governance Framework Review spoke to the chairs about the work being undertaken by the council to respond to the Local Government Commission’s (LGC) report ‘Enhancing local government for Auckland’.

The report follows the LGC’s determination regarding the reorganisation proposals in relation to North Rodney and Waitakere. The report included non-binding recommendations for the council to consider which we are required to report back on to the LGC.

The recommendations are consistent with the outcome of the Governance Framework Review and encourage further work in some areas. There were some recommendations specific to Rodney and Waitakere. We have generally accepted the recommendations.
1. The council’s response will be factual e.g. what we are doing to address the recommendations. The draft response will be considered by the Joint Governance Political Working Party on 20 June 2018. Workshops will be held with Rodney and Waiheke Local Boards and relationship managers will facilitate discussions with other local boards.

Item 6: Community Facilities update

Rod Sheridan, General Manager Community Facilities provided an update to the chairs on the following topics:

- project streetscapes
- asset risk assessment programme
- capital delivery – local driven initiatives (LDI)
- community-led and LDI project time charging
- project 17 maintenance contracts.

Project Streetscapes

This is a continuation of consolidating the delivery of services across the council family and standardising outcomes. As a result the following services have been bundled under the umbrella of Project Streetscapes and will be bound under the management of each of the Project 17 contracts:

- C8D, city and town centre cleaning
- Berm mowing and vegetation management
- Loose litter collection, bins and bin maintenance
- Holiday places (loose litter, bins and bin maintenance)

There has been some delay in implementing this. New go-live dates are:

- 1 April 2019 – bern mowing and vegetation
- 1 July 2019 – town centre cleaning and loose litter collection

Two considerations of the project are looking at standardising services for bern mowing and vegetation management and service levels for town centre cleaning, in particular around the city centre.

Costs from the contractors have initially come in higher than anticipated. This means Community Facilities will need to delay their workshops with local boards. The workshops will take place when Community Facilities has more detail to discuss.

The following points were raised in discussion.

- The intent of Project Streetscapes, to have one contractor provide services to all aspects of a town centre is great.
- It would be helpful for elected members if communication material is prepared for the community on the changes that will happen as a result of Project Streetscapes. For example, who is responsible for what, what levels of service are to be expected and who to contact on matters relating to this service delivery.
- There is often an inadequate level of service in response to autumn leaf fall. This service will be the responsibility of Community Facilities from April 2019.
- Clarity was sought on who is responsible for swales on rural roads. This needs to be clear for Project Streetscapes.
- Disappointed with the level of street sweeping AT currently undertakes in some areas.
- Street trees are the council's responsibility. Important to ensure trees are not interfering with street light (safety).
- Community Facilities are investigating how weed management is managed through these contracts.
- The suggestion was made to do a rolling implementation of the changes to these contracts in order to avoid any issues and take on board lessons learnt.
- Keen to progress the berm planting policy, would like to see a community-led approach taken to this.
- What is the audit process for these contracts? There are staff specific to local areas to undertake audits. These staff will speak to the board once a month to report back on their audits and may work from local board offices some days.
- Holiday places refers to baches and holiday parks.
- Keen to have an understanding on the standards being proposed for Project Streetscapes and how different town centres are categorized.

Asset risk assessment programme

Ben Meadows, Programme Manager-Asset Risk Assessment briefed the chairs on the asset risk assessment programme. The programme was set up in 2017 for a two year period to take a comprehensive approach to managing the council's assets with regards to asbestos, seismic and compliance requirements. The programme is undertaking surveys and management plans for the council's building portfolio with regards to asbestos, seismic and compliance requirements. There is a range of related legislation that this programme is responding to.

The council's building portfolio which this programme relates to includes 5000+ buildings of varying sizes and construction types, the average building age is 31 years and 50 per cent of the buildings were constructed pre-1976. Pre-1973 there was lot of asbestos material used in construction.

It was noted that tenants of council buildings were being kept informed of any issues relating to asbestos in the buildings they occupy.

Capital delivery – Locally Driven Initiative (LDI)

Rod Sheridan noted that with regards to capital delivery of LDI projects there are focus on:

- Delivery, including prioritizing projects to ensure delivery at the earliest possible opportunity
- Resourcing, acknowledge that resourcing of LDI has been a challenge, continue to refine how resources are provided appropriately.
- Programme development, looking for comprehensive LDI programmes from all local boards and acknowledge that this hasn't been adequately resourced to-date.

It was noted that this message has been heard for some time and a timeframe for ensuring delivery of projects was sought.

Community led and LDI project time changing

Rod Sheridan noted that all capital projects in the organisation have staff time put against them, this is standard accounting process, no different for LDI. Staff costs can be capitalised against the delivery of assets.
The following points were raised in discussion.

- Is this the best process? How do we communicate this to community groups? We don’t want to have community groups funded by the council to deliver a project who are then charged for council staff time to do so.
- Is staff time on consultation and engagement capitalised as well? Yes through design, going to tender and delivery, need to clarify with regards to engagement.
- There is an issue around transparency of costs.

Project 17 maintenance contracts

Rod Sheridan provided an update on the Project 17 maintenance contracts.

- There is still some tidying up happening following the storms in April. The storms created $2-3 million dollars of damage.
- Focusing now on urgent issue of leaf fall in parks.
- Continuing weekly local report for audits.
- There are still some contract performance issues. Will continue the high-level of auditing until the expected service levels are achieved.
- There has been a decline in requests for service this month.

It was noted that health and safety issues are the priority in responding to storm damage.

**Item 7: Auckland Council submission on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill**

Bonnie-May Shantz, Principal Strategic Advisor Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research briefed the chairs on the council’s submission on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill.

The Bill seeks to:

- promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities
- restore territorial authorities power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed as a consequence of development.

Submissions close on 25 May 2018. Local boards have until 15 May to provide their submissions for consideration in the council’s submission and 21 May to be attached to the final council submission. A political working party has been set up to work with staff to approve the final submission.

Two local board representatives for the political working party were sought. Lisa Whyte, Chair Upper Harbour Local Board and Lydia Soane, Chair Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board were confirmed as the two local board representatives. Staff will provide these representatives with a summary of the local board views on the Bill.

The following points were raised in discussion.

- It is not appropriate to confine local board representatives to chairs, it should be any appropriate local board member.
- It was felt that the ratio of governing body and local board members on the political working party should be closer to equal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Points</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff to provide the local board representatives on the political working party with a summary of the local board views on the Bill.</td>
<td>LBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

11 June 2018

To: Local Board Chairs Forum
From: Josie McKay, Quality Advice Senior Advisor

Subject: Quality Advice decision-makers survey (2018)

Purpose

1. To brief local board chairs on the results of a recent decision-maker survey on the quality of advice from Council employees and Auckland Transport.

2. To seek your further views on identified quality issues.

Context

Quality Advice Programme

3. The quality advice programme aims to lift the quality of advice provided to decision makers, both elected and appointed. It is a critical component of Council’s organisational strategy and performance plan (2017-2019).

4. The programme is anchored by a set of quality advice standards and includes a range of activities to set and communicate expectations; train and support staff to meet the standards; provide staff with tools and guidance to meet the standards; and to measure progress.

5. Overarching drivers and performance measures for the programme are set by:
   - the elected member survey – the quality of advice is a key driver of elected members’ overall satisfaction with the support they receive. Overall satisfaction in the last survey (2017) was 53%.
   - assessment of reports by New Zealand Institute of Economic Research (NZIER) against the quality advice standards. Council’s performance plan (2017-2019) has a target for NZIER assessments of ‘good or better’ (8 out of 10) by 2019. We are currently assessed as ‘adequate’ (7.11 out of 10).

6. With input from the Political Advisory Group, the programme last year developed a set of secondary measures to give us a more nuanced picture of quality advice performance as the programme continues. This included interim surveying of elected and appointed decision-makers, between elected member surveys, which occur every 18 months.

Decision-makers survey

7. During May, you were asked to complete the first interim survey about the quality of advice you receive from council employees and Auckland Transport. The survey was sent to all members of local boards, Governing Body and the Independent Māori Statutory Board.

8. The main purposes of the survey were to:
• ensure the programme’s ongoing quality improvement priorities are appropriate and responsive to current issues
• measure the effectiveness of Council’s quality interventions, on an interim basis, between the elected member surveys
• gauge whether the introduction of the new political report template, and its supporting guidance, has had any effect on the quality of reports in the eyes of decision-makers.

9. The survey asked decision-makers for any general comments on the quality of advice, and to rate (on a scale) their:
• knowledge of council’s quality advice standards
• overall satisfaction with the quality of agenda reports, advice at formal meetings, advice for workshops and with the timeliness of advice
• satisfaction with specific areas of reports, for example, with consideration of options, risks, financial implications (etc), based on their most recent set of reports
• perception of improvement (or not) since the new political report template
• satisfaction with aspects of advice and reporting by Auckland Transport (local board members only)
• satisfaction with advice to particular committees (governing body members only)
• satisfaction with verbal advice at workshops or formal meetings, based on their most recent interactions.

Discussion

Response rate and reliability

10. Thirty-four decision-makers responded to the survey – six members of Governing Body (29% response rate) and 28 local board members (19% response rate). No IMSB members responded.

11. The survey’s low response means we must treat any findings with caution. The findings cannot be considered representative of decision-makers in general. This includes that we are unable to compare results reliably to the elected member survey, in order to draw conclusions about any trends in satisfaction.

12. However, we can regard the survey as providing useful feedback from those members who were able to respond. It has indicated some areas of concern which we will test further with decision-makers including local board chairs at the forum.

Survey feedback and themes

13. Judith Webster, Quality Advice Programme Lead will give a short presentation on some key issues emerging from the results.

14. The following key themes are apparent in the survey results:

    • Many didn’t know content of the quality advice standards in any detail

More than 40% of local board members who responded said they did not know the quality advice standards at all, or in any detail. This is significant as most of Council’s quality improvement efforts are aimed at improving our performance against the standards.
Most were satisfied with the overall quality of advice, but not its timeliness

The majority of local board member respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of agenda reports (50% satisfied or very satisfied), verbal advice to formal meetings (60%) and advice to or for workshops (57%).

This trend was more pronounced in the combined results as local board members were more likely to be neutral or dissatisfied than governing body respondents.

Timeliness of advice remains a key concern, with only 36% of local board members (and 47% of all respondents) satisfied, and 25% dissatisfied.

There was agreement on the most important parts of reports, and in the strongest areas of reports.

Over half of local board member (and combined) respondents indicated financial implications and consideration of options were in their 'top 3' most important areas. Local board member respondents then chose local board views (43% selected in their top 3), clear recommendations (30%) and use of evidence (32%).

The areas of reports all respondents (and local board members alone) were most satisfied with were clear recommendations and financial implications. For local board member respondents, 58% and 54% were satisfied or very satisfied with these areas. However, these were generally the only areas of reports that the majority of respondents were satisfied with – for most areas of reports, only between 30 and 50% of respondents were satisfied.

The areas of reports local board respondents were most dissatisfied with were local board views (32% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), definition of problem/opportunity (25%), use of evidence (29%) and consideration of options (22%).

However, there was also considerable variability in board members’ experiences across the areas, with most areas exhibiting a larger spread/distribution of answers than was the case with the governing body responses.

Local board member respondents observed a good deal of inconsistency

A continuing theme in the feedback/comments that is also reflected in the data from the survey is the high variation in quality that local board members (in particular) observe in the advice they receive. One comment representing this was:

'Some departments are doing very very well, but others are poor and that makes it difficult to answer. [O]n balance I have indicated [I am] satisfied but there are outliers where I am very satisfied or dissatisfied'.

The report template has had some encouraging initial effects

The survey data has shown some encouraging signs of improvement in key areas since the new political report template was introduced. Many respondents felt the template has improved or very much improved the overall quality of reports (44% of all respondents and 30% of local board member respondents).

Most of the areas of reports signaled with a new heading (which have new supporting guidance for staff) were felt to have improved by 33-38% of respondents (21-29% of local board members), with most others neutral.
Satisfaction with verbal advice was reasonably high

A strong majority of survey respondents were satisfied with the verbal advice they received (based on their most recent interactions), with 68% of local board respondents (and 73% of all respondents) satisfied or very satisfied at both workshops and formal meetings.

This is in contrast with previous feedback, in which elected members have sometimes raised concerns about advice that is more like advocacy.

There was dissatisfaction with Auckland Transport's engagement

Local board members who responded to the survey were generally dissatisfied with Auckland Transport (AT) engagement with their board (43% net dissatisfied vs 39% satisfied). Members were more satisfied with AT’s reporting (54% satisfied), advice to support Transport Capital Fund (TCF) decisions (50% satisfied) and quality of verbal advice at meetings and workshops (57%). However, each of these areas had a strong 'tail' of dissatisfaction (25-29%).

These results will be shared with AT. The programme is currently working with AT to improve the quality of their reporting to local boards, both on monthly updates and TCF.

Further feedback

15. Following the presentation, we are seeking comments from chairs on any current quality issues. We are generally interested in whether the themes identified above are common across other local board members and whether there are any that may not be representative.

16. We would also like to explore some specific results that need further clarification for us to understand more fully. Specific issues we will invite feedback on will include:

- timeliness – whether the issue is deadlines not being met (if so, which) or where the main issues occur
- variation in quality of report areas – for us to better understand the 'tail' of poor advice so we can target our initiatives
- workshops – any issues with advice (written or verbal)
- political report template – to support our review of the template.

17. Given the low response rate to the survey, we are also interested in any views about how we might better seek your feedback or evaluation of the quality of advice you receive.

Next steps

18. We will record your feedback today to supplement the high level results in the survey. Later this month, we will hold a parallel discussion session with the mayor and deputy-mayor and chairs and deputies of committees of the whole.

19. A final report on the survey, incorporating the feedback from the discussion sessions, will be provided to decision-makers in July. The programme will review programme and organisational priority improvement areas in the course of finalising the survey report.

20. Specific feedback in the survey relevant to particular departments or committees will also be communicated to relevant staff.
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board update
Councillors Chris Darby and Richard Hills
19 June 2018

RLTP CONFIRMED TODAY

As we mentioned last month, the draft RLTP secures a number of critical projects for North Shore ward, delivering key infrastructure that we have been advocating for. Today, the RLTP was confirmed, providing timeframes for the key projects.

The Lake Road Improvements project is currently scheduled for 2020/2021. SeaPath will commence in this financial year, followed by SkyPath, which ramps up in 2020/2021. Northern Corridor Improvements (NCI), which include the extension of the existing Northern Busway, will start within this financial year. This will have significant impacts for the people of North Shore ward, given the decrease it will create in the number of road users from the North.

$17 million is planned for downtown ferry development, commencing 2018/2019. This will ease congestion that North Shore ferry commuters face daily.

Route protection and future proofing activities for a new integrated transport system crossing of the Waitemata will start in 2019/2020. The investment into safety will start immediately, and will pick up pace in the 2019/2020 year. The programme is likely to include expansion of red light/speed combined cameras at $9.5 million, which is around six new cameras.

The full funded capital programme is available on Auckland Transport’s website:

INVESTIGATING QUALITY OF WATER AT TAKAPUNA BEACH

Councillor Hills recently met with Healthy Waters to discuss water quality in Takapuna. There is no raw sewage in the outfalls. However, the quality is not satisfactory and is causing equal concern to ourselves and the board.

Healthy Waters staff are working through a complex environment to diagnose the issue. This involves investigating the entire stormwater network to ascertain where the problem is being caused. A mix of CCTV cameras, smoke and/or dye testing is being employed to identify the source of contamination.

We will receive regular updates on this work and will ensure that the board is kept up to date.
TRANSFER OF MANAGEMENT FOR MAUNGAIKA / NORTH HEAD

This month's Governing Body meeting (27 June) will consider a report outlining a transfer of management responsibility of Maungauika/North Head from the Department of Conservation to the Tūpuna Maunga Authority (TMA).

The report follows my correspondence with Minister Eugenie Sage last year, requesting reinvigoration of this conversation after a year or more of impasse on agreeing maintenance arrears.

Maungauika/North Head was transferred to mana whenua following a Treaty of Waitangi settlement with Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau in 2012. Under the settlement legislation, the Department of Conservation (DoC) remained the administering body of Maungauika/North Head until Auckland Council and the Crown agreed to the costs of routine maintenance.

While officials of the Crown and Council have now agreed in principal, no outcome has yet been agreed by the Governing Body. Council officials have approached TMA, seeking their views on a proposal put by officials. The forthcoming report will outline the joint officials recommendations and the feedback received from TMA.

As I previously conveyed to this board when I was a TMA member, I encourage you to be proactive in providing feedback to me or Cllr Hills, directly to the mayor and TMA council members.

- Chris Darby

REGIONAL FUNDING FOR NORTH SHORE NETBALLERS

Last week's Environment and Community Committee meeting discussed the allocation of the community access scheme.

Noticing that the $28,000 underspend resulted from a change in circumstances of another North Shore recipient, Cr Hills led an amendment to allocate this funding to North Harbour Netball for two years – bringing an increase of $56,000 to the facility.

Netball North Harbour have confirmed that this funding will enable the facility to continue providing 24 hour community access to high quality facilities.

- Richard Hills

THE NORTH SHORE BUS NETWORK

In the past three years, capacity over the three major North Shore routes (Takapuna to city, Onewa Road and Northwren Busway) of the Northern bus network has increased by 460,000 seats per month. This included 32 additional double deckers.

The new bus network will increase our service capacity again, by a huge 40% across the North Shore. We're continuing to advocate for higher frequency and the introduction of more double deckers.

This week's Active Modes research update confirms that 38 per cent of Aucklanders now ride bikes, with 52,000 starting in the past year (up from 46,000 last year). This research also shows that most people that take public transport will walk up to 20 minutes to get to a bus, train or ferry. With 63 per cent of these trips taking less than 15 minutes.
OUT AND ABOUT

Over the past few weeks we've caught up with the Waitemata Police leaders and the Sunnynook Community Centre. We sadly farewelled our colleague, Councillor Dick Quax, and thank you for your support during this time.

COMING UP

On Monday night we attended the local citizenship ceremony, welcoming all of our newest, fully-fledged community members. This was a moving and celebratory event, and we strongly encourage you to join us in future.

Chris Darby
Auckland Councillor
North Shore ward

Richard Hills
Auckland Councillor
North Shore ward