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Agenda

What: Local Board Chairs Forum
Where: Reception Lounge, Town Hall
When: 9 July 2018, 12:00 – 2:20 pm
Who: All local board chairs (or their delegates)
Meeting chair: Angela Fulljames, Chair Franklin Local Board
Apologies: Kit Parkinson (Carmel Claridge attending), Pippa Cooms (Richard Northley 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>Angela Fulljames, Chair Franklin Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Panuku's processes and definitions for service and non-service assets</td>
<td>David Rankin, Chief Operating Officer Marian Webb, Manager Portfolio Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Update on myrtle rust</td>
<td>Phil Brown, Biosecurity Manager Sarah Gibbs, Biosecurity Advisor Maunga Simon Randall, Delivery Business Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alcohol control bylaw review</td>
<td>Bonnie Apps, Policy Analyst Paul Wilson, Team Leader Policies &amp; Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marina Assets – Strategic Approach</td>
<td>John Carter, Senior Project Planning Leader Marian Webb, Manager Portfolio Strategy Carlos Rahman, Senior Engagement Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

3 July 2017

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

Subject: Action Points from Local Board Chairs Forum on 11 June 2018

Item 1: Welcome from the Chair
George Wood, Chair Devonport-Takapuna Local Board welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that it was Margaret Miles, Chair Upper Harbour first meeting of the Chairs’ Forum.

Report on action points from previous meeting
Louise Mason, General Manager, Local Board Services, gave a status update on the action points from the 14 May 2018 Chairs’ Forum. In particular it was noted that Panuku will be attending the July Chairs’ Forum meeting to discuss the topic of service/non-service assets.

Item 2: Auckland Transport update with Shane Ellison, Chief Executive Auckland Transport

Shane Ellison, Chief Executive, Auckland Transport (AT) and Wally Thomas, Chief Stakeholder Relationships Officer gave the chairs a general update on AT work. Shane noted that it’s an exciting time for Auckland Transport as central and local government are aligned, which provides for great opportunity.

Shane’s brief to deliver is in the context of:
- Auckland having refreshed its strategy in the context of rapid change and population growth
- people and business want faster, easier, more personalised transport services
- transforming AT – culture, values, partnerships.

Shane also discussed with the chairs:
- the direction of the government’s transport policy statement (connected, safe, accessible and sustainable)
- the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP)
- the recent report on road safety in Auckland and a work programme of safety initiatives which AT will be engaging with the boards on in July
- making improvements to how customer services information is reported to local boards.

The following points were raised in discussion:
- AT will be bringing to local boards a proposed programme for safety initiatives and seeking local board input on this. There is $700 million in ATAP over ten years for safety and the goal is for a 60% reduction in deaths and serious injury.
- What is AT doing to gear up to deliver the ambitious transport capital programme? The capital programme ramps up over time, it does not all need implementation at once. AT will start liaising with industry over the next few months, they will need some certainty as to what is coming down the pipeline. AT is also planning to bundle up projects into programmes to reduce the number of individual projects.
- Pleased to see the proposed improvements to reporting on customer service information.
- It was noted that it is currently difficult to track an issue once it has been logged with customer services.
• AT will be able to report back to the chairs in the new year with regards to progress on transforming AT's culture. This process will be run with input from AT staff only.
• It was noted that part of culture change is recognising good behaviour. The chairs were encouraged to let AT management know when they saw behaviour that should be recognised.
• AT was encouraged to work early on and constructively with local boards to help bring the community along in the delivery of projects.
• AT is doing a piece of work on how it works with elected members, in recognition that things do not always work well in this space. Input will be sought from local board chairs for this.
• Local boards would like to see better quality advice in the reports they receive from AT.
• Local boards are having to track the progress of the issues they raise with their AT relationship managers. To save local board members doing this an issues register to record issues raised by local boards was sought.
• AT would like to identify local board transport capital projects within the first three months of the financial year. Fewer and larger projects were sought.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Points</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wally Thomas to return to Chairs’ Forum in three months to provide an update on improving reporting to local boards and AT’s work on improving how it works with elected members.</td>
<td>AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Ellison to return to Chairs’ Forum in six months to provide an update on progress with transforming AT’s culture and progress on delivering the capital programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 3: Decision makers quality advice survey

Judith Webster, Quality Advice Programme Manager briefed the chairs about the findings of the recent quality advice decision makers survey and facilitated a discussion to explore the results. Tracy Mulholland, Chair Whau Local Board and member of the Quality Advice Political Advisory Group spoke about the importance of the quality advice programme.

The quality advice decision makers survey was undertaken in May, six Governing Body and 28 local board members responded.

Key themes of the survey findings

• Knowledge of quality standards not widespread
• Majority satisfied with advice, but not its timeliness
• ‘Top 3’ parts of reports for most: options, financial implications and local board views
• Quality inconsistent across most areas
• High satisfaction with recent verbal advice

Next steps for this work are to have a discussion with chairs and deputy chairs of Governing Body committees and IMSB members. The quality advice programme will be assessed in-light of this feedback to consider how it can address the issues raised.

The following points were raised in discussion.
- Favour quicker and easier ways to provide feedback on individual reports, generally high-level reporting back loses some of the impact.
- Staff advice has a tendency to be subjective and lacking evidence.
- Local board views are still often not sought or considered on important regional issues.
- There is a lag in local boards raising an issue and having it reported to the board.
  - Delays can be caused by the fact that the staff presenting to local boards do not have the answers to their questions so have to come back to them later.
  - Sometimes a report on the agenda is out of the blue which means the local board has not had a chance to consider the recommendation.

Item 4: Community Facilities update

Rod Sheridan, General Manager Community Facilities provided the chairs with an update on the work of his department.

Project Streetscapes
- Currently reviewing the pricing from the full facilities suppliers, it is considerably higher than was anticipated.
- Working with AT defining assets and service specifications.
- Will come back to local boards prior to going to Governing Body in mid-August.
- The project is still on track for contractors to have enough time to mobilise before taking on the contract amendments in April and July 2019.

Capital delivery
- It was noted that the council is not receiving many applications to our tenders at the moment.

Charging staff time on LDI projects
- Community Facilities is discussing this with Finance. While this is standard practice and unlikely to change with regards to LDI projects, staff are working through options for how this could not be charged to community-led projects.

Update on full-facilities contracts (project 17)
- Audit results over the last couple of months have shown steadily increasing improvement in contractor performance.
- Community Facilities is working with customer services and digital transformation to improve the customer experience when requesting services and logging issues. An app is being investigated for customers to log issues. The challenge is working through how issues logged this way can be managed at the back-end through to resolution.

The following points were raised in discussion.
- There is mixed messaging about where the council is at with regards to dealing with the storm damage from April, in particular fallen trees. A lack of assurance that the council is on top of this was expressed. It was noted that the council is back down to normal arboriculture crew levels, we no longer have crews from outside of Auckland working on storm damage.
• Concern was expressed that there is insufficient budget for storm damage. Reassurance was given that there is a reasonable amount of budget allocated for this in the 10-year budget.

• Pleased to hear there is more thinking going into not charging for staff time on community-led projects.

• When will local boards see a clear programme of the next three years of capital delivery? Community Facilities will report to local boards in July/August on this, once the final 10-year budgets have been approved.

• Recent press interest has raised the issue of inequity in access to playgrounds. Staff are investigating this issue.
  o It was noted that there have been misleading messages from the council on this topic. There has been discussion of a regional budget but what it is intended to be used for is not clear. Playgrounds are the responsibility of local boards.
  o Concern was expressed that playgrounds outside of south Auckland might get sweated for a number of years while the playgrounds in south Auckland are brought up to the same standard as the rest of Auckland.

• It was noted that the design and consenting step of capital projects takes a lot of time and that there is only a small team delivering in this space. Community Facilities is having active conversations around how they can do this better.

• The work of the Community Facilities team was recognised and the chairs’ gratitude was passed on to the team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Points</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rod Sheridan to attend the July Chairs’ Forum to provide an update on progress investigating options for not charging staff time to community-led projects, free clean up from storm damage and an update on project streetscapes.</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

SUBJECT The transfer of assets within the Council Group

DATE 27 June 2018

TO The Local Board Chairs forum

FROM David Rankin, Chief Operating Officer

1. The purpose of this memo is to inform Local Board chairs about the Council’s internal transfer process with respect to service and non-service properties.

Key Points:

2. Auckland Council acquires properties for its current or future infrastructure and service requirements. Service property is defined in the Local Government (Tamaki Makaurau Reorganisation) Council-controlled Organisation Vesting Order 2010 (The Vesting Order). These include Council’s offices, parks, libraries, community centres and property required for transport purposes.

3. The Vesting Order provides Panuku with the right to manage and control existing Council non-service property.

4. All properties are held at Net Book Value (NBV) on the Auckland Council fixed asset register. While Panuku manages the property, the title of the property remains in AC’s name and ownership for tax purposes. The properties are not transferred to Panuku’s fixed asset register.

5. When a property is no longer required for a current or future Council’s service purposes, it is reviewed to ascertain if it is required for an alternative Council service use or if it is potentially surplus to Council’s infrastructure and service requirements. This process is undertaken by Panuku with approvals obtained by the governing body.

6. The internal transfer process from service to non-service has been agreed between the Councils Community Facilities department and Panuku under the guidance of the Councils Finance department.

Service to non-service:

7. Properties become non-service when a council department or a CCO reviews its operational fixed asset registers and identifies a property that it no longer requires, or when the property ceases to be required for the infrastructure service purpose for which it was held. For example, if a new library is built in a community, the old library building (and the land on which it is built) becomes non-service when the service use and associated budget transfers to the new library facility. Another example, a property may have been acquired to construct a road. On completion of the project any land not used for the construction of the road becomes non-service, as it is no longer required by Council for that public work.

8. It has been agreed that the General Manager Community Facilities approves the transfer of a property from the Councils portfolio to the Panuku managed portfolio and vice versa.
9. On receipt of these properties, Panuku undertakes due diligence to determine if these properties are required for an alternative council service or if there were any outstanding legal impediments preventing them from being progressed through the standard rationalisation process.

10. Internal consultation undertaken with council and CCOs seeking expressions of interest for alternative service uses.

11. All council departments and CCOs are consulted to establish whether a property is required for a current service, or a future funded project, or whether it must be retained for a clear strategic purpose as per the Long Term Plan (LTP). Expressions of Interest (EOI) are sought if a council department or CCO considers that part or all of property should be retained for a planned and funded service use.

12. EOI are considered by a cross-council steering group comprised of senior managers. This provides an opportunity for properties to be considered in a cohesive, integrated and ‘whole of council’ approach to be taken to the property portfolio. If an EOI sets out a robust financial analysis and evidence based rationale to retain property, then the EOI is endorsed and the property is transferred to the new asset holder. If however the reasoning for retention is more subjective, a thorough business case which provides a detailed analysis of the reason for retaining the property, and a budget for the OPEX and CAPEX costs associated with the retention of the property is required.

The role of Local boards:

13. Local Board does not have any decision making delegation with respect to the internal transfer of council’s assets.

14. Local boards are informed at the commencement of the rationalisation process for specific properties. Following the close of the EOI period, the relevant Local Board is engaged with. If a Local Board expresses an interest in a site being retained, it must provide an evidence based service need and rationale for the retention. A business case must be prepared in order to support the request. This will be submitted to Financial Strategy & Planning as part of the review and authorisation process, to ensure that no asset is transferred where there no is funding available to support it.

15. Upon approval and/or transfer of the asset please advise the Legal and Risk team so the insurance details can be updated.

16. If a planned and funded service use is identified for a property that is being rationalised, it is transferred out of the Panuku managed portfolio to the operational fixed asset register of the department or CCO that requested that the property be retained, and that department or CCO becomes responsible for the ongoing costs associated with that property. If a service use, future-funded project or strategic purpose is not identified for a property, it is considered for disposal.
Memo

To: Local Board Chairs' Forum
From: Debbie Edwards, Senior Policy Manager, Community and Social Policy

Subject: Review of Alcohol Control Bylaw 2014

Purpose
1. To inform how local board views will be sought on the review of the Alcohol Control Bylaw.

Background
2. This review is of particular importance to local boards because the Bylaw enables them to make alcohol bans by resolution in their local board areas. This excludes regional parks, Auckland Domain and Tūpuna Maunga.
3. Alcohol bans aim to address high levels of alcohol-related crime or disorder caused or made worse by drinking in particular public places.
4. Social Policy and Bylaws staff process alcohol ban requests. Local boards decide when to make an alcohol ban and allocate funding for signage. Community Facilities staff install signage and New Zealand Police enforce alcohol bans.

Focus of the review
5. The Bylaw provides a decision-making framework that enables alcohol bans to be adopted by resolution. The focus of the review is on the decision-making process. The review of new or existing permanent alcohol bans is not included.
6. More information about the review is attached.

Local board input
7. Staff will attend the Local Board Chairs' Forum on 9 July 2018 to further inform the chairs about the Bylaw and review process, and to provide an opportunity for discussion.
8. Staff will then attend Local Board Cluster workshops on 16 and 23 July 2018 to discuss the Bylaw and obtain members' informal views.
9. Formal Local Board views will be sought at local board meetings in August 2018. A report at the meeting will provide information and prompt responses to key questions, including:
   • do local boards wish to retain delegated authority to adopt alcohol bans?
   • are the decision-making criteria in the Bylaw effective and efficient?
10. Local board views will be presented to the Regulatory Committee in late 2018. We will inform local boards of the outcome of the review and next steps.

End
Alcohol Control Bylaw Review Information

Alcohol Control Bylaw 2014
Auckland Council is reviewing its Alcohol Control Bylaw 2014. This bylaw enables Council to ban alcohol on particular public places if there is enough evidence crime or disorder is caused or made worse by drinking there.

This could include parks, beaches, town centres, streets and carparks.

Focus of the review
The review is about how council makes alcohol bans.

Existing or new alcohol ban locations are not part of the review. These were reviewed in 2015, and new alcohol bans are considered on request.

Currently Local Boards hold the authority to make alcohol bans in their areas while the Regulatory Committee are authorised for Tūpuna Maunga, areas of regional significance and the Auckland Domain.

Decisions are made based on Local Government Act 2002 and bylaw criteria.

Local Government Act 2002 criteria
To make alcohol bans councils must comply with criteria under section 1478 of the Local Government Act 2002 including being satisfied:

(a) there is documented evidence of a high level of crime or disorder that can be shown to have been caused or made worse by alcohol consumption in that area

(b) the alcohol ban is appropriate and proportionate to the evidence and can be justified as a reasonable limitation on people’s rights and freedoms.

Auckland Council cannot change these criteria.

Bylaw criteria
Under the current bylaw Auckland Council must also consider:

- implementing community-focused solutions as an alternative to or to complement an alcohol ban
- the views of the New Zealand Police, Māori; and the views of owners, occupiers, or people council believes are representative of the interests of premises within the area
- standardised alcohol ban timeframes, where appropriate and not contrary to the Local Government Act 2002 criteria.

These criteria can be changed.

Bylaw review process
We are currently seeking feedback from key stakeholders about the Bylaw: Questions include:

1. Do problems from drinking in public places still need to be addressed?
2. Are alcohol bans effective?
3. What alternatives could be used?
4. Who should decide when and where alcohol bans are adopted?
5. How should these decisions be made?
6. Should temporary and permanent alcohol bans be treated the same or differently?

Feedback provided by stakeholders will be included in a findings report in late 2018.

Based on these findings, council will determine whether the bylaw should be retained, amended, revoked or replaced.

The reviewed Bylaw will be publicly notified in 2019, so that everyone can have their say before a final decision is made.
Member’s Report
G Gillon July 2018

The Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee received a disturbing report on 7 June 2018, the “Parks and Open Spaces Value for Money (s17A) Review 2018” report. This report recommends assessing Auckland parks and open space for disposal. The committee appeared to support aspects of the report and referred its recommendations to a closed workshop. Apart from regional parks, most parks and open space falls under Local Board jurisdiction and Local Boards have not been consulted on this policy direction.

This week the Herald ran a series of articles and some aspects were disputed or denied by the Mayor. But, the NZ Herald revealed that a second report regarding the potential disposal of parkland currently used as golf courses will also be discussed at a closed workshop. This Board has a strong record or voting to oppose park sales and ensure that all current parks (reserves and non-reserves) are kept in public ownership for community use.

Public land at several marinas is also proposed for sale, as are several holiday parks and public carparks. Again, this Board has worked hard to retain the Takapuna Holiday Park and so should be concerned at this latest direction. We have had a high level of community concern since the ‘sale’ of Bayswater Marina. The Board allocated funding to the local community group in an effort to involve the community in future developments. But this is coastal land and was formerly public land. In addition, many of our residents value the ecological and environmental benefits provided by the large areas of open space provided by golf courses; even if they don’t play golf themselves.

These sales occur because assets can be moved from service to non-service. Staff are apparently delegated to move assets from Service to Non-Service, without recourse to the relevant local board. This maybe a result of local board delegations to staff.

Panuku apparently receive their authority for asset sales from Local Government (Tamaki Makaurau Reorganisation) Council-controlled Organisations Vesting Order 2010. However, non-service property specifically excepts parks and reserves as well as property used as a heritage property or community facility.

1 http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Open/2018/06/APP_20180607__AGN_6953_AT_WEB.htm

2 Auckland Council Property Limited

Right to manage and control existing local authority non-service property

- [1]In this clause,—

  - (a)means a structure, system, or other thing that provides or distributes basic services to the population within its district or region (for example, a structure, system, or other thing that provides or distributes water, sewage disposal, energy, fuel, or communications); and

  - (b)includes the Auckland transport system

non-service property, in relation to an existing local authority, means the property (both real and personal) that, immediately before the close of 31 October 2010, is—

- (a)owned by the local authority; and

- (b)not infrastructure or used to deliver its services (for example, property not used as council offices, a park or reserve, art gallery, library, swimming pool, recreation centre, sporting facility,
This means that Council or Panuku has acted ultra-vires by moving council land which could be used as local parks is being considered for divestment and community houses such as 3 Victoria Rd from service to non-service.

The Governing Body in 2017 approved the Local Boards delegated the final decisions on local asset disposal and reinvestment to local boards.\(^3\) It seems that this policy can be and perhaps has been short-circuited by the movement of service property into the non-service category without recourse to local boards. This process has then allowed Panuku to dispose of the property. An example is 3 Victoria Rd in Devonport and Rosie Bolt Reserve in Kaipatiki.

In addition, section 48k of the Local Government Act 2002 provides for non-regulatory decision-making to be allocated to the local board.\(^4\) I understand that that regarding property disposal, the delegation is guided by the delegation protocols, which says:

> In exercising their delegated authority, officers will refer the following to the Local Board for a decision (within any parameters set by the Local Board or any regional strategy or policy) relating to the disposal of land to the Governing Body.

Although the local boards do not have the ability to purchase or dispose of property, the decision to recommend purchase or disposal, to the Governing Body, should rest with the local board and community; not Panuku.

**Service and Non-Service Developments**

The Governing Body in 2017 also approved the Local Boards delegated the final decisions on local parks being designated a reserve.\(^5\) Many of the neighbourhood parks that have been identified

\[\begin{align*}
\text{community hall, community centre, or other community facility, early childhood centre, public toilet, as housing for elderly persons, as a wharf or boat ramp, or as a heritage property.}
\end{align*}\]

\(^2\)On and from 1 November 2010, the right to manage and control the non-service property of each existing local authority vests in Auckland Council Property Limited. For this purpose, Auckland Council Property Limited also has ownership of the furniture, fittings, equipment, computers, computer software, consumables, materials, and other like property of each existing local authority that is used for the management and control of the authority’s non-service property.


as ‘surplus’ have not been gazette as reserves despite the fact the community treat the spaces as parks. The Board may consider gazetting, or strengthening in some other way, the status of these open space areas so as to better protect them. The Board could join in action with other Boards to reduce costs of declaring spaces a reserve.

Service property optimisation

v) approve the current ‘optimisation of service assets’ policy being strengthened by delegating the final decisions on local asset disposal and reinvestment to local boards, providing all policy criteria have been met.

w) request that appropriate support be provided to local boards to enable them to utilise the policy

3 Victoria Rd, Devonport
Panuku have converted 3 Victoria Rd, Devonport from a service to non-service use. The legislation clearly places “other community facilities” and “heritage property” as not being able to be classified as non-service. Therefore, such a classification is against the Act. 3 Victoria Rd was clearly being used as a community facility, supported by the DT Board, for an ‘i’ site, offices for our community development Trust, our Business Association and the Devonport Museum.

Reserves and Parks
Panuku have also been placing some of our neighbourhood parks under threat of sale. This is clearly a lapse of procedure in this process. Any proposal for disposal must be consulted upon whether the park has been gazetted under the Reserves Act or not. There are clear case law definitions on how consultation must take place. The Office of the Controller and Auditor General states that “The requirement to act fairly is most relevant to consultation, and this requirement is given particular emphasis. Local authorities must follow proper processes to ensure that those individuals or groups

ii) the decision to classify a reserve under section 16(1), which has been delegated by the Minister of Conservation to Auckland Council

iii) the decision to classify a reserve under section 16(2A)

iv) the decision to reclassify a reserve under section 24(1)

v) the decision to propose to the Minister of Conservation that the status of a council-owned reserve should be revoked under section 24(1), but only where the reason for the request to revoke is because the local board wishes to manage the land under the Local Government Act 2002

7 Subpart 3—Restrictions on disposal of parks, reserves, and endowment properties

Parks and reserves

138Restriction on disposal of parks (by sale or otherwise)

(1) A local authority proposing to sell or otherwise dispose of a park or part of a park must consult on the proposal before it sells or disposes of, or agrees to sell or dispose of, the park or part of the park.

(2) In this section,—dispose of, in relation to a park, includes the granting of a lease for more than 6 months that has the effect of excluding or substantially interfering with the public’s access to the park

(a) means land acquired or used principally for community, recreational, environmental, cultural, or spiritual purposes; but

(b) does not include land that is held as a reserve, or part of a reserve, under the reserves Act 1977.
affected by their decisions are given natural justice (or predetermination).” The excerpt from a 1998 OAG publication is still placed as the defining relevant advice document on the OAG website. Interestingly, they also argue that councils should “View public consultation as more than simply notifying the public and receiving written submissions.”

Dispute
I wish to draw the Board’s attention to the resolution passed unanimously at our meeting. The Board raised a dispute with the Governing Body over the non-allocation of decision-making to the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board of the project on 40 Anzac Street, Takapuna. And to consider referring the dispute to the Local Government Commission for a binding determination should the dispute not be resolved with the Governing Body. The Act says there must be “timely resolution of the dispute”. This has not occurred. I am concerned that there have now been a series of actions that could raise a dispute in a similar manner. 3 Victoria Rd is an obvious one, but we need to keep a watching brief on our parks and golf course as well to ensure the policy (particularly in relation to the Board’s role) is adhered to.

Resolution 1
To recommend, to the Governing Body, that delegations that provide Staff the authority to move assets from Service to Non-Service be restored to the relevant local Board with effect as from the 1st January 2017.

Resolution 2
That officers follow-up resolution regarding our June Resolution number DT/2018/84, 3 Victoria Rd with particular emphasis on clarifying i. the status of the budget to undertake earthquake strengthening at 3 Victoria Road, Devonport and ii. clarification on the governance role of local boards during the process to transfer an asset from the service to non-service portfolio.

Resolution 3
The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board signal that the circumstances surrounding the decision-making at 3 Victoria Rd, could warrant initiating a further dispute with the Governing body.

---


Ibid. p.57

16 Chairpersons’ Report A written report from Chairperson Gillon and advice provided by Eric Perry, Relationship Manager, in response to the report, was tabled. A copy of the tabled Chairperson’s report and advice has been attached to the official minutes and can be viewed on the Auckland Council website as a minutes’ attachment. Resolution number DT/2018/51 MOVED by Chairperson G Gillon, seconded by Member J O’Connor: That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna Local Board 17 April 2018 Minutes Page 8 a) receives the Chairperson’s report. b) raises a dispute with the Governing Body over the non-allocation of decision-making to the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board of the project on 40 Anzac Street, Takapuna. c) considers referring the dispute to the Local Government Commission for a binding determination should the dispute not be resolved with the Governing Body. d) requests that local board officers assist with the administration required for resolution number DT/2018/51 b) and c) above. e) receives the advice provided to the board by Eric Perry, Relationship Manager, in response to the Chairperson’s report.

Local Government Act 2002 sec.2. 48R, Disputes about allocation of decision-making responsibilities or proposed bylaw
Resolution 4
That the Devonport/Takapuna Local Board considers any sale/disposal proposal involving reserve, park, open space, service and non-service assets in the local board area, to require a full public consultation process.

Resolution 5
Requests officers advise of the process for declaring a reserve and whether any costs could be mitigated by combining with other local boards in a group action or whether this is better achieved via a strengthened Openspace Management Plan or some other means.