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Bike Tamaki Drive, requests:

- Support for Tamaki Drive Programme
- Addressing Safety & Amenity for all users
  - Focus on Active Modes (Cycling & Walking)
- Consulted with key Auckland Transport experts, OLB Chair and OLB Transport lead

Local core team:
- Clear Goals
- Simple Measures
- Open Inclusive
- Focused on Tamaki Drive

Working with:
- Auckland Council
- Auckland Transport (AT)
- Local Boards
- Bike Auckland & Bikes Welcome
Bike Tamaki Drive

Introduction

- Advocates for Active Modes on Tamaki Drive
- Mission statement: To improve amenity and safety for active modes on Tamaki Drive
- We are proposing...

... a Tamaki Drive Active Modes Programme

Local core team:
- Clear Goals
- Simple Measures
- Open Inclusive
- Focused on Tamaki Drive

Working with:
- Auckland Council
- Auckland Transport (A.T.)
- Local Boards
- Bike Auckland & Bikes Welcome
1. Frequent serious accidents and fatalities on Tamaki Drive
2. Plans in place to provide separated cycle lane Quay Street to Ngapipi Bridge starting in Jan 19
3. Plans are not yet in place from Ngapipi Intersection up to Vale Road (asides Watene safety treatment)
4. Tamaki Drive is struggling and needs help to meet the requirements of both today’s and future cyclists / pedestrians
Focus Hazards & Issues

1. Existing cyclists needs are not being met by the current cycle path, creating safety risks for all users.

2. Lack of clear on-road cycle lane confuses cyclists and motor vehicle drivers, creating safety risks for all users.

Annex A - Hazard identification with AT Safety Team (39)

Annex B - Issue identification with AT Cycling Team (76)
Attachment A

Ngāpipī Example (1/3)

New road layout in January 2018
Ngapipi Example (3/3)
Programme Illustration

1. Phase One - Good **On-road** Capability St Heliers to City
   a. Immediate start - 2018 - 2019
   b. Fatalities & Serious Crashes mainly Motor Vehicle vs Bicycle
   c. Complete Phase 1 Requirements & Priority 1-2 Hazards

2. Phase Two - Cycle **Path** Upgrade, On-road Enhancement
   a. Start may overlap Phase 1 - 2019 - 2021
   b. Complete Phase 2 Requirements & Priority 3-4 Hazards

3. Phase Three - Separated **Cycle Lane** St Heliers to City
   a. Start may overlap Phase 2 - 2021 - 2024
   b. Complete Phase 3 Requirements & Priority 5 Hazards

4. Annex C - Programme Requirements (12)
OLB Support Sought

1. We seek support from the Orakei Local Board in development and implementation of the Programme Plan in its entirety
2. We ask the Local Board, with the assistance of Auckland Transport, to assess the projects contained in the Plan for suitability for Local Board Transport Capital Funding (LBTCF)
3. We hope to work closely with the Board to ensure feedback from our 150+ Orakei constituents is clearly communicated
### Tamaki Drive Hazards

**High risk routes in the Ōrākei Local Board area – 2012-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Ranking</th>
<th>Route Name</th>
<th>Speed Zone</th>
<th>Active Routes</th>
<th>Collective Crash Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tamaki Drive (Ngāpouri Road)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Tamaki Drive (West Street)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High risk intersections in the Ōrākei Local Board area – 2012-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Ranking</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Speed Zone</th>
<th>Active Routes</th>
<th>Collective Crash Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Waitemata Crescent / Tamaki Drive</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bike Tamaki Drive

Safe excellent Bicycle Riding facilities for all groups of cyclists on Tamaki Drive

Inclusive of all cycling groups:
- Road cyclists
- Leisure cyclists
- Commuter cyclists
- Sports cyclists

Supporting all cyclists:
- Local cyclists
- Visitors - International & NZ
- All ages and ability levels
- Family friendly
Annex A – Hazards P1

1. •B - Slip lane Tamaki / SH16, provide priority to cycle lane, motor vehicles to give way
2. •H - Ngapipi Intersection, avoid Green for cars left over Green cycles straight on conflict
3. •R - Kohi Averill Ave junction, provide clear bike navigation & de-clutter/simplify
4. •U - Consistent end to end on-road marking and supporting road signs
5. •Y - 30 km/h Beach/Village Centre limit on road, 15 km/h advisory for path
Annex A – Hazards P2

6. • Z - Speed camera and red light safety camera enforcement on straight sections/junctions
7. - (R10) Close fast passing (Ngapipi to Quay Street) - collision hazard (3, 4)
8. • A - Complex Tamaki / Strand junction, provide clear through junction bike navigation
9. • F - Ngapipi Bridge narrows road, provide clear on-road navigation & widen
10. • G - Ngapipi Intersection, provide clear through junction bike navigation & safe signal lights
11. • J - Watene Crescent junction, re-design for safe motor vehicle/bike navigation
12. • N - Mission Bay entrance, revise on-road marking & signs for safe navigation
13. • P - Mission Bay junction, provide clear through junction bike navigation
14. • V - Consistent end to end cycle path/lane marking and supporting signs
15. • W - Path surface treatment end to end for rideable surface
Annex A – Hazards P3

16. I - Akarana Yacht Club entrance, re-design for enhanced motor vehicle/bike safety
17. C - Slip lane Tamaki / Solent, provide priority to cycle lane, motor vehicles to give way
18. D - Complex Tamaki/Solent junction, provide clear through junction bike navigation
19. E - Estuary Bridge narrows road, extend for safer bike navigation
20. L - Okahu Wharf, re-design pedestrian / bike path for safe navigation
21. M - Tamaki Yacht Club, revise on-road marking & signs for safe navigation
22. O - Mission Bay Pavilion car park, re-design pedestrian / bike path for safe navigation
23. Q - Mission Beach Car Park, provide clear bike navigation & pedestrian/bike crossing
24. S - Kohi Yacht Club, address club parking and on-road marking & signs
25. X - Green trimming end to end & maintained for adequate height & width, road & path
Annex A – Hazards P4

26. • T - St Heliers Bay Road junction, provide clear on-road bike navigation through junction
27. • K - Kelly Tarlton crossing point, re-design for safe pedestrian / bike navigation
28. • (R5) On-road glass & debris - puncture / fall hazard (4, 2)
29. • (R6) Road edge rough & uneven - puncture / fall hazard (3, 2)
30. • (R7) Dooring risk from parked cars - collision hazard (3, 4)
31. • (R12) Pedestrians walking into road between parked cars - collision hazard (2, 3)
32. • (C3) Car Doors (opened into path of cycle) - collision hazard (3, 3)
33. • (C4) Vehicle crossing points (distracted, cycle not seen) - collision hazard (3, 3)
34. • (C6) Inadequate lighting - puncture / fall hazard (3, 3)
35. • (C7) Path glass & debris - puncture / fall hazard (4, 2)
36. - (C2) Pedestrians (distracted, unaware of cycles) - collision hazard (3, 2)
37. - (C9) Cyclists & Pedestrians at night without lights - collision hazard (3, 3)
38. - (C10) Sea flooding path on high tides - fall hazard (2, 2)
39. - (C11) Lamp post in GI to Tamaki, Ngapipi cycle lane - collision hazard (2, 2)
Tamaki Drive – Map Based Overview – Principle Hazards/Issues

- 4-lane section Quay Street to Ngapipi Intersection (~3.1 km)
- 2-lane section Ngapipi Intersection to Vale Roa (~6.1 km)
- Supporting Major Hazard Issue annotation
- See: Hazard Analysis & Issues/Requirements work
- © BTD Core Team 2018
4-lane section Quay Street to Ngapipi Intersection (~3.1 km)

- A – Complex Tamaki / Strand junction, provide clear through junction bike navigation
- B – Slip lane Tamaki / SH16, provide priority to cycle lane, motor vehicles to give way
- C – Slip lane Tamaki / Solent, provide priority to cycle lane, motor vehicles to give way
- D – Complex Tamaki/Solent junction, provide clear through junction bike navigation
- E – Estuary Bridge narrows road, extend for safer bike navigation
- F – Ngapipi Bridge narrows road, provide clear on-road navigation & widen
- G – Ngapipi Intersection, provide clear through junction bike navigation & safe signal lig
2-lane section Ngapipi Intersection to Mission Bay (~3.0 km)

- H – Ngapipi Intersection, avoid Green for cars left over Green cycles straight on conflict
- I – Akarana Yacht Club entrance, re-design for enhanced motor vehicle/bike safety
- J – Watene Crescent junction, re-design for safe motor vehicle/bike navigation
- K – Kelly Tarlton crossing point, re-design for safe pedestrian / bike navigation
- L – Okahu Wharf, re-design pedestrian / bike path for safe navigation
- M – Tamaki Yacht Club, revise on-road marking & signs for safe navigation
- N – Mission Bay entrance, revise on-road marking & signs for safe navigation
- O – Mission Bay Pavillion car park, re-design pedestrian / bike path for safe navigation
- P – Mission Bay junction, provide clear through junction bike navigation
2-lane section Mission Bay to Vale Road (~3 km)

- Q – Mission Beach Car Park, provide clear bike navigation & pedestrian/bike crossing
- R – Kohi Averill Ave junction, provide clear bike navigation & de-clutter/simplify
- S – Kohi Yacht Club, address club parking and on-road marking & signs
- T – St Heliers Bay Road junction, provide clear on-road bike navigation through junction
- U – Consistent end to end on-road marking and supporting road signs
- V – Consistent end to end cycle path/lane marking and supporting signs
- W – Path surface treatment end to end for rideable surface
- X – Green trimming end to end & maintained for adequate height & width, road & path
- Y – 30 km/h Beach/Village Centre limit on road, 15 km/h advisory for path
- Z – Speed camera and red light safety camera enforcement on straight sections/junctions
Annex B – Issues

1. B1 - Path - Vale to Ngapipi Intersection
2. B2 - Road - Vale to Ngapipi Intersection
3. B3 - Path - Ngapipi to Quay Street
4. B4 - Road - Ngapipi to Quay Street

Mapped to:
- Requirement R
- Hazard H
Annex B.1 – Path Issues

1. No clear start or end to Tamaki Drive R2
2. No clear cycle path marking R2
3. Busy junction with no on-road marking indicating cycle usage R2
4. No way-finding signs to near-by cycle routes eg Riddell R2
Annex B.1 – Path Issues

5. No cycle navigation maps, just one for bus routes R2
6. Low overhanging trees R3
7. Pedestrians using full width of path R2
8. Available path often far too narrow R5
Annex B.1 – Path Issues

9. Narrow path with adjacent car doors H32
10. Rough path surface from tree roots & past repairs R3
11. Pedestrians, often with limited mobility, having to be in cycle path to enter and leave the bus R2
12. Multiple poles and signs mounted in cycle path R2
Annex B.1 – Path Issues

13. Cycle path breaking up, insufficient maintenance  R3
14. Some sections wide & flat, encouraging higher speeds  R10
15. Consider cycle speed guidance for busy complex areas such as village centres: St Heliers, Kohi & Mission  R10
16. Glass and other litter, insufficient cleaning  R4
Annex B.1 – Path Issues

17. No safety signage for pedestrians, car doors left open blocking cycle path R2
18. Cycle path marking not maintained through new developments and repairs R2
19. Existing markings heavily faded and worn R2
Annex B.1 – Path Issues

20. Mature trees lifting path surface R3
21. Dangerous, unmarked path features eg dip in curb R3
22. Wide road junction on blind corner, encourages motor vehicles to enter / leave at speed, creating safety risk for all users H16
Annex B.2 – Road Issues

1. Wide junction at start of Tamaki Drive, no cycle marking R2
2. Busy village junctions, with no cycle marking R2
3. Existing cycle markings faded and not maintained R2
4. In road-way visual surface lights highlighting cycle presence only in Kohi, needed for all major junctions R6
Annex B.2 – Road Issues

5. Clear junction cycle path marking sometimes present, sometimes absent - needs to be consistent end to end R2

6. Cycle path directing cyclists into car door zone, then ending with no clear onward route provided R2

7. Busy sections with no clear indication to motor vehicles that bicycles will be present - sharrow or lane needed R2
Annex B.2 – Road Issues

8. Good cycle lane marking in part, needs to be consistent end to end R2
9. Flush cycle lane needs to be protected or raised, similar to Franklin Road design to alert vehicle drivers R1
10. Cyclists need safe routes around parked vehicles R2
11. Consistent road marking on both sides is needed R2
Annex B.2 – Road Issues

12. Shattered glass and other puncture / fall hazards need to be cleaned up promptly - maintenance is inadequate R4

13. Some sections are good, allowing higher speeds, speed advisory guidance in village centres is needed R10

14. Good to see clear signage this should be consistent throughout eg Bike Lane R2
Annex B.2 – Road Issues

15. Death and serious injuries occur action is needed H1-39
16. Cycle lane ends abruptly into T2 section, confusing cyclists and motor vehicles consistent change needed R2
17. At cycle lane end points safe routing for cyclists and motor vehicles needs to be clearly indicated R2
18. Junctions need consistent cycle lane marking R2
19. Mixing cyclists with high volume motor vehicles at 50 km/h, separation is needed for safety of both R2
20. Consistent safe routes around bus stop points are required R2
Annex B.2 – Road Issues

21. Red cycle lane lights are needed when it is Green for vehicles to turn left across the cycle lane H2
22. Sharrows are needed to indicate cyclists will be using vehicle lanes at narrow points, such as the bridge R2
23. Narrow curb gaps to support cyclists back onto the road are far too short and adjacent car parking too close H9
Annex B.2 – Road Issues

24. At cycle / bike lane end clear onward route is needed to provide clarity for cyclists and motor vehicle drivers R2
25. Share with Care signs are opposite to cycle path marking
26. Wide busy junction on blind corner needs review to provide clear cycle lane and speed reduction measures H16
27. Odd markings indicating road cyclists should join the cycle path should be removed, since path is not safe at road cycle speeds R2

28. Cycle lanes starting from nowhere are a feature, these should be joined to consistent end to end road marking R2
Annex B.2 – Road Issues

29. Road markings too narrow on some corners to be helpful, bring cyclists and motor vehicles together  R2

30. Vehicle lanes are busy with lots of roadside car parking, generating risk of cyclists being hit by car doors  R12

31. In Mission Bay with so much roadside and formal car parking it would help to add a pedestrian/cycle crossing  R1
Annex B.2 – Road Issues

32. Cyclists already have to take vehicle lane in narrow busy sections to avoid car door opening risk R2
33. Pedestrians are routinely in cycle path and on road at the busiest sections R11
34. Narrow sections would benefit from suspension of car parking to support cyclist and motor traffic flow R12
Annex B.2 - Road Issues

35. Low trees and bushes obstructing the on-road cycle lane on Mechanics Bay, city bound R4.

36. Vehicles routinely drive on on-road cycle lane entering Mission Bay H12.
Annex B.3 – Path Issues

1. Very uneven, broken, non-maintained surface R3
2. Cycle path is very narrow with low overhanging trees R3
3. Periodic flooding and intense sea-spray H38
4. Large amounts of glass and other puncture hazards R4
5. Lighting not effective H34
Annex B.3 – Path Issues

6. New lamp post in middle of new cycle path
7. Pedestrians often confused which side of line to walk
8. Cyclists at night without lights are collision risk
9. Door risk from parked cars on non-shore side
10. Lack of consistent marking at crossing points for boat club, coffee stop and Port
11. ... [paused since project to address in progress ...]
Annex B.4 – Road Issues

1. Frequent close, high speed passing **R2**
2. Dangerous route marked at Ngapipi to Path (city bound) **H1C**
3. No safe return to Road from Path (city bound) **H9**
4. Parked cars force cyclists into on-coming traffic over blind bridge crest **R12**
Annex B.4 – Road Issues

5. Sustained frequent close, high speed passing to Quay St R:
6. Sharp road edge into gutter, can topple cyclist off H39
7. Left turning cars to Strand cut off cyclists going straight H1
8. Large trucks from SH16 drive far too close on sections to/from Port entrance at Solent Street R2
9. ... [Paused since project to address is in progress ...]
Annex C – Requirements

1. **Cycle Lane.** A new design of cycle lane, from Vale Road to Ngapipi Intersection, along Tamaki Drive, suited to all cycle groups, perhaps borrowing from the Franklin Road approach (which follows proven Danish design)

2. **Signage & Markings (Lane, Path, On-road).** Consistent bicycle lane and path signage, including on-road markings, for the full length of Tamaki Drive - including Wayfinding & Navigation

3. **Path Surface & Tree Trimming.** Resolve cycle path uneven surfaces and low over-hanging tree branches to create a safe leisure path, with clear consistent marking throughout for cycle use
Annex C – Requirements

4. Maintenance (Lane, Path, On-road). Maintenance of cycle lanes and paths is needed to sweep away glass, litter, shar grit etc that currently creates risk of puncture and falling

5. Capacity Increase (Lane, Path, On-road). Cycle and Pedestrian traffic volumes need close monitoring to ensure adequate capacity is provided at high quality

6. Markings & Indicators (On-road). Clear consistent road marking and indicators are needed to alert motor vehicle drivers of presence of cyclists and to provide clear navigation for cyclists
Annex C – Requirements

7. Safety Cameras (Red Light & Speed). Road safety cameras should be introduced both at challenging junctions and on longer straight sections where motor vehicle speed can be excessive.

8. Issue Reporting Signage. Communication signage should be provided giving easy access to AT, Advocacy and Police teams, including the number/web address to report issues.

9. Pedestrian & Cycle Crossing Points. Pedestrian crossing points should be marked for pedestrian and cycle crossing.
Annex C – Requirements

10. Speed Reduction in Village & Beach Areas. Road speed should be reduced to 30 km/h for village centres to improve safety for cyclists and motor vehicles (15 km/h advisory pat speed)

11. Additional Crossing Points. Additional safe crossing points should be installed for pedestrians and cyclists - including lights to alert motorists, such as those already in place at Kohi - eg Mission Bay car park to restaurants

12. Reduced Roadside Car Parking. Roadside car parking should be removed for specific narrow sections to reduce hazards for cyclists and motor vehicles
## Annex C – Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>vs Phase</th>
<th>Requirements Serial</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Good on-road City to St Heliers link</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Signage &amp; Markings (Lane, Path, On-Road)</td>
<td>Consistent bicycle lane and path signage, including on-road markings, for the full length of Tamaki Drive - including Wayfinding &amp; Navigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-  Plan Hazard (H.) Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maintenance (Lane, Path, On-Road)</td>
<td>Maintenance of cycle lanes and paths is needed to sweep away glass, litter, sharp grit etc that currently creates risk of puncture and falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-  Address Priority 1 &amp; 2 H.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Cycle Crossing Points</td>
<td>Pedestrian crossing points should be marked for pedestrian and cycle crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-  Map Issues to Reqts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Additional Crossing Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-  Complete Phase 1 Reqts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reduced Roadside Car Parking</td>
<td>Additional safe crossing points should be installed for pedestrians and cyclists – including lights to alert motorists, such as those already in place at Kohi - eg Mission Bay car park to restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cycle Path Upgrade &amp; On-road Enhancement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Path Surface &amp; Tree Trimming</td>
<td>Roadside car parking should be removed for specific narrow sections to reduce hazards for cyclists and motor vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-  Complete Priority 1 &amp; 2 H.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Markings &amp; Indicators (On-Road)</td>
<td>Resolve cycle path uneven surfaces and low over-hanging tree branches to create a safe leisure path, with clear consistent marking throughout for cycle use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-  Address Priority 3 &amp; 4 H.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Safety Cameras (Red Light &amp; Speed)</td>
<td>Clear consistent road marking and indicators are needed to alert motor vehicle drivers of presence of cyclists and to provide clear navigation for cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-  Review Issue Mapping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Issue Reporting Signage</td>
<td>Road safety cameras should be introduced both at challenging junctions and on longer straight sections where motor vehicle speed can be excessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-  Complete Phase 2 Reqts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Speed Reduction in Village &amp; Beach Centres</td>
<td>Communication signage should be provided giving easy access to AT, Advocacy and Police teams, including the number / web address to report issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Separated Cycleway &amp; Completion of Hazard &amp; Issue Mitigation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cycle Lane (extend to Vale Rd)</td>
<td>Road speed should be reduced to 30 km/h for village centres to improve safety for cyclists and motor vehicles (15 km/h advisory path speed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-  Complete Hazards &amp; Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Capacity Increase (Lane, Path, On-Road)</td>
<td>A new design of cycle lane, from Vale Road to Ngapipi Intersection, along Tamaki Drive, suited to all cycle groups, perhaps borrowing from the Franklin Road approach (which follows proven Danish design) Cycle and Pedestrian traffic volumes need close monitoring to ensure adequate capacity is provided at high quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ellerslie Theatrical Society Inc.

Financial Situation
18 October 2018
**Previous billings**

We were notified of a 3% increase for 2016-2017, although the letter is dated within the Council financial year, on 4 July 2016.

This letter also informed us that we should continue to book by phone or email. Because of this, ETS was not able to use the online booking system and has therefore been unaware of the current charges displayed by the booking system.
Dear Rona,

Back in 2014, your Local Board made a decision to introduce a new fee structure for the hire of a council managed halls. This was to ensure a fairer and more consistent charge was applied across the region where hirers were paying comparable fees for comparable venues.

As a regular hirer with a preferential rate your increase will be capped at 3% for the 2016/17 financial year.

The rate for the Ellerslie Theatrical Society will move from $943.06 to $971.36 per month.

Auckland Council is mindful of the effect increases can have on community groups. We recognise the vital role you play locally in developing a sense of belonging and engagement but in balancing your needs with those of the wider community, we believe this is a workable solution.

As your organisation receives such a generous subsidy, our system is unable to calculate that subsidy online and in order for you to continue to receive it, we will need you to revert to making your bookings by phone as you previously did. Therefore to add any future bookings from the beginning of July, you will need to call 09 379 2030 or email venuehire@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz. When doing so, you will need to mention the special subsidy arrangement before starting the booking process.

We will ensure any arrangements you have with your Local Board is honoured and taken into account.

As usual you will receive an invoice at the end of the month for the current month.

We apologise if this causes complications but if you have any queries, please get in touch with our team.

Kind regards

Peter Matvos
Team Leader Venue Hire
Community Places
Arts, Community and Events
14 June 2017

On 14 June 2017, we were informed that our billings would increase in the 2017-2018 year and were advised to apply for a Local Grant.

We were not informed of the amount of the billings following the removal of all preferential rates for 2017-2018.

We applied for a Local Grant in Round One of 2017-2018 and were awarded $10,000 by Orākei Local Board.
Dear Rona,

In June 2014, the Ōrākei Local Board, based on advice from council staff, made a decision to introduce a new fee structure for the hire of council managed community venues. This was to ensure a fair and consistent approach to fees was applied across the region, with hirers paying similar fees for comparable venues.

Currently, you pay a preferential fee for your use of community venues, which is lower than the standard fee in place across the Ōrākei Local Board area. In the last two years, capped increases to your fee have moved you closer to the standard fee.

Ōrākei Local Board has decided to remove all preferential rates for the 2017/2018 financial year based on community feedback from the 2017/2018 Annual Budget consultation. This means that the amount you are charged for the use of community venues will increase from 1 July 2017.

The Ōrākei Local Board will consider funding venue hire costs through its contestable community grants.

Key dates for the Ōrākei Local Board funding rounds are:

**Quick response grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>19 June 2017</td>
<td>14 July 2017</td>
<td>17 August 2017</td>
<td>1 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>22 January 2018</td>
<td>16 February 2018</td>
<td>15 March 2018</td>
<td>1 April 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>24 July 2017</td>
<td>1 September 2017</td>
<td>16 October 2017</td>
<td>1 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>19 February 2018</td>
<td>30 March 2018</td>
<td>17 May 2018</td>
<td>1 June 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 February 2018

We were notified by email on 19 February 2018 that our billings for the remainder of the financial year would be for variable amounts.

The nett billing for 2017-2018 was $11,755.99, which was within our own budget of $12,000.

The letter did not mention that the billings were for the Main Hall only and did not include the Committee Room.
From: Christine Waugh on behalf of Venue Hire <VENUEHIRE@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 19 February 2018 4:10 PM
To: ronacolbert@outlook.com
Subject: Breakdown of charges until 30 June 2018

Kia ora Rona,

As discussed previously, the Ellenzi Theatre Society will now be on a standard rate and no longer be receiving the $771.36 per month.

For your bookings from February to June 2018 I have applied the $10,000 grant that was approved for your group. Below is a breakdown of the charges, because I tried to apply the grant evenly for the 5 months some months you will not be invoiced at all.

February - $0.00
March - $2416.00
April - $0.00
May - $853.96
June - $1695.49

I am out of the office tomorrow at an all day workshop but if you have any queries regarding the above please email me and I will get back to you on Wednesday.

Nākau roa.

Christine Waugh | Continuous Improvement Adviser
Community Places | Venue Hire
Acts, Community and Events
neunire@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Auckland Council, Private Bag 92006, Auckland 1143
Visit our website: http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/communityvenues

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 in error please notify us immediately and delete copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any virus or similar carried with our email, or any affects 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.
9 March 2018

Our billings for March through June 2018 were changed on 9 March so that we would be billed in equal monthly amounts of $1,241.36, so that the full year would still be $11,755.98.

This was the first time that we had been told that the billings applied only to the Main Hall.
Hi Reno,

As discussed, I have updated the charges for bookings in the Main Hall for March, April, May and June to make the charges more evenly spread through the months. Your invoice for Main Hall will total $1241.36 until the end of the financial year (end of June).

I will look at your charges for next financial year (July 2018 to June 2019) next week. I will break the charges down to what you will pay each day and advise when we will apply the day rate for you. Obviously, I will not be able to give you an accurate charge for every month of next year at this stage as your grant has not been approved yet.

Thank you,
Christine Waugh | Continuous Improvement Adviser
Community Places | Venue Hire
Auckland Council | Private Bag 25002, Auckland 1142
Visit our website: http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/communityvenues

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 alterations or similar content of 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.
17 April 2018

We received notification of the full billings for April through June 2018 on 17 April.

We would be billed $15,969.23 for the full year, after discounts and the grant had been applied.

This is the first time that we had been aware of the total nett charges, and the timing of this email meant that we had no opportunity to apply for additional funding before 30 June.

The total nett billing was $4,213.25 above what we had been informed on 19 February.

Most funders work on rounds that close on stated dates and have longer response times than two months, and we could find none that would fit with the 30 June deadline.

We therefore request that our billing be adjusted back to the situation as we understood it at 19 February 2018, by giving us a credit of $4,213.25.
## Attachment A

**Item 9.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Christine Waugh</th>
<th>To: <a href="mailto:ronacolbert@outlook.com">ronacolbert@outlook.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject: FW: Ellerlie War Memorial Hall charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kia Rēnā,**

I have had look in to your invoice for March, you did have quite a few Committee Room bookings throughout March and as per below email the $1241.36 was the total for your Main Hall bookings. However, as I was going through it I discovered a mistake in my previous calculations. Instead of charging $1241.36 for the Main Hall I had charged $1381.27, therefore we will credit back $139.91 for this invoice.

The total payment that needs to be made for March is **$2540.96**. ($1241.36 for Main Hall and $1299.80 for Committee Room bookings)

Below I have highlighted what each of your invoices will be for the next three months. Committee Room and Main Hall charges. Please note if any time or date changes are made this may change.

**April**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Room</th>
<th>$326.40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$1241.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1567.76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**May**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Room</th>
<th>$735.60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$1241.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1979.36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**June**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Room</th>
<th>$1262.40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$1241.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2503.76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thanks,**

Christine Waugh | Continuous Improvement Adviser
Community Places | Venue Hire

[mailto:renuehire@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](mailto:renuehire@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)

**From:** Christine Waugh  
**Sent:** Friday, 9 March 2018, 2:14 PM  
**To:** ronacolbert@outlook.com  
**Subject:** Ellerlie War Memorial Hall charges

Hi Rona,

As discussed, I have updated the charges for your bookings in the Main Hall for March, April, May and June to make the charges more evenly spread through the months. Your invoice for Main Hall will totally $1241.36 until the end of this financial year (end of June).

I will look at your charges for next financial year (July 2018 to June 2019) next week. I will try and break the charges down into what you will pay each day and advise when we will apply the day rate for you. Obviously I will not be able to give you an accurate charge for every month of next year at this stage as your grant has not been approved yet.
**Overall view 2016-2020**

The spreadsheet opposite shows our estimates of our position.

For 2018-2019 we have a grant from Ōrākei Local Board in the form of a Local Grant in Round One. We are also seeking other funding for $19,000.

For 2019-2020, we have prepared a budget and received an estimate of charges, although we would prefer a Community Lease to be in place by July 2019.

Our committee has approved our initial preparation of a feasibility study to be completed by January 2019, subject to receiving information from Auckland Council. We intend to work with the Board in preparing a Community Lease so that we can seek approval of it from our Members and sign it in April 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>budgeted</td>
<td>19-Feb-18</td>
<td>09-Mar-18</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>difference</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>difference</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>grant</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>1000.49</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>1000.49</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>1000.49</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>1000.49</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>1000.49</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>1000.49</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
<td>971.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LG1812-413
LG1812-218
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Presentation notes: As a matter of public record

Tena Koutou katoa

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

My name is Donna Tamaariki and this is Moana Tamaariki-Pohe – we represent Orakei Water Sports.

This presentation is dedicated to the man you see on the screen - our Dad, Tamaiti Arama Tamaariki. His final sunset was May 19th this year. He truly epitomized Mana Moana.

The Orakei Local Board approved a revised concept plan for the Landing in August 2013.

The Board worked with all the existing clubs and user groups at the time, including Ngati Whatua Orakei and Orakei Marina Management Trust to develop this concept plan.
Orakei Water Sports is one of the stakeholder affirmed in the plan.

We have been advised that the Orakei Local Board are considering awarding the management and leases for the entire Landing to one entity, namely the Akarana Marine Sports Trust/RAYC.

First and foremost,...

This proposed action is contrary to the expressed wishes of Orakei Water Sports and other stakeholders.

We sincerely hope that this is not the case.

I now wish to outline 3 points that strengthen our position...

Point 1

If this is indeed the case, then we consider this course of action to be in breach of the Local Government Act 2002 in that Orakei Local Board has failed to consult with persons or groups affected by or who have an interest in the particular decision.

Pursuant to Section 82 and 78 of the Act.

We believe the Board should consult with, at the very least, those stakeholders affirmed in the 2013 Landing Concept Plan prior to making a decision.

And to the best of ‘my’ knowledge, this has not occurred.

Point 2.

The Orakei Local Board should not be put in a position where they are asked to rubber stamp a decision and should act in accordance with the law.

(We are cognisant that the Orakei Local Board is made up of three (possibly four) Board members who were not party to the development of the Plan).

Point 3.

Orakei Water Sports and other stakeholders affirmed in the Plan have operated with integrity and in good faith. We have been open and transparent.
We truly hope that the Orakei Local Board considers the facts that are important to the decision and will not be influenced by a personal relationship.

In closing...

Orakei Water Sports is of the view that the Orakei Local Board will be acting outside of its legal powers should it precede with the proposed decision to award the management and leases for the entire Landing to one entity, namely the Akarana Marine Sports Trust/RAYC.

Therefore, we strongly encourage the Orakei Local Board to uphold the 2013 Landing Concept Plan.

Thank you for accepting this 3 minute presentation.
18 June 2018

The Chair
Orakei Local Board
AUCKLAND

AKARANA MARINE SPORTS CHARITABLE TRUST

As you know, the Orakei Marina Management Trust (OMMT) owns and manages the Orakei Marina at Okahu Bay, Auckland. The trust represents the 170+ berth holders at Orakei marina and is a key stakeholder at the Landing.

We are writing to express our concern as to the truthfulness of advice recently given to the Board by the Akarana Marine Sports Charitable Trust (AMSCT).

You may be aware that the AMSCT recently put a proposal to the Local Board that it be delegated rights to manage all of the operations and activities at the Landing, effectively overriding the spirit and intent of the 2013 Okahu Landing Concept Plan. The proposal presented to the Local Board indicated that the AMSCT had been undertaking ongoing engagement with OMMT in respect of the management of the Landing. This indication is false. There has been no engagement or discussion by the management or Board of AMSCT with the trustees of the OMMT since 2015 when OMMT objected to the proposed redevelopment of the Akarana yacht club’s facilities at the Landing.

Accordingly, additional indications in the proposal document presented by AMSCT that OMMT was in support of it, are also factually incorrect.

For the record, OMMT does not support AMSCT being given any management or operational rights over any of the Landing other than that area that has been leased to it.
Our expectation is that the Local Board and Auckland Council will maintain control and operational oversight for all activities on the Landing.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Chair
18 June 2018

His Worship, The Mayor
Auckland Council
Private Bag 93 200
AUCKLAND

Your Worship,

I am the Chair of the Board of Trustees of the Orakei Marina Management Trust (OMMT), which owns and manages the Orakei Marina at Okahu Bay, Auckland. OMMT represents the 170+ berth holders at Orakei Marina and is a key stakeholder at the Landing.

I am writing to express our concern as to the process of engagement followed by the Akarana Marine Sports Charitable Trust (AMSCT) in recently securing “approval” for it to host the 49er, 49erFX and Nacra 17 World Champs from its soon to be completed Hyundai Marine Sports Centre at the Landing in December 2019. Our concern is that the process followed by AMSCT did not involve any proper engagement or consideration of other users at the Landing, including the Marina, and relied on misleading key officials as to such matters.

As I am certain you will appreciate, the 49er, 49erFX and Nacra 17 World Champs are a significant event, involving over 400 sailors and their support crews. It will have significant effects on all other users of the Landing and Okahu Bay, including the public.

From our research, the proposal by AMSCT to host the event was first pitched to ATEED several months prior to its presentation to the Local Board. However, at the presentation to ATEED, AMSCT advised that it had already informed potentially affected parties and the Local Board of their proposal to host this event. These statements were clearly incorrect, given that the first presentation to the Local Board did not occur until several months after the presentation to ATEED. The comments at this presentation were clearly
intended to assure ATEED that local consultation had occurred. But none had at that date.

When the AMSCT eventually did present to the Local Board, it informed The Local Board that all other potentially affected parties had already been consulted. Again, this was incorrect. In fact, the first that OMMT and other Landing users heard of the proposal to hold this event was when it was loaded to the AMSCT website and announced in the New Zealand Herald https://www.nzherald.co.nz/sport/news/article.cfm?c_id=4&objectid=120127 57.

From our discussions with Auckland Council staff, it appears that this announcement in the Herald was also the first time they learned of the event about to be hosted at the Landing.

We are very disappointed at the approach AMSCT has taken to securing "approval" to its hosting of this event at the Landing. It has misled the Local Board and ATEED as to the true extent of engagement it has undertaken and omitted to consult with any of the other stakeholders at the Landing, including Council staff involved in its day to day management. By publicly announcing the event, it has also forced all parties into an outcome they cannot object to. I believe this was AMSCT’s objective all along.

OMMT has an Agreement with AMSCT in respect of parking and event traffic management at the Landing. To date, no steps have been taken by AMSCT to comply with key aspects of this Agreement around event management planning. OMMT has put AMSCT on notice that until a satisfactory event management plan is put in place, it will take all steps necessary to prevent it from being held at Okahu Landing.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

The Chair
18 June 2018

The Chairman
Akarana Marine Sport Charitable Trust
The Landing
AUCKLAND

Dear Mr Taylor,

AGREEMENT WITH ORAKEI MARINA MANAGEMENT TRUST

I refer to our agreement dated 23 February 2015 (Agreement).

I am writing on behalf of the Board of the Orakei Marina Management Trust (OMMT) to put you on notice that the Akarana Marine Sports Charitable Trust has breached certain requirements of the Agreement.

Breaches of Agreement - Construction

Clause 2.1.1(a) of our agreement required AMSCT to construct the new Akarana Marine Sports Centre in accordance with conditions set out in Schedule 1. Conditions B and C required certain things to be completed before construction commenced, namely:

B. Prior to construction commencing, a copy of the Construction and Construction Traffic Management Plans required as conditions of consent and approved by the Council shall be provided to OMMT. AMSCT shall include the measures to be adopted to comply with condition A, above, in any such Management Plan put to the Council for approval.

C. No demolition or construction activities shall commence on site until the parking management measures to be put in place for some of the car parks in the Easement Area (as per the proposal from Auckland Council in Schedule 3) are in place and operational.
The AMSCT failed to comply with either of these requirements. An approved Construction and Construction Traffic Management Plan was not provided to OMMT until requested by OMMT which occurred several months after construction had commenced.

Also the parking management measures contained in the Agreement are still not completed and operational.

OMMT takes these breaches seriously and reserves all of its legal rights and remedies in respect of them.

Breaches of Agreement – Operation

Condition D of our Agreement relates to operation and provides:

D. AMSCT agrees to manage traffic and car parking associated with the operation of the new Akarana Marine Sports Centre facilities at The Landing in accordance with the Framework Traffic Management Plan in Schedule 2 (FTPM Plan). Without limiting the contents of the FTPM Plan, AMSCT will ensure that an Event Traffic Management Plan is prepared for any event to be hosted at the AMSCT facilities that is anticipated to involve more than 150 persons (excluding staff and AMSCT personnel), unless an alternative arrangement is otherwise agreed with OMMT.

We understand that AMSCT is proposing to host the 49er, 49erFX and Nacra 17 World Champs from its soon to be completed Hyundai Marine Sports Centre at the Landing in December 2019 and has announced its intentions to do so in the press.

Section 3 of the FTPM Plan in our Agreement requires AMSCT to consult with OMMT “in advance on the events to be held” at the centre. No such consultation occurred with OMMT in respect of this proposed event. The first OMMT learned of it was in the press.

OMMT is extremely disappointed at AMSCT’s approach to the planning for this event. AMSCT has breached its agreement to consult with OMMT before such events are confirmed. OMMT considers that until this breach is rectified, with adequate consultation, AMSCT is not legally able to host this event. We consider that a full presentation ought to be made to the Board, to which all interested berth holders can be invited.
Furthermore, OMMT expects that a draft Event Traffic Management Plan, as required under our Agreement, should be prepared for this proposed event and be available for discussion at the presentation.

Our Agreement also requires AMSCT to provide OMMT with all proposed events 12 months out from the middle of each year. We look forward to receiving such details as soon as they are available.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

The Chair
Item 9.6
October 2018

Presentation to Ōrākei Local Board re Jetty Restoration at Wilson’s Beach, Remuera

This jetty is a Council asset and a valuable public amenity. It is used by many people daily, and its understated appearance is in keeping with its surroundings. It is also an extremely important part of the environment and ecology of Hobson Bay in respect of its constant use by shags/condors for their feeding purposes. And it provides a safety barrier for youngsters paddling in the shallows at the sandy beach recently restored by OLBB at the request of WBAG.

This presentation is founded on:

**History/Heritage**

Photo from 1918 (100 years ago) shows the original jetty, built by my great grandfather Captain TC Tilly RN prior to his death in 1900. Heritage implications. 1911 – Extended up and over sewer pipe for boat access to the harbor and beyond. 1930 – Railway and Waterfront/Tamaki Drive. Occasional jetty repair and replacement since then.

2010 – Extension demolished, along with sewer pipe. New underground 2014 – Wilson’s Beach restoration completed. Photo

2018 – Storm damage to northern end. Several piles compromised. Council has prevented access on safety grounds. If left it will deteriorate and become an eyesore. Our verbal Engineer’s Report indicates that a restorative repair would not be complicated or expensive. (In anticipation of Andrew’s report. I will amend my words as appropriate)

**Environment/Ecology**

The officially protected Black and White Shag species (Maungakiekie Tamaki Local Board leaflet) need a structure like our jetty from which to dive for fish to feed their young. Shags have relatively poor eyesight, so they need this only remaining above the water structure. (Photos of shags on jetty rails)

Grey Herons have a feeding ground immediately to the west of the jetty. This is protected from high speed jet skiers by the jetty. The Heron numbers have been gradually increasing, along with other wading birds, throughout Hobson Bay. See Anna Coffey-Noall’s email sent to OLBB on 1 October

**Safety**

The jetty provides the western safety barrier to the approx. 25m stretch of sandy beach so popular with very young children. The eastern barrier is the rock groyne immediately in front of Victoria Avenue. Retaining this safe area for small children is essential, because the main 50m section of beach is used by the older paddle boarders, kayakers, water and jet skiers and the like. The ultimate demolition of the jetty would remove this safety barrier.
Community Support
The Wilson’s Beach immediate community comprises some 70 adults plus their families living on Victoria Avenue and Shore Road from the roundabout to the beach. The community arose out of the support for the resanding of the beach funded through the Orakei Local Board. Only two neighbours objected to that. I know of only two neighbours who object to the restoration of the jetty. Within Council itself, Councillor Desley Simpson is 100% supportive of our efforts to restore and retain the jetty – mostly for Heritage reasons.

Finally, I would like to think that the OLB will continue its support for the restoration of Wilson’s Beach, referred to in ....

Orakei Local Board and Auckland Council’s own publications
‘Our Auckland’ June 2012 – ‘The existing timber jetty, built before the First World War, will also be restored’ (leaflet)
‘Hobson Bay Action Plan’ makes several references to ‘Improving leisure and recreation opportunities on land and water’. As well as ‘creating new and improved connections for pedestrians and cyclists’. Specifically ‘Complete the missing link in the walkway from Victoria Avenue/Wilson’s Beach to the eastern side of Shore Rd Reserve’ (at Portland Rd). The jetty is part of that. Also Environment and Heritage. ‘Investigate possible protection of historic heritage places and features in and around Hobson Bay’. Pre 1900 considerations

Conclusion
Continued denying public access to the jetty is its death knell. Its subsequent lack of maintenance could contravene Heritage legislation.
It needs immediate restorative repairs to its piles, and reopening for this Summer’s use.
A temporary, but safe jetty fix, recognizing the partial overlap with the Tinana Walkway is requested by the vast majority of residents and visitors to Wilson’s Beach.

Bruce Renshaw
279 Victoria Avenue
Remuera 1050
Auckland

Pp Wilson’s Beach Action Group
Please protect me!

- I am a New Zealand pied shag, kahauwhi.
- I am a protected species and it is against the law to harm me.
- If you fish here, there will be no fish left for me or my young.
- If you find discarded fishing line, please remove it so that I don’t get tangled in it.
- If you find me injured, please contact Pam Howlett’s Cormorant Sanctuary on (09) 570 4750.
- It is against the law for your dog to harm me.
- Please keep your dog on a leash.

Find out more phone 09 30 30 301
or visit aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
From: Bruce and Sue Renshaw <bruce.renshaw@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Sunday, 8 November 2015 3:27 p.m.
To: 'Bruce and Sue Renshaw'
Subject: Sent from Snipping Tool

Photo (3)

Taken from Jetty looking East.
AN UPGRADE OF Wilson's Beach in Hobson Bay will benefit the many people who use the walkway linking the area at the bottom of Victoria Avenue through to Shore Road in Remuera.

The Ōrākei Local Board project will see the western arm of the beach upgraded as part of the board's plan to improve walkways around Hobson Bay.

Local board member Mark Thomas says residents were the catalyst for the project.

"The upgrade will involve stabilising the beach and improving pedestrian access. Stormwater improvements will also be made to reduce discharge over the beach."

"The local board is also having new planting added to the area and existing mangroves in the bay near the beach tidied up."

"The existing timber jetty, built before the First World War, will also be restored."

These developments will feed into a masterplan for the future of Hobson Bay, which Ōrākei Local Board will begin to develop later in the year.
Conservation and Protection of Pied Shag Habitat at Wilson’s Beach Revisited

Risks to Pied Shags:

- Numbers have now reached a critical, desperate level
- Pied Shags are a protected species with characteristic poor vision
- Pied Shags use the jetty during the day to rest
- Pied Shags use the jetty during the day to fish from
- No other site in this area that Pied Shags now use to fish
- Threats to the surviving birds are increasing rapidly, because:
- Council plan to remove the jetty "because pipeline gone" ill advised
- Pied Shags can and do get caught in set nets and drown
- Set netting for flounder occurring at Wilson’s Bay now every week

Other reasons to retain the jetty:

- Children, local residents, visitors from other areas and countries find pleasure in watching the shags sitting on and fishing from the jetty
- The removal of the jetty would be inconsistent with the council’s current conservation goals and appeals to the public in Conservation week
- The site of the jetty deter people from using set nets only in that small part of Wilson’s Beach
- The jetty affords habitat protection to the grey herons which feed immediately adjacent to its Western side
- Increasing amounts of water traffic - jet skis, paddle boards, kayaks water skiers, inflatable craft etc. now use all other parts of Wilson’s Beach except...
- The area on the RHS of the jetty, where young children paddle and swim in safety from water traffic.

Thank you for your attention to these issues.

I would like to suggest that the Council gives Wilson’s Beach exactly the same protections as Judge’s Bay has and has had for a long time; both of these tidal habitats are places of significant historical importance in the city.

Anna Coffey-Ncally
3/267 Victoria Avenue
Remuera
Auckland
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Consultation Plan

176-182 Shore Road, Remuera, Ōrākei Local Board
Commercial Lease Extension
November 2018
Introduction
The purpose of this plan is to outline the consultation approach to be undertaken to ascertain community interest in retaining the garden centre use for the land at 176-182 Shore Road, Remuera. The engagement scope of the plan includes the Ōrākei Local Board (decision maker), the public and Auckland Council departments - Parks and Community Facilities.

1.0 Background
The Shore Reserve East is located on the corner of Ōrākei Road and Shore Road in Remuera. The land is owned by the Crown but is vested in council.

An agreement between the Minister of Conservation and Auckland City Council was formed in 2005 to allow council to grant a commercial ground lease to Palmers Garden World for an initial fifteen years (15).

This term could be renewed for a further 15 years subject to council undertaking a public consultation process to ascertain whether it is in the publics’ interests to retain the garden centre. The agreement with the Crown states that council’s decision whether to renew the lease should have regard to the outcomes of the public consultation.

Palmers Garden World (Palmers) currently has a commercial lease on Shore Reserve East which expires in 2020. This lease is managed by Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku).

Palmers approached Panuku requesting the consultation be undertaken to complete the lease renewal process to provide more certainty of tenure to their business and allow them to enhance and improve their facilities without the uncertainty of when the lease could expire.

2.0 Consultation approach and process

2.1 Overview
This plan outlines the consultation approach to be undertaken to ascertain community interest in retaining the garden centre use. The consultation process will be undertaken in accordance with section 82 of the
Local Government Act 2002. Further, Stakeholder and community input are essential to understanding community preferences and opportunities for the site and for informed and robust decision making.

Indicative dates for this process are shown in the diagram below.

2.2 Māori Engagement
Panuku has a comprehensive engagement process with mana whenua. The process and details of the consultation will be communicated with mana whenua groups. Mana whenua views will be sought and considered as appropriate.
### 3.0 Stakeholders

Stakeholder groups identified for engagement are shown in the table below, with a summary of engagement objectives, principles and mode for each group. For further information on engagement activities and outputs see Appendix 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Goals for Engagement</th>
<th>Modes of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council staff (e.g. Parks, Land Advisory, Legal)</td>
<td>Inform Consult</td>
<td>To seek feedback on the process and confirm any potential future plans for the site</td>
<td>Email, Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council staff working in the local board area</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>To jointly plan for this process</td>
<td>Emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana Whenua</td>
<td>Inform Consult</td>
<td>To inform and hear the views</td>
<td>Letter to inform of the process and seek views. Kanohi ki te kanohi if required with interested groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents &amp; Garden centre users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar Juniors Rugby Football Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outboard Boating Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnell Cricket Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snore Road Dog Walkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei Basin Advisory Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei Bay Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Remuera Residents Association | Inform & consult | • Inform of the process  
• Provide relevant information  
• Provide opportunity to have a say  
• Encourage participation in the process  
• Inform of decisions and outcomes | Utilise appropriate materials and activities to suit the needs of different audiences  
Online engagement:  
Open day at the site  
Flyers  
Posters and information boards |
<p>| Baradene College |                      |                       |                     |
| St Kentigern Boy’s School |                      |                       |                     |
| Victoria Avenue Primary School |                      |                       |                     |
| Ōrākei Community Association |                      |                       |                     |
| Meadowbank Primary School |                      |                       |                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Goals for Engagement</th>
<th>Modes of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide the media with balanced and objective information to assist in understanding the purpose of consultation.</td>
<td>Briefing with local reporters if required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 Objective and overview of the consultation

4.1.1 Objective
The overall objective of consultation is to obtain meaningful feedback from stakeholders, mana whenua and the public to ascertain the public interest in retaining the garden centre use over the land at 176-182 Shore Road.

Activities will be undertaken to:
- inform the local community of the consultation process,
- provide balanced and objective information in a format that is appropriate to community preferences to enable meaningful participation,
- provide opportunity for input and feedback and encourage participation,
- ensure that all those interested in a potential decision are informed and able to have their say, and
- seek and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision on the garden centre.

All feedback received will be considered with an open mind and the decision will be communicated to all participants.

4.1.2 Level of Engagement
The framework that will be used for this consultation is the Public Participation Spectrum - IAP2 (Appendix 1). This involves assessing and communicating with the community at an appropriate level throughout this process.

**Inform** – To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the issue. Promise to the public ‘We will keep you informed’.

**Consult** – To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions. Promise to the public ‘We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influences the decision.’

4.1.3 Communications
The overall objective is to provide clear and comprehensive communications throughout the consultation process, which reaches all those affected by the decision to be made. To do this we have the following communications objectives:
- Raise awareness of the consultation and awareness of the opportunities to provide feedback (e.g. how and when),
- Publicly announce the decision, and
- Front-foot any media queries.
5.0 Closing the loop

Comments and views received will be reported to the local board and will also feature in a supporting consultation report.

A copy of the consultation report will be made available and will be communicated with the community to ensure we close the loop with participants.

6.0 Decision-maker

The Ōrākei Local Board is the decision maker. Panuku staff engaged with the local board to inform and consult about the process. The Ōrākei Local Board members are the only Auckland Council elected members who were consulted about this process.

The spokesperson for this project is the local board chair.

7.0 Success Measures and Evaluation

Following the completion of this consultation, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the process will be undertaken. This evaluation will include:

- Appropriateness of the consultation approach incl.: level of involvement – number of submissions/feedback forms, comments, and quality of responses
- Media coverage - did it contain key messages and was it positive neutral or negative
- Inclusivity of approach – whether feedback is received from a range of audiences, including particular demographic groups relevant to the local board area
- Satisfaction with the process and outcome – for example via short survey of key stakeholders/project team and local board interviews as well as monitoring of any comments/complaints about the process.

In addition, following the consultation the project team will note down any lessons about what worked/didn’t work well, what could be done differently next time and any follow-up required.

Appendix 1: Consultation Activities

The following section sets out the consultation activities that will be undertaken to raise awareness and hear feedback from the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Raise awareness of the process | Communications activities to inform people on how they can be involved in the process. Activities include:  
  - Local paper ad  
  - Flyer drop  
  - Social media channels  
  - Our Auckland story | 20 Oct – 29 Oct |
| Online Survey | Survey on Auckland Council ‘Have You Say’ website. The survey will seek community feedback on their preference to retain the garden centre use of the site. Supporting documents: | 1 Nov – 29 Nov |
### Attachment A

#### Item 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mana whenua engagement</td>
<td>Communications to inform mana whenua of the process and seek their views.</td>
<td>20 Oct - 29 Oct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Post consultation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local board workshop</td>
<td>To present consultation outcome</td>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local board business meeting</td>
<td>To seek local board decision</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To inform people about the decision</td>
<td>Communicate the decision with the public</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 2: Public Participation Spectrum**

[Diagram of IAP2’s Public Participation Spectrum]

- **Inform**: To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities, and solutions.
- **Consult**: To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and decisions.
- **Involve**: To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.
- **Collaborate**: To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.
- **Empower**: To place final decision making in the hands of the public.

© IAP2 International Federation 2014. All rights reserved.
It is not clear which of the documents accompanying the Draft Code of Conduct form part of the Code for the purposes of compliance and determining alleged breaches. For example, Attachment 1 – Expenses Policy approved by the Remuneration Authority, and subsequently adopted by the Governing Body, and Attachment C – Governance Roles and Responsibilities. Any attachment that does not specifically relate to the Code of Conduct should not be included.

Draft Code of Conduct

The Ōrākei Local Board notes that the draft Code of Conduct is a set of principles that provides elected members with guidelines for making ethical choices in the conduct of their work and is not a legally binding contract. On that basis it should be voluntary and not be compulsory, relying on penalties. The Board does not support elected members being required to sign the Code at the time members make the statutory declarations before legally acting as Governing Body or Local Board members. The question also arises as to when other new members, whether elected or not, are required to sign up to the Code of Conduct.

The Ōrākei Local Board does not support the draft Auckland Council Code of Conduct for the reasons set out below:

a) The draft Code goes well beyond what is expected in the legislation including the imposition of sanctions.

b) The draft Code contains inconsistencies throughout and needs to be reviewed to ensure that terms and references are consistent. For example, the use of the word “council” throughout the documents.

c) The legislation refers to “members”. The draft Code refers in places to elected members. It is not clear whether the word “members” includes members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board, and of working parties and the like, and co-opted members. Accordingly, to remove any doubt a definition of “member” should be included in the Introduction directly after the excerpt from the legislation.

d) The introduction section should include the wording from the declaration that elected members make when they are sworn into office as this sets out expectations of behaviour for elected members as set out in legislation and reinforces the principle “that elected members act in the community’s interest”.

e) The material breaches section, which sets out what constitutes a material breach, requires further work to provide clarity on what constitutes a breach as the current wording is wide-ranging and will likely result in more breaches then under the current Code.

f) The draft Code contains possible sanctions for material breaches including suspension from committees or other representative bodies. However, there is nothing in legislation which provides for any sanctions or penalties, so this must be removed from the draft Code. In fact, Schedule 7 clearly states: “To avoid doubt, a breach of the code of conduct does not constitute an offence under this [Local Government Act 2002].”

g) The draft Code suggests that the Investigator could be a council staff member, who can make a decision on the conduct of an elected member and impose sanctions. This is not appropriate and is quite contrary to the principle of separation of functions of management and governance and employees of the Council should not be in a position to impose any sanctions on elected members. Any decision on conduct and/or sanctions should be decided by elected members.
h) The draft Code does not allow elected members to provide genuine criticism of staff reports or decisions made by Auckland Council, in a respectful way, without this being an alleged breach of the Code.

i) The draft Code does not require the Conduct Commissioner to ‘ensure’ they have the views from the elected member before making a decision on the complaint or a sanction. The Board considers that for any investigation to be balanced and fair the Conduct Commissioner must seek the views of the relevant elected member(s).

j) The draft Code must enable the elected member to be able to challenge a decision from the Investigator or the Conduct Commissioner to ensure fairness, transparency, natural justice and reasonableness.

k) The draft Code doesn’t appear to be modelled on the model code of conduct prepared jointly by Local Government New Zealand, the Society of Local Government Managers, and the Department of Internal Affairs, and in particular the draft Code allows members of the public to complain under the draft Code when the model code of conduct does not provide for this.

l) The draft Code at paragraph 4.11 refers to “Alleged breach relates to a conflict of interest” yet Attachment A contains policies and protocols relating to Conflict of Interest. Why the duplication?

m) The Ōrākei Local Board seeks the 9th bullet point under the Respect principle to be amended to require elected members to maintain confidentiality of confidential information rather than the confidentiality of all information.

Attachments

Attachment A: Conflict of Interest policy

The Board does not support the Conflict of Interest policy for the following reasons:

a) Breaches of this policy are deemed to be breaches of the draft Code of Conduct.

b) Section 1 Purpose covers some detail the need for elected members to have an “open mind” and make decisions based on their merits. Voting on party lines or caucusing, or simply a member stating that he/she will vote according to what the majority of constituents of a ward or area prefer, could be construed as a breach of this policy as the member(s) enters a voting situation with a predetermined mind, in the public perception. This is a breach of clause 3.7. The draft Code should clarify the situation in terms of merit-based decision-making with an “open mind”.

c) Clause 1.2 infers that possible judicial review of decisions of Auckland Council will cause delay, cost and uncertainty for “Auckland” (whatever that term means as it is too broad) but the Board considers that such reviews will only cause issues for Auckland Council and not all of Auckland.

d) Section 4 Register of Members’ Interests. The Board totally opposes this section of the policies and protocols, as there is no legal basis for it. Requests for personal information from members about themselves or family must have a rationale and a legitimate legal reason to request same. While persons may be willing to disclose this information, the draft Code in effect coerces members to provide personal information and failure to do so is deemed to be an alleged breach of the draft Code. There is a question whether this request could be a breach of the Privacy legislation. Further questions must be why this information is collected? What is the legal authority? The legislation places the onus for declaring interests particularly those covered by the Local Authorities (Members’
Interests) Act 1968 on individual members and there are legal provisions for breaches. The draft Code goes further and seeks to declare these material breaches under clause 2.19. The Board notes the advice by staff that this is best practice advice from the Auditor General and is not required by legislation.

Attachment B - Access to information protocol

The Board supports the move to develop an access to information protocol for elected members but considers that the protocol should focus on the question of whether there is a good reason to withhold the information from the elected members instead of whether the member needs the information to fulfil their role.

Attachment C - Election Year Policy

The Board does not support the Election Year Policy as it possibly unlawfully restricts the ability of local board members and local boards to fulfil their legislative role for the full period of their term of office, on the grounds that it creates “an electoral advantage” for current members in the lead up to each election.

Attachment D – Communications Policy

It is noted that the placeholder box at the end of this attachment, states that “Other policies and guidelines that are relevant to communications are being reviewed for their suitability for inclusion here”. If this attachment is to be read as part of the draft Code, then elected members need to see the most up to date attachments.

Attachment G – Governance roles and responsibilities

The term “Councillor” is mentioned in this attachment once but this does not reflect a term from the legislation relevant to the draft Code and elected members are referred to without definition, so it would be sensible to quote the legal definition for elected members in the draft Code.