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1 Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed everyone present.

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Franklin Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 26 June 2018, including the confidential section, as true and correct, subject to the following amendment to Item 6.2, Resolution number FR/2018/86:

Acknowledgement – the recent passing of Kathleen Margaret Pollock (Kath).

Clause a) acknowledges the recent passing of Kath Pollock Kathleen Margaret Pollock (Kath) and her contribution to the community, in particular to the Girl Guides, including swimming and line dancing in particular.

5 Leave of Absence

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

6 Acknowledgements

6.1 Acknowledgement: Passing of Jack Laing, Waiuku

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To acknowledge the passing of Jack Laing and notes his contributions to the community through local sports clubs, as a Waiuku Borough Council Councillor, and especially his involvement with Waiuku Rugby Club.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Franklin Local Board:

a) acknowledges the recent passing of Jack Laing, Waiuku, and notes his contributions to the community through local sports clubs; as a Waiuku Borough Council Councillor, and especially his involvement with the Waiuku Rugby Club.

7 Petitions

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

Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Franklin Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

8.1  Deputation - Andrew Sinclair - Cycleways and walkways in Franklin

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Andrew Sinclair wishes to address the board on cycleways and walkways in Franklin.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Andrew Sinclair wishes to discuss making the most of our volcanic summits via cycle and walking.
3. Secondly, how to capitalise on the cycling tourism potential by better connecting Auckland and Pukekohe Railway Station to the Waikato.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:
a) receives the presentation on cycleways and walkways and thanks Andrew Sinclair for his attendance.

8.2  Deputation: David Comery, CEO Vodafone Events Centre and Vector Wero Whitewater Park

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. David Comery, the new CEO of Vodafone Events Centre and Vector Wero Whitewater Park, wishes to introduce himself to the Franklin Local Board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. David Comery wishes to develop a closer working relationship with all boards in the South Auckland area.
3. David has made a deputation to the boards closest to the ‘park’, Manurewa and Otara-Papatoetoe, and would like to make the same deputation to the other southern boards in the coming months.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:
a) receives the presentation and thanks David Comery, of Vodafone Events Centre and Vector Wero Whitewater Park, for his attendance.
A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from members.

9.1 Public Forum - Rebecca and Fred Nolan - Slip Repair, 3 Pohutukawa Road Beachlands

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Rebecca and Fred Nolan will be in attendance to present on slip repair at 3 Pohutukawa Road, Beachlands.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Franklin Local Board:

a) receives the presentation on slip repair at 3 Pohutukawa Road, Beachlands, and thanks Rebecca and Fred Nolan for their attendance.

10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”
Grant of lease to the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated, 107 Monument Road, Clevedon

File No.: CP2018/09534

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To revoke the resolution passed by the Manukau City Council on 14 December 2005 to classify 107 Monument Road as a recreation reserve.
2. To grant a new lease to the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated at 107 Monument Road, Clevedon.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
3. In 1994 Manukau City Council purchased the land at 73R Monument Road Clevedon from the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated.
4. Subsequently council purchased the land at 107 Monument Road for showground purposes and the association relocated to this area. This occurred in 2010 and the association have been without a formal occupation agreement since then.
5. Options for a suitable agreement have been considered to accommodate the range of activities occurring on the site.
6. This report recommends that an earlier resolution of the former Manukau City Council to classify the land as reserve be revoked and a lease be granted to the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated for part of the land at 107 Monument Road Clevedon.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) revokes the resolution passed by the former Manukau City Council Community Development Committee 14 December 2005 to classify 107 Monument Road as a recreation reserve pursuant to the provisions of section 16(2A) of the Reserves Act 1977 (Minute No. CD/DEC/2209/05).

b) approves public notification and iwi consultation on the proposed lease to the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated at 107 Monument Road as is a requirement of the Local Government Act 2002.

c) appoints a hearings panel to hear any submissions if required and make any recommendations to the board for further decisions if required.

d) subject to there being no submissions, grants a community lease to the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 for the area described in Attachment B to this report subject to:

i) term - ten (10) years with one (1) right of renewal of ten (10) years

ii) rent of $1 plus GST per annum

iii) a concurrent licence being provided to allow the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated to have exclusive use of the full site at 107 Monument Road including the other lease areas for 20 days per year as described in the report.

iv) all other terms and conditions in accordance with Auckland Council
Horopaki / Context
7. This report addresses revoking an earlier resolution of the Manukau City Council to classify land at 107 Monument Road as recreation reserve and granting a community lease to the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated for the area they occupy at 107 Monument Road Clevedon.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
8. The Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated was incorporated on 29 May 2017. Prior to this the association was known as the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association under the provisions of the Agricultural and Pastoral Societies Act 1908.
9. The association owned the land at 73R Monument Road and in 1994 the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Empowering Act 1994 was passed that allowed the land to be sold to Manukau City Council to meet the needs of recreation activities with increasing population growth in the area. The land at 107 Monument Road was subsequently purchased and made available to the association for their activities.
10. 107 Monument Road Clevedon is legally described as Lot 1 DP 90733 comprised in certificate of title NA47D/1145 and contains an area of 22.13 hectares more or less.
11. The land is held in fee simple by the Auckland Council under the Local Government Act 2002 and is not subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977. A previous resolution of the Manukau City Council to classify as a reserve has not been carried out as it referred to the incorrect section of the act.
12. Attachment A to this report shows the area and the arrangement of buildings and improvements on the land. Attachment B describes the proposed lease area to the association and maintenance obligations.
13. The site usage provides for a range of activities outside those of the association and include the following;

   **Summer season**
   - Pony club rallies every Saturday from September to May
   - Six pony club events including Ribbon Day, One Day Event, Showjumping, Auckland District One Day team event, Secondary School team event
   - Grounds used for group and individual lessons throughout the week
   - Auckland Manukau Dressage Group monthly local shows and National Show and/or Championship Show from August to May
   - Judges clinics and training days each month
   - The Easter Show equine event held each year over Easter
   - The Horsemastership group weekly clinics
   - The carriage riding group show and training days.

   **Winter season**
   - Dressage group training days from June to August twice a month
   - Members of Dressage Group and Pony Club train on the all-weather arenas
   - Activity Clinics.
14. Alongside these uses by the association and organised groups the community also make use of the grounds for casual recreational activities and for walking, jogging and golf practice.
Current agreements
15. The occupation by the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated has so far been without any formal agreement, although a lease was held for the previous site.

16. There are two other leases on the site, to the Clevedon Pony Club (a branch of the Manukau District Pony Club), and the Auckland Manukau Dressage Group Incorporated.

Proposed lease
17. The proposal for a lease to the Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated is for the area outlined in yellow on Attachment B to be leased to the association. This provides an area sufficient for their core activities and an area for the Clevedon Farmers Market to operate. The farmers market operates from the site under an agreement with the association.

18. The occupation can be authorised with a community lease for a term of 10 years with a right of renewal of 10 years. This term is described in the community occupancy guidelines 2012 for groups owning the buildings and other assets.

19. This proposal was discussed with the association on 1 June and the proposed area reflects their long-term request for a lease.

20. Associated with the lease will be a licence for the association to use the whole area of 107 Monument Rd for 20 days per annum. This is for five days before and five days after the annual show and for another 10 days for shows, exhibitions, competitions, or other related activities. This agreement is also built into the leases for the other occupiers of the site.

21. The land is currently owned by council under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002.

22. Manukau City Council resolved in 2005 to classify the land as recreation reserve but the reference to the authority to do so was incorrect, so the classification has not been done.

23. Other than classifying the land as reserve for consistency of classifications in the area there are no practical advantages to proceeding with this. There are no advantages for use of the land and to retain the Local Government Act designation has some advantages particularly in allowing the Farmers Market to operate.

24. Provided that the board approves the land not being held as a reserve, the earlier 2005 resolution of the Manukau City Council can be rescinded and this report recommends that occurs.

25. Because the lease is longer than six months the Local Government Act requires consultation on the proposal.

The Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Association Incorporated
26. The Clevedon Agricultural and Pastoral Show has as its main annual event the only spring time agricultural show in New Zealand. Since the first show in 1908 the annual show has been held except for a few exceptional events such as war and adverse weather events.

27. The association maintains a strong tradition of rural education and continues to develop and adapt the show’s activities.

28. The financial information provided by the association shows the finances are well managed. There appears to be sufficient reserves for contingencies and the statement of performance indicates income and expenditure are used each year on the core activities of the association.

29. The association derives a significant part of their income from the rental paid by the weekly farmers market and this supports the objectives of the association.
30. This income is for the letting of stall spaces by the market organisers – most of any income from the sale of goods at the market flows to the stallholders rather than to the market organisers or the association.

The Farmers Market
31. The Clevedon Farmer Market was approved by council in 2005 to operate each Sunday at the showgrounds. Originally this was at 73R Monument Road, but the market has transferred along with the association to 107 Monument Road. The market operated by a third party continues to operate based on the agreement reached between the association and the market in 2005.

32. The Clevedon Farmers Market provides an opportunity for artisan food producers to sell to the public at the weekly event. The market has grown in popularity since its inception and is a vibrant activity in the community attracting visitors to the area.

Lease Areas and Maintenance
33. The association owns their buildings on the site and maintains these. Amongst the buildings owned by the association, and within the lease area is a pony club storage room and a public toilet that is owned and maintained by council. These areas are excluded from the associations lease area but access across the area for council and the pony club will be a specific term described in the association lease.

34. To acknowledge the impact of the increased use of the park due to the farmers market activity the association agrees to maintain the entrance driveway at gate six from the entrance to the carpark within the lease area. This is marked in orange on Attachment B. The commitment is to grade and metal this area at least once per annum.

35. To be included in the maintenance is the parking area to the north of the access road marked in blue on Attachment B. The association has agreed to grade the parking area as required and the other elements (kerbs, planting and other infrastructure), to be maintained by council.

36. The association wishes to use local suppliers for materials to undertake the maintenance works to the driveway and parking area. To ensure that works are carried out to a consistent standard across the site this will require the association to obtain landowner approval prior to the works occurring.

37. Parking areas, loading bays, driveways and pathways, within the lease area will be maintained by the association.

38. Grass mowing over the entire site including within the lease area will continue to be undertaken by council contractors, as will the maintenance of all other access ways and parking areas on the site.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
39. The proposed lease was workshopped with the board on 10 April and again on Friday 18 May 2018. The board supported the rescinding of the former Manukau City Council resolution to classify the land as Reserve. The board also supported granting a lease to the association.

40. This proposal was discussed with the association on 1 June 2018.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
41. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader legal obligations to Māori. The Council recognises these responsibilities are distinct from the Crown’s Treaty obligations and fall within a local government Tamaki Makaurau context.
42. These commitments are articulated in the council’s key strategic planning documents the Auckland Plan, the 2015-2025 Long-term Plan, the Unitary Plan and Local Board Plans. The purpose of community leases is to encourage participation and create local benefits for all communities.

43. When consulting on leasing issues by way of public advertising, legal advice on best practice is to also consult with iwi in order to meet the requirements of section 78 of the act. This is by way of a presentation to the Mana Whenua Forum and direct email to iwi with specific interest in the area.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
44. Although there are some minor changes to the current arrangements and responsibilities at the site there will be no significant change to any financial obligations for council.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
45. There is a small risk that the iwi consultation and public notification will generate submissions that may need to be heard. The procedure for this is discussed in the next steps below.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
46. The land is owned by council under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002. Section 138 of the Act requires that before a lease of longer than six months is granted council must consult the community on the proposal. This is undertaken by public advertisement. When consulting on issues, legal advice on best practice is to also consult with iwi in order to meet the requirements of section 78 of the act. This is by way of email to iwi with specific interest in the area and by a presentation to the Mana Whenua Forum. The public notification and iwi consultation processes take six weeks, run concurrently and are undertaken before granting the lease.

47. Staff will undertake the iwi consultation and public notification and, provided there are no objections, draft and issue a deed of lease and licence to the group.

48. If there are any submissions resulting from the consultation and notification process staff will work with the chair of the local board on the process to consider any submissions. If any of the submitters wish to be heard, a hearing panel should be appointed to hear these and make any recommendations to the board for further decisions. The board can either appoint the whole board as the hearings panel or delegate to fewer members to be the panel. This report recommends that a hearing panel be appointed.
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Application for approval under the Reserves Act 1977 and Conservation Act 1987 for a 30 year concession to build a seawall on Sunkist Bay Reserve

File No.: CP2018/13009

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Franklin Local Board for a 30 year concession to build a seawall on Sunkist Bay Reserve.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The applicants, GA King and AL King as Trustees of Silent Lucidity Trust, are seeking a concession (licence) under the Reserves Act 1977 (the Reserves Act) and Conservation Act 1987 (the Conservation Act) to build a rock masonry seawall within Sunkist Bay Reserve to protect the toe of the cliff from erosion. The proposed wall will replace a temporary seawall placed after a slip which occurred in 2017.
3. The applicant has received resource consent for the construction of a 60 metre seawall and reclamation of 65 metres of the coastal marine area for a term of 35 years.
4. Sunkist Bay Reserve is held by the Crown but administered by council under a Reserves Act appointment to control and manage. Any permit, licence, lease or easement granted by council needs to be by a concession under Part 3B of the Conservation Act.
5. As a requirement of the Conservation Act, public notification was undertaken by council. One submission was received, which was in support of the application. The submitter did not wish to be heard.
6. Iwi consultation, as a requirement of the Reserves Act, was undertaken, with one response received.
7. Public access to the section of Sunkist Bay Reserve where the seawall is proposed will not be affected by the addition of the seawall.
8. Council specialists support the application as the applicant will be responsible for ongoing maintenance and repairs to the wall. This will occur via an encumbrance registered on the Certificate of Title of the private property to ensure that future owners are held to ongoing ownership and maintenance requirements in perpetuity.
9. The proposal aligns with the Franklin Local Board Plan outcome 1 “A well-cared for natural environment”.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) approves a 30 year Reserves Act 1977 and Conservation Act 1987 concession for GA King and AL King as Trustees of Silent Lucidity Trust to build a seawall within Sunkist Bay Reserve.
Horopaki / Context

10. The applicants, GA King and AL King as Trustees of Silent Lucidity Trust, are seeking a Reserves Act and Conservation Act concession (licence) to build a rock masonry seawall within Sunkist Bay Reserve to protect the toe of the cliff that their property sits at the top of.

11. A large slip from the applicant’s property at 1 Cherrie Road occurred in 2017 which deposited a significant volume of debris and vegetation onto the foreshore of Sunkist Bay. Following the slip the applicant built a temporary wall around the slip debris. The proposed application will replace this temporary wall with a permanent rock masonry wall (plans and photos of the proposed wall and surrounding environment can be found in Attachment A).

12. The applicant has been granted resource consent to build the 60 metre sea wall and for reclamation of 65 metres of the coastal marine area (a copy of the resource consent is attached as Attachment B).

13. A portion of the proposed seawall sits within Sunkist Bay Reserve which forms part of the Manukau City Domain. The Manukau City Domain comprises nine separately named domains all held by the Crown and all lying within the boundaries of the former Manukau City Council.

14. In 2010 Auckland Council inherited the powers under the Reserves Act to control and manage the Manukau City Domain. Section 59A (1) of the Reserves Act requires any permit, licence, lease or easement proposed to be granted by any council over any Crown owned reserve to be by way of a concession under Part 3B of the Conservation Act.

15. The Minister of Conservation’s (the Minister) power to grant a concession was delegated to council in the 2013 delegations to local authorities amendment. A copy of the delegation to council is attached in Attachment C.

16. Under Section 17Z of the Conservation Act, the maximum term for a concession is 30 years unless special dispensation is given by the Minister for exceptional circumstances. In their deputation to the Franklin Local Board on the 5 June 2018 the applicant’s consultant, Davis Coastal, said that they were supportive of a 30 year term of concession.

17. Under section 17SC (1)(b) of the Conservation Act a licence for a term (including renewals) of more than ten years is required to be publicly notified. A public notice was placed in the Pohutukawa Coast Times on the 15 June 2018 with copies of the notice held in the Beachlands Library and the Franklin Local Board office as well as being placed in the ‘Public Notices’ Section of council’s website. The 30 day submission period finished on 12 July 2018. There was one submission received which was in favour of granting the application.

18. As a requirement of the Reserves Act the council is required to consult with all iwi with an interest in the Franklin Local Board area. The council contacted the relevant iwi and only received one response from Ngāti Te Aha who said that they deferred to Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki. The applicant, as a requirement of the Resource Management Act 1991, had previously consulted with local iwi during the resource consent process. Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki was supportive of the proposal and has provided construction recommendations in a letter report (Attachment D).

19. Sunkist Bay Reserve is an unclassified reserve under the Reserves Act. There is no scope to grant a licence on an unclassified reserve under the Reserves Act but as the concession (licence) will be granted under the Conservation Act, council will be able to grant the concession without going through the classification process.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Public access

20. Public access to Sunkist Reserve is not considered to be greatly affected by the proposal. There will be some reduced access along the foreshore area but as access to the foreshore is only possible at low tide by climbing over a rocky shore platform from Sunkist Bay (and via a walkway from the end of Cherrie Road) or via private access stairs from the subject site or similar access on other nearby sites, the effect is only considered minor. Note also that the applicant has not sought an exclusive interest in the reserve land.

Natural character and amenity

21. The proposed wall will not adversely affect the amenity of the reserve, such as neighbour’s views, or affect the natural character of the coastal environment or the intrinsic values of Sunkist Reserve as the adjoining coastline around the proposed wall is already highly modified with the presence of a number of existing seawalls.

22. The most dominant feature of the western end of Sunkist Bay Reserve is the presence of Pohutukawa trees. It has been identified in the resource consent findings that a mitigating factor for this application is that the proposed seawall will protect fallen Pohutukawa trees.

Public benefit

23. Coastal structures on reserves should show clear public benefits or opportunities to be gained, such as landscape enhancements, improved public access and safety, structures providing additional recreational opportunities or more useable public space.

24. The proposal is predominantly for private benefit as the seawall is planned to slow the rate of cliff regression from the subject site and protect the physical integrity of their property. However there is a health and safety benefit to users of the reserve as the seawall will protect users if another slip occurred.

Effectiveness of seawall

25. The applicant commissioned a geotechnical cliff assessment of the cliff at 1 Cherrie Road (Attachment C). In the report it suggested that shore protection (seawalls) should be considered to reduce long term regression at the toe of the cliff.

26. The report suggested that other geotechnical stabilisation measures such as in-ground palisade walls or a mesh and anchor system should also be considered to protect the cliff from long term regression. At this stage the applicant has not proposed how they plan to halt regression of the central and upper cliff face. These additional cliff stabilisation measures will likely require additional resource and building consents but will not require additional land owner approval as the cliff is located within the applicant’s property boundary.

Specialist advice

27. The proposal has been reviewed by coastal and geotechnical specialists at council who are supportive of the proposed works on the reserve.

28. Council’s parks and places specialist and maintenance delivery co-ordinator have been consulted and have not raised any concerns with the proposal.

Recommendation

29. Staff support the granting of the concession application for the following reasons:
   - the effects on Sunkist Bay Reserve from the construction of the seawall are minor,
   - council staff have not raised any objections
• public notification was undertaken and only received one submission which was in support of the application and did not wish to be heard.
• iwi consultation under the Reserves Act was undertaken by council and one response was received deferring to Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki. Iwi consultation undertaken by the applicant during the resource consent process was positive
• there won’t be any financial implications for council if the application is granted as the applicant will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance and repairing any damage of the seawall.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
30. A workshop was held on 22 May 2018 with the Franklin Local Board to discuss the application and the requirements for public notification. The Franklin Local Board met on 5 June 2018 at a business meeting and it was resolved to publicly notify the concession. The Board also resolved to appoint a hearings panel to discuss any submissions and supported the next phase be expedited with efficiency to avoid stress to the applicant (Franklin Local Board Resolution FR/2018/70).

31. Franklin Local Board plan outcome 1 “A well-cared for natural environment” is met, in part, by providing some protection to a cliff that is subject to erosion.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
32. Section 4 of the Conservation Act 1987 is the driver for iwi consultation and reads; “This Act shall so be interpreted and administered as to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi”. Auckland Council is expected to fulfil the obligations of section 4 on behalf of the Crown as treaty partner when dealing with either council owned or council managed reserves.

33. It is council’s practice to consult with all iwi with an interest in land within a local board area. Council consulted with all iwi with an interest in the Franklin Local Board area and only received one response. Ngati Te Ata said that they deferred to Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki.

34. As part of the resource consent process under the Resource Management Act the applicant’s consultant consulted with Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki who were supportive of the proposal and have provided construction recommendations in a letter. The applicant’s consultant also contacted a number of other iwi before they applied for resource consent.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
35. The applicant will be required to pay an application fee and the costs of the public notification. They will also be required to pay an annual concession fee for ongoing monitoring of the concession.

36. As an encumbrance will be registered on the Certificate of Title there will not be any financial implications to the Council as the applicant will be responsible for all maintenance and repairs.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
37. For this proposal it is important that the structure remains in private ownership and is not vested in public ownership, to avoid any future risk or liability to council.

38. An encumbrance will be registered on the certificate of title of the private property to ensure that future owners are held to these requirements in perpetuity. A notation will also be recorded on councils property file of the applicant and on the property LIM report.

39. It should be noted that if a concession for the seawall at 1 Cherrie Road is granted that it may create a precedent for adjoining coastal properties or similar locations. There are a
number of similar cliffs within the Franklin Local Board area that are subject to similar erosion processes so it is likely that similar applications will be received. However all future applications should be assessed on a case by case basis and in conjunction with regulatory services.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

40. If the application for a concession is approved by the Franklin Local Board, staff will provide the applicant the concession including relevant conditions. All other standard land owner approval conditions (e.g., health and safety plan, reinstatement of site, liability insurance, etc.) will also be included.

41. An encumbrance will be registered against the Certificate of Title and noted on the property LIM report.

42. If the application is declined by the Franklin Local Board, the applicant will be notified accordingly.
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The proposed seawall will be built to a similar construction and amenity to the existing seawall in Sunkist Bay Reserve (pictured above).
Decision on an application for resource consent under the Resource Management Act 1991

Non-complying activity

Application numbers: BUN60318181, LUC60318182, CST60308879
Applicant: Silent Lucidity Trust
Site address: 1 Cherrie Road, Beachlands
Legal description: Lot 23 DP 19523, Lot 24 DP 19523

Proposal:
To construct a permanent rock masonry seawall approximately 60m in length at the base of a cliff following a recent large cliff failure, and for reclamation of approximately 65m² of the coastal marine area. This involves reshaping the existing talus material to create a suitable platform for the wall, 140m³ of cut earthworks to establish a foundation for the seawall, and 100m³ of fill behind the wall to level out the land. The existing 32m rock ‘wall’ which was undertaken as emergency works in August 2017 will be replaced as part of the works.

The resource consents required are:

Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP (OP)):
- Table E11.4.3 (A28)- Restricted discretionary activity for earthworks exceeding 5m² in the Significant Ecological Areas Overlay.
- Table E11.4.3 (A30)- Restricted discretionary activity for earthworks exceeding 5m³ in the Significant Ecological Areas Overlay.
- Table E36.4.1 (A9)- Restricted discretionary activity for all other buildings and structures on land in the coastal storm inundation 1 per cent annual exceedance probability (AEP) area.
- Table E36.4.1 (A22)- Discretionary activity for hard protection structures not otherwise provided for.
- Table F2.19.1 (A1)- Non-complying activity for reclamation or drainage not otherwise provided for.
- Table F2.9.10 (A142)- Discretionary activity for hard protection structures.

Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal (ACRP:C):
- Rule 10.5.9- Discretionary activity for the occupation by any activity specified as a discretionary activity by another rule in the plan.
- Rule 11.5.5- Discretionary activity for any activity which is not a permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity, and is not prohibited.
• Rule 12.5.18- **Discretionary activity** for the erection or placement of any structure, which is not provided for in any other rule contained in chapter 12 and is not located in Coastal Protection Areas 1.

• Rule 13.5.3- **Non-complying activity** for any reclamation or drainage that is not provided for as a restricted discretionary, discretionary or prohibited activity in any other rule contained in chapter 13, which is not otherwise restricted by Rule 13.5.4.

Overall the proposal is deemed to be a non-complying activity.

**Decision**

I have read the application, supporting documents, and the report and recommendations on the application for resource consent. I am satisfied that I have sufficient information to consider the matters required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and make a decision under delegated authority on the application.

Acting under delegated authority, under sections 104, 104B, 104D and Part 2 of the RMA, the application is **GRANTED**.

1. **Reasons**

   The reasons for this decision are:

   1. In accordance with an assessment under s104(1)(a) of the RMA the actual and potential effects from the proposal will be acceptable as:

      o In terms of ecology, the shifted talus material would have displaced or killed invertebrates adapted to the area, and the proposal will retain material which will alter the habitat for invertebrates. Council’s coastal specialist considers it possible that new invertebrates will colonise the area, and given that the affected area is not seen to be of high ecological value, any adverse effects on ecological values will be less than minor.

      o The proposal will partly reduce access along the foreshore area, however the foreshore is only accessible from Sunkist Bay reserve (and via a walkway from the end of Cherrie Road) at low tide which involves climbing over a rocky shore platform, or via the private access from the subject site or similar access on other nearby sites. Given the limited access to the foreshore currently, it is considered that any adverse effects on public access are less than minor.

      o Access to the subject site for construction will be via the foreshore and accessed from Sunkist Bay Reserve and there will likely be short-term adverse effects during the construction period. A condition of consent will require that a Construction Management Plan is provided, which will address, among other things, sediment control, spill procedures and management of public access. It is therefore considered that adverse effects arising during the construction process can be managed and will be no more than minor.

      o The proposal will add built elements to the coastal environment and will have some effects on natural character and amenity. Pohutukawa trees are characteristic of the Beachlands coastline and add to overall amenity values; the proposal will retain and protect the fallen Pohutukawa tree, thereby helping to maintain coastal amenity values. Given the highly modified nature of the adjoining coastline, and the recessive colours of
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the seawall, it is not considered that the proposal will have more than minor adverse effects on amenity values or the natural landscape, when viewed from the sea or the beach. The seawall is oriented towards the sea and is located well away from surrounding dwellings and properties. As such it will not be visually obtrusive to neighbouring properties.

- The Council’s coastal specialist considers that the interaction of coastal processes with the proposed seawall is unlikely to have more than minor adverse effects on coastal landforms.

- Although the applicant has not proposed any particular measures as part of this application to address stability at the top of the cliff, the proposed seawall will help to slow the rate of cliff regression and will provide some protection to the property. Overall, although there are adverse effects associated with the proposal, they are considered to be no more than minor, and the adverse effects of doing nothing are considered to be greater.

- Written approval has been obtained from the owner of the adjoining property, 1 Hawke Crescent, and effects on this party have been disregarded.

- An arborist report was provided with the application and concluded that the tree has retained enough viable root zone area and live canopy to survive in its new location. Council’s Senior Arboriculture and Eco Specialist has reviewed that report and has undertaken a site visit, and confirmed that the proposal to build the masonry wall seaward of the displaced pohutukawa tree will be beneficial, both in the short-term and long-term.

- Conditions of consent can ensure that the proposed works do not adversely affect the health of the Pohutukawa tree.

- Under the RMA, esplanade reserves can be created through reclamations. In this instance, the provision of esplanade reserve is not considered to be of great benefit in providing for public access and recreational use, particularly given the existing limited physical access to the foreshore. It is also relevant to note that the applicant proposes only to build a seawall to protect their property, and that the purpose of the proposal is not to claim ownership of any new land seen to be created by the proposed filling behind the seawall.

- The proposal involves works on Crown land (recreation reserve being Lot 40 Deeds Plan 619), administered by the Department of Conservation (DOC). While an application for a concession under the Reserves Act is currently still being processed, a condition of consent will require that no works can be undertaken on Crown land until a concession under the Conservation Act (approved by way of delegation to Auckland Council) has been granted.

2. In terms of positive effects:

- The seawall will protect the fallen Pohutukawa tree and retain some amenity values, as well as protecting the cliff toe from further erosion and slowing the rate of cliff regression, thereby protecting the physical integrity of the subject site and providing for the wellbeing, health and safety of the applicant. These positive effects are considered to outweigh the potential adverse effects on the environment.
3. In accordance with an assessment under s104(1)(b) of the RMA the proposal is considered to be generally consistent with the objectives and policies of the relevant statutory documents including the NZCPS and the HGMPA. In respect of the NZCPS in particular the proposal is found to be consistent with Objectives 1-6. It is also concluded that the proposal is on balance consistent with the purposes of relevant NZCPS policies including Policy 1, 2, 3, 6 and 10 noting in respect to Policy 10 that while land above MHWS may technically be available for the proposed seawall (as it could potentially be constructed above MHWS) the functional benefits of the seawall are best achieved by locating it as proposed and there are no reasonable alternatives to the proposal (particularly where the retention of the fallen pohutukawa tree is seen as a key outcome). The proposal is however of local, not significant regional or national benefit, thus is not consistent with Policy 10 (1) (d). However, overall and on balance, the proposal is found to be consistent with the key objectives and policies of the relevant statutory documents.

4. The proposal passes the first test under s104D of the RMA for non-complying activities as adverse effects of the proposal are considered to be no more than minor, therefore the application can be considered based on its merits.

5. In accordance with an assessment under s104(1)(c) of the RMA no other matters are considered relevant.

6. This proposal is considered to achieve sustainable management purpose of the RMA under Part 2 as it is protecting both a natural and physical resource (i.e. the cliff and Pohutukawa trees, and the dwelling and occupants therein) from erosion and coastal instability. It will also enable the applicant to provide for their health, safety and wellbeing by protecting the ongoing residential use of the site, without adversely affecting the potential of natural and physical resources to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.

7. Overall, it is considered that the proposal can be appropriately consented.

2. Conditions

Under section 108 of the RMA, these consents are subject to the following conditions:

General conditions

1. The proposed activities shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and all information submitted with the application, detailed below, and all referenced by the council as consent number CST60308879.

- Application Form, and Assessment of Environmental Effects prepared by Davis Coastal Consultants, dated September 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report title and reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Dated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Cliff Assessment; 1 Cherrie Road, Beachlands</td>
<td>Engeo</td>
<td>06/04/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboricultural Report</td>
<td>Tree Management Solutions</td>
<td>07/11/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Plan title and reference | Author | Sheet No. | Dated
--- | --- | --- | ---
Existing Context Plan | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 02 | 20/09/17
Existing Layout Plan (Prior Emergency Works) (Rev A) | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 03 | 15/02/18
Existing Sections (Prior Emergency Works) | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 04 | 20/09/17
Emergency Works Plan | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 05 | 20/09/17
Emergency Works Sections and Detail | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 06 | 20/09/17
Proposed Layout Plan (Rev C) | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 07 | 19/03/18
Proposed Wall Sections 1 of 2 (Rev B) | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 08 | 21/03/18
Proposed Wall Sections 2 of 2 | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 09 | 20/09/17
Typical Seawall Section (Rev A) | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 10 | 21/03/18
Proposed Stormwater and Crevice Details | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 11 | 20/09/17
Proposed Earthworks Plan (Rev A) | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 12 | 19/03/18
Pre-Slip Topographical Survey | Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | SK01 | 22/02/18

Other additional information

Letter headed, “Ref: Site Visit and Assessment Summary: 1 Cherrie Road, Beachlands”
Jonathan Billington of Ngai Tai ki Tamaki Tribal Trust | 30/10/17
Email headed, “RE: CST60308879 s92 1 Cherrie Road Beachlands” addressed to Nick Endecott (Auckland Council) and Craig Davis (consultant)
Sam Scott-Kelly of Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 24/11/17
Letter headed, “Seawall- 1 Cherrie Road, Beachlands CST60308879- Section 92 Response”
Sam Scott-Kelly of Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 08/11/17
Email headed, “RE: BUN60312372 – 1 Hawke Crescent, Beachlands” addressed to Ashishka Sharma (Auckland Council)
Sam Scott-Kelly of Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 23/02/18
Email headed, “RE: 1 Cherrie Road – Updated Earthworks Plan” addressed to Danielle Ter Huurme (Auckland Council)
Sam Scott-Kelly of Davis Coastal Consultants Ltd | 21/03/18

2. The consent holder shall pay the council an initial consent compliance monitoring charge of $960 (inclusive of GST), plus any further monitoring charge or charges to recover the actual and reasonable costs incurred to ensure compliance with the conditions attached to this consent.

Advice note:

The initial monitoring deposit is to cover the cost of inspecting the site, carrying out tests, reviewing conditions, updating files, etc., all being work to ensure compliance with the resource consent. In order to recover actual and reasonable costs, monitoring of conditions, in excess of those covered by the deposit, shall be charged at the relevant hourly rate applicable at the time. The consent holder will be advised of the further monitoring charge. Only after all conditions of the resource consent have been met, will the council issue a letter confirming compliance on request of the consent holder.
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Pre-Development Conditions

3. No works shall be undertaken on Lot 40 Deeds Plan 619 until the consent holder has provided written evidence to the Team Leader Compliance Monitoring South that a concession under Part III B of the Conservation Act 1987 has been granted.

4. Prior to the start of any works within the coastal marine area, a finalised Construction Management Plan (CMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Team Leader Compliance Monitoring South.

The purpose of the CMP is to ensure that all works are undertaken in a manner which avoids, remedies or mitigates potential adverse effects during construction works. The construction management plan shall specify, but not necessarily be limited to, the following matters:

   a) Construction timetable;
   b) Construction methodology, including:
      i. Details of any temporary structures in the coastal marine area (CMA) (e.g. silt fences)
      ii. Methods to remedy any disturbance resulting from works.
   c) Site management, including details of:
      i. Site access, including methods to clearly identify and delineate all entry and exit points to the common marine and coastal area.
      ii. Bunding or containment of fuels and lubricants to prevent the discharge of contaminants;
      iii. Method to manage the effects of vehicle movement within the CMA.
      iv. Maintenance of machinery and plants to minimise the potential for leakage of fuel or lubricants;
      v. A spill contingency plan in the event that there is any discharge of contaminants to the common marine and coastal area;
      vi. Methods to ensure compliance with noise standards, including underwater noise and vibration management;
      vii. Restrictions and methods necessary to maintain public health and safety, including means for restricting and notifying the public of any restrictions on public access to and along the coastal marine area;
      viii. Management of public access to and along the coastal marine area while the activities are being carried out;
      ix. Methods to minimise disturbance of the foreshore and/or seabed, including minimising siltation and discolouration, and avoiding disturbance of the Significant Ecological Area-M2;
      x. Removal of all spoils from the CMA.
   d) Site reinstatement upon completion of activities.

5. The Construction Management Plan (CMP) must be certified by the Team Leader Compliance Monitoring South prior to commencement of works on site. All works shall comply with the approved Construction Management Plan at all times. All personnel working on the site shall be made aware of the requirements contained in the CMP. A copy of the approved CMP shall be held on-site at all times while any activity associated with construction is occurring.
6. In accordance with the Geotech report prepared by ENGEIO Limited dated 6/4/17; the proposed toe wall along with the associated works shall be designed by a chartered professional engineer to ensure the structural strength and integrity of the seawall following a detailed slope stability assessment. A building consent for the seawall shall be obtained prior to construction commencing.

7. Prior to the commencement of works, the Consent Holder shall hold a pre-start meeting that:
   
   - Is located on the subject site;
   - Is scheduled not less than 5 days before the anticipated commencement of earthworks;
   - Includes the consent holder’s arborist;
   - Includes representation from the contractors who will undertake the works.

The following information shall be made available at the pre-start meeting:
   
   - Resource consent conditions;
   - Certified Construction Management Plan;
   - Approved plans for the seawall design (Condition 6).

The conditions of consent will be discussed at this meeting and explained to all contractors, subcontractors and supervisory staff.

Advice Note:

To arrange the meeting, please contact Council’s Southern Monitoring Compliance team (monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz).

8. The Team Leader Compliance Monitoring South shall be notified at least 10 working days prior to any activities commencing on the subject site.

Development in Progress Conditions

9. The construction of the seawall and the placement and compaction of any fill material shall be supervised by a suitably qualified engineering professional.

10. The works shall be managed to ensure that they do not lead to any uncontrolled instability or collapse affecting either the site or adversely affecting any neighbouring properties. In the event that such collapse or instability does occur, it shall immediately be rectified at the consent holder’s expense.

11. If any archaeological or cultural heritage sites are exposed during construction works, the following procedures shall apply:

   - If it becomes apparent that an archaeological or traditional site has been exposed, works shall cease immediately.
   - The site supervisor shall immediately secure the area in a way that ensures that any artefacts or remains are untouched.
   - The site supervisor shall notify tangata whenua, Heritage New Zealand, the Department of Conservation, and Auckland Council, that an archaeological or traditional site has been exposed and so appropriate action can be taken. This includes such persons being given a
reasonable time as determined by the Council to record and recover archaeological features discovered before work may recommence on the site.

Specific conditions - land use consent LUC60318182

12. Works shall be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of the Arboricultural Report prepared by Tree 3- Tree Management Solutions, dated 7th November 2017. A suitably qualified and experienced arborist shall provide adequate supervision of any excavations or other works in the root zone area of any trees to ensure any adverse effects on tree health or stability are avoided.

13. Under section 125 of the RMA, this consent lapses five years after the date it is granted unless:
   a) The consent is given effect to; or
   b) The council extends the period after which the consent lapses.

Specific conditions - coastal permit CST60308879

Post-Development Conditions

14. The right to occupy the common marine and coastal area is not an exclusive right, and the consent holder shall at all times permit all persons to use the authorised structures for the purpose of providing public access to and along the coastal marine area.

15. The seawall structure authorised by this consent shall be maintained in a structurally sound condition for the duration of the consent at the consent holder's expense.

16. The consent holder shall, within one week following the completion of the works, remove all machinery and materials from the Coastal Marine Area, to the satisfaction of the Team Leader Compliance Monitoring South.

17. The Team Leader Compliance Monitoring South shall be notified, in writing, of the expected date of the completion of construction activity, ten working days prior to the expected completion date.

18. Certification from a suitably qualified and experienced engineering professional responsible for supervising the works shall be provided to the Team Leader Southern Monitoring Compliance within ten working days following completion. Written certification shall be in the form of a engineering/geotechnical completion report, or any other form of certification acceptable to the Council.

19. Within twenty working days of the completion of construction activity, the consent holder shall supply the Team Leader Compliance Monitoring South with a complete set of ‘as-built’ plans. The ‘as-built’ plans shall include a location plan, a plan which shows the area of occupation, structure dimensions and levels (top and bottom) of the seawall and a typical cross-section.

20. Within twenty working days of the completion of construction activity, the consent holder shall supply a copy of the ‘as-built’ plans to the New Zealand Hydrographic Authority (Land Information New Zealand, Private Box 5501, Wellington 6011 or customersupport@linz.govt.nz).
21. As soon as reasonably practicable following the completion of the consented works (but within no more than 6 months), the consent holder shall supply an “as-built” plan showing the location and levels (top and bottom) of the seawall in relation to property boundaries to the Team Leader Compliance Monitoring South for the Council’s records.

Duration of consent

22. Coastal permit CST60308879 shall expire on 12th April 2053 (35 years) unless it has lapsed, been surrendered or been cancelled at an earlier date pursuant to the Resource Management Act 1991.

3. Advice notes

1. Any reference to number of days within this decision refers to working days as defined in s2 of the RMA.

2. For the purpose of compliance with the conditions of consent, “the council” refers to the council’s monitoring inspector unless otherwise specified. Please contact monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz to identify your allocated officer.

3. For more information on the resource consent process with Auckland Council see the council’s website www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz. General information on resource consents, including making an application to vary or cancel consent conditions can be found on the Ministry for the Environment’s website: www.mfe.govt.nz.

4. If you disagree with any of the above conditions, or disagree with the additional charges relating to the processing of the application, you have a right of objection pursuant to sections 357A or 357B of the Resource Management Act 1991. Any objection must be made in writing to the council within 15 working days of notification of the decision.

5. The consent holder is responsible for obtaining all other necessary consents, permits, and licences, including those under the Building Act 2004, and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. This consent does not remove the need to comply with all other applicable Acts (including the Property Law Act 2007 and the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015), regulations, relevant Bylaws, and rules of law. This consent does not constitute building consent approval. Please check whether a building consent is required under the Building Act 2004.

The consent holder is advised that the seawall, whilst being able to slow the regression of the cliff by protecting the toe of the cliff, will not remedy instability issues at the top of the cliff. The consent holder is advised to obtain geotechnical advice to address this issue.

Barry Kaye

Duty Commissioner

11 April 2018
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RESERVES ACT 1977

INSTRUMENT OF DELEGATION FOR TERRITORIAL AUTHORITIES

1. PURSUANT to section 10 of the Reserves Act 1977 I, NICK SMITH Minister of Conservation, DELEGATE to all territorial authorities (as defined in this Instrument of Delegation) such of my powers, functions and duties under the Reserves Act 1977 as are set out in the following Schedule subject to the Limitation of Powers in the Schedule and to the conditions in paragraph 2 of this Instrument.

2. The delegations in this Instrument apply only where the territorial authority is the administering body of the relevant reserve (i.e. affected by the decision to be made) by virtue of a vesting or an appointment to control and manage.

3. This Instrument replaces the previous Instrument of Delegation dated 10 March 2004, which is hereby revoked.

Definitions:

“Administering body” – means an administering body under the Reserves Act 1977.

“Territorial authority” – means a local authority and a unitary authority as defined in section 5 Local Government Act 2002.

“Vested reserve” – means a reserve vested in a territorial authority (not in the Crown).

SCHEDULE

SECTION SUMMARY OF POWERS LIMITATION OF POWERS

6(3) Revoke a Gazette notice and issue a fresh notice or amend the original notice Only applies to notices in the Gazette given by the territorial authority

14(4) Gazette resolution to declare vested land to be reserve.

Note: it is, therefore, no longer necessary to consult the Commissioner in terms of sec 14(3) of the Act.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF POWERS</th>
<th>LIMITATION OF POWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15(1)</td>
<td>Authorise or decline to authorise, by Gazette notice, the exchange of land in any reserve or any part(3) of a reserve for any other land to be held for purposes of that reserve.</td>
<td>Only to be exercised where the territorial authority did not derive title from the Crown, or title would be deemed not to be derived from the Crown if the reserve was going through a revocation process (s.25). The territorial authority must consult with the Crown before making a decision under s.15(1) if the land it proposes to grant in exchange was purchased with funds provided either wholly or partly by the Crown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15(3)</td>
<td>To do all things necessary to effect any exchange authorised by the local authority under Section 15(1) of the Act, or by the Crown in the case of vested reserves derived from the Crown, including the payment or receipt of any money by way of equality of exchange in the case of non Crown derived reserves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>Classify, by Gazette notice, according to their principal or primary purpose all reserves. [Note this delegation does not affect sections 16(2) and 16(2A) Reserves Act]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16(4)</td>
<td>To advertise the intention to classify a reserve in accordance with sec 16(1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18(2)(c)</td>
<td>Determine in which cases exceptions can be made to the preservation of flora and fauna and the natural environment.</td>
<td>Does not apply to the revocation of reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(2)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(3)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(1)</td>
<td>Change the classification or purpose of a reserve by notice in the Gazette.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(2)(e)</td>
<td>To consider all objections received to a proposed change of classification or purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(2)</td>
<td>To form an opinion that the change of classification or purpose of a scenic, nature or scientific reserve is justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF POWERS</td>
<td>LIMITATION OF POWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(5)</td>
<td>To form an opinion that the change in the classification of a historic reserve is justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25(1)</td>
<td>Upon revocation of the reservation of any public reserve (or part of one) pursuant to section 24 Reserves Act, dispose of that land in such manner and for such purpose as the Minister specifies. [Note this is intended to allow Territorial Authorities to decide how and for what purpose the land may be disposed of].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41(1)</td>
<td>To approve reserve management plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42(1)</td>
<td>Give or decline to give express written consent to the cutting or destruction of trees and bush on any historic, scenic, nature, or scientific reserve. Determine terms and conditions subject to which written consent is given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(1)</td>
<td>To consent to the use of a reserve for temporary or permanent personal accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(2)</td>
<td>To consent to any vehicle caravan, tent or removable structure remaining on a reserve during the period 1 November to 31 March.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Give or decline to give prior approval to administering body to erect, or authorise any voluntary organisation or educational institution to erect shelters, huts, cabins, lodges etc, on any recreation or scenic reserve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF POWERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48(1)</td>
<td>Consent or refuse consent to administering body granting rights of way and other easements over any part of a vested reserve for any of the purposes specified in section 48(1). Impose such conditions as it thinks fit in giving the consent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48A(1)</td>
<td>Consent or refuse consent to administering body granting a licence over a vested reserve to any person or department of State - (a) To erect, maintain and use buildings, dwellings, masts and other structures, and plant and machinery; and (b) To construct, maintain, and use tracks and engage in other works - for any of the purposes specified in section 48A(1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48A(3)</td>
<td>Approve terms and conditions determined by the administering body.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Grant or decline to grant in writing any qualified person a right to take specified specimens of flora or fauna or rock mineral or soil from a reserve for scientific or educational purposes. Form opinion as to whether qualified person has the necessary credentials. Impose conditions on the grant in writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50(1)</td>
<td>Authorise or decline to authorise any person to take and kill any specified kind of fauna that may be found in any scenic, historic, nature or scientific reserve. Authorise or decline to authorise the use of firearms, traps, nets or other like objects within reserve for the foregoing purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to fauna, the delegation is for exotic fauna which are not protected under the Wildlife Act 1953.

The delegation is for non-protected exotic fauna only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF POWERS</th>
<th>LIMITATION OF POWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51(i)</td>
<td>Authorise or decline to authorise in writing an administering body to introduce indigenous flora or fauna or exotic flora into any scenic reserve for any of the purposes referred to in section 51(i).</td>
<td>Impose conditions on the giving of the authorisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52(i)</td>
<td>Declare by Gazette notice that any 2 or more reserves, or parts of 2 or more reserves, or parts of one or more reserves and the whole of one or more other reserves, are to be united to form one reserve.</td>
<td>All affected reserves or parts of reserves must have the same administering body and must all either be vested in that body or all held under an appointment to control and manage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 (i)(d)</td>
<td>To consent to an increase in the number days the public shall not be entitled to have admission to a reserve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 (i)(e)</td>
<td>To approve the fixing of charges generally or with respect to any specified occasion or event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54(i)</td>
<td>Give or decline to give prior consent to administering body, in the case of a recreation reserve vested in it, to grant leases for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and to grant a lease or licence for any of the purposes specified in paragraph (d) and to exercise all powers of the Minister referred to in the First Schedule that pertain to leases under s.54(i)(a), (b), (c) and (d).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION SUMMARY OF POWERS

Give or decline prior consent to administering body permitting, in a lease, the erection of buildings and structures for sports, games or public recreation not directly associated with outdoor recreation.

Consent or decline consent to variations or amendments to leases and consent to the carrying out of any other necessary actions arising out of the leases consistent with the First Schedule, Reserves Act.

55(2)(a) (d), (e) (f) and (g) In the case of a scenic reserve to give or decline to give consent to:

- the enclosure and grassing or grazing of open parts of the reserve;
- the setting apart of areas for other purposes;
- the erection of buildings and other structures and amenities;
- such things considered necessary for the public to obtain the benefit of the reserve;
- the setting apart of sites for residences and other buildings and structures necessary for the management of the reserve.

LIMITATION OF POWERS

Must be satisfied that the facilities, amenities, buildings or structures are necessary and cannot readily be provided outside or in close proximity to the reserve.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF POWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56(1)</td>
<td>Give or decline prior consent to administering body, in the case of a scenic reserve vested in it, to grant leases or licences for the purposes set out in s.56(1) and to exercise all powers of the Minister referred to in the First Schedule that pertain to leases under s.56(1)(a) and (b). Consent or decline consent to variations or amendments to leases and licences, and consent to the carrying out of any other necessary actions arising out of the leases and licences consistent with the First Schedule, Reserves Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56(2)</td>
<td>Give public notice in accordance with section 119 of the Reserves Act and give full consideration in accordance with section 120 to all objections and submissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58(b)</td>
<td>Set apart and use part of a reserve as a site for residences and other buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58A(1)</td>
<td>Give or decline prior consent to administering body, in the case of an historic reserve vested in it, to grant leases or licences for any of the purposes specified in that subsection. Consent or decline consent to variations or amendments to leases and licences and consent to the carrying out of any other necessary actions arising out of the leases and licences, consistent with the First Schedule, Reserves Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF POWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59A(i)</td>
<td>In accordance with Part IIB Conservation Act 1987, grant or refuse a concession in respect of any reserve controlled or managed by an administering body under s.28 Reserves Act so that the administering body may apply Part IIB as if references in that Part to a conservation area were references to such a reserve and references to the Minister of Conservation and to the Director-General of Conservation are references to an administering body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67(i)(b)</td>
<td>Consent or decline consent to lease of recreation reserve set apart for race course purposes, to a racing club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72(i)</td>
<td>To enter into and agree the terms of a lease or other agreement for the farming of a recreation or local purpose reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73(i)</td>
<td>Consent or decline prior consent to an administering body granting a lease of recreation reserve in the circumstances specified in s.75(i), where the reserve is vested in the administering body, and consent or decline prior consent to an administering body granting a lease in the circumstances specified in section 73(i) in all other cases. Exercise all powers of the Minister referred to in the First Schedule that pertain to leases under s.73(i).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF POWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73(2)</td>
<td>Consent or decline prior consent to an administering body granting a lease of recreation reserve for afforestation where the reserve is vested in the administering body, and consent or decline prior consent to an administering body granting a lease of recreation reserve for afforestation purposes in all other cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73(3)</td>
<td>Form opinion as to whether recreation reserve is not likely to be used for purposes of a recreation reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent or decline consent to administrating body granting leases of whole or part of reserve vested in administering body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant or decline to grant leases of whole or part of a reserve held under an appointment to control and manage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise all powers of the Minister referred to in the First Schedule that pertain to leases under s.73(3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73(5)</td>
<td>Consent or decline consent in writing to a member of an administering body becoming the lessee of any land under the control of that body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73(6)</td>
<td>Consent or decline consent to surrender of lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74(1)(b)(ii)</td>
<td>Consent or decline consent to granting of a licence to occupy a historic, scenic or scientific reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF POWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75(1) and (2)</td>
<td>Consent or decline to consent to the afforestation of a recreation or local purpose reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Where under the provisions of the Reserves Act consent or approval is required, give consent or approval subject to such conditions as are thought fit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signed** at Wellington this ______ day of Jul., 2013

by NICK SMITH
Minister of Conservation
30th October 2017

1 Cherrie Road
Beachlands
Auckland

sam@daviscoastal.co.nz

Ref: Site Visit and Assessment Summary: 1 Cherrie Road, Beachlands

Tena koe Sam,

1. This formal communication serves to confirm the analysis of our site assessment on 19/10/17 as above. We appreciated the opportunity to meet with you onsite and observe the aspects of the proposed works of potential concern to us. Anne McLeod from our office will forward an invoice to you within the next week for the site visit.

2. Ngāi Tai Ki Tamaki, the Board

2.1. Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki Tribal Trust (in so far as the Board) maintains the Crown and Iwi recognised mandate to negotiate the historical treaty settlement grievances with the Crown.

2.2. The Board, is also the Iwi Authority that represents the general business of Ngāi Tai, including but not restricted to, local and central Government, fisheries, aquaculture, farming, education, environmental, social and other affairs.

3. Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki Kaitiakitanga

3.1. Ngāi Tai has an established Kaitiaki Rōpū responsible for the Resource Management activities throughout the Ngāi Tai rohe, rohe moana. The Kaitiaki Rōpū is responsible for the following three (3) fundamental principles and values.

3.1a. to protect taonga (sites of wāhi tapu and other cultural significance)

3.1b. to promote taonga (sites of wāhi tapu and other cultural significance)

3.1c. to partner taonga (sites of wāhi tapu and other cultural significance)
3.2. Ngāi Tai acknowledges the RMA 1991, LGA 2002 and now the Draft Unitary Plan as well as the suite of planning tools and instruments that serve to guide and advise the consenting authority in all their respective decisions. Ngāi Tai are committed to encouraging all consenting authorities to ‘give proper and meaningful effect’ to iwi and cultural issues of significance as opposed to the ‘have regard’ as per the RMA 1991 language.

4. Planning


4.2. Section 6 Matters of National Importance

4.2b. The protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate sub division and use and development and;

4.2e. The relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, waters, wāhi tapu and other taonga.

4.3. Section 7 Other Matters

4.3a. Kaitiakitanga, (Māori guardianship and stewardship recognition and practice)

4.3e. Recognition and protection of heritage values of sites, buildings, places, or areas

4.4. Section 8 Treaty of Waitangi

4.4a. In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources shall take into account the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi

4.5. Local Government Act 2002

4.5a. Section 4 Treaty of Waitangi

4.5b. In order to recognise and respect the Crown’s responsibility to take appropriate account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and to maintain and improve opportunities for Māori to contribute to local government decision-making processes, parts 2 and 6 provide principles and requirements for local authorities that are intended to facilitate participation by Māori in local authority decision-making processes.

5. Revised Tainui Environment Plan. August 2013

5.1. One of two Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki Environment Plans that must be considered as described in Section 18 of the LGA 2002 by resource consenting authorities when considering resource consent applications. www.waikatotainui.co.nz

Ngai Tai Ki Tamaki Tribal Trust, 102 Maraetai Drive, Maraetai
P.O Box 59, Beachlands, 2147 Ph. (09) 537 - 9485

6.1. The second of two Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki Environment Plans that must be considered as described in Section 18 of the LGA 2002 by resource consenting authorities when considering resource consent applications. www.hauraki.iwi.nz

7. Kaitiaki Site Assessment Summary

7.1 The property at 1 Cherrie Road, Beachlands had suffered a significant land slip due to erosion of its coastal cliff boundary.

7.2 A mature Pohutukawa tree has been deposited at the base of the cliff, dislodged during the slip. The proposed sea wall will encompass the tree and slip material in situ. The project has sought the opinion of an arborist who is optimistic about its survival chances.

7.3 Emergency repairs have been undertaken with a temporary rock wall placed to prevent the slipped earth washing away from around the Pohutukawa tree. Machinery and transport access for emergency repairs was facilitated via the seaward side of the coastal boundary. The repair is in the form of a rock riprap wall placed around the tree and materials deposited by the slip.

7.4 The proposed wall is to be of similar construction and visual amenity to the rock masonry wall at nearby Sunkist Bay Reserve. The emergency riprap wall will be removed as the new wall is constructed.

7.5 Construction access is proposed seaward of the coastal margin as in the emergency repair. Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki require that equipment and processes are in place to mitigate any effects of issues that arise from construction machinery operating within or transiting the CMA. We request that allowances be made for Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki to undertake cultural monitoring of this coastal access.

7.6 Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki request that replanting include only native species at the coastal margin.

8. Kaitiaki Conclusion

8.1 With the above taken into consideration, Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki have no issue supporting this application. We confirm in this instance there is no requirement to obtain a Cultural Impact Assessment.

Mauri Ora

Jonathan Billington

Ngai Tai Ki Tamaki Tribal Trust, 102 Maraeiti Drive, Maraeiti
P.O Box 59, Beachlands, 2147 Ph. (09) 537 - 9485
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Application for approval under the Reserves Act 1977 and Conservation Act 1987 for a 30 year concession to build a seawall on Sunkist Bay Reserve
1 Introduction and Scope of Report

ENGEIO Ltd was engaged by Geoff and Amanda King to undertake a Geotechnical Cliff Assessment of the property (herein referred to as ‘the site’) at 1 Cherrie Road in Beachlands, Auckland (proposal ref. P2017.000.090). The purpose of the assessment was to develop a geological model for the site and use this model to estimate the likely future regression profile of the cliff at the site.

Data has been gathered from a field investigation, which comprised two deep machine boreholes and a visual cliff assessment, with background information sourced from publically available geological maps and geotechnical reports, including site-specific geotechnical documents held in the Auckland Council property file.

This factual report is intended to inform conceptual design options for stabilising the cliff to preserve the amenity and aesthetics of the cove and beach below the site, and the potential for utilising some of the land near the crest of the cliff to support a future amenity area.

Our scope of work does not include detailed slope stability analyses, or geotechnical design of retaining walls or other slope support systems. These items will form part of a future scope of work when the design concept has been agreed upon. This report is not intended to be of sufficient detail to accompany an application to Auckland Council for Building Consent.

2 Site Description

The site at 1 Cherrie Road is located on an approximately rectangular block of land having a total area of 2,337 m². Its legal description is Lot 23 DP 19523 & Lot 24 DP 19523, and it is located at the end of Cherrie Road, accessed via the northern end of the cul-de-sac. A large two-storey house is located in the south-eastern corner of the property, and opens out onto a north-facing patio and lawn that wraps around to the west of the house.

The site is bounded by residential properties to the south and west, by the Cherrie Road easement to the east, and by the shore platform to the north. The cliff bisects the site at an approximately east-west orientation, and the land to the south of the cliff crest is relatively flat. The cliff crest undulates on an east-west alignment, and features a number of large, mature trees, including pohutukawa. A timber trellis fence extends along the crest of the cliff, and a large timber pole retaining wall spans the central and western portion of the fence line. A private staircase provides access to the beach below (north), from the eastern edge of the retaining wall.

The property below the cliff is characterised by a narrow north-south trending cliff spur at the western site boundary, a small cove in the central portion of the site below the timber pole retaining wall, and a broad, rounded cliff spur at the eastern site boundary. A low keystone block retaining wall has been constructed at the toe of the cliff to protect the cove from further erosion through wave action.

The site location and topography are depicted on the site location plans in Figure 1.
3 Published Geology

The site is mapped by the Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences (GNS) as being underlain by the Puketoka Formation of the Tauranga Group sedimentary lithology (late Pliocene to middle Pleistocene Epoch, 1.8 to 2.4 million years ago), which is characteristic of much of the Auckland area.

Puketoka Formation soils comprise mainly pumiceous deposits of light grey to orange-brown, well sorted, bedded (2-200 mm), mud, sand and gravel comprising angular to well-rounded rhyolite pumice clasts and weathered rock derived from the surrounding areas. Minor beds comprise white, pumiceous silt and clay, and black peat with organic-rich clay.

The Puketoka Formation soils are underlain by the East Coast Bays Formation of the Waitamata Group sedimentary lithology (Miocene Epoch, 20 million years ago). Derived from deep marine sediments, deposition is thought to have come about by turbidity (density) currents, resulting in alternating or interbedded sandstone, siltstone and mudstone sequences. These sequences are often exposed in coastal cliffs along Auckland’s east coast, and form the lower reaches of the cliff section at the site.

In-situ weathering of the bedrock material has created, in most locations, an overburden comprising mixtures of silts, clays and sands, being predominantly orange, brown and grey in colour, and often containing hard, dark-brown iron oxide (limonite) concentrations.

4 Background Information

We have been provided with two geotechnical documents contained within the Auckland Council Property File for the site. They are summarised in the following sections.

4.1 Chambers Consultants Limited, 1 May 1995, ref. 94-0069

In May 1995 Chambers Consultants Limited prepared a letter for the site titled “Proposed House at Above Address. Lots 23 & 24 DP 19523.” The letter was prepared to provide geotechnical guidance with regard to the proposed new house at the site and to address Council concerns regarding regression of the cliffline.

The author noted that the high tide mark is now “well into Lot 24”, which was indicative that considerable cliff regression had occurred in the years since the title was given (circa 1930s). The rate of regression was considered to have slowed, as evidenced by the presence of mature vegetation across the cliff.

The ‘inlet’ at the toe of the cliff was considered to be an anomaly in the cliff strata that has funneled waves into this location, causing locally accelerated erosion and regression. A wall was recommended across the inlet at the toe of the slope to act as a wave barrier, with a nominal design comprising 1 m timber poles concreted into the sandstone with timber rails and rock backfill suggested. This was considered to be adequate to protect against “normal erosion” at the toe of the cliff.
A subsurface investigation comprising five hand auger boreholes to depths of 3.5 m and five scala
penetrometer tests to depths of up to 1 m below the base of the hand auger boreholes were
completed across the proposed new building footprint and at the cliff crest. The boreholes identified
grey and brown, inorganic clays and silts with layers of peat and organic soils. Measured shear
strengths ranged from 42 to 174 kPa, with typical values less than 100 kPa. Where encountered,
groundwater was measured at depths between 1.4 and 2.1 m.

The author considered sandstone to be present at a depth of approximately 4 m below the ground
surface, corresponding to where the scala penetrometer tests met practical refusal, and
recommended that the future dwelling be designed with leading edge driven steel piles to refusal on
that strata. A second retaining wall was recommended where the cliff crest is closest to the proposed
house (interpreted to be upslope of the ‘inlet’ at the toe), with a suggested design comprising timber
poles socketed into rock and tied back with a deadman anchor.

4.2 Chambers Consultants Limited, 26 August 2002, ref. 940069

In August 2002 Chambers Consultants Limited prepared a letter titled “Cliff Protection at 1 Cherrie
Road, Beachlands – Building Consent No. 95/2095.” The letter presented the consultants
observations of the two retaining walls that had previously been constructed at the site after the
submission of their 1995 geotechnical recommendations.

The upper wall was observed to have been constructed in accordance with the design and was
considered to be “functioning adequately”. The poles were noted to have been tied back to a
deadman anchor in the grassed area below the residence, with galvanized rods threaded through the
poles. No obvious signs of movement or ground slumping were noted.

The lower wall was observed to be a “keystone-type wall” to a height of 1.2 m, curved to fit the cove.
Photographs of its construction were reviewed by the author, and it was concluded that the wall was
properly constructed in accordance with the keystone system, with a reinforced concrete footing. The
author considered the wall to be well constructed and superior to the original proposal.

The letter concluded that both of the walls met the conditions imposed by the 1995 letter report, and
the Auckland Regional Council consent.

5 Coastal Cliff Regression

5.1 East Coast Bays Formation Cliffs and Stability Considerations

The East Coast Bays Formation bedrock exposed in the cliffs along Auckland’s eastern coastline is
believed to have been deposited in a submarine basin approximately 20 million years ago as a series
of turbidity currents. Deformation of these sediments is believed to have occurred when fresh
deposition sequences slid over the more consolidated lower units, causing them in places to be
buckled into folds of varying dimensions with associated small scale faults.

Thus, deformation occurred while the sediments were soft and plastic, before the final consolidation,
dewatering and cementation processes, giving rise to the syncline / anticline features visible in many
of the sea cliffs around Auckland.
The main mechanisms of failure operating in these coastal cliffs, particularly where there is only a thin layer of overburden soil at the top of the cliff, are local block falls, including toppling and slabbing failures triggered by weather along failure planes in the rock mass. Where the rock is significantly folded and / or faulted, the overburden soil profile tends to be more deeply weathered and accordingly deep seated, larger scale slope failures are more common.

Cliff failures can also be triggered by ingress of water into the soil overburden and through the underlying rock structure. This can occur where stormwater or surface water is allowed to discharge onto the slope, and also where leaking structures such as swimming pools or water tanks are present.

Sliding along bedding planes on their own is considered less likely, but can take place in conjunction with movement on the fracture planes, and can be triggered from the removal of toe support brought about by wave action at the base of the cliff.

The phenomena of wave attack and general face weathering are common to most East Coast Bays Formation sea cliffs in the Auckland region and Geologists have assessed the average rate of retreat to be approximately 3 to 6 metres per century. While coastal erosion does occur progressively over time, large episodic events are generally responsible for the loss of several metres of cliff in a single event.

Factors that can locally accelerate the rate of retreat include:

- Exposure to coastal weathering processes, including sun, rain, wind, and wave action.
- Adverse dip of bedding planes out of the slope, and associated groundwater seepage on these bedding planes.
- Significant faulting, folding, or other discontinuities within the rock mass.
- Significant depths of overburden soils and highly weathered rock.
- Concentrated and/ or uncontrolled stormwater discharges onto the cliff from above.
- Heavy vegetation (e.g. large trees) that may exert high leverage on the cliff through wind loading.

5.2 Auckland Regional Council Coastal Erosion Assessment

In February 2009 the former Auckland Regional Council released Technical Report No. 009 titled ‘Regional Assessment of Areas Susceptible to Coastal Erosion’. The report was prepared by Tonkin & Taylor Limited for Auckland Regional Council in 2006, and presents information on the current and potential scale and extent of the area susceptible to coastal erosion within the Auckland region.

The report considers possible future long term regression rates for Auckland’s coastlines including beaches, hard cliffs, and soft cliffs, and applies a systematic approach based on the geology and landform, physical processes, and interactions between the two.

For hard cliffs of the type present in the lower portion of the cliff at the site, the report uses the Geological Strength Index (GSI) developed by Hoek and Brown to characterise rock mass description. The GSI is a system for estimating the rock mass strength of a cliff exposure based on visual inspection of the surface conditions and structure.
For soft cliffs, defined as lightly cemented, cohesive soils consisting of marine, alluvial and organic materials, the GSI approach is not appropriate. Instead, the behaviour of these cliffs is based on visual inspection and an understanding of soil mechanics.

The report presents the following inferred historic Long Term Retreat (LTR) rates relative to the assessed GSI range for a hard cliff, based on the findings of the comprehensive assessments completed for the report. All numbers were rounded up to the nearest whole number as a conservative measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GSI Range</th>
<th>Historic Long Term Retreat Rate (m/100 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 ± 5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 ± 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.5 ± 7.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 ± 10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25 (soft cliffs)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table from Auckland Regional Council Technical Report 2009/009

The report also comments on the effects of climate change, stating that “sea-level rise is thought to have an effect on soft, poorly consolidated cliffed coastlines (soft cliffs), but not on more competent rock with GSI values greater than 25.”

### 5.3 Beachlands Hazard Evaluation Scoping Study

In March 1992 the former Manukau City Council released a draft document titled ‘Scoping Study for Hazard Evaluation of Beachlands Coastline’. The study was completed by Fraser Thomas Limited (ref. 27893), and presents the findings of their study of the coastal cliffs comprising a review of geological maps, aerial photographs and field mapping.

The report concentrates on collecting factual information for the area, and identifies possible causes and mechanisms of cliff regression in Beachlands. It also presents recommendations for future work by both Council and property owners to identify, and mitigate, the risks of cliff regression to public infrastructure and private property.

The report identified two coves forming in the cliff in the immediate vicinity of the site at 1 Cherrie Road, and characterised the cliff as having 2 – 10 m of Waitemata Group sandstone and siltstone at the base with alluvial sediments of the Tauranga Group above to the cliff crest. At the site, and elsewhere on the cliffline, it was observed that where sandstone is exposed at the toe of the cliff to a height of generally 2 m or greater above the wave cut platform, the resulting alluvial cliff above was generally steep to very steep (60° - 90°). It was also observed that where the Waitemata Group sediments were observed to be faulted or ‘intricately folded and contorted’, as they are in the vicinity of the site, the cliff will be subjected to continuous frittering, slaking and slabbing-style failures with episodic slips considered likely.
At the time of this study, Beachlands did not have a reticulated stormwater system for roads or private properties. Uncontrolled stormwater discharge onto slopes and cliffs was identified as a significant contributing factor to cliffline regressions, and the pipe outfall at the end of Cherrie Road was identified as a typical example where the cliffline has regressed forming a small embayment.

In terms of regression of the cliffline by toe erosion, Fraser Thomas determined that active regression of the cliff will continue unless toe protection structures are constructed. Further to this, regression of the cliff crest will also continue unless remedial works are carried out to mitigate contributing factors. Overhanging pohutukawas along the Beachlands cliffline, such as those present at the site, were considered to enhance the stability of the cliffline crest and the seaward slopes.

The Fraser Thomas report presented a Recommended Building Line Limitation for the Beachlands coastline to delineate the zone within which buildings are considered to be potentially at risk of damage from cliffline instability. This was developed by projecting a 1(V):2(H) regression line for the highly weathered residual soil or alluvial soil from their base exposure in the cliff face, and allowed for toe erosion of 3 m parallel to the cliff face. Their methodology was deliberately generalised and is intended to be reappraised through site specific assessments for individual properties.

The Building Line Limitation for the site at 1 Cherrie Road is approximately at the location of the existing dwelling and it may be inferred that the remainder of the seaward side of the property is at risk of slippage associated with cliff regression. This risk is somewhat mitigated by the existing toe and cliff crest retaining walls, which will be taken into account in site specific regression models discussed in Section 8 of this report.

6 ENGEIO Site Investigation

ENGEIO visited the site on 6 and 7 March, 2017 to conduct a walkover and visual appraisal of the property, dwelling and surrounds, incorporating geological mapping of the cliff face and shore platform. In addition, two machine boreholes were drilled to a depth of approximately 20 m in the flat land at the crest of the cliff.

6.1 Site and Cliff Crest Observation

During our site visit, we made the following observations:

- The dwelling is set on near-level land and is set back between approximately 6 and 12 m from the slope crest. Below the slope crest, the land rapidly steepens to between 30 and 45 degrees and is heavily vegetated, obscuring much of the soil profile.
- A timber trellis fence separates the gently sloping to near-level upper portion of the site from the oversteepened soil slopes which form the upper reaches of the cliff (Photos 1 and 2).
- The anchored timber post retaining wall located in the western and central portions of the site was noted to show signs of outward rotation, disrupting the alignment of the trellis fence (Photo 2). We understand that this retaining wall is tied back to a deadman anchor buried in the lawn, and no obvious evidence of movement such as ground cracking/deformation was observed through the lawn at the time of our visit.
- A timber and concrete stairway provides beach access from the central portion of the site (Photo 3). We understand this is relatively new and no clear signs of distress were observed.
Below the slope crest, evidence for widespread soil creep and shallow soil movement was observed, particularly in the form of exposed irregular soil mounds, soil scarps, and rotated tree trunks (Photo 4).

A mid-slope bench was observed in the northeast of the site. From the lawn, the slope down to the bench is covered in low lying vegetation, while the bench itself is occupied by a large phoenix palm (Photo 5).

To the east of this bench, north of Cherrie Road, significant cliff slope regression and soil evacuation was observed, likely related to the historical uncontrolled stormwater discharge. The stormwater is now transferred to the base of the cliff using a flexible flume (Photo 6).

Figure 2: Cliff Crest Photographs

Photo 1: View north from the front lawn
Photo 2: Outward rotation of the timber post retaining wall and deflection of timber trellis fence
Photo 3: Timber and concrete beach access way
Photo 4: Observed soil creep and soil failure along the central portion of the slope
Photo 5: Mid-slope bench with established phoenix palm in the northeast of the site
Photo 6: Stormwater flume north of Cherrie Road
6.2 Cliff and Shore Platform Observation

During our site visit we undertook a visual assessment of the exposed shore platform and cliff section. We noted the following:

- Due to historical rapid cliff regression and cove formation, a keystone block sea wall has been constructed within the main cove, below the beach access stairs (Photo 7).
- The toe of the cliff is exposed to wave action, and weathering of the sandstone and siltstone beds is clearly visible.
- Competent moderately to slightly weathered rock was exposed in the lower portion of the cliff section, generally extending to approximately 2 m above the shore (Photo 9). This material is comprised of interbedded sandstone and siltstone, with the less resilient siltstone beds preferentially weathering and frittering away, leaving the sandstone beds slightly overhanging. The rock mass is generally blocky, with relatively well defined, moderately persistent, iron stained joints.
- Highly weathered rock and site soils have continued to regress above this sea wall, with local overhangs supported by tree roots observed proximal to the wall (Photo 8) and shallow soil failures observed within the mid-slope and upper-slope soils as discussed in Section 6.2.
- A rockfall zone at the toe of the cliff provides evidence of the nature of the failure mechanisms operating along the lower portion of the site, which appear to occur on varying scales. The highly weathered rock commonly shows signs of loose surficial debris, likely formed through cycles of wetting and drying, which spill onto the lower slope and shore. Larger blocks (up to 0.5 m) were locally observed across the shore, and likely form in more competent material, or where the rock mass is more blocky in nature (Photo 9).
- A primarily north-trending fault cuts through the shore platform, extending along the eastern side of the north-trending ridge spur and into the main cove, as marked on Figure 3. The cliff spur is also bound by faults to the west, one of which extends in to a sea cave (Photo 11). Bedding through the cliff spur is upturned, dipping between 50 and 85 degrees to the north and northwest (Photo 10). Numerous northeast to southwest trending normal faults cut through the cliff and shore platform in the east of the site, the most dominant of which have been marked on Figure 3, with an example shown in Photo 13. A number of these faults converge in the main cove to the north of the property, likely facilitating the preferential erosion that has occurred.
- A portion of potential fault crushed zone was noted exposed on the cliff face east of the main cove, with clearly truncated bedding observed (Photo 14).
- Evidence for rapid cliff regression and potentially shallow soil failures was observed proximal to the Cherrie Road stormwater outfall.
Figure 3: Site Map

Base image sourced from Auckland Council Maps, not to scale.
Franklin Local Board  
24 July 2018

Geotechnical Cliff Assessment – 1 Cherrie Road, Beachlands

Figure 4: Cliff and Shore Platform Photographs

Photo 7: Historically eroded cove and keystone seawall protection

Photo 8: Root supported, overhanging highly weathered rock and soil above the sea wall

Photo 9: Example of exposed rock along the shore and typical shallow slabbing failure

Photo 10: Rotated/upturned bedding along the north trending spur, immediately west of the main cove

Photo 11: Cave/cove forming to the west of the north-trending spur with overhanging soil and vegetation

Photo 12: Regularly oriented bedding continues west of developing cave/cove

Photo 13: Example of a northeast to southwest trending normal fault, intersecting the main cove

Photo 14: Possible fault crush zone in cliff, immediately east of the main cove and sea wall
6.3 Machine Borehole Investigation

ENGEIO supervised the drilling of two machine boreholes (BH01 and BH02) to a target depth of approximately 20 m. The locations of the boreholes are shown on Figure 3. Full borehole logs and photographs are presented in Appendix 1 and are written in general accordance with the New Zealand Geotechnical Society field classification guidelines (NZGS, 2005).

6.3.1 Summary of Subsurface Conditions

Subsurface testing yielded a relatively consistent subsurface profile over the site in keeping with our geomorphological observations. In general, the site consisted of a topsoil layer underlain by both alluvial and residually weathered soils, which were further underlain by weathered siltstone and sandstone of the East Coast Bays Formation. Table 2 below shows the indicative depths of the various materials encountered, which are described in more detail in the following sections.

Table 2: Summary of Subsurface Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machine Borehole (Depth achieved)</th>
<th>Material Description</th>
<th>Groundwater encountered (m bgl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Alluvium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH01 (19.95 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth Range (m)</td>
<td>0.0 – 0.4</td>
<td>0.4 – 7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undrained Shear Strength (kPa)</td>
<td>NA (^1)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT ‘N’ Value</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Evaluation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Soft to Very Stiff, Loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH02 (19.95 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth Range (m)</td>
<td>0.0 – 1.4</td>
<td>1.4 – 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undrained Shear Strength (kPa)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>76 – 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT ‘N’ Value</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Evaluation</td>
<td>Stiff to Very Stiff</td>
<td>Soft to Stiff, Loose to Medium Dense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)NA = Not Assessed  
\(^2\)Only one shear vane test was conducted and may not be representative of unit strength  
\(^3\)RA = Recovered As
6.3.2 Topsoil / Fill
Topsoil was encountered in the upper portion of the site (the lawn and garden), and was typically dark brown in colour, consisting of silts and clays with subordinate sand. Topsoil frequently contains amorphous organic matter and organic inclusions, such as rootlets, and was encountered at the majority of test locations across the site, generally within the upper 0.5 m. Some of the topsoil is interpreted to have been placed as fill associated with local landscaping and garden features.

6.3.3 Alluvium (Puketoka Formation)
Alluvium refers to a soil or sediment that has been eroded or reshaped by water. The alluvium encountered in the boreholes comprised of a mixture of sand, silt and clay with subordinate organic inclusions underlying the topsoil / fill along the upper reaches of the site. This alluvium extended up to 8 m below ground level, was generally wet, and contained discrete organic rich beds.

6.3.4 Residually Weathered Soils (East Coast Bays Formation)
We consider the residual soils to be in-situ, naturally weathered products of the underlying bedrock material. At this site, native soils are primarily comprised of slightly to highly plastic clays, clayey silts, sandy silts, and sands. Native soil thicknesses extended to up to approximately 11 m depth in the boreholes.

As residual soils are weathered from the parent rock, it can be common to observe relict rock structure within the soil mass. While this material is strictly defined as ‘Completely Weathered Rock’ rather than residual soils, the material exhibits soil strengths and, from an engineering perspective, should be treated as a soil.

6.3.5 Highly Weathered Rock (East Coast Bays Formation)
The highly weathered rock material refers to the layer of competent soils / extremely weak to un cemented rock located between the residually weathered soils and competent, weathered bedrock. This zone varies in thickness along the cliff section, with the strata generally recovered as un cemented to poorly cemented sands, silts and clays with remnant bedding and rock structure. It is typically grey to dark bluish grey and may rapidly increase in strength with depth, becoming weakly cemented near the contact with bedrock.

In BH01, this layer extends from approximately 11 to 13.2 m depth, while in BH02 this layer extends from 9.6 to 14.3 m depth.

6.3.6 Competent Weathered Bedrock (East Coast Bays Formation)
East Coast Bays Formation bedrock is moderately to slightly weathered, grey to dark grey, interbedded sandstone and siltstone. The rock material at this site was commonly extremely weakly cemented and recovered partially as a soil. Observed native discontinuities were primarily limited to bedding planes, with occasional moderately closely spaced to closely spaced, steeply inclined, planar joints.

Bedding inclination generally ranged from subhorizontal to moderately inclined, apart from a small zone at 17.95 m depth in BH01 where it became very steeply inclined. Variations in bedding orientation are common in the East Coast Bays Formation, and often attributed to folding and faulting during deposition.
6.4 Groundwater

Based on historical hand auger boreholes, we understand that localised perched water is likely to be present between 1.4 m and 2.1 m depth, often coinciding with organic rich soil layers. While we did not observe seepage through the soil face or along the soil/rock interface at the time of our visit, we anticipate this occurring following periods of rain.

Piezometers were not installed in the machine boreholes completed under ENGEO’s guidance, however a stabilised groundwater reading was attained from BH01 which showed regional groundwater at 14.6 m depth. Given that the property is elevated approximately 16.5 m above sea level, we can assume that regional groundwater is tidally influenced and is likely to vary on the order of a couple of metres throughout the day.

7 Cliff Geological Assessment

The cliff can be broadly divided into three geotechnically distinct layers as shown in Figure 5: competent moderately to slightly weathered rock at the base, highly weathered rock in the lower portion, and residual and colluvial soils from the central to upper portions.

Figure 5: Annotated Cliff Section

Annotations based on site observations. Scale is approximate.
Base of Cliff

The lower portion of the cliff (approximately 2 metres from the shore platform) is comprised of competent, slightly to moderately weathered, grey, iron stained, extremely weak interbedded sandstone and siltstone layers. Site assessments indicate that both the shore platform and the lower portion of the rock face has been faulted and / or folded historically, likely creating the conditions for the aforementioned coves and the variations in bedding orientation. The overall westerly bedding dip direction observed across the eastern and central portion of the site is considered neither favourable nor non-favourable for cliff stability as it broadly parallels the cliff alignment.

The cave / incipient cove located west of the cliff spur is currently expressed as a sea cave, with the overburden / ceiling comprised largely of soil and loose, weathered rock supported in place only by roots of established vegetation. This cave marks the western extent of the rotated bedding observed in the north trending spur. Our assessments suggest that the apparent rotated block may be bound by at least two faults, which are preferentially eroding to form the observed coves. This spur appears more resistant to erosion and mass wasting than the remainder of the site regardless of the adverse bedding.

We consider regression of the lower slope likely to continue, largely due to mass wasting and forming loosened blocks of sandstone through preferential weathering of the siltstone.

The basal portion of the cliff stands at an angle of approximately 65 to 80 degrees, and is generally not vegetated. Seepage along bedding contacts or joints was not widely apparent at the time of our inspection.

Lower Portion of Cliff

In the lower reaches of the cliff (between approximately 2 metres and 5 metres above the shore) the rock material appears to be highly weathered, and shows signs of surface deterioration / disintegration. This material readily fritters and crumbles with little effort, frequently forming small quantities of fine debris along the shore. This material generally inherits the bedding characteristics of the underlying rock, although less well expressed and defined.

Due to its more weathered state, this portion of the cliff generally stands at a flatter angle of 60 to 70 degrees, although this varies based on local conditions and may occasionally be observed subvertical or overhanging. Vegetation is sparse, however the roots of overlying vegetation do extend to within this layer.

Central and Upper Portion of Cliff

The central and upper reaches of the cliff (between approximately 5 and 14.5 metres above the shore) is comprised of a mixture of residually weathered soils of the East Coast Bays Formation and alluvial soils of the Puketoka Formation. These soils are largely supported by the dense overlying vegetation. The base of this layer (where it meets the highly weathered rock) may be subvertical, however evidence of frittering and dropouts between roots is widespread. The majority of the soil material, particularly within the central cove area, slopes back at approximately 30 to 45 degrees and may locally reach 60 degrees. The soil and vegetation show signs of widespread soil creep and shallow soil failures, evidenced by irregular surficial soils, rotated tree trunks and by minor soil scarp.

Regardless of toe regression, soil regression in the central to upper cliff slope is likely to continue.
The dense vegetation appears well established and may be supported by perched groundwater within the soils. No obvious signs of significant groundwater seepage in the form of wet patches or concentrated iron oxide staining were observed in the soils at the time of our visit.

**Geological Strength Index (GSI)**

Based on cliff assessments completed as part of the Auckland Regional Council coastal erosion assessment, Tonkin & Taylor Limited prepared an adapted GSI chart that presented the approximate distribution of typical Auckland rocks based on structure and surface condition observations. East Coast Bays Formation rock cliffs have been assessed to have a typical GSI of 35 to 65.

We have assigned GSI values of 38 to 48 for the competent rock exposed in the lower cliff and shore platform, and 20 to 30 for the highly weathered rock exposed in the lower third of the cliff. These GSI ranges have been shown on the GSI chart in Figure 6 below.

**Figure 6: GSI Chart**

![GSI Chart](image-url)
8 Qualitative Cliff Regression Assessment

The cliff and slope below the site is cut back at an overall angle of approximately 60 to 80 degrees along the lower slope and wave action is continuing to undermine the toe, primarily where structural features (faults etc.) and weaker siltstone beds are encountered. The central to upper reaches of the slope are currently laid back at an average angle of 30 to 45 degrees and soil creep and shallow soil failures are likely to continue as the soils attempt to come to rest at their preferred angle of repose. Historic scoping studies have suggested this angle of repose to be 1V:2H (26 degrees), however the soils are unlikely to reach this point while being actively oversteepened by toe erosion and weathering processes.

A significant depth of alluvium and weathered overburden soil (up to approximately 11 m) was encountered in our machine boreholes at the slope crest, and this does present a risk to the upper portion of the site as soil will normally adopt a flatter angle of repose over time than that of a rock cliff face. The presence of dense vegetation within the soils is limiting this natural regression under current conditions, however evidence of shallow soil instability and soil regression was still observed across much of the site.

While the cove to the north of the site is now protected by a sea wall, the soils upslope of the cove have been oversteepened by the rapid toe erosion experienced by the cliff. Accordingly, these soils will continue to regress for the foreseeable future irrespective of the lower slope protection. Heavy vegetation over the upper portion of the cliff is serving to bind and protect the overburden soils, but this can also exert significant leverage on the cliff under high wind loads.

Based on our field observations, desktop study, and experience in cliff assessments around the Auckland region, we consider that the lower section of cliff at the site should not be subject to an abnormally high rate of cliff retreat. Accordingly, we consider the most appropriate method of determining a future cliff regression model is to allow for an indicative worst case (conservative) scenario LTR rate of 5 metres over 100 years (Table 1). This regression rate has been considered for all competent rock along the base of the cliff, except for where it is protected by the existing sea wall. As much of the cliff face and slope is comprised of soils, we have considered a combined scenario where the overburden soil profile regresses mirroring the current upper slope angle. For East Coast Bays Formation Soil, this angle is approximately 35 degrees, while for alluvium, this angle is approximately 30 degrees. This flatter angle of regression for the soils partially allows for the binding effects of vegetation and assumes static conditions and baseline groundwater conditions.

Cross-Section A-A’ extends from the lower shore, capturing the cliff and slope to the east of the sea wall, and terminates at the central portion of the dwelling. We consider this to show the representative cliff geometry specific to the site. We have plotted what we consider to be the ‘likely’ long term regression, assuming a total of 5 m of erosion at the base of the cliff, shown on Figure 7. This assessment shows a ‘likely’ loss of approximately 5 m of lawn / amenity area from the timber trellis fence due an assumed 5 m toe regression over 100 years.

This model does not account for the ‘possible’ or ‘worst likely’ regression, and does not account for any potential mass evacuation or landsliding in the soil material. It is also important to note that the LTR rate considers cliff regression over a period of 100 years, which exceeds the building design life of 50 years. This sketch also does not account for potential sea level rise, which may expose softer portions of the cliff (GSI = 25) to wave erosion.
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A ‘possible’ or ‘worst likely’ regression model is best developed using detailed numerical slope stability software as it needs to consider alternate failure mechanisms as a function of a complex soil profile and variable groundwater conditions, rather than just an inferred failure envelope. This can be completed as part of the detailed design assessment to develop a cliff protection system.

**Figure 7: Conceptual Long Term Regression Sketch**

Contour data was sourced from Auckland Council Maps. All geological contacts are inferred based on limited site data.

**9 Cliff Protection System Concepts**

We understand you wish to protect amenity areas from potential loss due to long term cliff regression. Our assessment has indicated that regression should be anticipated to continue in the foreseeable future, with a ‘likely’ loss of approximately 5 m of lawn space over a 100 year period. Accordingly, a site specific retention/protection system should be considered to protect this amenity area. This report is intended to inform the selection and design of such a system.

Based on our assessment, we consider the following solutions may be feasible at the site:

- A mesh and soil anchor retention system, which would involve the drilling of soil / rock anchors and incorporating a slope reinforcement mesh to support the face. Similar systems have been implemented using rope access systems within the Auckland area, most commonly along East Coast Bays Formation cliffs. The dense vegetation on the cliff slope would require additional care and time during construction.
A buried pile retaining wall (palisade wall) specifically designed to protect against both long term regression and the potential for mass evacuation or landsliding within the near surface soils. Design considerations will include a cost vs benefit analysis of the proportion of land retained vs construction costs.

Further toe protection along the remainder of the cliff property. Halting toe erosion will reduce the rate of regression at the cliff crest and limit the total anticipated regression.

10 Conclusions and Closing Remarks

- The sea wall constructed to the north of the property is performing adequately and appears to have halted toe regression in this area, however the mid to upper-slope in this area is currently oversteepened and will continue to regress.
- The anchored timber post retaining wall above the cove and sea wall appears to be underperforming. This should be re-tensioned (if possible) in order to repair existing damage. Based on site observations, we have concerns that this retaining wall may have been under designed, and depending on the continued regression of the slope above the cove, this wall may need future repairs or replacement.
- The cliff below the site appears to be primarily comprised of alluvial and residual soils, with the competent rock exposed only in the lower portion of the cliff section. A large number of faults were observed in the vicinity of the site, likely facilitating the preferential erosion of the observed coves.
- Cliff regression in the East Coast Bays Formation typically occurs gradually, through a combination of localised block fails and frittering of the cliff face, and shallow slumping of the soil profile. However, large episodic events can and do occur within both the rock mass and occasionally, the soil profile, particularly where greater thicknesses of soils have accumulated.
- We consider a long term regression rate of 5 metres per 100 years suitable to be adopted for the base of the cliff for stability assessments. This would translate to a likely regression of 5 metres at the crest of the slope. This is considered to be a realistic, somewhat conservative figure, however this does not account for the potential of sea level rise which may expose weaker rock material to wave action.
- We understand the northern portion of the dwelling was designed with leading edge piles driven to refusal on a ‘sandstone’ thought to be present at approximately 4 m depth. While our ground model differs from that put forward by Chambers Consultants, our ‘likely’ 100 year regression line does not indicate that the foundations are at risk of long term regression.
- Vegetation at the crest of the cliff should be maintained and large trees regularly pruned by a qualified arborist to minimise the risk of significant wind leverage loads adversely affecting the cliff face and soil profile.
- No stormwater or surface water should be allowed to discharge onto the cliff crest or anywhere across the northern portion of the site beyond that of normal rainfall and sporadic sprinkler irrigation.
11 Limitations

i. We have prepared this report in accordance with the brief as provided. This report has been prepared for the use of our client, Geoff and Amanda King, their professional advisers and the relevant Territorial Authorities in relation to the specified project brief described in this report. No liability is accepted for the use of any part of the report for any other purpose or by any other person or entity.

ii. The recommendations in this report are based on the ground conditions indicated from published sources, site assessments and subsurface investigations described in this report based on accepted normal methods of site investigations. Only a limited amount of information has been collected to meet the specific financial and technical requirements of the client’s brief and this report does not purport to completely describe all the site characteristics and properties. The nature and continuity of the ground between test locations has been inferred using experience and judgement and it should be appreciated that actual conditions could vary from the assumed model.

iii. Subsurface conditions relevant to construction works should be assessed by contractors who can make their own interpretation of the factual data provided. They should perform any additional tests as necessary for their own purposes.

iv. This Limitation should be read in conjunction with the IPENZ/ACENZ Standard Terms of Engagement.

v. This report is not to be reproduced either wholly or in part without our prior written permission.
We trust that this information meets your current requirements. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned on (09) 972 2205 if you require any further information.
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APPENDIX 1:
Borehole Logs and Photographs
**LOG OF BORING BH01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>CONSOLIDATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>SILT with some sand and roots, dark brown. Low plasticity. Plastic encountered at 0.2 m depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CLAY with trace sand, light grey, light orange and light brown. High plasticity. Becomes brown to dark brown and organic stained with lenses of muddy amorphous peat from 1.3 m to 1.85 m depth and becomes wet at 1.3 m depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLAY with some silt, light greyish brown. High plasticity, sensitive. Mirror sand encountered at 2.65 m depth. Sand, fine to medium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Silty fine SAND: light grey to white. Poorly graded, subangular, dilatant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Silty fine to medium SAND: light greyish brown. Well graded, subangular, pumicous. Core Loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLAY with some silt, light greyish brown with orange mottles. High plasticity, sensitive. Core Loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>ALUM</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>CLAY with some silt, light greyish brown with orange mottles. High plasticity, sensitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLAY with some silt, grey with orange mottles. High plasticity, sensitive. Core Loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>ALUM</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Silty CLAY: grey. High plasticity. Relict rock structure observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayey sandy SILT: light brownish grey. Low plasticity. Sand, fine to medium, poorly graded. Becomes grey with occasional black bands from 5.1 m depth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistency/Density is based on strength testing and diagnostic features.
**LOG OF BORING BH01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>SPT N-Value</th>
<th>Total Core Recovery (%)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Clayey sandy SILT; light brownish grey. Low plasticity. Sand, fine to medium, poorly graded. Relict rock structure encountered at 10.3 m depth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>SST</td>
<td>Highly weathered; grey fine to medium SANDSTONE; extremely weak. Recovered as clayey SAND.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With moderately thinly spaced, thin beds of SILTSTONE; grey from 11.85 m depth. Bedding is gently inclined. Very stiff to hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closely to moderately closely spaced, steepl to gently inclined fractures encountered at 12.45 m depth. Potentially drilling induced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very thin band of organics encountered at 12.97 m depth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>SLT</td>
<td>Moderately weathered, grey SILTSTONE; extremely weak. Recovered as silty CLAY, high plasticity, hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With steeply inclined, planar rough to undulating rough, clean, very narrow fractures from 14.05 m depth. Moderately closely to closely spaced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very thin band of organics encountered at 14.35 m depth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Becoming sandy from 14.7 m depth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>SST</td>
<td>Slightly to moderately weathered, grey, fine to medium SANDSTONE; extremely weak to very weak.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Becomes extremely weak, recovered as silty fine to medium SAND from 15.60 m depth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Becoming fine to coarse grained from 16.95 m depth and partially recovered as fine to coarse gravel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thin bed of grey SILTSTONE; extremely to very weak encountered from 14.47 to 14.60 m depth. Bedding is subhorizontal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very thin bed of grey SILTSTONE; extremely weak encountered at 17.95 m depth. Bedding is very steeply inclined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>SLT</td>
<td>Slightly to moderately weathered, grey, microfractured SILTSTONE; very weak. Recovered as fine to medium GRAVEL due to native discontinuities and drilling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End of Hole Depth: 19.95 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Termination: Target depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistency/Density is based on strength testing and diagnostic features.
## LOG OF BORING BH02

### Geotechnical Investigation
1 Cherrie Road
Beachlands
13729

### Client
Geoff & Amanda King

### Core Diameter
96 mm

### Hammer Efficiency
86%

### Hole Depth
19.95 m

### Drilling Method
Mud Rotary

### Drilling Contractor
Drill Force Ltd

### Latitude

### Longitude

### Application for approval under the Reserves Act 1977 and Conservation Act 1987 for a 30 year concession to build a seawall on Sunkist Bay Reserve

### Attachment E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>USCS Symbol</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Log Symbol</th>
<th>SPT N-Value</th>
<th>Water Level</th>
<th>Moisture</th>
<th>Consistency/ Density Index</th>
<th>Total Core Recovery (%)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>FILL</td>
<td>SILT with some sand and rootlets; dark brown. Low plasticity [TOPSOIL/FILL].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>CLAY</td>
<td>CLAY with trace sand; light grey, light orange and brown. High plasticity [FILL].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLAY with trace sand; light brown with orange mottles. High plasticity [FILL].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>FILL</td>
<td>Silty fine SAND; light grey to white. Poorly graded, subangular, dilatant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLAY with minor fine to medium sand; light brown. Low plasticity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organic CLAY; brown to dark brown. High plasticity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>FILL</td>
<td>Silty fine SAND; light grey to white. Poorly graded, subangular, dilatant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Silty fine to medium SAND; light greyish brown. Well graded, subangular, pumicous. Core Loss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>FILL</td>
<td>CLAY with some silt; light brown. High plasticity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>FILL</td>
<td>CLAY with some silt; grey with brown mottles. High plasticity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine to medium SAND with minor silt; grey. Well graded, subangular to subrounded. Core Loss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine to medium SAND with minor silt; grey. Well graded, subangular to subrounded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine to medium SAND with minor silt; grey. Well graded, subangular to subrounded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine to medium SAND with minor silt; grey. Well graded, subangular to subrounded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine to medium SAND with minor silt; grey. Well graded, subangular to subrounded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine to medium SAND with minor silt; grey. Well graded, subangular to subrounded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine to medium SAND with minor silt; grey. Well graded, subangular to subrounded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine to medium SAND with minor silt; grey. Well graded, subangular to subrounded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine to medium SAND with minor silt and occasional bands of CLAY; grey. Well graded, subangular to subrounded. Relict rock structure observed, bedding is moderately inclined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistency/Density is based on strength testing and diagnostic features.
**LOG OF BORING BH02**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>SST</td>
<td>Highly weathered, grey fine to medium SANDSTONE; extremely weak. Recovered as fine to medium SAND with minor silt and occasional bands of CLAY; grey. Well graded, subangular to subrounded. Relict rock structure observed, bedding is moderately inclined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>SLT</td>
<td>Slightly to moderately weathered, grey. SILTSTONE: extremely weak to very weak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>SILTSTONE: recovered as silty CLAY, high plasticity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>EAST COAST BAYS FORMATION</td>
<td>Moderately weathered, grey, fine to medium SANDSTONE; extremely weak. Recovered as fine to medium SAND with minor silt. Moderately inclined, very thin band of organics encountered at 14.75 m depth. Thin bed of moderately weathered, grey SILTSTONE, recovered as silty CLAY encountered at 15.2 m depth. Thin bed of moderately weathered, grey SILTSTONE, very weak encountered at 16.05 m depth. Thin bed of moderately weathered, grey SILTSTONE, very weak encountered at 17.06 m depth. With planar rough, moderately closely spaced, steeply inclined, very narrow, clean joints from 18.5 m depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End of Hole Depth: 19.95 m**

**Termination: Target depth**

Consistency/Density is based on strength testing and diagnostic features.
Application for approval under the Reserves Act 1977 and Conservation Act 1987 for a 30 year concession to build a seawall on Sunkist Bay Reserve

Attachment E

Item 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>06/04/2017</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Geoff and Amanda King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drawn by</td>
<td>KJL</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>1 Cherrie Road, Beachlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Core Photos: BH01 (0.0 m to 19.95 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ENGEIO Ref.</td>
<td>13729.000.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment E

Item 12

Please note the surface discolouration in core box 5 of BH02 is due to surficial weathering and occurred post-drilling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>06/04/2017</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Geoff and Amanda King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drawn by</td>
<td>KJL</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>1 Cherrie Road, Beachlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Core Photos: BH02 (0.0 m to 19.95 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale (approx.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ENGEO Ref.</td>
<td>13729.000.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kahawairahi Reserve, Beachlands

File No.: CP2018/11497

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Franklin Local Board for the concept design of the Kahawairahi Reserve; which will allow the developed design and consenting phase to proceed.
2. To seek approval from the Franklin Local Board to name the reserve ‘Kahawairahi Reserve’.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
3. A concept design has been completed for the development of a new reserve and playground in Kahawairahi Drive, Beachlands (refer attachment A).
4. Budget of $770,000.00 is available from growth funding for this development.
5. Public consultation, mana whenua and local board views have been sought and included as part of the development of the concept design.
6. This report seeks the board’s approval of the concept design which will allow developed design and consenting to then proceed.
7. Additionally the board is requested to approve the name ‘Kahawairahi Reserve’ as requested by local iwi.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) approves the concept design for Kahawairahi Reserve, allowing for the developed design, consenting and physical works phases to then proceed.

b) approves the naming of the reserve as ‘Kahawairahi Reserve’.

Horopaki / Context
8. Land has been acquired in Kahawairahi Drive in the Jack Lachlan subdivision, Beachlands, to allow for the provision of local play and recreation activities for the community.

9. The reserve fills a gap in the playground network in an area which is experiencing rapid growth from the recent completion of the subdivision and soon from other residential subdivisions in the vicinity nearing completion.

10. The development of the reserve connects existing and proposed greenways to link the Pine Harbour ferry terminal through to Beachlands.

11. The draft concept design was presented to the Franklin Local Board at a workshop 10 April 2018 which addressed the full reserve development including provision of play and recreation activities as well as linking the reserve to the wider greenways network.

12. The costs to deliver the full scope of the concept were over and above the available budget.

13. The board requested the following additional information to inform their decision making:
   - outline options for reducing scope of the concept to deliver within budget or
   - confirm sourcing of additional funding to meet the shortfall
   - consider opportunities to collaborate with the Pohutukawa Coast Trail Group
• detail the approach to litter management and a conversational seating solution for the youth area.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

14. Minor changes have been made to the design following the board workshop including:
   • changes to the ‘youth seating’ area adjacent the half court to a more informal style and arrangement of seating units
   • removal of rubbish bin but inclusion of ‘take rubbish home with you’ to reserve signage
   • addition of ‘rubberised cushion fall’ to part of the sand pit area to increase play activity options available for people with disabilities.

15. The concept plan has been circulated to the Pohutukawa Coast Trail project team to request feedback on potential synergies between the projects. While no additional budget is now required, there may still be opportunities for a coordinated signage strategy.

16. A planning assessment has picked up that the land has not been correctly zoned through the acquisition process meaning contrary to earlier advice a resource consent will be required for this development. This has been included in the project’s budget.

17. The consenting process will be managed in-house to help expedite the process which will assist in a timely delivery of the reserve.

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

18. Development of the reserve at Kahawairahi Drive will provide local play and recreation opportunities for this community.

19. The development of the reserve connects existing and proposed greenways to link the Pine Harbour ferry terminal through to Beachlands

20. This supports the following Franklin Local Board Plan outcomes:
   • Outcome 1: A well cared for environment
   • Outcome 4: Growth is dealt with effectively
   • Outcome 5: Communities feel ownership and connection to their area.

21. The draft concept design was presented to the Franklin Local Board at a workshop 10 April 2018 which addressed the full reserve development including provision of play and recreation activities as well as linking the reserve to the wider greenways network.

22. The board’s feedback from that workshop has been addressed – refer to paragraphs 12 and 13 above.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

23. Ngai Tai Kī Tamaki have been engaged through the design process and have offered the historic name ‘Kahawairahi’ for use as the reserve name providing a strong link to Māori heritage.

24. Development of the reserve includes a significant amount of native revegetation of the adjacent riparian zone helping with the preservation of native flora and fauna.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

25. Cost estimate for delivery of the Kahawairahi Reserve concept is $770,000.

26. The original budget approved in the 2017/2018 work programme was $585,000. The variation required for the full reserve development has been approved and the full budget of $770,000.00 is now available from growth funding to enable the project to commence.
27. Budget allocation over time and a breakdown of project cost estimates are provided in the tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$770,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost estimates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal management</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$668,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$770,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**
28. Identified project risks include:

- Risk of cost escalation arising from unanticipated delays in delivery; additional costs arising from unanticipated resource consent compliance conditions.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**
29. Following approval of the concept design by the local board the design will be finalised and consenting phase will proceed.
30. Handover to Project Delivery and procurement for physical works will follow the resource consent decision.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Kahawairahi Landscape Concept</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Timothy Keat - Senior Growth Development Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extension of existing road names for residential subdivision at 20 Eighth View Avenue and 84 Ninth View Avenue, Beachlands by New Avenues No 64A LP

File No.: CP2018/12590

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Franklin Local Board, for extending existing road names (Keshvara Road, Eighth View Avenue and Ninth View Avenue) for new sections of road created by way of subdivision at 20 Eighth View Avenue and 84 Ninth View Avenue in Beachlands.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the Council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across the Auckland Region.
3. The road names “Keshvara Road”, “Eighth View Avenue” and “Ninth View Avenue” had been previously approved and these new roads are an extension to those existing roads.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) approve the road names for the new sections of Keshvara Road, Eighth View Avenue and Ninth View Avenue as shown in Figure 1 in this report proposed by the applicant by way of subdivision at 20 Eighth View Avenue and 84 Eighth View Avenue on Beachlands in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974.

Horopaki / Context
4. The applicant has further developed the site at 20 Eighth View Avenue and 84 Ninth View Avenue in Beachlands creating residential vacant lots for development. The resource consent applications under which these subdivisions have been approved are BUN60082732 and SUB60318351.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
5. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect:
   - A historical or ancestral linkage to an area;
   - A particular landscape, environment or biodiversity theme or feature; or
   - An existing (or introduced) thematic identity in the area.
6. The Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines allowed that where a new road needs to be named as a result of a subdivision or development, the subdivider/developer shall be given the opportunity of suggesting their preferred new road name for the Local Board’s approval.
7. The road name extensions are deemed to meet the council’s road naming guidelines.
8. Following an assessment against the road naming criteria, the road name “Keshvara Road”, “Eighth View Avenue” and “Ninth View Avenue” (applicant’s preferred road names) was
determined to meet the road naming guideline criteria. The applicant is applying for a continuation of Keshvara Road, Eighth View Avenue and northern portion of Ninth View Avenue, approved by the Board under resolution number FR/2014/191 and FR/2015/142 respectively. It is noted that FR/2014/191 only approved the naming of southern portion of Ninth View Avenue road. As this applicant is only applying for an extension of existing road names serving the subdivision, no alternative names have been provided.

9. Local iwi groups were consulted as part of the initial road naming process for Eighth View Avenue, Ninth View Avenue and Keshvara Road.

10. The names proposed by the applicant, is considered for approval by the Local Board. (As repeated from above, there were no alternative names given as the applicant is applying for a continuation of Keshvara Road, Eighth View Avenue and Ninth View Avenue).

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

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

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

12. The applicant has previously corresponded with local iwi who has given their support for the names. This application is only for an extension to those roads with the approved names.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
13. The applicant has responsibility for ensuring that appropriate signage will be installed accordingly once approval is obtained for the road name extension.

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

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
15. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand who records them on their New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by councils.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>Figure 2 - Plan of approval of Ninth View Avenue Road</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Rayya Ali – Intermediate Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers | Trevor Cullen - Team Leader Subdivision  
Nina Siers - Relationship Manager |
Figure 2 – Plan for approval of Ninth View Avenue Road
New Road Name Approval for the residential subdivision at 1/141 – 6/141 Queen Street, Waiuku

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Franklin Local Board for a new road name for a private way created as part of a six lot subdivision at 1/141 – 6/141 Queen Street, Waiuku.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the Council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming for the Auckland Council.

3. The creation of this subdivision pre-dates the requirement for road naming of private ways serving six or more lots. Therefore on behalf of the homeowners, Emma Smith, has prepared the submission for road naming to Council.

4. The names were selected via ballot with the homeowners so all are in agreement with the selections. The names suggested by the homeowners for consideration of the private way at 1/141 – 6/141 Queen Street, Waiuku are:

   - Meadowview Close
   - Brooklea Close
   - Sunset Lane (not considered acceptable by LINZ)

5. Local iwi groups were consulted and Ngati Te Ata has proposed the following name:

   - Waka tiwae Lane

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) consider for approval the new road names, ‘Meadowview Close’, ‘Brooklea Close’ and ‘Waka tiwae Lane’ for the private way created by way of subdivision at 1/141 – 6/141 Queen Street, Waiuku, pursuant to section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974.

Horopaki / Context
6. The Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines allow that where a new road needs to be named as a result of a subdivision or development, the subdivider/developer shall be given the opportunity of suggesting their preferred new road name for the Local Board's approval.

8. The residential six lot subdivision is served by a short private way (less than 250.0m) accessed off Queen Street, Waiuku. The subdivision is largely developed with only one vacant site left. A numbering system is currently being used, for example 1/141 - 6/141, but the landowners wish to name their private way. Note that an adjoining site at 141 Queen Street, Waiuku (Lot 1 DP 392365) will also have use of the private way, so there will be seven (7) users.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

9. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect:

- A historical or ancestral linkage to an area:
- A particular landscape, environment or biodiversity theme or feature; or
- An existing (or introduced) thematic identity in the area.

The applicant has proposed the following names for consideration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Proposed New Road Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Name</td>
<td>Meadowview Close</td>
<td>For the outlook all properties have onto the meadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Sunset Lane</td>
<td>For the spectacular sunsets over Karioitahi Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Brooklea Close</td>
<td>For the surrounding water ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi Suggestion</td>
<td>Waka tiwai Lane</td>
<td>Suggested as these were the waka used regularly by Ngati Te Ata (and other) iwi to move people and their belongings up and down the ‘Awaroa ki Manuka waterway’ that connects the Waikato River to the Manukau Harbour, this being the main highway back in the old times. The lower end of Queen Street coming onto Otaua-waiuku Road sits within that catchment. The Waka tiwai is still used today for recreational purposes at the Turangawaewae regatta by Waikato iwi. It is a smaller vessel in size compared to the regular sized waka.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By way of background the applicants have chosen names that reflect the landscape features in the vicinity of the subdivision, and the iwi have chosen a name that reflects the ancestral linkage to the area.

10. The proposed suffixes ‘Lane’ or ‘Close’ are considered appropriate as they accurately describe the characteristics of the private way which is a short enclosed roadway.

11. The relevant iwi groups were consulted and a response was received from Ngati Te Ata suggesting Waka tiwai as a preferred name.

12. The proposed names were sent to LINZ for feedback, and the address specialist advised that ‘Sunset Lane’ was not unique, but confirmed that the remaining names were good to use.

13. As the applicant’s suggested name Meadowview Close meets the criteria, it is recommended for consideration for approval while noting that the alternative names
Brooklea Close and Waka tiwai Lane are also appropriate as they comply with all the criteria of the road naming guidelines.

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

14. The decision sought from the Franklin Local Board for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate impact on the community.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

15. The applicant has consulted with local iwi and a response was received from Ngati Te Ata in support of the name ‘Waka tiwai Lane’. No other responses were received.

16. The decision sought from the Franklin Local Board on this report is linked to the Auckland Plan Outcome, “A Maori identity that is Auckland’s point of difference in the world”. The use of Maori names for roads, buildings and other public places is an opportunity to publicly demonstrate Maori identity.

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

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

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

18. There are no significant risks to council as road naming is a routine part of the subdivision development process with consultation being a key part of the process.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

19. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand who records them on their New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by councils.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Locality Plan</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Scheme Plan</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Lesley Wood - Intermediate Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers             | Trevor Cullen - Team Leader Subdivision  
                          | Nina Siers - Relationship Manager |
Attachment A: Locality Plan (Subject sites outlined in red)
Attachment B: Scheme Plan (S142349)

Note Lot 1 DP 392365 will also use the private way
New Private Way Names Approval for the subdivision at 238 – 250 Whitford Park Road, Whitford by Estate of D.M. Arlington

File No.: CP2018/12715

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Franklin Local Board for new road naming for three private ways on the subdivision approved at 238 – 250 Whitford Park Road, Whitford by Estate of D.M. Arlington.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the Council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across the Auckland Region.
3. The Applicant has submitted the following names for consideration for the new private way A, B and C at 238 and 250 Whitford Park Road, Whitford:
   - **Private Way A**
     - (a) Saracen Way – preferred name
       - Alan Frederick Way – first alternate name
   - **Private Way B**
     - (b) Persimmon Place – preferred name
       - Fig Tree Way – first alternate name
   - **Private Way C**
     - (c) Chukka Grove – preferred name
       - Regal Park Grove – alternate name

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) approves the names Saracen Way for private way A, Persimmon Place for private way B and Chukka Grove for private way C created by way of the subdivision at 238-250 Whitford Park Road, Whitford in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974.

Horopaki / Context
4. The application site had been approved for 18 lot rural-residential subdivision and four access lots from enhancement planting, including bulk earthworks under resource consent 51707 (BUN60081820) on 5 July 2017.
5. The roads (Private Way) A & B require names and they serve more than 6 lots. The applicant would also like to name private way C in order to keep it within the subdivision naming theme since the prior roads are named.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

6. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect:
   - A historical or ancestral linkage to an area;
   - A particular landscape, environment or biodiversity theme or feature; or
   - An existing (or introduced) thematic identity in the area.

7. The Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines allow that where a new road needs to be named as a result of a subdivision or development, the subdivider/developer shall be given the opportunity of suggesting their preferred new road name/s for the Local Board’s approval.

8. The applicant has proposed the following names for consideration for each of the private ways approved at 238 – 250 Whitford Park Road, Whitford.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Proposed New Road Name – Private Way A</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Preference</td>
<td>Saracen Way</td>
<td>Owner played on polo team with this name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Alan Frederick Way</td>
<td>Owner Name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Proposed New Road Name – Private Way B</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Preference</td>
<td>Persimmon Place</td>
<td>Grown on property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Fig Tree Way</td>
<td>Grown on property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Proposed New Road Name – Private Way C</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Preference</td>
<td>Chukka Grove</td>
<td>Huge native bush in direct line with this road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Regal Park Grove</td>
<td>Links to polo and history of royal family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The proposed suffix of ‘Place, Grove and Way’ is deemed acceptable as it accurately describes the characteristics of the private way being a cul-de-sac at the end.

10. The names proposed by the Applicant are deemed to meet the road naming guidelines.

11. The owners, Alan Fredrick Arlington and Diana Margaret Arlington, have been contributing members to the local community for many years. The history of their past commitments including volunteer work undertaken can be found in attachment B of this report.

12. The applicant consulted the local iwi and a response was received from Ngai Tai KI Tamaki that they endorse and support the names proposed therein. The Ngai Tai KI Tamaki representative confirmed the area although important is not culturally significant.

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

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

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

12. The applicant has previously consulted with local iwi who have given their support for the names.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

13. The applicant has responsibility for ensuring that appropriate signage will be installed accordingly once approval is obtained for the new road name.
Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
14. There are no significant risks to Council as road naming is a routine part of the subdivision development process with consultation being a key part of the process.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
15. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand who records them on their New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by Councils.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Email with updated private way name preference</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>History of Alan Frederick Arlington and Diana Margaret Arlington</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rayya Ali – Intermediate Planner</td>
<td>Trevor Cullen - Team Leader Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good morning Rayya,

As per our discussions last night can we please confirm the following:

- Persimmon Place — Road B
- Chukka Grove — Road C
- Saracen Way — Road A

Again thank you for working with us.

Chey Barnes
Senior Construction Manager

---

**McKENZIE&CO CONSULTANTS LTD**

We help to develop great places and people

**M** 027 666 6924   **P** 09 320 5707  **O** Level 1, 2 Osterley Way, Manukau, 2104
**P** P O Box 259-309, Botany 2163, Manukau, Auckland
**www.mckenzieandco.co.nz**

NOTICE: This e-mail is intended to be read by the named recipient only. It may contain information that is confidential, proprietary or the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately and delete this e-mail. You may not use any information contained in it. Legal privilege is not waived because you have read this e-mail. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not represent those of McKenzie & Co Consultants Ltd.

---

From: Rayya Ali <rayya.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 9 July 2018 4:07 PM
To: Chey Barnes <chey@mckenzieandco.co.nz>
Cc: Roger Low <Roger.Low@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>; Trevor Cullen <Trevor.Cullen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Road Naming for subdivision application 51707

Hi Chey,

I have just been going through the proposed private way names and assessing them against LINZ Road naming database.

- Arlington street already exists in the Waterview area
- Frederick Road/Way/Street also exists in multiple locations around Auckland
  * Alan Frederick Way is a long name.
- Falmouth Street is located in Murray’s Bay area.
- Diana Avenue/Place/Drive exist in multiple locations across Auckland
  * Diana Margaret Mews is a long name but otherwise no conflict.
- Fig Tree Lane already exists in Mill Water.
The following names are acceptable and do not exist in LINZ database for the Auckland region:

- Persimmon
- Chukka
- Saracen

Any of the above could be used for the Private Ways. Due to your clients prior preference for Arlington Fields Way and Diana Margaret Mews, we request that your client reconsider these preferences.

For any other road name suggestions, I would have to re-check against the database, revise the report and try to get it accepted by the Local Board contact person for the July meeting. If it is not practicable to do so in time for acceptance on the Local Board Agenda, the report will have to be deferred for consideration until the August meeting.

Kind regards,

Rayya Ali | Intermediate Planner
Auckland Council | Southern Resource Consent
Mob: 021 809 9201 Email: rayya.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Auckland Council, Level 3, Kotuku House, 4 Osterley Way, Manukau
Visit our website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

---

From: Chey Barnes [mailto:chey@mckenzieandco.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 9 July 2018 3:18 p.m.
To: Rayya Ali
Cc: Amber Shine
Subject: Re: Road naming for subdivision application 51707

Ok can I have an answer for you tomorrow or will this be too late?

Sent from mobile

On 9/07/2018, at 3:17 PM, Rayya Ali <rayya.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz> wrote:

Hi Chey,

If we want to include these names in the July meeting, I suggest you send shorter names for the private way. Alternatively, if you can consult LINZ, then we can include it in the August local board meeting.

Kind regards,

Rayya Ali | Intermediate Planner
Auckland Council | Southern Resource Consent
Mob: 021 809 9201 Email: rayya.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Auckland Council, Level 3, Kotuku House, 4 Osterley Way, Manukau
Visit our website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Hi Rayya,

All names were cleared by NZ post as per correspondent required

This has been the process used previously. Please advise if we need to consult with LINZ and I will do so accordingly and you can add this to your report

Sent from mobile

On 9/07/2018, at 2:27 PM, Rayya Ali <rayya.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz> wrote:

Hi Amber,

I understand that Chey is away on training today. Could you please respond to the email below on his behalf.

Alternatively, we can include the road naming report in the Franklin Local Board meeting in August after consultation with Land Information New Zealand as it is required.

Please let me know.

Thanks.

Kind regards,

Rayya Ali  |  Intermediate Planner
Auckland Council  |  Southern Resource Consent
Mob: 021 809 920  |  Email: rayya.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Auckland Council, Level 3, Kotuku House, 4 Osterley Way, Manukau
Visit our website:  www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Hi Chey,

I have been in discussion with the senior subdivision advisors regarding the preferred names. Just in terms of the names provided, have you had any consultation with LINZ?

Furthermore, the following names are considered to be too long for the
private way:

A
Arlington Fields Place
Alan Frederick Way
Falmouth Bay Place

B
Diana Margaret Mews

Please provide shorter names for private ways to be considered as soon as possible in order for it to be considered in the July Local Board meeting.

Note: Arlington Street already exist on LINZ road naming system.

Thanks.

Kind regards,

Rayya Ali  | Intermediate Planner
Auckland Council  | Southern Resource Consent
Mob: 021 809 920 1 Email: rayya.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Auckland Council, Level 3, Kotuku House, 4 Osterley Way, Manukau
Visit our website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

---

From: Chey Barnes [mailto:chey@mckenzieandco.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 29 June 2018 9:15 a.m.
To: Rayya Ali
Cc: cforsyth@xtra.co.nz; 'Revel Arlington'
Subject: FW: FW: Road Naming for subdivision application 51707

Hi Rayya,

Thanks for working through this with us so thoroughly and promptly, it is appreciated! All replies below in red for consideration.

A
Arlington Fields Place
Alan Frederick Way
Falmouth Bay Place

B
Diana Margaret Mews
Fig Tree Way
Persimmon Place

C
Chukka Grove - huge native bush in direct line with this road
Saracen Way
Regal Park Grove

---
We look forward to the outcome of the hearing.

Chey Barnes  
Senior Construction Manager

Bsurv  
<image001.png>
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NOTICE: This e-mail is intended to be read by the named recipient only. It may contain information that is confidential, proprietary or the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately and delete this e-mail. You may not use any information contained in it. Legal privilege is not waived because you have read this e-mail. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not represent those of McKenzie & Co Consultants Ltd.

From: Rayya Ali <rayya.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>  
Sent: Thursday, 28 June 2018 10:13 PM  
To: Chey Barnes <chey@mckenzieandco.co.nz>  
Subject: Road Naming for subdivision application 51707  
Importance: High

Hi Chey,

As discussed on the phone, please find attached the road naming guidelines that are relevant to your application. Please note road names ending with the following are most appropriate for the private way:

- Close
- Court
- Place
- Way

Please let me know your preferred names by tomorrow.

Thanks Chey.

Kind regards,

Rayya Ali | Intermediate Planner  
Auckland Council | Southern Resource Consent  
Mob: 021 809 920 | Email: rayya.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz  
Auckland Council, Level 3, Kotuku House, 4 Osterley Way, Manukau  
Visit our website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.
Alan Frederick and Diana Margaret Arlington

“Mick and Di” as they were known moved to Whitford in 1964 when the roads were still gravel. They came from East Tamaki and they had a family business in Otahuhu which was a tannery. They were founding members of Papatoetoe Pony Club, past President, life members and the club began on their land. In the late 60s they were part of a group of 4 who lent money interest free to the club to buy their land in Flat Bush where the club remained for many years. Papatoetoe Pony Club later sold that land at a vast profit to move to Brookby where they have established the best pony club in NZ and a secure future for generations. In the early seventies the Arlingtons then began Whitford Pony Club on their farmland and later this moved to council land behind the War Memorial before purchasing the grounds that it still occupies today again with assistance from the Arlingtons in securing the land and fundraising for the mortgage. They were life members of Whitford Pony Club and Diana began the Riding for the Disabled at Whitford and volunteered for most of her life weekly till she was unable to do so and it moved to Totara Park. They were life members of Whitford Pony Club. They also were very involved in Pakuranga Hunt and were life members for the years of volunteering.

They both were very early in volunteering to the neighbourhood crime watch using their own vehicle once a week to drive the area - this continues to this day with a vehicle provided but back then there were no mobile phones so no idea what they did to report crime if they came across it.

They offered and shared their home to many including local Howick schools and kindergartens coming out for school day trips to meet all the animals that were on site such as pet sheep, ducks, chickens, guinea fowl, geese and of course given pony rides - something that most didn’t experience otherwise.

The Arlingtons could be relied on in the community to help out with most local fundraisers and were heavily involved in all things equestrian all over NZ not just in Whitford.
**Auckland Transport monthly update**

**File No.:** CP2018/11889

---

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

1. To provide an update to the Franklin Local Board on transport-related matters in their area, including the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) and projects.

**Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary**

2. The Franklin Local Board currently has five LBTCF proposals underway. Construction was completed on the Waiuku pavers upgrade last month, and construction is well-advanced and nearing completion on three others (Beachlands gardens upgrade, and new kerb and channel in both First and Second View Avenues).

3. The increased LBTCF funding approved by Auckland Council became available on 1 July. There is now $1,197,240 available in the current political term for local transport projects in the Franklin area.

4. In response to Franklin Local Board resolutions, Auckland Transport is developing a public transport promotional campaign for Pukekohe but proposes it is practical to wait until August so the combined enhancements of the new overbridge and the improved rail timetable from 12 August can be bundled together for the campaign. Auckland Transport has also engaged Traffic Engineering Solutions to carry out an independent review of the rural road signs that have been installed in the Franklin Local Board area.

5. At Pukekohe station, the new over-bridge is due for completion in late July with a phased opening.

6. Auckland Transport is proposing to standardise the colour of street name blades and general information signs across the Auckland Council area.

7. Auckland Transport consulted the Franklin Local Board on two proposals in its area in the last month.

**Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s**

That the Franklin Local Board:

a) receives the report entitled ‘Auckland Transport update to the Franklin Local Board – July 2018’.

---

**Horopaki / Context**

8. Auckland Transport is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. Auckland Transport reports on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.

9. This report addresses transport-related matters in the local board area and includes information on the status of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) and LBTCF projects.

10. The LBTCF is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council and delivered by Auckland Transport. Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport...
infrastructure projects that they believe are important but are not part of Auckland Transport’s work programme.

11. Any LBTCF projects selected must be safe; must not impede network efficiency; and must be located in the road corridor or on land controlled by Auckland Transport (though projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
Local Board Transport Capital Fund

12. The Franklin Local Board’s transport capital fund to date is summarised below. Increased LBTCF funding has been approved by Auckland Council, for the 2018/19 and subsequent financial years, which became available on 1 July. The amount approved for the Franklin Local Board is now included in the financial summary table below.

Franklin Local Board transport capital fund financial summary:

| Funds available in current political term (includes 2019/20 FY) | $2,856,450 |
| Amount committed to date on projects approved for design and/or construction | $1,659,210 |
| Remaining budget (from 2019/20 FY so not required to be allocated by the end of the current political term) | $1,197,240 |

13. The Board’s current or recently completed LBTCF projects are included in the table below (NB: ROC = rough order of costs, and FEC = firm estimate of cost):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Progress/Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 443 | Upgrade of Beachlands town centre gardens  
  • FEC estimate of $279,396 (for hardwood)  
  • Spend to date = $164,923 | • On 6-Jun-17, the Board approved construction, based on hardwood FEC.  
  • Construction in progress.  
  Latest update:  
  • The contractor is currently working on the two gardens on the western side in front of the main shops. The gardens on the eastern side are 95% complete (just planting and seat arm rest to complete).  
  • The contractor is expecting to complete the project by the middle of July.  
  • See photos taken on 10 July at Attachment A. |
| 516 | Waiuku pavers upgrade, Stage 2  
  • ROC estimate of $505,000  
  • Spend to date = $498,567 | • On 6-Jun-17, the Board approved the project for construction based on the estimate of $505,000.  
  • Construction was complete apart from 100m² in Kitchener Road, as further pavers had to be imported from China.  
  Latest update:  
  • Further pavers arrived and construction was completed in June.  
  • Final costs to be reported. |
| 518 | First View Avenue, Beachlands – installation of new kerb and channel between Sunkist Bay and Wakelin Roads (both sides)  
  • FEC estimate of $347,097  
  • Spend to date = $421,109* (*will be corrected as incorrectly includes AT footpath cost) | • On 28-Nov-17, the Board approved the project for construction based on the estimate of $347,097.  
  • Construction in progress.  
  Latest update:  
  • The contractor has completed a majority of the work for this project, including the footpath being installed by AT. Remaining items to |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 17</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **519** Second View Avenue, Beachlands – installation of new kerb and channel between Puriri and Cherrie Roads (north side)  
- FEC estimate of $340,000  
- Spend to date = $282,495 | complete are reinstatement of the berm/vehicle crossings, road sweeping and road marking.  
- Final corrected cost to be reported.  
- On 28-Nov-17, the Board approved the project for construction based on the estimate of $340,000.  
- Construction in progress.  
**Latest update:**  
- The contractor has completed the majority of the work for this project. Remaining items to complete are reinstatement of the berm/vehicle crossings, road sweeping and road marking.  
- Final cost to be reported. |
| **520** Pukekohe Flagtrax – proposed installation on existing streetlights in Pukekohe  
- ROC estimate of $147,000 (based on an estimated 150 units)  
- Spend to date = $6,770 |  
- On 6-Jun-17, the Board approved the project for detailed design and costings, based on the estimate of $147,000 for 150 FlagTrax units.  
- An inventory of poles has been compiled. This this for the loop road around the Pukekohe CBD that has 154 poles.  
- AT’s Streetlighting team has given further consideration to the proposal and does not support the installation of Flagtrax on AT assets.  
**Latest update:**  
- A meeting was held in early May between AT and a Board representative to discuss other options.  
- A follow-up meeting will be scheduled, but awaits AT getting a structural assessment of all existing lightpoles within the ring road currently without banner arms, to determine whether they could be fitted with them.  
- AT is having significant issues finding an already-contracted structural engineer available to undertake this work. |

**Responses to resolutions**

14. At its 5 June business meeting, the Franklin Local Board passed the resolution below:

**Resolution number FR/2018/71**

*That the Franklin Local Board:*

a) request that Auckland Transport plan a new public transport promotional campaign for the Pukekohe area once the new overbridge is opened, to ensure that potential users are aware of the improved facilities.

15. With the increased frequency to the Pukekohe train timetable coming on 12 August, shortly after the new overbridge is expected to open in late July, Auckland Transport proposes it is more practical to wait until August so the combined enhancements of the new overbridge and the improved rail timetable can be bundled together for the campaign.

16. At this stage, Auckland Transport is looking at bus back advertising and digital advertising specific to the area, but is still working this through. The promotion will be in line with the existing ‘Go Metro’ campaign. Further details will be provided when the concept has been refined further.

17. At its 26 June business meeting, the Franklin Local Board passed the resolution below:
Resolution number FR/2018/96
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) requests Auckland Transport to urgently audit the installation, placement and size of the chevron and other safety signs installed in the Franklin Local Board area, as part of the Rural Road Signage and Delineation project.

18. Auckland Transport has engaged Traffic Engineering Solutions to carry out an independent review of the signs that have been installed in the Franklin Local Board area. Once the review has been completed, remedial action will be undertaken to remedy any signs that have been incorrectly installed.

19. At its 17 November 2017 business meeting, the Franklin Local Board passed the resolution below:

Resolution number FR/2017/71
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) request that Auckland Transport expedite completion of the Comprehensive Parking Management Plan and parking survey for Pukekohe, in order that current and projected car parking requirements can be ascertained in light of the town’s growth and to inform decisions on proposed disposals of car parking land.

20. The parking survey had been completed and the final report has been drafted by a consultant. Auckland Transport met with the consultant on 12 June, and is seeking further information on and clarification of some of the assumptions that went into the assessment.

21. While Auckland Transport did not set a date for receipt of that further information, the consultant understands the priority of this task. It is therefore expected the final report should be completed within a few weeks.

22. At its 24 April business meeting, the Franklin Local Board passed the resolution below in respect of the Pukekohe station building:

Resolution number FR/2018/48
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) request Auckland Transport to commission a full building investigation/structural report on the old station building and, if the building is deemed possible to relocate, also estimated costs for both relocating the building and reinstating it on a new site with upgrades as necessary to comply with building code standards.

23. Auckland Transport has received a quote from GHD to undertake an initial investigation and has been in discussions to confirm the inspection scope and price. Additional quotes may also be sought. Further information will also be collated to help inform a ballpark relocation cost, including relocation costs for the old Parnell and Papakura station buildings.

24. As no relocation site has been identified, the assumption will be to relocate the building to a level site with all the services available and linked in (water, plumbing, electricity, sewage). However, it will be useful if a relocation site can be identified.

25. It is expected that the investigation should be completed in the first quarter of 2018/19 (i.e. by the end of September).

Local projects and activities

Pukekohe Station project update
26. The scope of works for Stage 2 of the station upgrade project includes a new six-bay bus station, a new 87-space park-and-ride, a new over-bridge with lifts linking the rail and bus stations, customer toilets and bus shelters, bicycle parking, new ticket machines on the bus
station side, and improved rail platforms with the removal of timber decks and replacement with concrete and asphalt.

27. The new over-bridge is due for completion late July with a phased opening. The Station Road side was opened and connected with the rail platform on Tuesday 10 July after receiving Building Control approval. The next Block of Line (BOL) is scheduled for 14-15 July, during which the old KiwiRail ramp will be lifted out and the remaining platform surfacing completed during the following few nights. Between the BOL and 26 July, Downer plans to complete the stairwell on the bus station side and open it to public. This is subject to Council granting the required Certificate for Public Use as well.

28. An issue arose with the new Exeloo as the flush not functioning satisfactorily. A remedial proposal to connect a larger pipe was unsuccessful and therefore the permanent toilets are still not operational. Auckland Transport’s designers have developed an option to install a retention tank with pump behind the bus shelter and are just finalising details. These are off the shelf items and provide the quickest solution. Concurrently, Auckland Transport is investigating the option to increase the size of the water meter as a longer term fix, which is subject to Watercare approval.

29. From Stage 1 of the project, an agreement for land purchase has been reached with owners of 99 Manukau Road but not yet processed. This is where Auckland Transport will purchase the strip of footpath in front of the shops to allow the installation of five car parks. The timeline for construction is not yet finalised.

30. For more information on the project, visit at.govt.nz/pukekohestation.

Road Safety investment for Franklin

31. An overview of road safety and speed management initiatives and proposals in the Franklin Local Board area in the coming three years is included as Attachment D. This will be followed by a workshop with the Board on 31 July to present and discuss local proposals for 2018/19 in detail.

Regional road signage changes

32. As part of the new regional signage suite that Auckland Transport is rolling out with its Transport Design Manual, Auckland Transport is proposing to standardise the colour of street name blades and general information signs across the Auckland Council area.

33. The summary of changes is detailed at Attachment B. The objective is to have consistent signage across Auckland.

34. The new street name signs will have a blue background with white letters. The blue background is used on other road signage and is a standard colour approved for use within the road corridor. The new general information signs will have a white background with blue letters.

35. Legacy Franklin and Papakura District signs also used a blue background with white lettering, while legacy Manukau and Auckland City signs used a green background with white lettering.

36. Auckland Transport will start using the new sign specifications from 1 July 2018. The rollout will occur progressively as existing signs need replacing or new signs are erected, meaning there will be no additional cost outlay.

Other transport news

New Network for the central suburbs

37. On Sunday 8 July 2018, Auckland Transport launched a new bus network for Auckland’s central suburbs. Most current services have changed, including bus routes, route numbers, timetables and some bus stops.
38. These changes are part of a simpler, more frequent and integrated public transport network that is being implemented for the whole of Auckland by the end of 2018, having begun with the New Network for South Auckland and Pukekohe/Waiuku in October 2016.

39. Franklin residents travelling into the central city by either car or rail and then catching a bus (such as the City, Inner and Outer Link services), will need to check for changes to those routes. Included at Attachment C is the new city centre route map.

40. Detailed information including maps and timetables are available on the Auckland Transport website: AT.govt.nz/newnetworkcentral

**Infringement notices for fare evasion on public transport**

41. From 18 June, Transport Officers can now issue infringement notices to passengers who fail to tag on with their AT HOP card or buy a ticket to use public transport. Offenders will face infringement fees of $150, or a fine of up to $500 if they choose to go to court rather than pay the infringement fee.

42. Changes to the Land Transport Act provided powers to Transport Officers on Auckland’s public transport network, and regulations that came into force on June 18 now enable the issue of infringement notices.

43. Fare evasion costs Auckland $2-$3 million a year, putting an extra burden on ratepayers and taxpayers – who already subsidise around half the cost of public transport fares.

44. Transport Officers hold a warrant from the Commissioner of Police as enforcement officers, and began working on the train network late last year, and are currently on the Western and Onehunga Lines. As Auckland Transport recruits more staff, they will begin to work on other services as well.

45. More than 90% of people who travel on public transport pay for it with an AT HOP card. Those without an AT HOP card can purchase one at any of Auckland Transport’s customer service centres or at one of the 150 AT HOP retailers around Auckland.

**Te reo Māori announcements on Auckland trains**

46. The first Auckland train service to have te reo Māori announcements left Britomart Station on 25 June for Onehunga, and since then all Auckland train services have te reo announcements, which was timed to coincide with Matariki.

47. This is the first stage in the te reo on public transport programme, and features the main safety announcements and the beginning and mid-point of the journey. The next stage will include an enhancement of the current messages in te reo throughout the journey.

48. The introduction of Māori language on trains is Auckland Transport’s contribution to Auckland Council’s Māori Language Policy. This policy recognises te reo Māori as a cultural treasure and an official language of New Zealand and our point of difference in the world.

49. The announcements have been recorded by actor and television presenter Miriama Smith.

**Safety improvements at Papatoetoe Station**

50. Franklin residents are advised that Auckland Transport is permanently closing the two pedestrian crossings across the tracks at Papatoetoe Station to make it safer for customers.

51. Auckland Transport is closing pedestrian crossings at stations where a safer alternative can be provided. This is one of many Auckland Transport initiatives to keep people safe, especially school children who regularly cross the tracks at Papatoetoe.

52. A new path is being opened through the park (off Station Road) connecting the existing park and ride area to the footbridge entrance adjacent to Station Road. Later in the year, a new stair access will also be put in adjacent to Shirley Road to make it easier to get to the station.
53. Papatoetoe will also soon have electronic ticket gates installed, as will Middlemore, Parnell, Papakura and Glen Innes. Electronic gates are already in place at Britomart, Newmarket, New Lynn, Manukau, Henderson, Ōtāhuhu and Manurewa stations.

**More Aucklanders choosing active transport**

54. According to Auckland Transport’s latest Active Modes Research, 38% of Aucklanders are riding bikes in 2018. That is up three percentage points on last year, with 518,000 Aucklanders now riding regularly or occasionally.

55. People are riding bikes more frequently in west and central Auckland, where infrastructure has improved.

56. Active Modes Research shows:

- 38% of Aucklanders are riding bikes in 2018, up three points on 2017.
- 69% of bike riders are stopping to visit shops, cafes and run errands on their way to their destination.
- 68% are walking for 10 minutes or more, at least twice a week (the same as 2017) to public transport, the shops or to run errands.
- Most Aucklanders who take public transport will walk up to 20 minutes to get to a bus, train or ferry – 63% of these trips are less than 15 minutes.
- 74% of those walking are motivated by keeping active.
- Aucklanders are using their cars less often, with 66% using their cars once a week or more, down three points on 2017.

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

57. Auckland Transport provides the Franklin Local Board with the opportunity to comment on transport projects being delivered in the local board area.

58. The local board’s views on any proposed schemes are taken into account during consultation on those proposals.

**Auckland Transport consultations**

59. Consultation documents for the following proposals have been provided to the Franklin Local Board for its feedback. The proposals are summarised below, as is any feedback received, and any responses to that feedback, if available at the time of writing.

60. Following public and stakeholder consultation, Auckland Transport considers the feedback received and determines whether to proceed further with the proposal as consulted on, or proceed with an amended proposal if changes are considered necessary.

61. **Proposed pedestrian refuges, ‘No Stopping At All Times’ (NSAAT) parking restrictions, bus stop relocation and new bus shelter, Beachlands Road and Bell Road, Beachlands** – in response to public requests for improved pedestrian facilities at this intersection, Auckland Transport is proposing to install new pedestrian refuges on both Beachlands and Bell Roads, NSAATs around the intersection supporting safe use of these facilities, slight eastwards relocation of an existing bus stop near the site, and a bus shelter at the new bus stop location.

62. The Board was concerned at the impact of the extent of NSAATs proposed and the traffic islands on the adjacent fire station. The Board requested Auckland Transport to make direct contact with the fire brigade to discuss its concerns. A meeting has subsequently been arranged for 12 July.

63. **Proposed pedestrian refuges and new footpath, Reynolds Road and Eastside Drive, Pupekohe** – in order to provide an alternative crossing location for pedestrians on Reynolds Road, Auckland Transport is proposing to install new pedestrian refuges on Reynolds Road and Eastside Drive, new footpath and kerb and channel on Reynolds Road linking the two.
refuges, a new manhole and catchpits, and new road markings and signage to support the refuges.

64. Given previous heavy vehicle design issues with the nearby roundabout at the Reynolds Road/Valley Road intersection, the Board requested that Auckland Transport use a truck on site to check that the proposed refuge on Reynolds Road is navigable by heavy vehicles, rather than relying on desktop tracking models. The Board advised that a vehicle has been offered by local transport operators.

65. Auckland Transport has agreed to carry out a live tracking exercise on this particular project to ensure that heavy vehicle tracking will not be compromised by the refuge island, which will be carried out at the detail design stage. Auckland Transport requested contact details for the local transport operator/s who offered to assist.

Traffic Control Committee (TCC) resolutions
66. Resolutions passed by the TCC during the month of June 2018 affecting the Franklin Local Board area are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/s (Suburb)</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Nature Of Restriction</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factory Road, Belmont Road, Pollock Road, Rainsford Road, Perla Road, Olivia Road, Parton Road, Taepu Road (Pukekohe)</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times, Traffic Island, Give-Way Control, Edge Lines</td>
<td>Approved in Principle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
67. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no impacts or opportunities for Māori. Any engagement with Māori, or consideration of impacts and opportunities, will be carried out on an individual project basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
68. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no financial implications.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
69. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no risks.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
70. Auckland Transport will provide another update report to the local board next month
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Attachment A

Beachlands gardens upgrade
Progress photos taken 10 July 2018
Traffic summary of changes

This summary highlights changes the new regional signage system has introduced into AT’s Code of Practice (ATCOP) for traffic signage in the Auckland road corridor.

Changes have been made to create a more consistent and legible set of rules.
### Key changes

**Colour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street name signs</td>
<td>White text on Green</td>
<td>White text on Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great North Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totara Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blue street name signs will provide consistency with the rest of the regional signage suite and will also mean our guide signs (which need to contrast with street name signs) will match NZTA’s highway guide signs providing more consistency for the driver.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advance direction signs</th>
<th>Top section (street name section) White text on Green</th>
<th>Top section (street name section) White text on Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great North Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totara Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Font**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street name signs</td>
<td>Gotham Highway Modified series E</td>
<td>Transport Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great North Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great North Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reptile Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Transport” font provides a more modern look than Gotham Highway and is approved by the NZ Transport Agency for this use. Transport appeared more legible in our tests and allows one more character per blade, reducing the number of times font compression or mid-mounting signs will be required.

**Depth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street name signs</td>
<td>225mm for local and collector roads 250mm for arterial roads and national routes</td>
<td>200mm for local and collector roads 250mm for arterial roads and national routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totara Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Totara Ave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legibility appears to be the same for 225mm vs 200mm deep blades, but there may be some cost savings by specifying 200mm blades and as these can be made longer than 225mm blade. This will reduce the number of times font compression or mid-mounting signs will be required.

**Impacts**

The change should produce positive benefits for visibility and clarity for all signs in Auckland and the change can be applied to all signs as maintenance or capital upgrades occur. There is little change in cost to produce and in some instances, local road signs may be cheaper to procure.
Auckland Transport’s Road Safety and Speed Management programme for Franklin Local Board area 2018-21

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To update the Franklin Local Board on Auckland Transport’s (AT) Road Safety and Speed Management Programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Auckland has a serious problem with people needlessly dying and being seriously injured on our roads and streets. In 2017, 64 people died on Auckland roads and an additional 749 were seriously injured.

3. Road Safety performance in the Franklin Local Board area has also worsened over the last five years due to various factors. These include economic and population growth, new demands on the unforgiving high-speed rural road network, and growth in vulnerable road users. Vulnerable road users are people walking, people on bikes, people on motorcycles, children and older road users.

4. There is a renewed focus among the Tāmaki Makaurau Road Safety partners including AT, NZ Police, the NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) and the Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC) on improving safety and reducing the high number of death and serious injuries (DSI) on the Auckland road network.

5. To meet its long-term goal of Vision Zero, AT is also proposing an ambitious safety infrastructure acceleration programme estimated to reduce DSI by around 20% over an initial three-year period. It will work closely with its partners to deliver on the Vision Zero goal for Auckland.

6. This follows the New Zealand’s Government’s commitment to deliver a new road safety strategy as outlined in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.

7. The AT Board and Executive Leadership Team have recently endorsed an increased three-year investment in road safety engineering, a Speed Management Plan and behaviour change activities to reduce road trauma, including in the Franklin Local Board area.

8. One of the fastest and most cost effective ways to reduce road trauma is to implement speed reduction measures. AT is currently working to identify areas and roads around the Auckland region to set lower speed limits. These roads will be added to the Schedule of Speed Limits and drafted into the bylaw. The bylaw will be consulted on Auckland-wide (consultation on the entire programme of works for the Auckland region at a strategic level). Post-consultation, the bylaw will need to be approved by AT’s Board, after which the new lower speed limits will be implemented and become legally enforceable.

9. The primary road safety focus areas in the Franklin Local Board area for the next three years include safe intersections and roads, safe speeds, motorcycle safety, sober driving, young drivers, distraction and Maori. These areas will be addressed through a combined annual programme of investment in safety engineering, speed management, education and training of road users and enforcement of safe road user behaviour with NZ Police.
Horopaki / Context

10. Auckland’s rapid growth has resulted in a number of challenges including housing, transport and public health. The recent increase in road trauma is both a transport and public health issue for the region with significant economic costs.

11. AT’s long-term Vision Zero goal emphasises that no loss of life on Auckland’s road network is acceptable, and that road designers and operators need to take greater responsibility for preventing road trauma.

12. The Vision Zero approach also accepts that road users are people who make mistakes and therefore all parts of the transport system need to be strengthened through a safe road environment, safe speeds, safe vehicles and safe road use, so that when mistakes occur, it does not lead to people dying or being seriously injured.

13. Speed management is a central part of the Vision Zero approach for reducing speeds to survivable levels for road users, particularly on unforgiving rural roads and in urban streets where there are large numbers of vulnerable road users.

14. Speed management is a low-cost area-wide treatment that will deliver substantial savings including reduced deaths and serious injuries, increased walking, cycling and public transport use, and increased public health benefits.

15. AT and its partners have a Road Safety Action Plan (RSAP) in place that identifies key actions from partners for addressing Road Safety Focus Areas in the Franklin Local Board area, including speed management. The RSAP is developed collaboratively by AT, NZ Police, ACC and the NZTA. It covers the NZ Police districts of Auckland City, Waitakere and Counties Manukau. The document is updated quarterly and a new one for the current financial year is being developed.

16. AT is investing in an ambitious road safety programme including safety engineering, speed management and behaviour change over the next ten years that will contribute towards a 60% reduction in road trauma across Auckland.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

17. Auckland’s DSi rates have increased between 2014 and 2017 as outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Region</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injuries</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. While the Franklin Local Board area DSi made up 9% of all Auckland DSi in 2017, it has increased 49% from 51 in 2013 to 76 in 2017. Franklin Local Board had the second highest level of DSi among rural local boards in 2017, and the highest rate of serious road injuries per capita, out of the three rural local boards in 2016.
19. Within the Franklin Local Board area, 23% of all DSi involved vulnerable road users.

20. AT’s Road Safety Action Plan for 2018-19 covers the Franklin Local Board area. Below is an excerpt from the action plan showing five-year DSi trends from 2013 to 2017 for the Franklin Local Board area. The primary safety intervention measures include aspects from the Safe Systems approach: improving the safety of the roads and intersections, improving safety for motorcycle users, speed management, alcohol/drugged driving prevention, young drivers, distraction/fatigue and Maori (shaded in red in the table below). Please note that DSi Focus Areas overlap, meaning one DSi can appear in multiple focus areas.

![Franklin Road Death & serious injuries by travel mode]

**Road Safety Focus Areas for Franklin 2018-21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Five year Road Death &amp; Serious Injury (DSi) trend</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe System Management</strong></td>
<td>2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 Total</td>
<td>Counties-Manukau Road Safety Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Intersections</strong></td>
<td>17 9 13 18 20 77</td>
<td>Safety Engineering, Enforcement &amp; Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Roads</strong></td>
<td>39 35 55 56 68 253</td>
<td>Safety Engineering, Enforcement &amp; Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Safety</strong></td>
<td>5 2 1 1 4 13</td>
<td>Travelwise Schools, Walking School Bus routes, Safe Crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motorcycle Safety</strong></td>
<td>4 5 14 18 10 51</td>
<td>Safety Engineering, Enforcement &amp; Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Speed</strong></td>
<td>16 18 20 18 18 90</td>
<td>Speed Management Changes, Education &amp; Enforcement Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol/Druge Driving</strong></td>
<td>13 4 12 17 17 63</td>
<td>Education &amp; Enforcement Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young Drivers</strong></td>
<td>9 9 15 10 10 53</td>
<td>Young Driver Training, Enforcement &amp; Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle Safety</strong></td>
<td>3 0 0 0 2 5</td>
<td>Cycle Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restrains</strong></td>
<td>1 2 6 6 12 27</td>
<td>Restraining Education &amp; Enforcement, including Child Restraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Older Road Users</strong></td>
<td>6 1 1 3 3 14</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distraction &amp; Fatigue</strong></td>
<td>6 5 10 6 10 37</td>
<td>Education and Enforcement Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maori</strong></td>
<td>5 3 16 10 15 49</td>
<td>Māori-based Learner License workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. The table also highlights how AT and its partners combine their resources and programmes to address high-risk areas and road user groups through a combination of safety engineering, speed management, education, training and enforcement activities. While a majority of these activities are planned in advance, the action plan is revised quarterly to be more responsive to emerging trends.
22. Road crashes are investigated by NZ Police and then mapped by NZTA across the Franklin Local Board area. The map highlights Franklin Local Board area’s fatal and serious crashes from 2013 to 2017 where the majority were midblock (i.e. not at an intersection) loss of control on bend crashes.

23. Road death and serious injury locations are also analysed to identify high-risk intersections and routes that have a high collective crash-risk (number of DSI per km or intersection) and personal crash-risk (rate of DSI per vehicle kilometres travelled). This methodology identifies a small percentage of the network carrying a large percentage of the road trauma.

24. Within the Franklin Local Board boundaries there are three high-risk intersections and five high-risk routes (based on 2012 to 2016 data), as outlined in the two tables below. Two of the high-risk routes are also high-risk for motorcycles.
25. **High risk routes in the Franklin Local Board area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Ranking</th>
<th>Route Name</th>
<th>Collective Crash Risk</th>
<th>Active Road User Collective Crash Risk</th>
<th>Motorcycle Collective Crash Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Whitford Road</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Heights Road</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mill Road</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>Low Medium</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Waiuku Road</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Whitford-Maraetai Road</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>Low Medium</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. AT has embarked on a bold programme to reduce the incidence of death and serious injury by 60% in a 10-year period. The initial three-year target is to reduce the incidence of death and serious injury by 20% from the 2018-19 financial year.

27. The tables below highlight some of the engineering improvements, speed management changes, and behaviour change activities that will be delivered in the Franklin Local Board area in 2018-21 as part of the 2018-21 AT programme.

**Safety engineering at high-risk intersections 2018-21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiuku Rd / Attewell Rd</td>
<td>Installation of roundabout at the intersection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other safety improvement projects 2018-21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookby Road/Alfriston-Ardmore Road</td>
<td>Install right turn bay into Alfriston-Ardmore Road and localised road widening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helvetia Rd/ Princes Street</td>
<td>Proposal to install a roundabout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitford Road</td>
<td>Improve road surface on the s-bend by micro milling³.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbrook Road</td>
<td>Audio tactile profile line marking, signage and delineation improvement along entire corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingseat Road</td>
<td>Installation of safety barrier near #731 Kingseat Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Collective Crash Risk = total number of fatal & serious crashes or estimated deaths and serious injuries within 50 metres of an intersection or within 1 kilometre of a corridor in a 5-year crash period
2 Active Road Users (ARU) = Pedestrians and Cyclists
3 A common technique when rehabilitating aging asphalt pavements is to mill off a portion of the existing surface before placing a fresh layer.
Mass action treatments along roads and at intersections (list can be provided) | Signage and delineation improvement. Proactive Intersection Improvement – to address ‘shoot through’ crash risk at crossroad intersection as part of mass treatment

**Pedestrian safety and shared path network expansion 2018-21**

- **Manukau Road, Pukekohe**: Zebra Crossing upgrade.
- **Patumahoe Road, Patumahoe**: Kea crossing upgrade.
- **John Street**: Install a raised zebra crossing outside school.
- **Bombay School**: Install a kea crossing outside Bombay School.
- **Reynolds Road/Valley Road**: Install pedestrian refuge island on Reynolds Road.
- **Beachlands Road/Bell Road**: Install pedestrian refuge islands at the intersection of Beachlands Road and Bell Road.
- **King Street, Waiuku**: Install footpath from Kitchener Road to pedestrian crossing prior to River Lane.
- **Upper Queen Street, Pukekohe**: Install footpath from Kitchener Road to No. 310.

**Speed management investigations 2018-21**

Investigation into safe and appropriate speeds on local roads.

**Road safety and school travel behaviour activities 2018-21**

- 20 active Travelwise school programmes and nine active walking school bus, along with re-engaging inactive Travelwise schools and walking school buses.
- Bikes in schools.
- Young driver licensing programme, social media campaign and road safety presentations to parents of teens.
- Driver distraction checkpoints with NZ Police.
- Motorcycle and scooter safety campaigns and checkpoints with NZ Police.
- Safe speed awareness campaign and events, including safe travel stops on holiday weekends.
- Non signalised intersection safety campaign and checkpoints with NZ Police.
- Drive drink free campaign and compulsory breath testing operations with NZ Police.
- Sober driver presentation at local sports clubs.
- Safety belt promotion and child restraint checkpoints with NZ Police.

28. Speed has an impact on both the likelihood of a crash occurring and the severity of injury, should a crash occur.

29. Therefore, one of the fastest and most cost effective ways to reduce road trauma is to implement speed reduction measures. Research shows that there is a very strong relationship between speed and road safety. It is difficult to think of any other risk factor that has a more powerful impact on crashes or injuries than speed.

30. A Vision Zero or Safe System speed is defined as the maximum survivable speed upon impact where the chance of death is less than 10%.

31. Speeds of 30 km/h are the maximum any vulnerable or unprotected road user (pedestrians and people on bikes) can withstand without sustaining death of serious injuries. Although this speed is common on local roads in Europe, it is uncommon in New Zealand.

---

4 Mass action treatment is an introduction of a new safety standard that is cost effective and is quickly implementable. It includes constructing engineering infrastructure like raised pedestrian crossings, signs, removal of slip lanes, etc.) across a large area that potentially reduces or removes threats to all users.
32. Speeds over 50 km/h dramatically increase the chances of death and serious injury in the event of a crash between two vehicles at an intersection.

33. Contrary to popular belief, the majority of Auckland road deaths and serious injuries occur on 50 km/h urban roads, involving vulnerable road users.

34. While a smaller percentage of speed-related crashes occur on rural roads, the ones that do happen are more likely to result in death. The Franklin Local Board area has a large network of 100 km/h roads that would benefit from a reduction to safe speeds of 80 km/h or 60 km/h.

35. Many people fear that reducing the speed limit will dramatically increase journey times. However, research shows that lower speed limits only marginally increased journey times. An NZTA study tracked travel times along six different routes in New Zealand. It found that when driving at the maximum posted speed limit wherever possible, drivers arrived at their destination as little as 1.08 minutes faster than when they drove 10 km/h slower.

**Taukī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

36. AT is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and its broader legal obligations in being more responsible or effective to Māori.

37. Māori residents in Auckland experience a much higher risk of road traffic injury than other ethnicities, in all age groups.

38. Māori are also over-represented in road deaths and serious injuries related to speed, making up 22% of all speed-related DSI.

39. The Te Ara Haepapa Road Safety programme is AT’s response to reduce death and serious injuries involving Māori and Rangatahi Māori. The programme is intended to focus delivery through whānau, hapū, iwi, and marae, kohanga reo, kura kaupapa Māori and Māori communities.

40. The Franklin Local Board area has seen an increase in Māori-related DSI in 2017 and some Māori communities will be engaged through the Te Ara Haepapa Road Safety programme.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

41. AT welcomes input from the Franklin Local Board to help address the road safety challenge that is generating such a significant burden on road users and their families.

42. Getting aligned with our partners and stakeholders (Local Boards, Councillors, Ministers, Ministry of Transport, NZTA, NZ Police, AA, Walk Auckland, Bike Auckland, to name a few) is imperative for the success of the AT road safety and speed management programme in the Franklin Local Board area.

43. Raising awareness of the growing road safety issue is a politically charged and sensitive topic, with expectations from some stakeholders that AT should deliver rapid changes to speed limits across Auckland, while others in the community may not like the speed limit reductions and speed calming measures.

44. AT will do this by talking about the unacceptable loss of human life and focus on road safety with our communities, stakeholders and the media.

45. This will include running a publicity awareness campaign followed by a consultation process on the bylaw.

46. Before and during the awareness campaign, AT will engage with its key stakeholders (NZTA, NZ Police, and AA) to identify roads that will be affected by the speed limit changes.

47. Once those roads have been identified, they will be added to the Schedule of Speed Limits and drafted into the bylaw.

48. The bylaw will be consulted on Auckland-wide (consultation on the entire programme of works for the Auckland region at a strategic level). Due to the urgent imperative to reduce the number of deaths and serious injuries, AT will in many cases not consult on each individual element of the safety improvement plan.
49. Once the bylaw has been approved by AT’s Board, then the speed limits become legally enforceable.

50. AT aims to change the road safety conversation by educating our audiences about what road safety is all about and that speed always determines the outcome of a crash. For example, it is not just about a new speed limit but also about whether our children can walk and cycle to school and how liveable our streets are, and the many health and environmental benefits that follow from this.

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Michael Brown, Road Safety Engineering Team Leader, Auckland Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Randhir Karma, Group Manager Network Management and Safety, Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar

File No.: CP2018/12358

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To consider the monthly update of the Franklin Local Board governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This report provides an update of the Franklin Local Board governance forward work calendar. A schedule of key decisions that will come before the board at business meetings over the next year is attached (Attachment A).
3. The calendar aims to support the local board’s governance role by:
   i) Ensuring advice on agendas and workshop material is driven by local board priorities
   ii) Clarifying what advice is required and when
   iii) Clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar will be regularly updated to ensure that formal reporting milestones for new projects are added to the schedule. Sitting behind the publicly reported calendar is a less formal but more detailed meeting schedule, which will help to coordinate the work of staff on local board projects and ensure that previous resolutions are acted upon.
5. At its business meeting on 6 June 2017, Franklin Local Board resolved that the governance forward work calendar would be reported monthly to enable greater public transparency on forthcoming local board key decision timescales (Resolution number FR/2017/82).

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) notes the July 2018 update of the Franklin governance forward work calendar (Attachment A to the report entitled ‘Franklin Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar’).

Horopaki / Context
6. The governance forward work calendar brings together reporting on all of Franklin Local Board’s projects and activities previously approved in the local board plan, long-term plan, departmental work programmes and through other board decisions. It includes governing body policies and initiatives that call for a local board response. Inclusion on a formal business meeting agenda will allow greater transparency for the public.
7. Sitting behind the publicly reported calendar is a more detailed meeting schedule, which will help to coordinate the work of staff on local board projects and ensure that previous resolutions are acted upon.
8. The forward work calendar is arranged in three columns: ‘Topic’, ‘Purpose’ and ‘Governance Role’:
   i.) Topic describes the items and may indicate how they fit in with broader processes such as the annual plan.
ii.) Purpose indicates the aim of the item, such as formally approving plans or projects, hearing submissions or receiving progress updates.

iii.) Governance role is a high-level categorisation of the work of local boards.

9. At its business meeting on 6 June 2017, Franklin Local Board resolved that the governance forward work calendar would be reported monthly to enable greater public transparency on forthcoming local board key decision timescales (Resolution number FR/2017/82).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
10. This report is an information report providing the governance forward work programme for the next six months.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
11. All local boards have been receiving governance forward work calendars on their business meeting agendas. This will support more effective management of the local board’s governance work.

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

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
13. There are no financial implications relating to this report.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
14. This report is a point in time of the governance forward work calendar. It is a living document and updated month to month. It minimises the risk of the board being unaware of planned topics for their consideration.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
15. Staff will review the calendar each month and will report an updated calendar to the board.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar 9 July 2018</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Denise Gunn - Democracy Advisor - Franklin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Franklin Governance Forward Work Calendar 2018-2019 (as at 9 July 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Transport monthly report</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly report – quarter four</td>
<td>Check in on performance/inform future direction</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report – approve local board input</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog Management bylaw and policy</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Space Management Framework</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol Control Bylaw Review</td>
<td>Provide feedback on policy options</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities partnerships policy - Draft</td>
<td>Provide feedback on policy options</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code of Conduct</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quick Response Grants Round One</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td>Local initiatives/ specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Swimming Pool Fund Grants</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td>Local initiatives/ specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Transport monthly report</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local community grants round one</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td>Local initiatives/ specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi board grants round one</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td>Local initiatives/ specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure Plans: Drury-Opaheke and Pukekohe Paerata – draft plans (phase 2)</td>
<td>Confirm board position and feedback</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Asset Management Plan</td>
<td>Confirm board position</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin Waterways Protection Fund Grants</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td>Local initiatives/ specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept/Oct</td>
<td>Draft Resilient Recovery Strategy (post public consultation)</td>
<td>Confirm board position</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Transport monthly report</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly report – quarter one</td>
<td>Check in on performance/inform future direction</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATEED 6-monthly report</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports Facility Investment Plan</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Pest Management Plan</td>
<td>Confirm board position</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Transport monthly report</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quick response grants round two</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td>Local initiatives/ specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panuku Auckland Local Board Six-Monthly report</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Facilities Auckland – end of year report</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homelessness review (tb)</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Golf Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Franklin Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar

#### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport monthly report</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly report – quarter two</td>
<td>Check in on performance/inform future direction</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport monthly report</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport monthly report</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly report – quarter three</td>
<td>Check in on performance/inform future direction</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Plan - Financial decisions for consideration by the governing body, Advocacy</td>
<td>Confirm board position</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport monthly report</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Community Grants Round Two</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td>Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi board grants round two</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td>Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport monthly report</td>
<td>Review progress with projects</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quick Response Grants Round Three</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td>Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Sea Rescue Grants</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td>Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Board Agreement 2018/19, Fees and charges schedule</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department work programmes</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly Report – quarter three</td>
<td>Check on performance / inform future direction</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dates yet to be confirmed for 2018:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Sports Facilities Plan</td>
<td>On-site Wastewater Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw</td>
<td>Trade Waste Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Bylaw</td>
<td>Review of Community Occupancy Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke free policy and implementation plan (prioritisation of sites for signage)</td>
<td>Urban Forest Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin Local Board workshop records

File No.: CP2018/00052

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To receive the workshop records for local board workshops held on 19 June, 26 June, 3 July and 10 July 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Workshop records are attached for 19 June, 26 June, 3 July and 10 July 2018.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) receives the workshop records for 19 June, 26 June, 3 July and 10 July 2018.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board workshop record 19 June 2018</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board workshop record 26 June 2018</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board workshop record 3 July 2018</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board workshop record 10 July 2018</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Denise Gunn - Democracy Advisor - Franklin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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Franklin Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Franklin Local Board held in the Franklin Local Board Chamber, 82 Manukau Road, Pukekohe on 19 June 2018, commencing at 9.30am.

PRESENT

Chairperson: Angela Fulljames
Members: Andy Baker, Malcolm Bell, Alan Cole, Sharlene Druyven, Amanda Hopkins, Murray Kay, Niko Kloeten, Brendon Crompton

Apology
Also present: Nina Siers (Relationship Manager), Karen Gadomski (Senior Local Board Advisor), Georgina Gilmour (Local Board Adviser), Denise Gunn (Democracy Advisor), Vanessa Phillips (RMPA), Faiithe Smith (LFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Monthly Update</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities / budget</td>
<td>The board discussed work programme progress with staff and queried various items. A summary of current coastal slips report was presented to the board and direction was sought on those with management options. <strong>Actions:</strong> - Staff to follow up on several work programme items and report back including the Clarks Beach Skate Park design project. - Staff to progress slip remediation as informed by local board feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Grants Round Two</td>
<td>Local initiatives/specific decisions</td>
<td>The board reviewed local community grant applications (round two) and multi-board community grant applications. <strong>Actions:</strong> - Proposed grants to presented for approval at the 26 June business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Action Planning: Low Carbon Auckland and addressing climate impacts</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>The board were presented with an overview of climate change projections for the local board area and provided feedback on local issues. <strong>Actions:</strong> - Staff to schedule further engagement opportunities as planning progresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving Local Board Plan outcomes through sustainability</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>The board were updated on local low carbon community and sustainable school programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Big Bay drainage issues update. | Local initiatives/ specific decisions | Assessment of the Big Bay drainage issues was presented. Community-led solutions were discussed. Actions:  
- Staff clarified that excess seaweed is not a drainage/water quality issue and is out of scope for this project.  
- Staff to discuss drainage issues assessment, remediation options and proposal to address with the community.  
- Staff propose regionally funding those remediation solutions that both community-led and Council-led assessments have identified.  
- A future workshop session to be set to review the success of these remediation initiatives and discuss what else (if anything) is needed to address outstanding issues. |

The workshop concluded at 3:15pm.
Franklin Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Franklin Local Board held in the Franklin Local Board Chamber, 82 Manukau Road, Pukekohe on 26 June 2018 commencing at 1.00pm.

PRESENT

Chairperson: Angela Fulljames
Members: Andy Baker, Alan Cole, Brendon Crompton, Sharlene Druyven, Amanda Hopkins, Murray Kay, Niko Kloeten
Apology Malcolm Bell
Also present: Georgina Gilmour (Local Board Advisor), Denise Gunn (Democracy Advisor), Coral Timmins (Strategic Broker)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZTA briefing – Safe Road project Drury to Paerata SH22</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>An update on the SH22 from Drury to Paerata Road Safety project, was presented to the board for their information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Chin, Prasad Tala, NZTA Jenni Wild, AT</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff to note that the delivery programme should consider other projects e.g. the Hingaia Road project to minimise impact on road users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local board communications team to support NZTA in keeping locals informed as informed as possible on project progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunua Traverse (Trail) project update</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>• Staff updated the board on the development of the Hunua Trail project. It is suggested that due to the degree of difficulty, the trail is better described as a traverse. The project development phase is now expected to be completed by the end of August 2018 (previously 30 June) with no cost implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Guthrie, Jonathan Sudworth, ATEED</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff to continue project development including a management structure and membership approach. Staff to draft a NZTA funding application for board review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Tourism update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Franklin Tourism Group presented their updated branding, strategic plan and priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hunt, Paul Braithwaite, Franklin Tourism Group Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The board noted that branding and content is west Franklin and suggested that the Franklin Tourism Group work to reflect the eastern Franklin tourism offer or work with the East Auckland Tourism Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Sudworth, ATEED</td>
<td></td>
<td>The board confirmed local funding is provided as strategic support for local tourism across Franklin through ATEED (the local economic development action plan).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 2.45 pm.
Franklin Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Franklin Local Board held in the Franklin Local Board Chamber, 82 Manukau Road, Pukekohe on 3 July 2017, commencing at 9.30am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Angela Fulljames
Members: Andy Baker (from 9.45), Malcolm Bell, Alan Cole, Brendon Crompton (from 9.40, left 2 pm), Sharlene Druyven, Amanda Hopkins, Murray Kay, Niko Kloeten (from 10.50 am).

Apology
Also present: Nina Siers (Relationship Manager), Karen Gadomski (Senior Local Board Adviser), Georgina Gilmour (Local Board Adviser), Denise Gunn (Democracy Advisor), Coral Timmins (Strategic Broker)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts Community and Events update</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>The board were updated and provided feedback on the arts community and events work programme activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Timmins</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff to follow provide information to the local board communications team on upcoming Franklin events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff to investigate feasibility and cost of a Fred Graham public artwork for Waiuku and a location on the east coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff to return to the board with further updates in August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Streetscapes</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Staff presented a project overview and process for transferring responsibility for streetscapes and streetscape asset maintenance from the current mixed model to a model whereby primary responsibility for asset maintenance will be delivered by Auckland Council (Community Facilities) and primary contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tery Everett, Peter Wrigley, Nichola Painter, Bill Teakura, Cherie Veza, Jenni Wild, AT.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff to provide maps to show proposed service levels across Franklin for board consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Board to provide feedback on site specific issues by 31 August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for expanded regional Mobile Library and Access service</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Staff presented the draft proposal for a re-designed mobile library service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Soljan</td>
<td></td>
<td>The board suggested that staff consider partnering with rural schools to supplement library options, investigate rural halls as hosts of rotating collections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff to return to a future workshop to present on the re-design proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Engagement Plan proposal      | Setting direction/priorities/budget | Staff presented and sought feedback on the scope of the Franklin Local Board engagement plan.  
**Actions:**  
- Staff to update the draft plan to reflect board feedback. |

The workshop concluded at 2.00 pm.
Franklin Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Franklin Local Board held in the Franklin Local Board Chamber, 82 Manukau Road, Pukekohe on 10 July 2018, commencing at 9.30am.

PRESENT

Chairperson: Angela Fulljames
Members: Andy Baker, Malcolm Bell, Alan Cole, Sharlene Druyven, Amanda Hopkins, Murray Kay, Niko Kloeten
Apology: Niko Kloeten, Brendon Crompton
Also present: Karen Gadomski (Senior Local Board Adviser), Denise Gunn (Democracy Advisor), Coral Timmins (Strategic Broker).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Infrastructure and Environmental Services Update | Local initiatives / specific decisions | The board requested that biodiversity management plan actions be progressed in 2018/2019 and provided feedback on a Pest Free Franklin capacity building initiative for 2018/2019.  
**Actions:**  
- Staff to proceed with biodiversity management plan actions  
- Staff to progress the Pest Free Franklin Capacity Building programme noting an emphasis on supporting existing local pest management groups and initiatives. |
| CCTV review | Keeping informed | Staff reported back on the proposed change in Pukekohe CCTV operational maintenance. The board discussed several aspects of the proposed MOU that they would like included.  
**Actions:**  
- Staff to follow up on the proposed MOU and circulate to the board |
| NZ Tourism Research Inc project | Local initiatives/ specific feedback | NZTRI presented their proposal to research the visitor potential of the Hunua, Clevedon, and Pohutukawa Coast area for board feedback.  
**Actions:**  
- Staff to continue to support NZTRI with access to information as required.  
- Staff to schedule a further workshop with the board to update on progress. |

Miriana Knox, Michael Ngatai
Duncan McClaggan
Eilidh Thorburn, Carolyn Deuchar, Karen Malacarne, NZ Tourism Research Institute.  
Jonathan Sudworth, ATEED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Promoting Environment Framework</th>
<th>Keeping informed</th>
<th>Staff presented an outline of the Health Promoting Environment framework.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winnie Hauraki, The Southern Initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy on dogs 2012 and Dog Management Bylaw 2012 - review</th>
<th>Input to regional decision-making</th>
<th>Staff presented the review on Policy on dogs 2012 and Dog Management Bylaw 2012. The board provided initial feedback to staff. Actions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Sinclair, Maclean Grindell.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff to return to a future business meeting for board recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 2.50 pm.