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1 Welcome
A board member will lead the meeting in prayer.

2 Apologies
At the close of the agenda apologies had been received from Member Hon. George Hawkins, QSO.

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 Papakura Local Board:
a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting held on Wednesday 26 September 2018, as a true and correct record.

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

6 Acknowledgements
At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

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

8 Deputations
Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Papakura 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 - Friends of Kirks Bush

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Margaret Gane from The Friends of Kirks Bush, will speak to the recent activities of the group.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) thank Margaret Gane from The Friends of Kirks Bush, for her update on activities.
8.2 Deputation - Citizens Advice Bureau

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Mary Wark from the Citizens Advice Bureau, will provide an update on the recent activities.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) thank Mary Wark from the Citizens Advice Bureau for her update on activities.

Attachments
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8.3 Deputation - Massey Park User Group / PIPS

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Glenn Archibald from the Massey Park User Group and PIPS will speak to the recent activities and issues.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) thank The Massey Park user Group for their update on activities.

9 Public Forum

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

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

10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”
Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“No 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."
Councillors' Update

File No.: CP2018/18122

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity for Councillors Daniel Newman, and Sir John Walker to update the Board on regional matters of interest.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) receive the Ward Councillors update from:
   i) Cr Daniel Newman:
     •
   ii) Cr Sir John Walker:
     •

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairperson's Update

File No.: CP2018/18123

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity for the Papakura Local Board Chairperson to update the local board on activities he has been involved in.

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

a) receive the verbal report from the Papakura Local Board Chairperson.

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To update the Papakura Local Board about transport related matters in its area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
1. This month’s report includes information on the:
   - Takaanini Park & Ride
   - Takaanini Platform upgrades
   - Papakura Park & Ride
   - Safer Communities Project
   - Residential Speed Management - Rosehill
   - Responses to previous resolutions by the Papakura Local Board to Auckland Transport.
2. This report also provides an update on delivery of various Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) projects.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport October 2018 report to the Papakura Local Board.

Horopaki / Context
3. This report addresses transport related matters in the local board area and includes information on the status of the LBTCF.
4. Auckland Transport (AT) is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. It reports on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting supports the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities on transport matters.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF)
5. The LBTCF is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council (AC) and delivered by AT. Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they believe are important but are not part of AT’s work programme. Projects must also:
   - be safe
   - not impede network efficiency
- be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome).

6. Through Auckland Council’s Long-term Plan 2018-2028, LBTCF funding has been increased to a total of $20.8 million per annum across all 21 local boards.

7. The allocation for the Papakura Local Board has therefore increased, with the updated figures for the remainder of this electoral term reflected in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Papakura Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Funds Available in the current political term</th>
<th>$2,082,843</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount committed to date on projects approved for design and/or construction</td>
<td>$1,833,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining budget (including additional funding)</td>
<td>$249,606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Table 2 below shows the status of projects to which the LBTCF has been committed.

Table 2: Status update on current Local Board Transport Capital Fund projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Status change over last month</th>
<th>Funds allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footpath links for McLennan Park</td>
<td>Construct 2 shared paths in McLennan Park linking the new roads to the north of the park to Artillery Drive</td>
<td>Funding Agreement is with Community Facilities for signing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$397,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park walkway &amp; lighting</td>
<td>Install pathway &amp; lights for commuters from King Edward Ave to Railway Street West through Central Park</td>
<td>Community Facilities has provided a Rough Order of Cost (ROC) of $300,000. Awaits Board decision</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Projects 12 &amp; 13: Papakura Greenways Plan - Elliot Street to Freelance Terrace.</td>
<td>Develop a pedestrian and cycling link from the town centre and existing boardwalk to the new Pescara Way footbridge over SH1</td>
<td>Currently with Council’s Community Facilities/Parks for investigation and delivery</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Walkway</td>
<td>Covered walkways on Railway St West</td>
<td>Completed in this term</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$156,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,833,237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to resolutions

Bellfield Subdivision signalisation

9. At the local board meeting on 26/09/2018, it was resolved that the local board write a formal letter of complaint to the Auckland Transport Chief Executive and Cynthia Gillespie to express the board’s dissatisfaction in Auckland Transport’s refusal to engage with customers concerned by the proposed Bellfield road traffic signals and reiterate that the board is fully aware that Auckland Transport cannot change the resource consent, but wants to make sure Auckland Transport experts can explain to customers why the signals are necessary from a traffic management standpoint (resolution PPK/2018/165).

10. As previously advised, AT notes the Papakura Local Board request for AT to organise a public meeting to discuss the proposed signalisation of the Bellfield Road / Taonui Street / Great South Road intersection.

11. AT has previously provided advice on this request in the Auckland Transport September 2018 report to the Papakura Local Board, that signalising this intersection was a decision made during Auckland Council’s consent process for the sub-division of the Special Housing Area (SHA) called Opaheke 1 Precinct.

12. Auckland Transport has no legal mandate to change this decision. Further Auckland Transport was not the legal entity that made this decision so is not able to legitimately comment on the reasoning for the decision.

13. Details of the consent including the independently produced ‘Integrated Transportation Assessment’ were provided as an appendix to the Auckland Transport September 2018 Report to the Papakura Local Board.

14. In response to the most current request by local board to the Chief Executive of AT, the request is currently with his office for consideration.

Electronic Gating Project – Papakura train station

15. At the local board meeting on 26 September 2018 the board requested a more detailed update on the cause of the continued delays to the installation of ticketing gates at the Papakura train station (PPK/2018/165).

16. The local board also requested further clarification about the delays in the electronic gating project for Papakura train station.

17. Delays have occurred because of contractual issues during the previous upgrade of stations on the southern network. As a result, AT has reviewed the preferred procurement strategy for ticket gating at the remaining stations at Middlemore and Papakura and the construction work will now be delivered through one contract tendered in accordance with AT’s current procurement strategy.

18. Delivery dates for the Papakura and Middlemore train station ticket gates will be confirmed once tenders have been received, though this is expected to be during the first half of 2019.

19. A workshop will be held in November 2018 with the project team to discuss the overall concept and provide certainty about timelines to the board.

Pararekau Road

20. At the Papakura Local Board meeting on 26 September 2018, the board resolved to reiterate advocacy to AT for the repair of Pararekau Road over the last 14 months which has been ignored by AT, and express its view that if there is an incident or accident on the road due to the current road conditions, the responsibility lies with AT and not the Papakura Local Board (resolution PPK/2018/165).

21. AT notes the Papakura Local Board’s concern about the ongoing delays to the reinstatement of Pararekau Road and the inconvenience to local residents, and confirms that it will work...
with the contractor/developer to resolve the issue. In the meantime, AT will undertake the remedial works as soon as a design has been finalised.

22. AT has agreed that the design will now include a footpath suitable for use by pedestrians, cyclists and residents using mobility scooters, to address concerns around pedestrian safety.

23. At the time of the writing of this report, a timeline had yet to be confirmed, although this is expected shortly.

**Local Board Advocacy**

24. This section provides a regular report about how AT is supporting the Papakura Local Board’s advocacy Initiatives as recorded in the Papakura Local Board Plan. The Papakura Local Board’s Advocacy Initiatives from the 2016-19 term are recorded in table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy Initiative</th>
<th>Key Initiative</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papakura’s cycleway and walkways provide safe, connected alternative routes to get us to where we need to go.</td>
<td>Begin implementation of the Papakura Greenways Local Paths Plan and Cycleway Plan.</td>
<td>Through the LBTCF, AT is currently supporting the delivery of Projects 12 &amp; 13 of the Papakura Greenways Plan, which delivers a walking, and cycling link from the Papakura town centre to the Karaka Harbourside community. Utilising the local boards LBTCF, road-to-road pathways through McLennan Park are being delivered by AC. This will improve walking and cycling links between the existing communities in the area and the new communities in the McLennan Park development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish safe, clear, walk and cycle links between key facilities.</td>
<td>AT is in the process of delivering the Safer Communities project, which aims to improve pedestrian safety and connectivity in Papakura, focusing on the Papakura Train Station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve, through AT, pathway safety including lighting and accessibility.</td>
<td>AT is in the process of upgrading street lighting within the Papakura Town Centre. These upgrades are linked to a safety audit commissioned by the local board in 2017. This will improve lighting within the Papakura Town Centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport is safe, convenient, reliable and affordable.</td>
<td>Advocate to AT to improve park-and-ride facilities at the Papakura and Takanini railway stations.</td>
<td>AT is currently investigating the redevelopment of an expanded bus interchange and park-and-ride at the Papakura Train Station.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Auckland Transport news

Takanini Park & Ride
25. AT plans to develop a formal park and ride at Takanini (Rail) Station early in 2019. Leasing issues are in the process of being resolved with AC, as KiwiRail leasing approval was obtained earlier this year.
26. Detailed design is now complete and the project design is under final review by KiwiRail. AT expects to receive KiwiRail approval, lodge resource consent application and begin physical works procurement by the end of November, subject to NZTA funding approval.
27. Issues, such as the disposal of contaminated soil and redesign of stormwater disposal, have been identified that have increased the costs and timeframes. As the current cost estimate is higher than the approved, additional budget needs to be approved before procurement can begin. A decision on this is expected on 19 October 2018.
28. Work is expected to be completed by March/April 2019.

Takanini Train Station Platform upgrades
29. An upgrade to the Takanini and Te Mahia train stations commenced on 30 March 2018. The works will bring platform amenity at Takanini and Te Mahia stations into line with other stations on the AT rail network.
30. The past month saw the installation of the new shelters, lights and light masts, CCTV cameras and electronic signage.
31. Minor works remaining are completion of edging on the platform and removal of old shelters, which will be completed by January 2019.
32. As part of the upgrade, the new platform signage reflects the Maori spelling of the local area, utilising the double ‘a’ in its spelling – Takaanini. In part, this acknowledges the advocacy by the local board in requesting that the signage at the station reflect the historical significance of the area to Mana Whenua.

Papakura Park & Ride & Bus Interchange
33. This project is seeking to deliver a multi-storey park-and-ride alongside an expanded bus interchange adjoining the Papakura train station. This is a key priority for the local board, and noted as its One Local Initiative, through AC’s Long-term Plan.
34. This project is included in the Auckland RLTP (2018-2028) as a funded project, with $12 million allocated for the Park and Ride development in years 2018-2020. A further $6 million is identified for the bus station interchange, but is currently unfunded.
35. Currently, AT/Aurecon are working on the Single Stage Business Case (SSBC) for Papakura Rail Station Access (including park and ride, bus, walking, cycling and on-demand services).

36. AT and its consultant Aurecon are developing investment options with a view to establishing a recommended option to take forward for NZTA funding application and then design/construction.

37. The SSBC is expected to be completed in November 2018.

**Safer Communities Project**

38. Papakura is one of three trial locations for the Safer Communities Project. This project is focused on improving road safety in local communities and promoting active modes of transport by improving pedestrian infrastructure.

39. Initial community consultation was carried out in October 2017, with feedback used to develop a priority list of projects to improve the ‘walkability’ in and around Papakura, including the town centre as the focal point.

40. Targeted engagement with key stakeholders included Papakura Local Board, Papakura Commercial Group, the Integrated Area Plan team for Manurewa, Takanini and Papakura, the Park & Ride project team and AC’s Parks, Sport and Recreation team.

41. It was initially expected that the programme would deliver some quick wins in the 2018/19 financial year, but with the complexities of the programme, including work currently underway on the Papakura Park & Ride/ Papakura Station Access Project, this has had to be reconsidered.

42. AT is currently expecting to begin public consultation in March/April 2019, complete scheme designs by June 2019, undertake detailed design in 2019/2020 with the projects scheduled to begin in the first half of 2020/2021.

**Residential Speed Management - Rosehill, Papakura**

43. AT is undertaking a regional programme to deliver road safety improvements on local streets to create safer environments for all road users, including pedestrians and people on bikes.

44. The Rosehill area, bounded by Chichester Drive, Park Estate Road, Rosehill Drive, and the side streets leading off Great South Road, has been identified as the highest priority area in the region.

45. Improvements will include speed-calming measures such as speed humps, raised tables (some with zebra crossings), and raised intersections.

46. Rosehill was prioritised for road safety improvements based on a number of reasons, such as safety concerns raised by local residents, local crash data, vehicle speeds on Rosehill streets, the location of community facilities and primarily schools.

47. AT has also prioritised other locations in Papakura for pedestrian safety improvements in AT’s Safer Communities project.

48. Over the next few months, AT will be undertaking public consultation with the first event on Wednesday 14 November from 4pm – 7pm at the Papakura Library meeting room, located at 209 Great South Road, Papakura.

**Pathway through Central Park**

49. Through a request from the Papakura Local Board, AT and AC Community Facilities department were asked to obtain a ROC for the development of a pathway with lighting from Railway Street West through Central Park to King Edward Avenue.

50. AC Parks and Places has confirmed support for the installation of a shared path through Central Park and has provided a ROC of $300,000 for a 3 metre wide shared path with associated lighting, as specified by the local board.

51. A workshop will be held with the Papakura Local Board to consider options.
Parking on Opaheke Road & Chapel Street

52. In mid-2018, some of the bus layovers from Railway Street West and O'Shannesssey Street were relocated to Chapel Street and Opaheke Road, to address concerns raised by local businesses and residents about pedestrian safety and visual amenity within the town centre.

53. The relocation of the bus layovers displaced some of the time-restricted car parking serving the community service providers located on the corner of Opaheke Road and Chapel Street.

54. AT has been working with the community services and AC’s Parks and Places staff to resolve the parking issues.

55. The community service providers have asked for disability parking and additional time restricted car parking spaces for their clients.

Bus Lane/T2-3 Lane Great South Road, Takanini

56. AT is in the process of planning and delivering improved bus priority lanes throughout Auckland, and in this local board area, on Great South Road, Takanini.

57. Since the initial briefing to the local board in October 2017, this project has been revised, in part, due to local board feedback.

58. In August, the local board formally resolved their preference for a T2-3 lane, cycle lane to be removed from the road carriageway and for parking restrictions to be during peak hours only.

59. This has been referred to the AT project team for consideration and options and cost implications are currently being reviewed.

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

60. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no local impacts.

Auckland Transport consultations

61. There was only one consultation event on behalf of the local board in September 2018 seeking feedback on broken Yellow Lines on Wood Street at intersections with Duke Street, Menary Street and Union Street.

62. A summary can be found in Attachment A of this report.

Traffic Control Committee resolutions

63. Traffic Control Committee (TCC) decisions within the local board area are reported on a monthly basis. The decisions affecting the Papakura Local Board area in September 2018 are listed below in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street name</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Nature of Restriction</th>
<th>Committee Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hingaia Road, Papaka Road,</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking</td>
<td>Lane Arrow Markings, No Stopping At All Times, Give-Way Control, Flush Median, School</td>
<td>Approved in Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhaniui Road</td>
<td>changes Combined</td>
<td>Crossing Point, School Patrol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbourside Drive, Hingaia</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times, Bus Stop, Lane Arrow Markings, Traffic Island, Flush Median,</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>changes Combined</td>
<td>No Passing, Give-Way Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: TCC decision for Papakura in June 2018
Item 13
Traffic Signal Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Signal Control</th>
<th>Vespa Road, Toporoa Street, Gingernut Place, Songline Road, Cloud Way, Hayfield Way, Ockhams Street</th>
<th>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</th>
<th>No Stopping At All Times, Give-Way Control</th>
<th>Approved in Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francesco Drive, Brianna Place, Paparekau Road</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times, Bus Stop, Give-Way Control, Road Hump</td>
<td>Approved in Principle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

64. 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

65. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no financial implications

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

66. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no risks. AT has risk management strategies in place for the transport projects undertaken in the Papakura Local Board area.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

67. AT will provide another update report to the Papakura Local Board next month.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board_Consultation_Proposed NSAAT restrictions - Wood Street</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kenneth Tuai - Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon – Manager Elected Member Relationship Unit, Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description of Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Yellow Lines on Wood Street intersections with Duke Street, Menary Street and Union Street.</td>
<td>This is expected to improve road safety by increasing visibility at these intersections. Cars parked near corners are currently blocking visibility for drivers travelling along these streets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. This report seeks the Papakura Local Board’s formal position on the Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku) proposal to recommend to the Finance and Performance Committee the disposal of two council owned properties in the Papakura Local Board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. 26-32 O’Shannessey Street, Papakura and 36 Coles Crescent, Papakura are off-street carparks no longer required for transport service purposes. The rationalisation process for the sites commenced in August 2015 and November 2017 respectively. Consultation with council departments and CCOs, iwi authorities and the Papakura Local Board has now taken place.
3. At the request of the Papakura Local Board, Panuku assessed the development potential of both sites and considers the properties suitable for development for housing purposes in line with the council-approved Panuku Statement of Intent (SOI) development objectives.
4. 36 Coles Crescent is subject to the Reserves Act 1977. If approval is obtained to dispose of the site for development purposes, the reserve status would need to be revoked. Final revocation of the reserve status will be subject to completing the statutory requirements of the Reserves Act 1977 and Local Government Act 2002, including public advertising.
5. A resolution approving the disposal of the sites is required from the Finance and Performance Committee before the proposed revocation and divestment can be progressed.

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

a) endorse Panuku Development Auckland’s recommendation to the Finance and Performance Committee to dispose of 26-32 O’Shannessey Street, Papakura; and revoke the reserve status and dispose of 36 Coles Crescent, Papakura subject to appropriate controls to ensure strategic outcomes in line with Panuku SOI development objectives.

Horopaki / Context
6. Panuku is required to undertake an ongoing review of council’s property assets. This includes identifying properties from within council’s portfolio that are no longer required for public work purposes and may be suitable for sale and development if appropriate. Panuku has a particular focus on achieving housing and urban regeneration outcomes. Identifying potential sale properties contributes to the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 (LTP) and the Auckland Plan focus of accommodating the significant growth projected for the region over the coming decades, by providing council with an efficient use of capital and prioritisation of funds to achieve its activities and projects.
7. Once a property has been identified as potentially no longer required for public work purposes, Panuku engages with council departments and its CCOs through an expression of interest process, to establish whether the property must be retained for a strategic purpose
or is required for a future funded public work. Once a property has been internally cleared of any public work requirements, Panuku then consults with local boards, mana whenua and ward councillors. All sale recommendations must be approved by the Panuku Board before a final recommendation is made to the Finance and Performance Committee. The Finance and Performance Committee makes the final decision whether to approve a property for sale.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
8. Property specific information and further analysis is included in Attachment A for 26-32 O’Shannessey Street, Papakura and Attachment B for 36 Coles Crescent, Papakura.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
9. This report provides the local board with an opportunity to formalise its views regarding both sites.
10. Additional property specific feedback received is included Attachment A for 26-32 O’Shannessey Street, Papakura and Attachment B for 36 Coles Crescent, Papakura.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
11. Māori have an active and specific role in Auckland’s open spaces, including kaitiakitanga (guardianship) of our land and marine resources. Land has a specific role in protecting, enabling and building Māori social and cultural capital. Marae, kohanga reo, and other Māori entities have been established on reserve status land, offering spiritual, cultural, as well as a range of social, educational, health and justice services.
12. The importance of effective communication and engagement with Māori on the subject of land is understood. Panuku has a robust form of engagement with mana whenua groups across the region. Each relevant mana whenua group is contacted independently regarding council-owned land subject to rationalisation and requested to give feedback.
13. Panuku’s engagement invites mana whenua to respond with any issues of particular cultural significance the group would like to formally express in relation to the subject properties. We also request notes regarding any preferred outcomes that the group would like Panuku to consider in our formal reporting to council. Possible outcomes could include commemoration or physical acknowledgment in the form of plaques or other mutually agreed means of recognition.
14. Mana whenua groups are also invited to express potential commercial interest in the subject sites. In the event the sites are approved for sale, all groups will be alerted of the decision, and all groups are alerted once a property comes on the market.
15. Additional property specific information is included in the mana whenua engagement section in Attachment A for 26-32 O’Shannessey Street and Attachment B 36 Coles Crescent.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
16. Capital receipts from the sale of surplus properties contribute to Auckland Plan outcomes and the LTP by providing the council with an efficient use of capital and prioritisation of funds to achieve its activities and projects. In the 2018/2019 financial year, the LTP has forecast the disposal of non-strategic council assets to the combined value of $24 million.
17. In accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, the annual Panuku SOI states the activities and intentions of Panuku, the objectives those activities will contribute to, and performance measures and targets as the basis of organisational accountability. For the 2018/2019 financial year Panuku is required to recommend to the council properties from within council’s portfolio that may be suitable for sale to a combined value of $30 million and to sell $24 million of property by 30 June 2019.
Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
18. 26-32 O’Shanessy Street and 36 Coles Crescent are not required by the council for current or future public work requirements that are funded or can realistically be funded in the future. To retain non-service property for an undefined purpose is contrary to the council’s Revenue and Funding Policy principles and would require support from the Finance and Performance Committee given the impact of not realising the sale of a non-service property, and to allocate the operational budget required to hold the sites.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
19. Should the Finance and Performance Committee approve the proposed disposal of 26-32 O’Shanesssey Street and 36 Coles Crescent, Panuku will explore development options to ensure outcomes in line with the Panuku SOI development objectives, specifically town centre regeneration and housing outcomes.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
<td></td>
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26-32 O'Shannessey Street, Papakura property information

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
1. 26-32 O'Shannessey Street, Papakura is an off-street car park released by Auckland Transport as it was not required for its future service needs and having no strategic purpose to retain. The rationalisation process commenced in August 2015. Consultation with council departments and its COOs, iwi authorities and the Papakura Local Board about the subject site has been undertaken. Given that no public work requirement has been identified by the council, Panuku recommends the disposal of this site with appropriate legal controls to achieve predetermined development outcomes in line with the Panuku SOI urban renewal and housing development objectives.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Property information
2. 26-32 O’Sshannessey Street, Papakura is a 809m² council owned site that was acquired by the former Papakura City Council in 1983 for parking purposes. The site is subject to a right of way obligation providing access to the adjoining property at 22 O’Sshannessey Street.
3. 26-32 O’Sshannessey Street was managed by AT as part of its car parking network. In 2015, the AT Board resolved that it was no longer required for AT’s infrastructure purposes. 26-32 O’Sshannessey Street was subsequently transferred from AT to council for rationalisation purposes.
4. The Auckland Unitary Plan zoning of 26-32 O’Sshannessey Street is Metropolitan Centre. It has a 2017 capital value of $580,000.

Internal consultation
5. The rationalisation process commenced in August 2015. No alternate service uses for the subject site were identified during the internal consultation.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
1. Panuku first engaged with the Papakura Local Board in November 2015 resulting in the local board providing informal advice that it was opposed to the proposed disposal of 26-32 O’Sshannessey Street and questioned AT’s decision to release the site from service. The local board later requested in 2017 the site also be investigated as an off street bus layover.
2. Panuku raised these concerns with AT, which confirmed that it does not require 26-32 O’Sshannessey Street, Papakura for current or future transport infrastructure purposes. AT also advised that the evaluation criteria used was in terms of catchment, utilisation and access to public transport consistent with the Auckland Parking Strategy 2015.
3. In April 2017, the local board requested that that the subject site be considered in the context of the Manurewa – Takanini – Papakura Area Spatial Plan as part of the rationalisation process. Staff confirmed with Council’s Central/South Planning team that individual sites such as 26-32 O’Sshannessey Street are not reviewed as part of the Area Spatial Plan for the Manurewa – Takanini – Papakura area. Central/South
Planning confirmed its previous assessment that it does not see a need to retain the subject site in council ownership.

4. The Papakura Local Board formally opposed the proposed disposal of 26-32 O’Shannessey Street, Papakura at its 20 September 2017 meeting on the following basis:
   - the site’s importance within the Papakura Town Centre, with any subsequent disposal being subject to appropriate planning and design controls / covenants to ensure that its future redevelopment contributes positively to the role of Papakura as an emerging metropolitan centre;
   - feedback from the Papakura Commercial Project Group, which has developed a conceptual development plan for the Papakura Town Centre as a metropolitan centre be considered as part of the decision making process;
   - requested that a disposal be considered within Panuku’s optimisation or reinvestment policy frame work;
   - the local board will address council’s Finance and Performance Committee opposing the disposal of this site.

5. Panuku advised the local board that 26-32 O’Shannessey Street does not meet the reinvestment policy framework criteria as the Papakura town centre is not a Panuku priority development location. Therefore, no sale proceeds can be reinvested in the specific area in order to deliver on certain public realm projects. Furthermore, the property does not meet the service property optimisation criteria as it does not provide a current council service. However, Panuku has agreed to seek urban renewal and housing development outcomes under its “support” development category which will supplement the revitalisation of the town centre.

6. At a workshop held on 23 May 2018, the local board was informed of the potential to enter into a development agreement with the adjacent landowner to achieve a mixed use development with housing outcomes comprising social housing for the older person or a possible kiwibuild component. The local board provided informal feedback that indicated it was not supportive of further social housing development in Papakura and that both disabled and short term public car parking be incorporated in any private development at 26-32 O’Shannessey Street.

7. At the request of the local board, Panuku undertook further investigations and advised the local board at a workshop held on 10 October 2018 that the potential to achieve the development outcomes outlined above was still achievable; however, public parking would not form any part of the agreement as AT does not require parking at this site.

8. Panuku advised that should the local board wish to include additional feedback from the Papakura Commercial Project Group as part of the local board’s formal feedback, Panuku will report as part of the decision making process.

**Mana Whenua engagement**

9. Ten mana whenua iwi authorities were contacted regarding the potential sale of 26-32 O’Shannessey St, Papakura. The following feedback was received:
   a) Te Kawerau-ā-Maki
      No feedback was received for this site.
b) **Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki**

Ngāi Tai ki Tamaki advised it had commercial interest in the property and signaled an increased interest in council owned property that may become available for sale in their rohe. Panuku will follow up with Ngāi Tai ki Tamaki should the property be approved for disposal.

c) **Ngāti Tamaoho**

Ngāti Tamaoho advised that Papakura is of high cultural significance to Ngāti Tamaoho, who occupied the area for centuries. It is currently the single location with the highest population of those who identify with Tamaoho. Panuku responded and advised Ngāti Tamaoho that the information would be considered by council’s Finance and Performance Committee when making a decision on the future of the site.

Ngāti Tamaoho also expressed commercial interest, as the site enables it to partly provide a presence in the community and also to provide a base from which to promote economic activity and if possible, support community service delivery. If approved for disposal, Panuku will follow up with Ngāti Tamaoho on potential commercial opportunities.

d) **Te Akitai Waiohua**

Te Akitai Waiohua advised it had commercial interest in the property. Panuku will follow up with Te Akitai Waiohua should the property be approved for divestment.

e) **Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua**

No site specific feedback received for this site; however Ngāti Te Ata has expressed general cultural interest across Tāmaki Makaurau, has potential commercial interest in any council owned land that comes available for sale in their rohe and notes specific association with the south western area of Auckland, focusing around Manukau and the western coastline. Panuku will follow up with Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua should the property be approved for disposal.

f) **Ngāti Paoa**

No feedback was received for this site.

g) **Ngāti Whanaunga**

No feedback was received for this site.

h) **Ngāti Maru**

No feedback was received for this site.

i) **Ngāti Tamaterā**

No feedback was received for this site.

j) **Waikato-Tainui**

Waikato-Tainui advised that as a matter of principal all lands are culturally important to Waikato-Tainui should they fall within their tribal rohe and would look at acquiring the property in the future should an opportunity arise. Panuku will follow up with Waikato-Tainui should the property be approved for divestment.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

10. Should the Finance and Performance Committee approve the proposed disposal for housing and urban renewal purposes, Panuku will explore disposal options such as an intensified mixed use housing development in line with the Panuku SOI objectives and the Auckland Plan.
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36 Coles Crescent, Papakura property information

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
1. 36 Coles Crescent, Papakura is an off-street car park that has been identified through the rationalisation process with development potential for housing and urban renewal development. The rationalisation process commenced in November 2017. Consultation with council departments and CCOs, iwi authorities and the Papakura Local Board has now taken place. Given that no public work requirement has been identified by the council, Panuku recommends the disposal of this site with appropriate legal controls to achieve housing and urban renewal purposes with predetermined development outcomes in line with the Panuku SOI development objectives.

2. 36 Coles Crescent is subject to the Reserves Act 1977. If approval is obtained to dispose of the site, the reserve status would need to be revoked. Final revocation of the reserve status will be subject to completing the statutory requirements of the Reserves Act 1977 and Local Government Act 2002, including public advertising.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
Property information 36 Coles Crescent, Papakura
3. 36 Coles Crescent, Papakura is a 3,586m² site that comprises of five separate parcels that are local purpose (parking) reserves, and two that are local purpose (service lane) reserves subject to the Reserves Act 1977.

4. The seven parcels were acquired by the former Papakura Borough Council and former Papakura District Council between 1953 and 1983 for parking and service lane purposes.

5. Another service lane reserve adjoins the northern boundary of the site. That 97m² site is also included as part of the council rationalisation process, as the service lane provides access to the rear of three privately owned properties and it would not be appropriate to remove that access unless it is provided by other means.

6. Following an enquiry from a member of the public seeking to purchase the site, a review established there is no requirement to use the site for transport purposes. Panuku subsequently commenced the rationalisation process for 36 Coles Crescent.

7. The Auckland Unitary Plan zoning of 36 Coles Crescent and the adjoining service lane is Metropolitan Centre. The combined parcels have a 2017 capital valuation of $1.7 million.

8. The entirety of 36 Coles Crescent is subject to the Reserves Act 1977. Accordingly the reserve status of the parcels will need to be revoked under section 24 of the Reserves Act 1977 before any proposed disposal could be completed.

Internal consultation
9. The rationalisation process commenced in November 2017. No alternate service uses for the subject site were identified during the internal consultation.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
10. In response to the concerns raised by the Papakura Local Board regarding the proposed disposal of 26-32 O’Shannessey Street, Panuku agreed in November 2017
to explore potential development options for the site at 36 Coles Crescent in conjunction with the development investigations at 26-32 O'Shanessey Street. This would potentially align with the outcomes of the planning work currently being undertaken by the Papakura Commercial Group.

11. At a workshop held on 23 May 2018, Panuku informed the local board of the potential to enter into development agreements with a potential development partner on this site. The local board provided informal feedback that supported preserving the existing access-way and parking for the adjacent pre-school facility. It also indicated that it was not opposed to the proposal for 16 residential units.

**Mana Whenua engagement**

12. Ten mana whenua iwi authorities were contacted regarding the potential sale of 36 Coles Crescent, Papakura. The following feedback was received.

a) **Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki**
   No feedback was received for this site.

b) **Ngāti Tamaoho**
   Ngāti Tamaoho advised that Papakura is of high cultural significance to Ngāti Tamaoho, who occupied the area for centuries. It is currently the single location with the highest population of those who identify with Tamaoho. Panuku responded and advised Ngāti Tamaoho that the information would be considered by council’s Finance and Performance Committee when making a decision on the future of the site.

   Ngāti Tamaoho also expressed commercial interest, as the site enables it to partly provide a presence in the community and also to provide a base from which to promote economic activity and if possible, support community service delivery. If approved for disposal, Panuku will follow up with Ngāti Tamaoho on potential commercial opportunities.

c) **Te Akitai - Waiohua**
   No feedback was received for this site.

d) **Ngāti Te Ata - Waiohua**
   No feedback was received for this site.

e) **Te Ahiwaru**
   No feedback was received for this site.

f) **Ngāti Paoa**
   No feedback was received for this site.

g) **Ngaati Whanaunga**
   No feedback was received for this site.

h) **Ngāti Maru**
   No feedback was received for this site.

i) **Ngāti Tamatera**
   No feedback was received for this site.

j) **Waikato-Tainui**
   No feedback was received for this site.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

13. Should the Finance and Performance Committee approve the proposed disposal of 36 Coles Crescent, Panuku will explore disposal options to ensure outcomes in line with the Panuku SOI development objectives, specifically town centre regeneration and housing outcomes.
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Figure 1: GIS aerial of property; subject area is highlighted in light-blue. Yellow-grid - adjoining service lane (97m2).
Papakura Local Grants, Round One 2018/2019 grant applications

File No.: CP2018/17801

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To fund, part-fund or decline the applications received for Papakura Local and Multiboard Grants Round One 2018/2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This report presents applications received in Papakura Local and Multi-board Grants Round One 2018/2019 which are provided in Attachment B.
3. The Papakura Local Board adopted the Papakura Local Grants Programme 2018/2019 on 18 April 2018 provided in Attachment A. The document sets application guidelines for contestable grants submitted to the local board.
4. The Papakura Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $129,000 for the 2018/2019 financial year.
5. A total of $2,000 has been allocated to the senior citizen programme in the Arts, Community and Events work programme 2018/2019. A total of $8,654.00 was allocated in the small grants round one (PPK/2018/149). An emergency grant of $2,000 was awarded to the Counties Manukau Softball Association (PPK/2018/184). This leaves a total of $116,346 available to be allocated to the remaining grant rounds.
6. A total of 18 applications were received in Papakura Local Grant Round One 2018/2019, and 12 multiboard applications requesting a total of $161,596.00 (Attachment B).

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

a) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in this round listed in Table One below:

Table One: 2018/2019 Papakura Local Board Grants Round One and Multi-board Applications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-103</td>
<td>innovative Limited</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the innovative youth leaders wananga cost.</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-104</td>
<td>Papakura and Districts Historical Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Towards the cost of vintage sewing classes.</td>
<td>$4,970.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-105</td>
<td>Papakura City Football Club</td>
<td>Sport and Recreation</td>
<td>Towards junior and youth coaching courses.</td>
<td>$1,392.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-106</td>
<td>Trust MYRIVR</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the project manager contract cost.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-111</td>
<td>South Auckland Choral Society</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Towards fees for a musical director and accompanist.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-115</td>
<td>Mercy Missions Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards poultry and poultry egg layer pellets.</td>
<td>$3,400.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-116</td>
<td>Papakura Business Association</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Towards the painting costs for the creative mural for the Papakura Town Centre.</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-117</td>
<td>Papakura Business Association</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Towards the cost of the Kereru sculpture for the Papakura Town Centre Square.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-118</td>
<td>The Rising Foundation Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards programme coordinator operating costs.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-120</td>
<td>Southside Drama</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Towards the Southside Drama workshops and production.</td>
<td>$3,180.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-122</td>
<td>Auckland Seniors and Caring Group Incorporated.</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Towards 2018 Christmas Party and Chinese Spring Festival celebration cost.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-125</td>
<td>Papakura Marae</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Towards co-ordinator costs for “Destination Papakura -Te Manaakitanga”. heritage programme</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-126</td>
<td>John Walker Find Your Field of Dreams Foundation</td>
<td>Sport and Recreation</td>
<td>Towards coaching and delivery costs for the” Run, Jump and Throw” programme.</td>
<td>$16,900.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Main focus</td>
<td>Requesting funding for</td>
<td>Amount requested</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-127</td>
<td>Kaitiaki Sisters Incorporated Society</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Sustainable communities, sustainable environment” workshops.</td>
<td>$14,863.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-128</td>
<td>Papakura Lions Club</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards advertising and security fencing for the Papakura Lions Annual Family Car Show.</td>
<td>$6,675.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-129</td>
<td>innonative Limited</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards event costs for the innonative young professionals evening.</td>
<td>$1,587.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-130</td>
<td>Life Education Trust Counties Manukau</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost to deliver health and well-being lessons to children of Papakura.</td>
<td>$14,325.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1914-132</td>
<td>innonative Limited</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards “life after high school hacks” workshop cost.</td>
<td>$1,323.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$114,115.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiboard applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-106</td>
<td>Lets Get Legal Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Requesting the cost of free drivers' license workshops.</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-118</td>
<td>Manukau Orchestral Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Towards the venue hire and technical costs for a musical performance at the Vodafone Events Centre.</td>
<td>$1,084.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-147</td>
<td>Auckland Central Riding for the Disabled Association</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of helmets.</td>
<td>$1,128.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-151</td>
<td>New Zealand Dance Advancement Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards venue hire, studio hire and the artistic coordinator cost for the “2019 Youth and Community Engagement” programme.</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-160</td>
<td>New Zealand Nepal Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the audio visual hire and operational costs of the Nepal Festival 2018.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-161</td>
<td>ADFC Limited</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards venue, sound and visual hire cost for the Auckland Drum Festival in April 2019.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-162</td>
<td>New Zealand Council of Victim Support Groups Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the costs to recruit, train and supervise the volunteer support workers.</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-174</td>
<td>LifeKidz Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of outdoor play panels and the cost of youth worker wages, to run youth programmes.</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-177</td>
<td>New Zealand Filipino Sto Nino Devotees Trust</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the venue hire and audio-visual costs for a two-day basketball competition and the Annual Sto Nino Fiesta and Sinulog Festival.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-182</td>
<td>Counties Manukau Sports Foundation</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the cost of the 2018 Counties Manukau Sporting Excellence Awards including venue hire, event co-ordinator and catering costs.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-190</td>
<td>Auckland Kids Achievement Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards wages for Kiwi Can leaders who deliver the Kiwi Can programme in schools.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1819-193</td>
<td>OUTLine Telephone Support Line</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards phone support line for “LGBTQI+” identified people to call for information.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | $47,481.00 |

**Horopaki / Context**

7. The local board allocates grants to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders and contribute to the vision of being a world class city.

8. Auckland Council Community Grants Policy supports each local board to adopt a grants programme.

9. The local board grants programme sets out:
   - local board priorities
   - lower priorities for funding
   - exclusions
   - grant types, the number of grant rounds and when these will open and close
   - any additional accountability requirements.

10. The Papakura Local Board adopted their grants programme for 2018/2019 on 18 April 2018 and will operate three quick response and two local grants rounds for this financial year.

11. The community grant programmes have been extensively advertised through the council grants webpage, local board webpages, local board e-newsletters, Facebook pages, council publications, radio, and community networks.
12. For the 2018/2019 financial year, the Papakura Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $129,000 for the financial year.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice**

13. The aim of the local board grant programme is to deliver projects and activities which align with the outcomes identified in the local board plan. All applications have been assessed utilising the Community Grants Policy and the local board grant programme criteria. The eligibility of each application is identified in the report recommendations.

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

14. Local boards are responsible for the decision-making and allocation of local board community grants. The Papakura Local Board is required to fund, part-fund or decline these grant applications against the local board priorities identified in the local board grant programme.

15. The board is requested to note that section 48 of the Community Grants Policy states "We will also provide feedback to unsuccessful grant applicants about why they have been declined, so they will know what they can do to increase their chances of success next time”.

16. A summary of each application received through Papakura Small Grants Round One 2018/2019 is provided in Attachment B.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

17. The local board grants programme aims to respond to Auckland Council's commitment to improving Maori wellbeing by providing grants to individuals and groups who deliver positive outcomes for Maori. Auckland Council’s Maori Responsiveness Unit has provided input and support towards the development of the community grant processes.

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

18. Following the Papakura Local Board allocating funding for the small grants round one, Commercial and Finance staff will notify the applicants of the local board’s decision.

19. The Papakura Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $129,000.00. This is the second allocation for the local board in the 2018/2019 year. A total of $2,000 has been allocated to the senior citizen programme (PPK/2017/110). A total of $8,654.00 was allocated in the small grants round one (PPK/2018/149). An emergency grant of $2,000 was awarded to the Counties Manukau Softball Association (PPK/2018/184). An amount of $116,346 is available to be allocated to the remaining grant rounds.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

20. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy and the local board grants programme. The assessment process has identified a low risk associated with funding the applications in this round.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

21. Following the Papakura Local Board allocating funding for the local grants round one, Commercial and Finance staff will notify the applicants of the local board’s decision.
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Papakura Local Board Community Grants Programme 2018/2019

File No.: CP2018/04853

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

Whakarāpopotanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy was implemented on 1 July 2015. The policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.
3. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year.
4. This report presents the Papakura Local Board Community Grants Programme 2018/2019 for adoption (see attachment A).

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) adopt the Papakura Local Board Community Grants Programme 2018/2019.

Horopaki / Context
5. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy was implemented on 1 July 2015. The policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.
6. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year. The local board grants programme guides community groups and individuals when making applications to the local board.
7. The local board community grants programme includes:
   • outcomes as identified in the local board plan
   • specific local board grant priorities
   • which grant types will operate, the number of grant rounds and opening and closing dates
   • any additional criteria or exclusions that will apply
   • other factors the local board consider to be significant to their decision-making.
8. Once the local board community grants programme for the 2018/2019 financial year has been adopted, the types of grants, grant rounds, criteria and eligibility will be advertised through an integrated communication and marketing approach which includes utilising the local board channels.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
9. The new Papakura Community Grants Programme has been workshopped with the local board and feedback incorporated into the grants programme for 2018/2019.
10. The new grant programme includes:
   - new outcomes and priorities from the Papakura Local Board Plan 2017
   - the same number of grant rounds for 2018/2019, as are available in 2017/2018.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
11. The Community Grants Programme has been developed by the local board to set the direction of their grants programme. This programme is reviewed on an annual basis.

Tauāki whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
12. All grant programmes respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to improving Māori wellbeing by providing grants to organisations delivering positive outcomes for Māori. Applicants are asked how their project aims to increase Māori outcomes in the application process.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
13. The allocation of grants to community groups is within the adopted Long Term Plan 2015 - 2025 and local board agreements.

Ngā rau tūpono / Risks
14. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy and the local board grants programme. Therefore, there is minimal risk associated with the adoption of the grants programme.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
15. An implementation plan is underway and the local board grants programme will be locally advertised through the local board and council channels. Targeted advertising and promotion will be developed for target populations, including migrant and refugee groups, disability groups, Māori and iwi organisations.
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Papakura Local Board
24 October 2018

Smiths Avenue community hall hire fee subsidy

File No.: CP2018/19875

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To approve a zero-fee hire for all activity at the Smiths Avenue community hall.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Smiths Avenue community hall (the Hall) is one of seven venues for hire in the Papakura Local Board area.
3. The Hall currently experiences lower levels of usage than other facilities in the area.
4. The Papakura Local Board recently invested $160,000 in capital improvements to the Hall, with the aim of raising levels of participation and engagement.
5. Staff recommend setting hire fees for all activity at the Hall to zero for the 2018/2019 financial year and offsetting any unrecovered revenue from existing Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) budget allocated to placemaking, to support increasing community participation and engagement at the Hall.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) approve a zero-fee hire for all activity at the Smiths Avenue community hall and subsidise any unrecovered revenue from the 2018/2019 work programme line #780.

Horopaki / Context
6. Local boards are responsible for setting local fees and charges, including subsidies, for council-run venues.
7. In 2014, council adopted the Hire Fee Framework. This operational policy guides the setting of fees and charges across the network of council-managed community centres and venues for hire. The framework also includes financial incentives aimed at enabling community outcomes.
8. The Hall is one of seven venues for hire in the Papakura Local Board area and currently experiences lower levels of usage than other facilities.
9. The local board recently invested $160,000 in capital improvements to the Hall, focussing on toilets and appearance, through to internal and external painting.
10. In June 2018, the local board adopted the Arts, Community and Events (ACE) 2018/2019 work programme (PPK/2018/110). The programme includes line #780 Community-led placemaking to facilitate community-led planning and neighbourhood development in Smiths Avenue, with an allocated budget of $55,000.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
11. Current hire fees for the Hall are set according to the Hire Fee Framework as follows:
12. Recent local board funded improvements have significantly improved the look and feel of the Hall and one of the key objectives is to increase community use of the facility by making it a more attractive and welcoming space.

13. Another way to try and increase community use of the Hall is by reducing the hire fees. Staff have considered the options, which include setting the hire fees to zero, and these options are set out in Table 1 below:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Financial impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>The Hall experiences lower levels of usage than other facilities in the local board area, which may not improve if the current hire fees are maintained</td>
<td>Budgeted revenue to the local board for FY18-19: $4,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current hire fees apply</td>
<td>Fewer people will experience the benefits of recent investment in the Hall and local community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No additional subsidies apply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Set fees to zero for community activity</td>
<td>Could create an expectation for continued subsidies in FY20 onward.</td>
<td>Local board underwrite unrecovered revenue, approximately $4,000, from existing LDI provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community activity is classed as no or low cost activity open to the wider community</td>
<td>Local celebrations and social activity that are not open to the wider community will still attract a charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Set fees to zero for all activity types</td>
<td>Promotes recent local board investment in the hall and local community</td>
<td>Could create an expectation for continued subsidies in the 2019/2020 financial year onward. The local board can allocate a budget in the next financial year work programme to allow the zero fees hire to continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subsidise all activity</td>
<td>Removes the barrier of cost to some local activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Staff recommend Option 3, that the local board set hire fees for all activity at the Hall to zero for the 2018/2019 financial year and offset any unrecovered revenue from existing LDI allocated to placemaking in 2018/2019 work programme line #780.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe /
Local impacts and local board views

15. At a workshop on 15 August 2018, the local board discussed options for subsiding the fees and charges, including subsidising all activity or only those activities open to a wider audience and community focus.

16. The board expressed concern in subsidising activity that was of a political or religious type and requested information on excluding these types of activity from a possible subsidy. Staff have looked into this possibility and concluded that excluding religious or political activity specifically is difficult. The booking system is currently configured to base any subsidy on outcome type (private, commercial, community) rather than the activity type (celebrations, meeting, political, dance).

17. The Hall is one of seven venues for hire in the local board area and currently experiences lower levels of usage than other facilities. Subsidising all hire fees could help to increase the number of people in the local board area using the Hall.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

18. The hire fee subsidy is not specifically targeted for Māori populations. However, it aims to be clear and transparent to all users and enable all Aucklanders, including Māori, to use the facility.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

19. If the hire fees for the Hall are set to zero the local board will be required to underwrite unrecovered revenue, which is budgeted to be $4,955.

20. A budget of $55,000 has already been allocated to work programme line #780 for community-led planning and neighbourhood development in Smiths Avenue and this can be used to subsidise hire fees.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

21. Setting the hire fee at zero could create an expectation for continued subsidies in the 2019/2020 financial year onward. The local board can allocate a budget in the next financial year work programme to allow the zero hire fees to continue.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

22. On receiving confirmation of a decision by the local board, staff will implement the appropriate administration arrangement.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval of the development of an open space network plan.

Whakarāpopototangamatuamatua/Executive summary
2. The key purpose of the open space network plan is to inform local board open space planning, resource allocation and advocacy over a 10-year period.
3. Staff recommend that the Papakura Local Board approve the development of an open space network plan. It provides an opportunity to improve the quality of parks and open space through greater connectivity, better access and utilisation as well as gap analysis.
4. There are limited risks in developing the open space network plan. The plan may raise community expectations that all projects are fully funded. No additional budget is provided for the implementation of the open space network plan.
5. If approved, staff will work with the local board to identify and analyse the current state.
6. Once the current state is completed, the project will move to identifying the aspirations of the local board and key moves required to improve performance of the open space network.
7. During the final stage of the project, the local board will identify prioritised actions to achieve the key moves and then adopt the open space network plan.
8. The target date for completion of the open space network plan is June 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga/Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) approve the scope of work for the development of an open space network plan.

Horopaki/Context
9. An open space network plan is a key mechanism for Auckland Council to implement the Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan 2013 at a local level.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu/Analysis and advice
10. The process for developing an open space network plan involves research, collaboration and planning phases.
11. The scope of work includes:
   - identifying and analysing the current performance of the open space network incorporating, amongst other things, the work of existing local park development plans
   - identifying the aspirations and key moves required to improve performance of the open space network
   - identifying and prioritising local place-based actions to achieve the key moves.
12. The scope of the open space network plan includes all open space that is controlled and managed by the local board, including parks, sports fields, greenways and outdoor civic areas.

13. Reserve management plans, regional parks, maunga and recreation facilities (including stadia, pools, indoor courts and cemeteries) are out of scope for this open space network plan.

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

14. Staff introduced the open space network plan and the components required for the successful completion at a workshop with the local board on 10 October.

15. Staff will workshop with the local board on 5 December 2018 to present survey results and present interim findings about the open space network. A Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats session will also be undertaken to seek the local board’s views.

16. Staff will continue to engage with the local board on the development of the open space network plan through further workshops.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

17. Based on the 2013 Census, there were 11,979 people living in the Papakura Local Board area who identify as Māori.

18. Papakura’s Māori population was ranked third in size out of the 21 Auckland local boards.

19. 36.7 per cent of Māori (4396 residents) were aged under 15 years and 4.1 per cent were aged over 65 years (497 people residents).

20. There are 11 iwi groups who have interests in the area:
   - Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei
   - Ngāti Tamaoho
   - Te Ata Waiohua
   - Ngāti Whanaunga
   - Ngāti Tamaterā
   - Waikato-Tainui
   - Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki
   - Te Akitai Waiohua Ngāti
   - Ngāti Paoa
   - Ngāti Maru
   - Te Patukirikiri

21. Consultation with iwi is proposed to take place at two fora held at the South/Central Mana Whenua Forum. Both dates are still yet to be confirmed.

22. The Papakura Local Board expresses its commitment to building its working relationship with local Māori through the 2017/2018 Local Board Agreement.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

23. Development of the open space network plan is funded by Community and Social Policy.

24. No funding has been allocated for public consultation, as the open space network plan informs local board decision-making. There is no statutory requirement to involve the public.

25. No additional budget is provided for the implementation of the open space network plan.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

26. There are limited risks in developing the open space network plan. The plan may raise community expectations that all of the projects are fully funded. However, no additional budget is provided.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

27. Staff will work collaboratively with the local board and mana whenua to prepare the current state.

28. Once the current state is completed, the project will then identify key moves and actions. The local board may then consider making these moves to improve the performance of the open space network.

29. It is intended the open space network plan will be completed by June 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Adopt the Healthy Environments Events Principles and Guide to Creating a Health Promoting Event for Auckland Council funded or delivered events in the Papakura Local Board area, as one part of the overall Healthy Environments Framework.

2. Endorse Community Places as a priority area for the Healthy Environments Framework.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

3. Healthy Families New Zealand is a major investment by government into reducing preventable chronic disease in New Zealand. It is based around a systems approach to health that addresses the environmental influences of health where people live, learn, work and play.

4. Healthy Families Manukau Manurewa-Papakura (MMP) has started developing a Healthy Environments Framework to support the council’s responsibility to provide spaces in the community that facilitate social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes, including wellbeing. Potential areas of council operations that could be included in the overall framework include events, leisure centres, community places, leasing agreements and funding grants. This report seeks adoption of the principles and guide for events as part of the development of the overall framework.

5. The Healthy Environments Framework is intended to support Auckland Council staff, local boards and community to increase healthy choices and options through the availability and accessibility of healthy food and drink choices, reduced smoking and alcohol related harm, and increased opportunities that encourage movement.

6. Healthy Families MMP has developed four Healthy Environments Principles which is provided as Attachment A, and Guide to Creating a Health Promoting Event provided in Attachment B, using a co-design methodology. These documents promote a range of options regarding wai (water), kai (food), smokefree, alcohol free and physical movement and has been endorsed by the Auckland Council Events team.

7. The report also seeks the board’s endorsement of the council’s community places as a priority area for the Healthy Environments Framework. This will enable Healthy Families MMP to work with staff from Community Places department and explore ways to make community places healthier environments.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) adopt the Healthy Environments Events Principles (Attachment A) and Guide to Creating a Health Promoting Event (Attachment B) for use at Auckland Council funded or delivered events in the Papakura Local Board area commencing in the 2018/2019 events season

b) endorse community places as a priority area for the Healthy Environments Framework and request Healthy Families Manukau Manurewa-Papakura to work with Community Places to investigate how community places can become healthier environments.
Horopaki / Context

8. A review of 55 studies on childhood obesity concluded that the most effective strategies to reducing obesity include improving the supply of healthier options, environments that support healthier options and reducing the promotion of unhealthy options.

9. Success in reducing obesity requires as many interventions as possible by a range of private and public agencies. Obesity is a major risk factor for a wide range of non-communicable disease, including heart disease, stroke, type 2 diabetes, cancer, osteoarthritis and depression.

10. The Agencies for Nutrition Action: Promoting Physical Activity at the Local Government Level (evidence snap shot; April 2015) highlights being physically active is a major contributor to an individual’s overall physical and mental health and wellbeing. The report also states that an incidental benefit is that there is an improved perception of community safety as there are more people using public places.

11. Māori and Pacific people have the highest rates of preventable disease in the Counties Manukau District Health Board area. Over half of Papakura Local Board residents are of Māori and/or Pacific descent.

12. The Healthy Auckland Together 2018 monitoring report highlights that children residing in the highest deprivation areas were 22 per cent less likely to have healthy teeth and gums than those residing in the least deprived areas. Healthy teeth and gums can help prevent serious health problems such as tooth decay and gum disease.

13. There are clear disparities in health outcomes for Maori communities compared to other ethnic groups in New Zealand. Data from the 2014/2015 New Zealand Health Survey shows that 41% of children in the Papakura and Manurewa ward are overweight or obese.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

14. The Healthy Environments Framework is being developed using a co-design methodology which uses the lived experience of people to explore, imagine and test new ideas and involves the people closest to the issues. The co-design methodology also assisted staff to determine the scope of the Healthy Environments Framework and identified opportunities for collaboration. Potential areas of council operations that could be included in the overall framework include events, leisure centres, community places, leasing agreements and funding grants.

15. Events were identified as the first area of council operation where a Healthy Environments approach can be tested and implemented. The attached principles and guide support governors, staff and the public involved in delivering Auckland Council events, and provides easy to implement options, tips and resources.

16. Over the past year, Healthy Families MMP has been working with Auckland Council and community-led event organisers to test the Healthy Environments events principles. The following table provides an overview of activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>EXPLORE</th>
<th>IMAGINE</th>
<th>TESTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified three local board funded events to test ways of improving access to healthy food and drink choices, reducing smoking and alcohol related harm and encouraging more</td>
<td>Over a six-month period, staff worked with event organisers to understand what it would take to create a healthy environment at an event. Event one (large scale) 1,750</td>
<td>From the feedback, staff were able to make the necessary improvements for the next event. This approach enabled staff to adapt and learn quickly.</td>
<td>Ongoing learnings led to more efficient prototypes. These were tested during Auckland Council selected events. For example, staff adjusted the location of water to increase accessibility and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 18

17. Healthy Families MMP understands the need to balance freedom of choice with offering healthy opportunities. It has sought to achieve the right balance that allows a common-sense approach and has taken this into consideration when applying the Healthy Environments lens over an event.

18. The benefits of adopting a Healthy Environments approach across a range of Auckland Council operations include:

- an increase in the availability and accessibility of healthy food and drink choices to reduce the risk of obesity and non-communicable diseases, and improve life expectancy of Papakura residents
- reduced smoking and alcohol related harm to Papakura residents
- increased opportunities that encourage movement for healthier living and a longer life.

19. A Healthy Environments approach will enable the Papakura Local Board to support residents to live longer, healthier and more active lives in its area.

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

20. The Healthy Environments Framework is aligned to the Papakura Local Board Plan and specifically contributes to Outcome 2 – Objective: Communities are supported to achieve their goals and aspirations. Invest in health promotion activities led by the community.

21. Healthy Families MMP sought local board input and feedback on the framework, principles and guide at a local board workshop on 11 July 2018. Feedback received at the workshop was positive and this report has taken into account all feedback received to date.

### Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

22. Healthy Families MMP has partnered with Māori during the development of the framework. Staff have been able to gather insights and learnings from participants and spectators who attended local events in the south (a combined audience of over 4000 people), of which a high number were Māori. These insights contributed to the development of the principles and guide.

23. The co-design process also used augmented reality technology to bring Māori knowledge and physical activity together and enabled participants to learn about some of the Manukau landmarks such as the Puhinui awa (stream) and the tohu (signs) of spring according to the Maramataka (Māori lunar calendar). This has been very successful and enabled the

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>movement.</th>
<th>participants and over 2250 spectators</th>
<th>uptake, prototyped types of water stations, and ensured promotion was clear and visible to event participants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event two (small scale) 186 registered participants</td>
<td>Event three (medium scale) 1,500 people Staff engaged with 653 different people, gaining real time feedback from event attendees, event organisers and vendors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

community to experience an interactive process that supports health and wellbeing from a Te Ao Māori perspective.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
24. There are no financial implications associated with the Papakura Local Board adopting the Healthy Environments Events principles and Guide to Creating a Health Promoting Event. Healthy Families MMP will continue the design, development and evaluation of the principles and guide as it is embedded and used by operational staff across the organisation.

25. Healthy Families MMP will seek to learn from event organisers’ experiences by testing the principles and guide at an event in each of the four Healthy Families MMP local board areas over the 2018/2019 events season.

26. For the 2019/2020 financial year and beyond staff envisage local boards will have the Healthy Environments Events principles and guide included in their event funding agreements. Community groups receiving local board funding for events will then implement the Healthy Environments events principles and guide as part of their funding agreement.

27. The Auckland Council Events team supports the Healthy Environments Events principles and Guide to Creating a Health Promoting Event. It is possible the Papakura Local Board may be approached in the future to support initiatives identified in the overall Healthy Environments Framework. All request for local board funding will be considered on a case by case basis.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
28. There are no risks associated with the actions recommended in this report. The board is being asked to adopt the Healthy Environments events principles and Guide to Creating a Health Promoting Event for use at events in the Papakura Local Board area funded or delivered by Auckland Council. Any operational matters associated with this will be supported and managed by staff.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
29. Healthy Families MMP will identify and work with an event organiser involved in delivering an Auckland Council funded event in Papakura who is willing to test and evaluate the Healthy Environments Events principles and Guide to Creating a Health Promoting Event in 2018/2019.

30. Healthy Families MMP will initiate discussion with the Community Places department to create a Healthy Environments approach to community places.

31. Healthy Families MMP will provide quarterly reports to the Papakura Local Board updating on progress.
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THE VISION: OUR SPACES
ENABLE AND PROMOTE
ACTIVE, HEALTHY &
FLOURISHING COMMUNITIES
PRINCIPLE 1.

WA! WATER IS THE EASIEST CHOICE

It’s easier to choose water over Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSB’s) because it is PROMOTED, made more VISIBLE & ATTRACTIVE, and more ACCESSIBLE (it is also free and/or cheaper).
Our community champions and leaders continue to promote smoke free and alcohol free (where appropriate).
We look for ways to nudge people to walk, cycle, play, and dance instead of driving or sitting.
A GUIDE TO CREATING A
HEALTH PROMOTING EVENT
PROTOTYPE
INTRODUCTION

This guide is for everyone involved in delivering Auckland Council events

Our 4 practical principles are designed to be easy to implement and come with options, tips and plenty of resources (because we know it might mean doing things a bit differently than norm)

Principle 1: Wai (water) is the first choice
Principle 2: Good kai (food) for all
Principle 3: Champion smokefree & alcohol free
Principle 4: Encourage movement

Yes it’s a prototype! We are keen to learn from your experiences so watch for a friendly followup call after your event

Why a health promoting event? research shows that the spaces we live, work and play in have a big part to play in supporting our general health

THE VISION:
OUR SPACES ENABLE AND PROMOTE ACTIVE, HEALTHY AND FLOURISHING COMMUNITIES
## PRINCIPLE 1: WAI (WATER) IS THE FIRST CHOICE

### 1.1 Free water is provided

Set up mobile water stations (great for summer events) OR mobile water bar stations (suited to events focused on food)

- **Cost:** <$
- **Cost:** $$$

*Tips:* Pre-plan the number of water stations/water bars for the size of the event – allow at least 1 water station/water bar or water bottle station per 500 people. Don’t forget to utilise existing council owned buildings and facilities to access free water.


### 1.2 Free water is promoted & accessible

Promote water using flyers, flags or site maps

- **Cost:** <$

Work with the event MC/host to actively promote free water

- **Cost:** $$$

Include ‘free water’ and ‘bring your own water bottle’ messaging in all advertising and promotion

- **Cost:** <$

*Tips:* It’s all very well providing free water, but your event-goers also need to know where it is and that it exists!

### 1.3 Water is the most prominent drink on display

Where vendors are also supplying non-wai (water) beverages, use the Auckland Council Food & Beverage Guidelines to implement the minimum bronze level

- **Cost:** <$

*Tips:* Encourage water as the cheapest option


### 1.4 Re-usable water bottles for sale

Encourage people to drink more water by offering re-usable water bottles for sale at your event

- **Cost:** $$$

*Tips:* This is a great way to cut down on waste at your event

### Key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum standard: choose one, some or all of the options below</th>
<th>Great for large events</th>
<th>No to low cost</th>
<th>Med to high cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Key:</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**PRINCIPLE 2: GOOD KAI (FOOD) FOR ALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Vendors align to Auckland Council Food &amp; Beverage Guidelines</th>
<th>&lt;$</th>
<th>$$$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select appropriate food vendors using the approved vendors list</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-plan practical examples for food vendors to demonstrate bronze level using Good Food, Good Times – Stall Holder Guide</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with the approved vendors to ensure compliance prior to the event</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tips: Incentivize healthy food & drink providers by giving them prime locations at the event*


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2 Limit snack, deep fried, confectionery &amp; ice-cream</th>
<th>&lt;$</th>
<th>$$$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use the Good Food, Good Times – Stall Holder Guide to ensure snacks, deep fried, confectionery and ice-cream options are a choice rather than the only option. This group should make up less than 20% of items available on sale.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tips: Avoid having vendors selling ‘snack or treat’ food located near the main entrances and main event attractions. 20% could look like 1 out of 5 vendors provide healthy options OR about 20% of each vendor’s offer.*


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3 Use healthy food alternatives for free food promotions</th>
<th>&lt;$</th>
<th>$$$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If using food to promote as prizes or free menu add-ons make sure it’s healthy e.g. corn on a cob, free salad on the side, brown bread for a sausage sizzle</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4 Community-led</th>
<th>&lt;$</th>
<th>$$$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore how to increase the amount of healthy food and drink available with your vendors, look for ways that benefit both vendors and eventgoers e.g. a healthy menu challenge</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tips: Take an active role to promote healthy menu options, start by using the Good Food, Good Times Stall Holders Guide*


---

**Key:**

- Minimum standard: choose one, some or all of the options below
- Great for large events: No to low cost
- Med to high cost: $$$
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### PRINCIPLE 3: CHAMPION SMOKEFREE & ALCOHOL FREE

#### 3.1 Advertise and promote Smokefree & Alcohol free event
- Include Smokefree and Alcohol free messaging in all pre-event advertising and promotion
- Signage on the day promotes Smokefree and alcohol free event


#### 3.2 Brief your MC/host on health promoting activities
- Meet with the event MC/Host and provide a full brief on the health promoting activities and key messages for the event
- Meet with the events staff and volunteers to provide a full brief on the health promoting activities and key messages for the event to support their understanding

*Tips: The work of our frontline staff is very important for communicating key messages – they are the people directly interacting with event-goers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>Minimum standard: choose one, some or all of the options below</th>
<th>&lt;$</th>
<th>$$$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🐕</td>
<td>Great for large events</td>
<td>No to low cost</td>
<td>Med to high cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PRINCIPLE 4: ENCOURAGE MOVEMENT

4.1 Plan activities to get people moving

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan multiple sporting activities such as bike blend, bike art, relays, bouncy castles and 3 on 3 basketball

Plan opportunities where people can connect with others such as puzzles, chess, storytelling, poetry slam, debates and cultural performances

Tips: Some activities will be better suited to some events than others. Use your discretion as to whether it is applicable to you and whether you have space. This is also a great way for people to connect socially and has flow-on effects for their mental wellbeing


4.2 Promote the movement / cultural activities

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Be sure to also promote the activities you are planning above

Tips: Including activities in your communication materials mean event-goers can plan accordingly (should they wear sport shoes?). Frame it positively, allowing event-goers the time and space to participate as they choose (not because they have to)

4.3 Promote active ways of getting to the event like walking & cycling

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider providing links to walking and cycling maps in pre-event signage

Where it is a larger event, consider promoting specific event paths and walkways

Encourage the use of walking, cycling or event paths/walkways e.g. foot path stencils, activating through entertainment or giveaways

Tips: Auckland City has a number of awesome off-road cycle and walkways perfect for getting eventgoers to local events – it’s a great way for family and friends to connect and also means less cars on the road

Resources: https://at.govt.nz/cycling-walking/cycle-walking-maps/#allmaps

Key:

- Minimum standard: choose one, some or all of the options below
- Great for large events
- No to low cost
- Med to high cost
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## CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS

### 5.1 Sponsors and/or partners align with the Health Promoting principles

Partner with local businesses, health organisations or agencies that can support you with delivering the Health Promoting Environment principles

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🐾</td>
<td>₹</td>
<td>₹$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 Evaluation

Have a plan in place for evaluating these principles

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🐾</td>
<td>₹</td>
<td>₹$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🐾</td>
<td>🐾</td>
<td>₹</td>
<td>₹$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Minimum standard: choose one, some or all of the options below
- Great for large events
- No to low cost
- Med to high cost
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EXTRA FOR EXPERTS

This guide is designed to be a first step towards creating a health promoting environment.

Principles are therefore quite practical and straightforward and do not overtly acknowledge the role that more complex social factors like inequity, diversity and culture have on health. We hope to incorporate this in phase two.

But in the meantime, to truly help our communities thrive, consider protective factors such as:

- **Social Connectedness**
  Connection to self, place, whanau and community

- **Celebrating Diversity**
  People from different backgrounds feel welcome and safe

- **Cultural Identity**
  People have strong connections to culture and we respect and celebrate people from different cultures to ours.

When planning your event.

That's it for now!
Good luck on an event that's good for our community & we hope good for you too! we look forward to hearing about it.
Draft Facility Partnership Policy

File No.: CP2018/18119

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To support the adoption and seek views on the draft Facility Partnership Policy.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. A ‘facility partnership’ is where Auckland Council invests in a community facility alongside others. Done well, partnerships can enable and empower our communities, and help us provide more of the quality facilities Auckland needs, faster and more cost-effectively.
3. The council intends to meet more facility needs through partnerships in future, and a new regional policy (Attachment B_Draft Facility Partnerships Policy) has been developed to guide their selection and support.
4. Key policy positions outlined in the draft Facility Partnerships Policy and summarised in Attachment A include:
   - a focus on shared outcomes
   - partnerships that recognise, value and honour Te Ao Māori
   - multiple partnership models, with fit-for-purpose arrangements
   - ‘Proactive’ and ‘Responsive’ partnership tracks
   - principles to shape eligibility and investment priorities
   - valuing (and costing) in-kind support
   - a stronger focus on the partnership relationship
   - greater acknowledgement of the complexity of developing/managing assets.
5. During policy development, staff engaged with Māori to explore specific opportunities and barriers for facility partnerships with Māori. The findings from this engagement (Attachment C_Facility partnerships with Māori - Summary report) have shaped a commitment in the draft policy to partner in ways that align with the Treaty Principles, and acknowledge the distinct characteristics of marae.
6. The draft policy was endorsed by the Environment and Community Committee in June 2018 for public consultation and formal engagement with local boards. The consultation activities carried out and the community feedback received are summarised in Attachment D (Attachment D_Draft Facility Partnerships Policy - Public feedback summary report). Public feedback was highly supportive of the draft policy overall.
7. Staff attended local board workshops on the draft policy during July and August. This report invites local boards to formally indicate their support for the proposed approach, and/or provide any additional feedback on the policy they would like the committee to consider.
8. A summary of all feedback and a final policy will be tabled for consideration and adoption by the Environment and Community Committee in November 2018.
9. Implementation of the new approach is expected to begin during the 2019/20 financial year.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) support the adoption of the draft Facility Partnerships Policy, and provide any additional feedback on the proposed approach for the Environment and Community Committee’s consideration.

Horopaki / Context
10. Auckland Council is a major provider of community, arts and sports facilities, and not the only provider. A ‘facility partnership’ is where the council invests in a community facility alongside others. Done well, partnerships can enable and empower communities, and help the council to provide more of the quality facilities Auckland needs, faster and more cost-effectively.

11. There are already around 300 of these arrangements in Auckland, and council has signalled more facility needs will be met through partnerships in future. There is currently no regional policy to guide the selection and support of facility partnerships.

12. In 2016, a cross-council team began work on a new regional policy. The team met with a number of partners and experts to understand existing practice and how policy could improve decision-making in the partnering experience.

13. Findings from discovery work were shared in December 2016 at walk-throughs with elected members, staff and participating partners, and reported to the Environment and Community Committee in February 2017 (resolution number ENV/2017/9).

14. A new approach was developed and tested at walk-throughs in February 2018. The committee endorsed the draft policy for public consultation and formal engagement with local boards in June 2018 (resolution number ENV/2018/74).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
Facility partnerships benefit the council and the community
15. Auckland Council supports facility partnerships because they can:
   - leverage external investment and community effort
   - empower communities, and help us respond to Auckland’s increasing diversity
   - optimise the existing facility network and reduce the need for new facilities.

Facility partnership selection and management is ad-hoc and inconsistent
16. Discovery work in 2016 and into 2017 identified a range of issues that are preventing the council from realising the full potential of facility partnerships.

17. Currently, facility partnership decisions are made on an ad-hoc basis. Often the lifetime costs and benefits of the partnership have not been fully considered, or how these relate to network gaps and evolving community needs.

18. Investment opportunities and selection decisions lack transparency, and our management processes tend to be uncoordinated and inconsistent. Many partners report that they feel under-prepared and insufficiently supported by council to deliver successfully.
Proposed policy provides strategic approach with tailored process

19. Staff have developed a new policy (Attachment B_Draft Facility Partnerships Policy) to respond directly to these findings.

20. This will enable the council and partners to make more informed and strategic investment decisions. Advice will be based on clearer evidence of need and impact and comprehensive costings and will emphasise viability and sustainability.

21. The new approach introduces a more transparent and contestable selection process. Requirements will be tailored to reflect the scale, complexity and risk of each proposal. The policy recognises the importance of quality relationships, and the need to better coordinate staff expertise and support to improve partners’ experience and build capability.

22. The draft policy proposes:
   - a focus on shared outcomes
   - partnerships that recognise, value and honour Te Ao Māori
   - multiple partnership models, with fit-for-purpose arrangements
   - ‘Proactive’ and ‘Responsive’ partnership tracks
   - principles to shape eligibility and investment priorities
   - valuing (and costing) in-kind support
   - a stronger focus on the partnership relationship
   - greater acknowledgement of the complexity of developing/managing assets.

23. A summary of key policy positions relating to these themes is provided as Attachment A (Attachment A_Facility Partnerships Policy - summary of key policy positions).

Public engagement held during July and August 2018

24. Staff undertook public consultation and briefed interested advisory panels between June and August 2018. Public consultation activities included six drop-in consultation events across Auckland, and online submissions via the council’s ‘Have Your Say’ website.

25. Public feedback was highly supportive of the draft policy overall. Those providing feedback generally saw the value of having a policy for this activity, and were positive about its intent. Responses to questions about specific aspects of the policy were also strongly affirmative.

Public feedback shows strong support for new approach

26. Key themes that emerged from the public consultation are:
   - Most respondents agree the new approach will better enable council to invest in the right facility partnerships, and ensure that partnerships work for both partners and council.
   - The investment principles, the proposal to enable appropriate commercial activities in facilities, and the establishment of Lead Relationship Brokers were all positively received by the majority of respondents.
   - The ‘Track, Type and Scale’ model was also welcomed for encompassing a wide range of facility partnerships, and the intention to ensure requirements are proportionate.
   - Respondents hope the new approach will make it easier for partners to navigate the multiple council systems and processes involved, and get good support from staff.
Using the Treaty principles to guide partnerships with Māori was welcomed by most, but this was acknowledged as a complex area.

Respondents appreciated a more visually appealing document that is easier to navigate.

**Most public concerns relate to application of policy**

27. Concerns identified included:

- how the investment principles will be applied in practice, especially where they must be ‘traded off’ against each other
- whether some communities will be unfairly advantaged by the new approach
- whether the higher level of staff support will be properly resourced, and implemented as intended across all parts of council
- whether the process is flexible enough to respond to the ‘messy reality’ of partnerships.

28. A full summary of the public consultation activities to date and a more in-depth description of key feedback themes is provided as Attachment D (Attachment D _Draft Facility Partnerships Policy - Public feedback summary report) for local board consideration.

29. Key national and regional stakeholders will also be briefed prior to the draft being finalised.

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

30. Local boards have a strong interest in facility partnerships and some decision-making responsibility in this area, including:

- determining local outcomes and advocating for local investment priorities
- governing local and sub-regional facility partnership relationships and agreements
- allocating local discretionary funding and community leases of council property.

31. Staff have engaged with local boards informally at various stages throughout the discovery work and subsequent policy development. Local board member views and concerns have helped shape the draft policy.

32. During July and August 2018, local boards were offered a workshop to hear an overview of the proposed policy approach and seek clarification on any areas of local interest or concern. Eighteen local boards requested a workshop.

**Formal local board feedback sought September and October 2018**

33. Community feedback has now been summarised for local boards’ consideration. Staff are seeking to understand local boards’ views on the new approach, and requesting a formal indication of support at local board business meetings during September and October 2018.

34. Staff would particularly value local board feedback on the following parts of the draft policy (Attachment B _Draft Facility Partnerships Policy), which are likely to have the most bearing on local board decision-making:

- the Tracks, Types and Scales model (p.16-23) to differentiate partnerships and customise the partnership process
- the draft investment principles (p.26) and priorities (p.33)
- proposed eligibility criteria for investment (p.27-30)
- the proposal to allow facility partnerships to generate revenue through appropriate commercial activities (p.31)
• the focus on quality relationships, as outlined in the proposed partnering principles (p.35) and supported by allocation of a lead relationship broker (p.38).

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
35. Marae are a focal point for Māori social, economic, environmental and cultural development, and are identified in the Community Facilities Network Plan as potential facility partners.

Engagement to better understand facility partnerships and Te Ao Māori
36. In 2017, staff undertook additional engagement with Māori, with a focus on marae, to ensure that the new policy incorporates any special context, barriers or opportunities for facility partnerships with Māori. A summary of the findings is provided as Attachment C (Attachment C _Facility partnerships with Māori - Summary report).
37. The draft policy reflects these findings and commits the council to partnering with Māori in ways which align with the Treaty Principles and reflect the distinct characteristics of marae.
38. The draft policy approach and the findings report will be shared at hui with interested marae during September, as part of initial discussions on a new Marae Investment Policy.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
39. The Facility Partnerships Policy is not supported by a dedicated budget. Future investment in facility partnerships will be provided through existing budgets for facility development and operation, allocated through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 and Annual Plan. Local boards may also award grants and community leases of council property to support facility partnerships.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of a new policy may create expectations that there will be additional budget to support facility partnerships.</td>
<td>All public-facing communications and guidance about the new policy will reference the funding available from existing regional and local budgets and how this will be allocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing facility partners may be concerned that the new policy will impact arrangements already in place, or ongoing council investment.</td>
<td>The new policy will guide decisions on new facility partnerships only, unless an existing partnership is already scheduled for review, and guidance will clearly state this. Where existing partnerships are to be reviewed, staff will ensure partners are adequately supported to prepare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The transition to the new policy approach will be operationally complex. It impacts multiple teams across the council, and new business processes, guidance and forms will need to be designed to support it.</td>
<td>Detailed implementation planning will be required to ensure the transition is as smooth as possible. Phased implementation over the first financial year (2019/20) may be necessary to achieve this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
40. A summary of all feedback and a final policy will be tabled for consideration and adoption by the Environment and Community Committee in November 2018.
41. Implementation of the new approach is expected to begin during the 2019/20 financial year.
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## Facility Partnerships Policy

### High level summary of key proposed policy positions

| A focus on shared outcomes | When selecting, managing and evaluating partnerships, we will prioritise the outcomes delivered (i.e. community benefits), not just the outputs (e.g. a new building).
|                           | We will partner based on aligned values and a shared vision.
|                           | We will only enter facility partnerships to develop an asset where an asset-based solution is essential to delivering the outcomes. |
| Recognise, value and honour Te Ao Māori | We will enter facility partnerships with Māori that align with Treaty Principles and provide for tino rangatiratanga.
|                           | We will acknowledge the special significance and role of marae. |
| Multiple models, fit-for-purpose arrangements | We will provide clear pathways for a variety of partners, facility types, partnership structures and investment mechanisms.
|                           | We will ensure our processes and requirements take account of each individual partnership's scale, complexity, risk and the partners' capability. |
| Proactive and Responsive partnership tracks | ‘Proactive’ partnerships: Council will seek partnerships through an open tendering process to address network gaps.
|                           | ‘Responsive’ partnerships: Council will also consider partner-initiated funding requests at set times to feed into the Annual Plan. |
| Investment principles to shape eligibility and priorities | We will take a principled approach to facility partnership investment decisions, and invest strategically, equitably, wisely and sustainably.
|                           | We will invest in existing spaces in preference to building new facilities.
|                           | We will support businesses / commercial activities playing a role in enabling viable facility partnerships in certain circumstances. |
| Valuing (and costing) in-kind support | We will estimate the value of ‘in-kind’ investment on both sides (e.g. use of council land, volunteer effort) to support better assessment of costs and benefits.
|                           | Access to council expertise can be critical to our partners’ success. Where necessary we will build capability support into business cases. |
| Greater focus on the partnership relationship | We will resource quality relationships over time, acknowledging these are foundational for successful partnerships.
|                           | We will allocate a lead relationship broker to every partnership to ensure joined-up support and a better partnering experience. |
| Acknowledge the complexity of developing and managing assets | We will ensure community partners are well-equipped and/or supported to design, build, operate and maintain quality facility assets.
|                           | We will ask better questions and involve subject matter experts earlier to support decision-making and reduce wasted effort on both sides. |
Draft
Facility partnerships Policy

June 2018
A facility partnership is...

Where Auckland Council invests in community facilities owned or operated by others, so Aucklanders can access more of the quality facilities they need, faster and more cost-effectively.

Community facilities are...

Places and spaces where Aucklanders can participate, play, learn, share, improve their health and wellbeing, celebrate and belong. They include...

- Community centres, hubs, halls and mobile facilities and special purpose facilities (e.g. youth centres, men’s sheds)
- Marae and cultural centres
- Libraries
- Arts centres and performing arts centres
- Indoor sports centres like multi-sports centres, swimming pools, leisure centres, indoor courts / gymnasiuems
- Outdoor facilities like sports fields, skate parks, playgrounds, splashpads and outdoor courts
1. The purpose

Why we have facility partnerships

Through facility partnerships, the council may invest in tangible things, like buildings, equipment, staff salaries and services. But what we are really investing in is the short, medium and long-term benefits these things will deliver: ultimately, a better quality of life for our communities.

We provide facilities not for their own sake, but for what they enable people to do and achieve, and because they make Auckland a better place to live. Community facilities contribute to building strong, healthy and vibrant communities and foster belonging and pride. They are an important part of realising the vision for Auckland as a ‘world class’ city. The council has already set a number of specific priorities around the outcomes that Aucklanders most need and want to see delivered through facilities.

We seek facility partnerships because they can enable the council and the community to provide more of the facilities Auckland needs, faster and more effectively. This aligns with our obligations under The Local Government Act, which requires the infrastructure we deliver to meets current and future needs, in a way that is most cost effective for households and businesses.

Given that these outcomes and benefits are the purpose of facility partnerships, they’re an important factor in our selection, management and evaluation of facility partnerships.

At the selection stage, a focus on outcomes helps decision-makers target the council’s limited investment where it can have the biggest impact.

At the management stage, the outcomes we’ve agreed will help staff work with facility partners to shape provision, and target access to those the facility is intended to benefit. These outcomes also help us monitor the facility (and the services and activities it enables) throughout its life.

During regular evaluation, we and our partners will be assessing if the benefits we wanted have been realised, and reflecting on the experience of the partnership itself.
We provide facilities because...

They benefit Aucklanders

Supporting local community identity, pride, belonging, participation and improving people's wellbeing

Helping Aucklanders to be more active, more often

Helping to make arts and culture part of our everyday lives

Valuing Te Ao Māori and enabling Māori aspirations

Enhancing and protecting our natural environment and our built and cultural heritage

*e.g. Auckland Plan, Thriving Communities, I am Auckland, Toi Whitikī*

“We have a lot of new migrants in our neighbourhood. We needed somewhere welcoming for them to go to meet new people and learn about life in Auckland. It helps to bring the community together.”

“My teenagers play sport down there – it's good for their fitness and confidence, and it helps them learn respect and teamwork. And keeps them out of trouble – there wasn't much to do round here before!”

“Having the art centre is great for the town – they run lots of classes there, and it's made the whole place feel more vibrant and alive. Well, you can see – the art has spilled out onto the streets!”

“We run programmes at the marae that improve people's lives; that build mana and connection with culture. Māori feel more comfortable here; most don't go to the community centre.”

“The community gardens have really improved the environment down there, and I think it's changed how people feel about the reserve. They're growing native seedlings there to replant along the stream banks, and people aren't dumping rubbish in the stream anymore.”

*attachment B item 19*
We seek facility partnerships because they enable us to...

**Leverage**

- Partnerships can leverage external investment, infrastructure and effort to deliver better community facilities sooner and at lower cost than when we attempt to do it on our own. We aim to leverage cost, time and risk.
- The council community and sector organisations, iwi, and whānau are in the best position to identify and leverage opportunities.
- The council has a range of assets which can be leveraged. For example, our sports and community facilities, our community buildings, and our land reserves.

**Optimise**

- Partnerships can optimise space and maximise investment by bringing together multiple, sometimes unrelated, organisations with similar needs to share one facility or by breaching new lines into existing ones.
- Investing in partnerships may not require building new facilities but through partnerships can be built into existing facilities.
- The value and cost of an asset can be enhanced through optimising the way it is used, rather than building new facilities.

**Empower and enable**

- Partnerships are a key for the council to empower and enable communities and build their mana.
- Partnerships are a tangible way to meet our Treaty obligations.
- Partnership agreements are critical to delivering facilities in a way that is responsive to the needs of the community.

**Attachment B**

Item 19

“With the new centre, the council is managing the design and construction, the sports trust has managed the asset and the community are engaged in an incredible facility.”

“Our organisation has a reputation in this community that stretches back decades. We know all the service providers, and can help the council really value the council’s technical expertise around managing buildings, and the legal and accounting side of things.”

“Our group started as a few parents wanting to keep our kids off the streets and now we’re doing it professionally. We’re registered as a charity and working with local youth, rough sleepers and the long-term unemployed. The council was very supportive of the idea, but we would welcome council support being formalised.”

“We welcome everyone who wants to come here – thousands of people do every year and we need their support. It’s a powerful experience, but it’s a big step for us.”

“Our project has a reputation in this community that stretches back decades. We know all the service providers, and can really value the council’s technical expertise around managing buildings, and the legal and accounting side of things.”

“We welcome everyone who wants to come here – thousands of people do every year and we need their support. It’s a powerful experience, but it’s a big step for us.”

“Our project has a reputation in this community that stretches back decades. We know all the service providers, and can really value the council’s technical expertise around managing buildings, and the legal and accounting side of things.”
We need a facility partnerships policy for...

Clarity

Policy helps develop a shared understanding of partnership, through:

- Establishing clear and consistent language around partnerships
- Setting out why, when and how we will partner, including being both more intentional and more responsive in our partnering with Māori
- Better differentiation of the different types of partnership, reflected in fit-for-purpose decision-making pathways and processes that are proportionate to their scale and risk.

Strategic decision-making

Given limited resources, policy helps us partner more strategically, by:

- Aligning our partnerships investment to existing strategies, policies and plans, with a focus on addressing the greatest needs first
- Ensuring we consider the costs and opportunity costs, downstream benefits and savings, trade-offs and risks before making decisions
- Ensuring we’ll see evidence of the outcomes we’ve invested in and the value that’s been delivered, while recognising partnerships can benefit communities in multiple ways.

Sustainability

Policy commits us to investing and supporting for success, by:

- Requiring ongoing costs and a realistic business and operating model to be identified, ensuring partners are able to run and maintain safe, quality facilities to the standards the community expects
- Setting realistic expectations of partners and partnerships, ensuring we consider and cost support needs upfront and ‘play to strengths’
- Treating partner relationships with the care and seriousness they deserve, including coordinating our support and advice within council to ensure a consistently good experience for partners.
Where does the facility partnerships policy fit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unitary Plan</th>
<th>Auckland Plan</th>
<th>Local Board Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td>Sports Facilities</td>
<td>Council Land Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td>Provision Plan</td>
<td>Local And Regional Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toi Whiti: Arts and culture Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Local And Regional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thriving Communities Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td>Network Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am Auckland - Children and Young People's Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td>Tākaro - Investing in Play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcomes → Our role → Priorities → Delivery → Budget → Mechanism

- What is the vision?
  - What outcomes and benefits are we working towards?
  - What will success look like?

- What specific outcomes do we want for different populations, sectors, places, activities?
  - What is our role in delivering them?

- What should council invest in, and where, to deliver these outcomes?
  - What are the priorities, to address needs and gaps?

- Will we deliver the outcomes by providing land, facilities or services, or a combination?
- How much will we invest in the outcomes?
  - How will we allocate: Capex (for assets)
  - Opex (for everything else)

- How will we enable the community and the market to deliver the outcomes, alongside direct council provision?
Facility partnerships and Te Ao Māori

Building on our founding partnership: Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi is our nation’s founding document and recognises the special place of Māori in New Zealand.

Auckland Council is committed to engaging and working with Māori in ways that are consistent with the Treaty Principles. This includes supporting delivery of services by Māori for Māori, based on Te Ao Māori values and practices.

Facilities contribute to Māori well-being by providing spaces to connect, socialise, learn, participate in and celebrate Māori identity and culture. Partnerships enable the council and Māori to share mana, matauranga and resources to support Māori aspirations and deliver Māori outcomes. Facility partnerships provide a way to jointly deliver Māori outcomes through marae, facilities, and other spaces and places.

Delivering Māori outcomes through facility partnerships

Supporting Māori values / directions

- Whanaungatanga / Develop vibrant communities
- Rangatiratanga / Enhance leadership and participation
- Manaakitanga / Improve quality of life
- Wairuatanga / Promote distinctive identity
- Kaitiakitanga / Ensure sustainable futures

- The Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau

Maori outcomes through arts and culture

- Promote and develop marae as regional cultural hubs
- Promote Māori art and culture, locally and internationally through the development of Māori cultural centres

“Māori culture is ‘Auckland’s point of difference in the world’... we are proud of Māori cultural identity and celebrate it.”
- Tor Whiti – Arts and Culture Strategic Action Plan

Maori outcomes through identity and wellbeing

- Advance Māori wellbeing
- Promote Māori success, innovation and enterprise
- Recognise and provide for Tiriti o Waitangi outcomes
- Showcase Auckland’s Māori identity and vibrant Māori culture

“Kaupapa Māori and Māori-led organisations... continue to be critical to delivery of appropriate and effective services for Māori... Actively partnering with others is a key mechanism for Auckland Council to support Māori identity and well-being.” – The Auckland Plan

Maori outcomes through sport and recreation

- Health and wellbeing for Māori
- Value Te Ao Māori

“We will acknowledge the special role of Māori and enable participation in decision-making, to build lasting reciprocal relationships and improve physical activity outcomes for Māori... This will be achieved through working in partnership with iwi and appropriate organisations.” – Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
The Treaty Principles / Te Tiriti Mātāpono

Treaty principles have been recognised and expressed by the Waitangi Tribunal and a range of Courts – the Privy Council, Supreme Court and High Court. The principles bridge the two texts of the Treaty, focusing on the intent of the Treaty and the future.

The Treaty Principles will help guide how the council and Māori work together to establish, shape and manage facility partnership arrangements.

Relevant principles for facility partnerships include:

**Rangatiratanga** – the duty to recognise Māori rights of independence, autonomy and self-determination, including the capacity of hapū, mana whenua and mataawaka to exercise authority over their own affairs. This principle enables the empowerment of Māori to determine and manage matters of significance to them.

**Partnership** – the duty to interact in good faith and in the nature of a partnership. There is a sense of shared enterprise and mutual benefit where each partner must take account of the needs and interests of the other.

**Active protection** – the duty to proactively protect the rights and interests of Māori, including the need to proactively build the capacity and capability of Māori.

**Orinātanga / mutual benefit** – to recognise that benefits should accrue to both Māori and non-Māori, to enable both to participate in the prosperity of Aotearoa giving rise to mutual obligations and benefits. Each needs to retain and obtain sufficient resources to prosper, and each requires the help of its Treaty partner to do so. This includes the notion of equality (for example, in education, health and other socio-economic considerations).

**Options** – recognising the authority of Māori to choose their own direction, to continue their own tikanga (customary practice) as it was or to combine elements of both and walk in both worlds. This principle includes recognition of Māori self-regulation.

**The right of development** – the Treaty right is not confined to customary use or the state of knowledge as at 1840, but includes an active duty to assist Māori in the development of their properties and taonga (treasured items).

**Applying the Principles**

We will seek facility partnership opportunities and arrangements with Māori that:

- Recognise Māori rights of independence, autonomy and self-determination.
- Actively build the capacity and capability of hapū, mana whenua and mataawaka.
- Are a shared enterprise, offering mutual benefit to Māori and non-Māori.
- Take account of the needs and interests of Māori partners, and ensure our needs and interests are clear to Māori looking to partner with us.
- Help to achieve equality of outcomes for Māori.
- Assist Māori in the development of their properties and taonga.
- Respect Te Ao Māori and Māori tikanga, including:
  - accommodating Māori decision-making structures and processes
  - referring to marae as marae, not facilities, upholding their mana by observing tikanga, and encouraging others to do the same
  - acknowledging and valuing the matauranga and resources that go into providing manaakitanga
  - acknowledging that the needs of iwi, hapū and whanau must take precedence on marae.

Further, we will:

- Acknowledge Māori hold a long-term holistic view of the world, where values and relationships are paramount.
- Acknowledge that individual partnership arrangements need to align with the kaupapa and aspirations of individual hapū, marae or Māori organisations.
- Welcome partnership discussions with marae and Māori facilities already serving their communities, to explore how the council can awhi (support) their activities.
Facility partnerships with marae

We recognise marae as focal points for Māori social, cultural, and economic development.

Marae are specifically identified in the Community Facilities Network Plan as potential partners.

Marae in Tāmaki Makauara may be mana whenua, mataawāka or taurāhere, large or small, rural or urban.

Some are primarily gathering places for their iwi or hapū, others are situated within school, church and institutional settings.

Many play a broader community role, hosting a holistic range of activities including:
- papakāinga and emergency accommodation
- formal and informal gatherings
- language and cultural instruction
- Māori arts and cultural activities
- health and wellbeing centres
- community and rongoā (medicinal) gardens
- whānau-centred social service

Marae have distinct characteristics that facility arrangements will acknowledge and reflect.

Marae are unique.

Marae are inseparable from their whenua, their tupuna, their people and their history.

The word ‘facility’ doesn’t fully express their unique role, or recognise the integral practice of manaakitanga.

Marae are taonga.

Marae have mana; they are a taonga. Marae have specific tikanga that must be followed to uphold their mana.

Marae also contain many taonga, especially in their wharenui, and some have pā or uru pā on their sites that are off-limits for visitors.

Marae are turangawaewae.

For Māori, marae are their home and ‘a place to stand’, and their needs must take precedence.

Marae may be required by iwi, hapū and whānau at short notice – e.g. for tangi – and can’t be available to the community at these times.

---

1 Mana whenua: Māori with territorial rights in Tāmaki Makauara, who belong to and derive power from the whenua (land), and who have authority and jurisdiction over the whenua or rohe (territory).

2 Mataawāka: Māori who are not mana whenua and have not retained their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Mataawāka or ‘urban’ marae are pan-tribal, and welcome Māori of all affiliations, or none.

3 Taurāhere: Urban Māori who retain their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Some taurāhere groups have whakapapa or historical links to particular sites in Tāmaki Makauara, and have received the blessing of mana whenua to develop marae there.

The council may partner with:

- Iwi and hapū
- Marae (mana whenua, mataawāka or taurāhere)
- Other whakapapa-based groups (where members descend from a common ancestor)
- Kaupapa-based Māori organisations (formed around a specific purpose)
- Takiwā-based Māori organisations (focused on a particular place)
2. The model
Shaping facility partnerships

Facility partnerships are not ‘one size fits all’.

The council will consider a wide range of partnership arrangements, within broad parameters. The important thing is not a partnership’s size or shape, but whether it has the necessary ingredients to successfully and sustainably meet the community’s needs.

This section outlines the key decision-making and management stages in our process, and the building blocks of our facility partnership model: Tracks, Types, and Scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKS</th>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>SCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tracks reflect whether the council or the partner(s) initiate the facility partnership, and how this impacts our investment and decision-making.</td>
<td>Our four broad types of facility partnership are primarily differentiated by the ownership of the proposed facility, and how we invest in it.</td>
<td>Our facility partnership scales reflect the project’s size and complexity, and will shape the level of planning and due diligence we and partners must undertake.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The facility partnerships lifecycle

All facility partnership proposals pass through the same overarching process decision-making process, but what happens at each stage will vary depending on the model of each individual partnership.

Stage 1  Stage 2  Stage 3  Stage 4  Stage 5  Stage 6  Stage 7

Low commitment / investment  Medium commitment / investment  High commitment / investment

Key Documents at each stage (actual document/ation required will vary depending on the individual partnership)

Facility Partnership Canvas
- Initial proposal
- Strategic assessment
- Needs assessment

Facility Partnership Canvas
- Full proposal
- Schedule of spaces, bulk and location plan (if appl.)
- High-level funding plan and business plan

Feasibility study
- Business case(s)
- Facility concept plans
- Draft partnership agreement

Final facility design
- Detailed project, funding and business plans
- Partnership agreement
- Performance agreement

Project reports
- Performance reports
- Facility Partnership Review

Staff will work with potential partners to establish their proposed partnership's Track, Type and Scale, and develop a customised 'road map' to help them anticipate the journey ahead.

Introduce & identify
- Outline the proposal at a high level and gauge support
- Early conversations between council and potential partners to scope the facility idea, the outcomes it will deliver and likely investment required

Strategic assessment
- Build the case for the proposed facility and partnership
- Research the need or opportunity to provide an evidence base for the proposed facility and partnership, and make the case for investment

Initiate / scope
- Scope the facility, the partnership and funding plan in more detail
- Flesh out the proposal to outline a high level facility specification, potential location(s), likely governance and operating model and a business plan

Plan & evaluate
- Make the business case for the project's desirability, feasibility and viability
- Prepare and cost facility concept plans, firm up the location, operating model and business plan, and undertake a cost/benefit analysis

Detailed planning
- Prepare a detailed project and funding plan and partnership agreement for approval
- Complete detailed project planning, confirming costs, funding and timeframes, obtaining approvals and consents and finalising legal arrangements

Execute & deliver
- Execute the project plan, open the facility
- Complete and sign off any capital works (build and fit-out or re-purposing and refit), open the new facility and formally celebrate the launch of the facility partnership

Review / renegotiate
- Monitor and periodically review facility partnership over agreed term
- Monitor and evaluate facility and partnership performance as agreed to ensure requirements are met, appropriate support is available and outcomes will be delivered
Is it a facility partnership?

Auckland Council invests in community outcomes in a range of ways. These include operating facilities and services directly, supporting the community sector’s delivery through grants, partnerships and leases, and procuring services from market providers. The table below shows where facility partnerships fit, and how they relate to these other key mechanisms for investing in outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the council funding or providing?</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services only</td>
<td>Community grants for services and activities delivered by sports, arts and community organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council procures sports, arts or community services and activities from private sector providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and assets</td>
<td>FACILITY PARTNERSHIPS with sports, arts and community organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council procures community access to private sector facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets only</td>
<td>Community leases for council properties (land and buildings) - occupied by sports, arts and community organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council properties (land and buildings) commercially leased by the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is leading delivery?</td>
<td>Council-led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-led</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This diagram shows some of the particular characteristics or changes in circumstances that could trigger a move between a facility partnership and one of the four other investment mechanisms shown.
Starting the partnering conversation
Partnerships can be initiated by either the council or the partner(s). The Track a partnership starts on will impact the investment available, and when and how proposals will be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROACTIVE TRACK</th>
<th>RESPONSIVE TRACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council actively seeks potential facility partners through an open tendering process</td>
<td>Council approaches a potential partner(s), with an opportunity specific to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A potential facility partner(s) approach council, which triggers a tendering process</td>
<td>A potential facility partner(s) approach council, about an opportunity specific to them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding**
- Fully or partially budgeted through the Long-term Plan
  - In-kind support may also be available
- Unbudgeted
  - In-kind or contestable funding support may be available

**Getting started**
- Starts with Community Facility Tender (EOIs) (Stage 2)
- Starts with early conversations (Stage 1)

**Progressing**
- Opportunities may be advertised and proposals progressed at any time of the year
- Stage 1 and 2: decisions to progress twice per year
  - Stage 3 and 4 proposals requiring funding: decisions to progress once per year
Proactive Track

Proactive Track partnership opportunities are aligned to network gaps identified by the council in the relevant network and investment plans.

The council allocates budget to address high priority network gaps through the Annual Plan and Long-term Plan processes. When an indicative budget has been allocated to address a high priority gap, the council will identify those opportunities which may be suitable for partnership delivery, and release a Facility Partnership Tender to call for proposals from potential partners.

As these opportunities have been identified by the council through its own network planning processes, some aspects of the business case for a facility partnership on the Proactive Track will already be in place. These specifications will inform the Facility Partnership Tender, which begins with an Expressions of Interest round (Stage 2), followed by the preparation of detailed project plans and business cases for shortlisted proposals (Stages 3 and 4). Business cases for market and direct delivery options may be considered alongside partnership options.

In some cases, the council may have a specific gap where there are only one or two potential partners due to the nature of the location, activity or population being targeted. In these cases, the council may approach a partner or partners directly to explore the opportunity together.

Decisions to progress Proactive track proposals through the key gates in our decision-making process (Gates 2, 3 and 4) will be made by the relevant decision-maker at regional or local level.

Responsive Track

Responsive Track partnerships are those where a partner identifies a gap or unmet need in their community or sector, and approaches the council for support.

By their nature, there is no ‘budget’ set aside for Responsive Track partnerships, and potential partners will have to do more upfront work to make the case for investment. This includes not only any funding that may be required, but the staff resource to support the relationship over time.

If the investment required is significant, Responsive Track partnerships would need their regional or local decision-maker (as appropriate) to advocate for new funding through the Annual Plan or Long-term Plan process.

However although funding is more limited for Responsive Track partnerships, decision-makers may still be able to commit other kinds of support - e.g. use of council assets, or support from staff - if they accept the idea has merit and meets a genuine community need.

Partners can initiate early conversations on the Responsive Track at any time (Stage 1). Responsive Track Proposals at Stages 1 and 2 will be assessed by staff twice per year, with decisions to progress to the next stage made by the regional or local decision-maker.

In some cases, the decision-maker may agree that the need identified in a responsive Track proposal is a priority, but want to initiate a wider tendering process to explore alternative ways of addressing it before committing to a specific partner or partnership.

Responsive Track proposals at Stages 3 and 4 that require funding will be assessed by staff once per year, prior to the Annual Plan, to enable unbudgeted funding requests to pass through approval Gates 3 and 4 as part of the Annual Plan process.
### Types

**What the partnership will involve, and who owns the facility**

All facility partnerships will fit into one of our four broad types. The types are differentiated by the ownership of the land, and whether we are building new or working with an existing property.

The facility partnership Type is significant to our decision-making process, because it will determine the:

- Need for funding, or committing the use of council assets (land and buildings)
- Whether we will be working with other funders / investors
- Steps we need to go through at each stage, including planning and consenting through the council’s regulatory arm
- Form and complexity of the legal agreements that will underpin the partnership
- Some projects may transition from one Type to another, through discussions, research and reformulating the proposal, or as new opportunities present themselves over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. DEVELOPMENT partnership | When the council partners with another organisation(s) to: Develop a new facility, or significantly upgrade an existing one, on land owned by the council.  
- **NEW FACILITY**: Five sports codes get together to develop an indoor sports centre on the site of an old squash club on a council reserve. |
| 2. ASSET partnership | When the council partners with another organisation(s) to: Develop a new facility, or significantly upgrade an existing one, on land owned by a partner.  
- **NEW FACILITY**: New outdoor courts and playing fields for community use are developed on school property owned by the Ministry of Education. |
| 3. ACTIVATION partnership | When the council partners with another organisation(s) to: Activate a vacant or under-utilised council property as a community, arts or sports facility.  
- **EXISTING FACILITY**: Artist studios and exhibition space are established in an empty council property. |
| 4. ACCESS partnership | When the council partners with another organisation(s) to: Open up (or increase) community access to an existing facility owned and operated by a partner.  
- **EXISTING FACILITY**: A marae is funded to provide bookable community space in a fast-developing rural area. |
## 1. Development Partnership

- May be able to leverage other government / philanthropic funds towards capital development costs.
- Should provide a lower (cash) cost way to address a network gap compared with building a council facility, reducing cost to ratepayers.
- Activates existing council land – often well-located with other community infrastructure.
- Opportunity to build capability and capacity of community organisations to meet their own needs, and leverage volunteer input.
- Long-term network solution, as the asset will usually be vested to council at conclusion of partnership.

## 2. Asset Partnership

- May be able to leverage other government / philanthropic funds towards capital development costs.
- Should provide a lower (cash) cost way to address a network gap compared with building a council facility, reducing cost to ratepayers.
- No reduction of open space.
- No council land involved can mean a shorter process: faster to progress to design and build stage.
- Partner may be an experienced facility operator with proven track record.

## 3. Activation Partnership

- Majority of investment is in-kind, so lower upfront (cash) cost, reducing cost to ratepayers.
- Activates existing council property – often well-located with other community infrastructure.
- Can build on existing relationships with proven delivery partners.
- Opportunity to build capability and capacity of community organisations to meet their own needs, and leverage volunteer input.
- Low risk arrangement, either side can exit relatively easily.

## 4. Access Partnership

- Provides a lower (cash) cost way to address a network gap compared with building a council facility, reducing cost to ratepayers.
- Good option in growth areas with limited land available for facility development.
- Suits partners with spare capacity looking to increase their use and revenue.
- Partner likely to be an experienced facility operator with proven track record.
- Opportunity to recognise role and build capability and sustainability of existing community facilities.
- Low risk arrangement, either side can exit relatively easily.

### Strengths of this partnership type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Leverages external funding, lower cost, community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset</td>
<td>In-kind investment, reduced upfront costs, flexibility and community involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>In-kind investment, existing relationships, low risk for both parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Lower cost, growth areas, increased community engagement, low risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1  DEVELOPMENT partnership

- Inexperienced partners may need substantial support to plan, design and build facility, and develop into facility operator role (funding and/or staff time)

- Reduces public open space (or other council land)

- Additional steps in planning and consenting process where the council is the landowner

- Can be complications if commercial activities planned to sustain facility operation, especially if land is held under Reserves Act

- If asset paid for by community, need clear governance, legal structure and exit strategy – as the landholder, ownership technically remains with the council

2  ASSET partnership

- Inexperienced partners may need substantial support to plan, design and build facility, and develop into facility operator role (funding and/or staff time)

- Multiple partners involved in funding, owning, managing, using asset and land can make decision-making more complex

- Tensions may develop between community and partner use over time (e.g. facilities on school land)

- May not be a long-term network solution; community access not guaranteed past partnership term

3  ACTIVATION partnership

- Smaller partners may need substantial support to develop into facility operator role (funding and/or staff time)

- Removes a property from another portfolio (e.g. venues-for-hire)

- Property may not be fit for purpose (e.g. accessible) without upfront asset improvements

- Where capital work is required, council as property owner means additional steps in planning, consenting, procurement processes

- Activating a council property will impact already stretched maintenance and renewals budget

4  ACCESS partnership

- Presumes existence of partners with desirable facilities + spare capacity

- Property may not be fit for purpose (e.g. accessible) without upfront asset improvements

- Tensions may develop between community and partner use over time

- Not a long-term network solution; community access not guaranteed past partnership term
Fit-for-purpose process

Because no two partnerships are the same, it’s important to ensure that our assessment, decision-making and management processes and practices are fit-for-purpose, and will protect the interests of the council, our partners and our communities.

We won’t over-burden simple, low-cost, low-risk partnerships with excessive costs, processes and paperwork. But we will make sure that we fully investigate and monitor larger, higher risk and more complex partnerships that will receive significant public investment. This is about balancing our ‘empowering and enabling’ role with our obligations as a public entity.

The facility partnership Scale is significant to our decision-making process, because it will determine:

- the planning, financial planning and due diligence we will undertake, and expect partners to undertake
- the documents and evidence we will need to inform our decisions, and how in-depth these will need to be
- any council support available to help partners complete each stage and progress to the next decision gate
- who will make the decision at each gate, and how this will happen
- approximately how long each stage might take and any associated costs (e.g. consent fees, professional services)
- the level of risk management and monitoring we will require
- the level of benefits management and monitoring we will require.

Influence over decision-making

Ideally, all partners would invest equally in a facility partnership, hold equal power, and share the risks equally, but this won’t always be the case. In most facility partnerships Auckland Council has been involved with, the council has been the biggest investor, taken on the most risk, and had the most at stake if the partnership or the facility were to fail.

We will expect a level of influence over key decisions that is proportionate to our level of investment and risk in the partnership, and the capability of our partners.

By ‘key decisions’, we mean those relating to:

- The facility’s location, size, design, construction and fit-out
- The facility’s operating model, financial management and key staff appointments
- The partnership’s legal structure, governance arrangements, and exit provisions.

Staff will work with partners during the early and middle stages of facility partnership development to shape governance and management arrangements that enable our agreed decision-making role.

Even where the council has a greater say in decisions, partners should still benefit from being in the partnership, and feel respected and supported in all of their dealings with us.
### Allocating Scale

There are six determining factors that will determine a partnership’s Scale:

- Overall value of our investment
- Proportion of the total cost council is investing
- Complexity / complicating factors
- Level of risk to council
- Use of council assets
- Proven capability of partner(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor / Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall value of investment over first 10 years</td>
<td>&lt; $2m</td>
<td>$2m - $5m</td>
<td>$5m - $10m</td>
<td>&gt; $10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the total cost council is investing</td>
<td>Less than 20%</td>
<td>20% - 49%</td>
<td>50% - 74%</td>
<td>75% or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity / complicating factors</td>
<td>Low complexity</td>
<td>Medium complexity</td>
<td>High complexity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of risk to council</td>
<td>Low risk for council</td>
<td>Some risk for council</td>
<td>Medium risk for council</td>
<td>High risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Funding support only</td>
<td>Occupying an existing council building</td>
<td>Building on council land</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>High capability, excellent track record</td>
<td>Good capability, satisfactory track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record + professional support</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How we see our status within the partnership</td>
<td>Minority partner</td>
<td>Cornerstone partner</td>
<td>Primary partner</td>
<td>Guiding partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated decision-making role</td>
<td>Partner(s) keep council closely informed of key decisions</td>
<td>Partner(s) consult council prior to key decisions</td>
<td>Council and partner(s) take key decisions together</td>
<td>Council guides key decisions in consultation with partner(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Different partnership proposals will sit at different points on the grid for each of the six factors.**

In assessing a specific facility partnership, we will use the highest scoring factor to determine the Scale.

The higher the Scale, the longer the project is likely to take, and the more costs partners should expect along the way.
The ‘overall level of investment’ will include both capital (construction) and operational (overhead) costs calculated over the first ten years of the partnership. We will also take into account the market value of any assets made available to the partner.

Our ‘proportional level of investment’ will be calculated on the basis of council’s share of the total costs of the project over the first ten years of the partnership.

‘Complicating factors’ could include land status, zoning and condition, numbers and types of partners involved, and the proposed ownership, governance and management model for the new facility. Greater complexity may shift the project into a higher scale, even if the overall value is low.

Where the land or building involved is a council asset, the council has an even greater responsibility to safeguard the wellbeing and interests of the wider community, and consider how the facility partnership may impact them. Accordingly, we will expect to have more influence where council-owned assets are involved.

Our ‘level of risk’ will be assessed by council staff based on the specific circumstances of the partnership, the partners, the facility and the site.

Our ‘partners’ capability’ will be assessed primarily on the basis of their track record of facility delivery and/or service delivery at an appropriate level, and/or whether they have factored in the support of suitably skilled and experienced professionals.
Who makes investment decisions?

Auckland Council has two complementary decision-making parts. The two governance arms each have distinct decision-making responsibilities for facility partnerships.

The governing body...
- Focuses on region-wide strategic decisions
- Decides where and when the council will invest in the facility network to address gaps and respond to growth
  - Develops regional strategies – e.g. for arts and culture, sport and recreation – that set outcomes and priorities for investment
  - Sets budget envelopes for overall facility network, and any major facility investments or upgrades through the Long-term Plan
  - Governs regional facility partnership relationships, funding or lease agreements and performance reporting

Local boards...
- Make most decisions on local places, facilities and activities
- May work together to support facilities that benefit several local board areas
  - Set outcomes and priorities for local investment through local board plans
  - Identify local facility needs and advocate for investment through the Long-term Plan
  - Govern local and sub-regional facility partnership relationships, funding or lease agreements and performance reporting
  - Allocate local discretionary funding
3. The investment

This section sets out the ways in which we and our partners might invest in facility partnerships, what kinds of partnerships we can invest in, and the principles that will guide that investment.

We will value our ‘in-kind’ support to provide a more accurate picture of our investment.

Where a partnership includes investment “in-kind” – e.g. free or very low-cost use of a council property, technical expertise or ongoing staff support – we will estimate the equivalent market value of the resource and include this in our calculations. We will encourage and support our partners to do the same.

This will enable the council to compare the true cost and value of different partnership options when making investment decisions, and when calculating the returns. In many cases we will want to compare in-house delivery, market provision and a range of partnership options before making investment decisions.
Our investment principles

We will take a principled approach to facility partnership investment decisions. These investment principles underpin our eligibility criteria and investment priorities.

We will:

**Principle 1**
Invest strategically, based on outcomes:
We will invest to deliver the outcomes outlined in our strategies, policies and plans. We will judge success based on the benefits delivered for communities on the ground.

**Principle 2**
Invest to help achieve equity for all Aucklanders:
We will invest to address known community needs and network gaps first. This is about enabling everyone to have access to good quality facilities regardless of their circumstances. Our investments will balance meeting the needs of existing and new communities, and communities of place, interest and identity. This may not mean the same levels or types of provision in every area.

**Principle 3**
Invest wisely, to deliver the maximum value for Aucklanders:
By value, we mean the services, activities and assets (outputs) and the social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits (outcomes) that a partnership will deliver. We will invest in those facility partnerships that provide the best overall return on investment.

**Principle 4**
Invest for sustainability:
We will seek investments that balance our desire to support community-led innovation, with the need to protect the council and the community from risk. We will only invest in facilities we’re confident will be desirable to users, feasible to deliver and viable to operate. We won’t enter partnerships unless we’re confident we can commit to resource an ongoing relationship.
What the principles mean for eligibility

Facility partnerships may take a wide range of forms, reflecting their diverse communities and circumstances. The eligibility criteria for receiving council investment through facility partnerships reflect our investment principles, and our duties and obligations as a local authority.

Ineligible proposals won’t be progressed, although staff may be able to suggest alternative funding partners if the council can’t assist.

---

Principle 1

Investing strategically

We will **only** invest in:

1. Facility partnerships where the outcomes sought are a **good fit** with the council’s and the other partner(s)’ *kaupapa* (purpose) as set out in our strategies, policies and plans, and the partner(s)’ own vision, constitution, organisational strategy and/or business plan.

---

We won’t invest in facilities that:

2. Primarily deliver **housing, education, health or other services** that are the responsibility of central government, UNLESS the council is a minority investor alongside the relevant central government agencies AND we’re satisfied that our investment will support enhanced community, Māori, arts, sport or recreation outcomes in line with our responsibilities as a local authority.

---

Once operating, we expect all partnership facilities to be:

3. Non-discriminatory, physically accessible to people of all abilities, and in all other respects compliant with New Zealand (and applicable international) **human rights** legislation.
**Principle 2**

**Investing equitably**

We will only invest in:

4. Facilities that address identified facility network gaps or unmet community needs. We will consider the broader picture of provision when assessing 'need', including the availability of non-council facilities that are accessible and affordable to the same target users. Our definitions of community are not just place-based, but also encompass communities of identify and interest.

5. Facilities that will be open for use by the wider community. (Facilities may be purpose-built for a particular activity, but shouldn’t be exclusively for the use of the partner organisation(s) and their members, or their membership should be open to anyone who wishes to join).

We won’t invest in facilities that:

6. Are places of worship or other buildings with religious purposes, OR will offer services or activities in order to promote a religion.

7. Are political party offices OR will offer services or activities in order to promote a political cause.

8. Are, or include, commercial premises, unless certain conditions are met (see ‘Facility partnerships and commercial activities’ p.31).

Once operating, all partnership facilities must be:

9. Affordable, i.e. set their fees and charges at or below the level charged by similar community facilities.
Principle 3

Investing wisely

All facility partners must be:

10. A registered charitable organisation, OR agree to invest profit (beyond any agreed cap) back into the facility, or an approved community purpose.

We will only invest in:

11. Developing new facilities where we agree that a new built asset is essential to deliver the outcome, rather than a service, activation or access response.

12. Facility partnerships that we are confident will deliver the same level of service to the community over the same period compared with the alternatives,

   a) AND at a lower total cost to ratepayers (accounting for all forms of support and investment over the life of the partnership, including any opportunity costs),

   b) OR at a similar or higher cost than alternatives, but where additional value will be delivered in return (in line with other strategic priorities).

We won’t invest in facilities where:

13. Analysis shows it would be more cost effective for the council or partner(s) to deliver the facility directly, and there isn’t sufficient extra value gained to outweigh the costs.

Where the facility partnership will include capital works:

14. That are paid for by the council (in part or in full) or involve council-owned property, at any point during the term of the partnership, the procurement of goods and services must align with Auckland Council’s Procurement Policy.

Once operating, we expect all partnership facilities to be:

15. Safe, properly maintained and legally compliant for public use.

16. Willing and able to meet reasonable accountability and monitoring requirements.
Principle 4

Investing sustainably

We will only invest in:

Facilities that we are confident will be financially viable and sustainable - i.e. have credible business models to meet establishment costs and ongoing operating costs (including any council investment).

All facility partnerships must be:

Formally constituted organisations with a recognised legal structure.

We won't invest in facilities that:

Have joint ownership (e.g. where the council would own one level, storey or area of a building or structure, and partner(s) would own another).
Facility partnerships and commercial activity

We recognise businesses and commercial activities can play a role in enabling viable facility partnerships, and we will support this in certain circumstances.

Facility partners may engage in commercial activities to offset their costs.

Council will actively encourage community partners to explore appropriate revenue generation opportunities to help them meet their ongoing operating costs. This could include commercial activities run directly by the partner (e.g. a gallery shop or a coaching programme), a concession run by a private operator (e.g. a café), or operating a social enterprise that supports the facility (e.g. a community garden).

The following conditions will apply to facility partnerships that incorporate commercial activities in their business model, including social enterprises:

- We must agree that the proposed commercial activity complements the purpose of the facility, and will increase public use and enjoyment of the facility and/or the surrounding site.
- The zoning of the land must allow commercial activity of the type proposed, or the land can be re-zoned to allow it, and the relevant decision-maker must support this change (investment in the partnership will remain contingent on this re-zoning).
- Any commercial activities related to the facility partnership must return all profits to offset the operating costs of the facility, or in the case of a concession run by a private operator, to pay a lease set at market rates.
- Any surplus generated by commercial activities must be reinvested in the facility, or a community purpose approved by us.

Businesses can be co-investors in facility partnerships.

Council will consider co-investing in a partnership alongside businesses that want to sponsor or otherwise support facilities in their communities. In these cases, Auckland Council’s Strategic Partnerships Policy will apply.

Businesses can express interest in a facility partnership opportunity.

Proposals on the Proactive Track: Businesses can respond to a Facility Partnership Tender advertised by the council. If selected to proceed past the first (EOI) stage, the relevant sections of the Auckland Council Procurement Policy and processes will apply thereafter.

Proposals on the Responsive Track: Auckland Council’s Unsolicited Proposals Policy will apply where businesses approach the council about a facility partnership outside of the Facility Partnership Tender process.

Refer to ‘Proactive and Responsive Partnership Tracks’ in section 4: The Model for more information about the Tracks.

From time to time, the council may contract commercial enterprises to manage council facilities through a formal procurement process, with opportunities advertised in the usual way. These are not facility partnerships for the purposes of this policy.
Facility partnerships and commercial activity

**Not-for-profit**
- Charity supported by grants & donations
  - Sells some good or services to help fund core social mission

**Social enterprise**
- Social purpose business
  - Directly fulfills a core social mission through trading
- Social benefit enterprise
  - Trades in order to fund a core social mission fulfilled by others

**For-profit**
- Socially responsible business
  - Donates to support a social mission fulfilled by others
- Commercial enterprise
  - Businesses can be co-investors, or express interest in an advertised partnership opportunity

Charitable organisations and social enterprises can enter facility partnerships with us, and engage in commercial activities to offset their costs (subject to the conditions outlined on the previous page.)
Using the principles to prioritise

In a growing city, with constrained funding and limited land and buildings available for community use, the council can’t support every facility partnership proposal we receive. Decision-makers will consider a range of factors to determine which partnerships will deliver the most benefits for Auckland – both financial and non-financial – and are the soundest choice.

We will prioritise some facility partnership projects over others, in line with the commitments made to Auckland, and with Aucklanders, in our existing strategies, policies and plans. We will identify the partnerships that are most likely to make an impact, in the areas Aucklanders have agreed investment is most urgently needed.

Our priorities directly align with our investment principles, and we expect all successful proposals will address at least one priority. Partnership proposals that meet multiple priorities will have a considerable advantage.

**Principle 1**
Investing strategically

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

1. Will deliver **priority outcomes** in line with our existing strategies, policies and plans.

2. Are Māori-led, and/or help to **celebrate Māori** as Auckland’s unique point of difference in the world, and/or honour documented commitments to Māori made by the former councils in the Auckland region.

3. Will capitalise on opportunities presented by the development or transformation of areas of **rapid growth and intensification**.

**Principle 2**
Investing equitably

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

4. Target **underserved populations** (communities of place, interest and identity).

**Principle 3**
Investing wisely

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

5. Optimise use of the council’s or the community’s **existing facilities and assets**, including current facility partnerships that can make the case for further investment.

6. Are for multi-purpose facilities (i.e. which can be used for a broad range of activities, and/or bring together **multiple organisations and groups**, who would otherwise require separate premises.

**Principle 4**
Investing sustainably

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

7. Can **leverage other sources of income or investment**, meaning the council will be covering less than 50% of the construction and/or establishment costs, and/or less than 25% of the ongoing operating costs.

8. Will develop facilities which are environmentally low-impact and sustainable in their design, construction and operation.
## Boosting the likelihood of investment

Even after applying our investment principles, eligibility criteria and priorities, our funds and assets will still be oversubscribed. This page outlines other matters our decision-makers will take into account when choosing between partnership proposals.

Staff will look for the following when advising decision-makers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 1</th>
<th>Investing strategically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Where the partnership will build the capacity, skills and resilience of the partner(s) and the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 2</th>
<th>Investing equitably</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Where the proposed partnership would:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>honour a historical commitment between the council and the partner(s) to work together;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>significantly increase goodwill, confidence or trust in the council within the facility’s host community from a low base;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>otherwise have a significant positive knock-on or ripple effect in the host community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 3</th>
<th>Investing wisely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Where the partnership would secure a prime location for the facility otherwise unavailable or unaffordable to the council, and this location is likely to be a major contributor to its success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Where the partnership facility would likely be better used than a standard council-managed facility of the same type, because the partner(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have an established reputation with the local community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have better access to the facility’s intended users than the council, and/or are better positioned to provide locally or culturally appropriate services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌</td>
<td>Where one or more partners (including the council) feel they’d need to control the majority of decisions, to an extent that is disproportionate to their level of investment and risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 4</th>
<th>Investing sustainably</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Where the partnership would leverage an established working relationship between the council and the partner(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Where the partnership would attract significant volunteer input, pro bono expertise, or discounts on goods or services for the facility which are otherwise unavailable to the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Where each partner’s proposed roles and responsibilities reflect their individual strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Where the proposed partnership is ‘win-win’ and will provide clear mutual benefit for all parties, without undue workload, pressure or risk falling on smaller partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌</td>
<td>Where there’s either no ability or no desire to adjust the partnership - e.g. its structure, deliverables, investment levels - if circumstances change, or initial expectations prove unrealistic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The relationship

Partnerships may be agreed between organisations – but ultimately, they are formed between people. Relationships are what make partnerships different to contracts, and lift the commitment between partners above a transactional arrangement.

Quality relationships are foundational for a healthy facility partnership; they set the tone for all of the work the partners do together, and are the springboard for any future collaboration. Good relationships are built on trust and good faith, mutual understanding and mutual respect. Good relationships can only be built over time and require ongoing effort.

Auckland Council has committed to taking an Empowered Communities Approach when entering relationships with community-led organisations and projects – including facility partnerships. An empowered community is one where individuals, whānau and communities can influence decisions, take action and make change happen about the issues that matter to them.

The council’s Empowered Communities Approach is based on principles of equity, inclusion and collaboration, and aligns closely with our commitment to realise Māori aspirations and outcomes. Our partnering principles provide guidance to council staff about how to work in ways that are more empowering of communities.

Our partnering principles

Auckland Council will resource and treat facility partnership relationships with the care and commitment they deserve. This commitment to quality partnership relationships means we will:

1. Be open, honest and upfront with our partners (and potential partners) about what we can and can’t commit to and why, and follow through on the commitments we make. We will communicate regularly with our partners, and keep each other in the loop.

2. Take responsibility for ‘partnering on the inside’, acknowledging the council’s size and complexity can make us difficult to partner with. We will prioritise continuity in our relationships, and actively manage the transitions when key people change.

3. Factor in adequate frontline and specialist staff support as part of the business case for any new facility partnership.

4. Recognise and value partners’ financial and non-financial contributions, and the risks all parties take by working in partnership. We will agree roles and responsibilities that play to our strengths, and allow all partners to meaningfully participate in decisions.

5. Support our partners in a way that builds capability in both directions: building the capability of our partners to do things for themselves, and of our own people to work alongside them.

6. Seek to respond together to any challenges we encounter, and work collaboratively to make the best of every situation. We will work through any issues related to differences in our working style and culture.
Potential facility partners
Many different organisations and groups could play a role in providing or investing in facilities for Auckland:

Potential future facility partners for Auckland Council include:

- National and regional organisations in the community, arts and sports sectors
- Iwi bodies, marae and kaupapa Māori organisations
- Tertiary institutions and schools
- Local trusts, societies, cooperatives, groups and clubs
- Facility development trusts (set up to enable smaller organisations to collectively fund, develop, govern and manage a shared facility)
- Social enterprises, or other commercial organisations delivering community outcomes

Potential future co-investors in facility partnerships include:

- Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)
- Government ministries and departments
- Funding agencies / philanthropic bodies
- Post Settlement Governance Entities (PSGEs)
- Private, corporate and philanthropic entities

Our partners’ people can include:

- Boards of Trustees and Boards of Directors – may be paid or volunteers
- Kaumatua, iwi or hapu liaisons
- Management committees for smaller organisations, usually volunteers
- Management staff – e.g. chief officers, directors, general managers and facility managers
- Frontline staff – e.g. reception staff, coordinators, coaches, maintenance and cleaners – paid or volunteers
- Consultants, lawyers, accountants, fundraisers or other contracted professionals
Council support for facility partnerships

Our partners

Our elected members

The council family includes a range of skilled and experienced staff, each of whom helps to support facility partnerships in different ways. No one group of staff can provide quality support and advice on their own – we need everyone on board to do this well.

Staff involvement includes:

- Having early conversations with potential partners, co-investors and council decision-makers
- Helping to prepare and assess facility partnership proposals and plans, and making recommendations to decision-makers
- Giving technical, financial and legal advice to partners and decision-makers, helping partners to navigate council processes and systems
- Helping to design, plan, cost, consent and project manage facility partnership building projects
- Holding relationships with partners and managing funding and lease agreements once a facility is operational
- Helping to build the capacity and capability of partners, when needed
- Evaluating and reporting on the benefits delivered through facility partnerships
Our roles and responsibilities

The council is a large and complex organisation, with many different roles it must play simultaneously.

These include regulatory / kaitiaki roles, and empowering / awhi roles. These roles may sometimes be in tension, or even direct conflict.

We can’t avoid this complexity, as each function and role we play is an important part of serving Auckland. But there will be limits to what we can do through partnerships, what we can do with or for our partners, and what our partners can do themselves.

In particular, the council must always:

- Keep people safe
- Ensure we and others comply with the law, and are seen to do so
- Act in ways that are consistent with our duties as a local authority and kaitiakitanga, and in alignment with our own policies and plans
- Balance competing interests among communities of place, interest and identity
- Set out to allocate scarce resources fairly, transparently, and for maximum benefit.

To help manage any tension between our roles we will:

- Be upfront: we will acknowledge, discuss and actively manage tensions as they arise, accepting that in some cases finding common ground will not be possible
- Be coordinated: where our different roles are in tension internally, we will try to ensure this is flagged early and resolved, before (further) commitments are made or work progressed
- Champion where we can’t act: sometimes, we may not be able to partner ourselves, but if we strongly support the kaupapa, we can help bring together others who can.

Lead relationship broker

We know that the council’s large size and complexity as an organisation can make us difficult for partners to build relationships with. Every facility partnership will be allocated a lead relationship broker within the council.

This person:

- Will establish a relationship with the key people in the partner organisations
- Is responsible for assisting the partner(s) to navigate council processes and systems, and accessing and/or coordinating advice from the ‘virtual team’ of specialist and technical staff involved in each facility partnership
- Will be the first port of call for the partner(s), elected members and other council staff interacting with the partnership
- May change over the lifecycle of the partnership, but where this needs to happen the transition will be carefully managed
5. The agreement

Clarifying and formally documenting the legal arrangements relating to the facility and the partnership is an important way to protect the short, medium and long-term interests of all parties.

Facility partnerships are some of the most complex arrangements we enter into, because they cover physical assets, often big investments and usually long periods of time - sometimes generations. The financial stakes are higher, the potential risks are greater, the considerations are more technical, and every choice carries an opportunity cost.

The graphic at right identifies a number of aspects relating to the legal side of facility partnerships, which underpin the formal arrangements Auckland Council can make with our partners and protect everyone’s interests.

As no two facility partnerships are the same, the specific legal considerations will vary between projects. Staff will consult with our in-house legal team and ensure partners and decision-makers understand the potential implications of individual proposals from Stage 2 onwards. All parties must fully investigate and resolve the legal dimensions of a facility partnership to their mutual satisfaction before entering any formal agreement at Stages 3 or 4.

---

Our ethical practice principles

Auckland Council will run an ethical, prudent and inclusive facility partnerships programme. This means we will:

1. Be accountable for how we invest public money in facility partnerships and how we show the return on that investment, and require our partners to do the same.

2. Only take justifiable risks: we will balance our desire to support high-potential, community-led innovation, with our need to prudently invest public funds and protect the council and the community from risk.

3. Seek prior legal advice and formally document all facility partnership commitments and agreements (and any subsequent material changes), to ensure clarity for all parties.

4. Act fairly and transparently: we will be open and honest, and aim to balance the needs and interests of everyone involved in or impacted by facility partnerships.

5. Be inclusive in our intent, our processes and requirements, our decisions and our behaviours. We will work with partners who value inclusion and diversity.

6. Have a culture of seeking feedback, listening, reflecting and continuously seeking to improve, and we will encourage our partners to do the same.
Legal considerations

**Organisational types**
- Auckland Council has specific rules and practices around partnering with some types of organisation - e.g. facility trusts, social enterprises, other types of commercial organisation and schools.

**Partnership and facility management structure**
- The council, partner(s) and co-investor(s) will need to agree and document arrangements for the funding, ownership, governance and operation of the facility. This will include negotiating levels of partnership and community access, identifying and mitigating conflicts of interest, agreeing when and how the partnership will be wound up, and if there will be options for early exit.

**Financial obligations**
- Many facility partnerships will involve council grants or contracts for service as part of their funding model. These may be paid out in advance, in arrears, or as the project hits key milestones. Different types of payments have different tax obligations and accounting requirements.

**Leasing council property**
- Partners establishing a facility in a council building will require a commercial lease, community lease or license to occupy the property. Lease negotiations will include expectations and arrangements for property management (e.g. maintenance, renewals and improvements), and any sub-letting or co-tenancy arrangements.

**Leasing council land**
- A partner-owned facility built on council land will require a ground lease, with provisions made for renewing the lease, vesting assets to council or remediating the land at the end of the lease.

**Managing risk and disputes**
- The council and partners will need to identify a range of possible risks early on, monitor these as the partnership proposal progresses, and actively manage them once the facility becomes operational. Partnership facilities will need to be fully insured and legally compliant for public use, with clear operational policies, clearly defined liability and a process for managing disputes.
6. The facility

Land and building considerations

As an experienced facility provider, we understand how much is involved in planning, designing, constructing, running and looking after built assets that will do the job they’re built for, endure thousands of hours of community use, weather and all sorts of change in and around them – year in, year out.

This can be complex, specialised and expensive work. In entering facility partnerships, the council and partners will need to navigate both land considerations (planning, leasing and technical aspects), building considerations (design and construction, leasing, operation and maintenance). As no two facility partnerships are the same, the specific considerations will vary between projects.

We don’t develop community facilities for their own sake, but for what they enable people to do and achieve. We enter facility partnerships to enable activities where a physical space and/or built asset is an essential ingredient, and where this is currently missing.

If the space or asset isn’t critical or is already available, then a service-based solution - such as a new programme in the library, at the mall, or on the internet – might meet the need just as well as developing a new facility, and more cost-effectively. That’s why we will always look for service solutions first, which could include a facility partnership through our Access partnership model.

However many facility partnerships will involve developing new built assets, re-purposing or upgrading existing ones. They may not always involve developing buildings – an outdoor basketball court, for example – but there will always be a physical component.

The land

All facility partnerships have land considerations – they will sit on a specific site that is owned by someone, next to other properties, reached from a particular street, located in a neighbourhood, precinct, suburb and local board area, in the rohe (customary territory) of one or more mana whenua.

The area may have specific cultural, heritage or geotechnical features or significance, and it will grow and develop in accordance with its zoning under the Unitary Plan. Facilities will also take their place in a natural ecosystem – with its own character, behaviour, patterns and vulnerabilities.

The building or asset

A facility’s design, configuration, fit-out and operation can be the difference between a successful facility, an under-used facility, and a failed facility.

If building new, the planning, design and construction are critical phases for the project; they can be costly, complex and involve multiple decisions and trade-offs. Partners will require the support of qualified professionals.

If developing, re-purposing or activating an existing building, it may need renovation, new fittings or equipment, or improvements to come up to specification for public use. It may have special cultural or heritage significance, with added protection under the Unitary Plan. It may have existing tenants, or the potential to sub-let or bring in co-tenants.

All facilities need plans in place to manage regular community access and use, comply with leases and funding agreements, and the ongoing management, maintenance and renewal of the asset to keep it safe and in good condition.
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1 Context / Horopaki

Summary of background

Auckland Council operates or supports a wide range of community facilities, including community centres, arts and cultural facilities, libraries, sports fields and swimming pools. Most are owned and directly managed by the council, but around 300 are owned and/or operated by community groups, sports organisations and schools. These arrangements come in many shapes and sizes, and are collectively known as ‘facility partnerships’.

The Community Facilities Network Plan (adopted 2015) states the council will meet more facility needs through partnerships in future, but noted there was no consistent policy for selecting and supporting them. In 2016, a project was initiated to develop a new Facility Partnerships Policy.

Facility partnerships could provide a valuable mechanism for the council to partner with Māori, to support tino rangatiratanga and to enable positive outcomes for Māori. Facility partnerships with marae are an obvious starting point.

However our stocktake had identified fewer than five facility partnerships with Māori out of 300+ in our existing portfolio. We wanted to make sure that the new policy properly considers any special context, barriers or opportunities for marae or Māori organisations.

To achieve this, we met with seven marae and three Māori organisations to explore how facility partnerships might fit within Te Ao Māori, and insights from these conversations were refined at four findings hui with a wider group. This report summarises what we learned through this work.

1.1 Project background and context

Community facilities are an important part of realising our vision of Auckland as a world class city. They contribute to building strong, healthy and vibrant communities by providing spaces where Aucklanders can connect, socialise, learn and participate in a wide range of social, cultural, art and recreational activities.

Auckland Council operates or supports a wide range of facilities that benefit the community, including community centres, venues for hire and rural halls, arts and cultural facilities, libraries, recreation centres, sports fields and swimming pools.

Most of these facilities are owned and directly managed by the council, but around 300 are owned and/or operated by community groups, sports organisations and schools. A number of these are sited on council parks or in council-owned buildings, or were built or operate with some financial assistance from Auckland Council (or its predecessors). These arrangements come in many shapes and sizes, and are collectively known as ‘facility partnerships’.
The Community Facilities Network Plan states the council will meet more facility needs through partnerships in future, as a way of ‘doing more with less’ in a growing city, and empowering communities that want to actively contribute to their own development.

However, it noted that the council currently has no consistent policy for selecting and supporting facility partnerships. Following the adoption of the plan in 2015, a project was initiated in 2016 to develop a new regional Facility Partnerships Policy.

1.2 Facility partnerships with Māori

Auckland Council recognises Te Tiriti o Waitangi / the Treaty of Waitangi as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand, and as establishing an enduring partnership between Māori and the Crown. The council has committed to engage and work with Māori in ways that are consistent with a Treaty-based relationship.

Facility partnerships could provide a valuable mechanism for the council to partner with Māori, to support tino rangatiratanga and to enable positive outcomes for Māori in line with this commitment.

The Treaty Principles provide an overarching context for all our relationships with Māori, and need to guide how the council and Māori work together to establish, shape and manage facility partnership arrangements in future (relevant Treaty Principles are listed at Appendix B).

Facility partnerships and marae

Marae are specifically identified in the Community Facilities Network Plan as potential community facility partners, and are an obvious starting point for exploring facility partnerships with Māori.

Marae are already a focal point for Māori social, economic, environmental and cultural development, and ‘enabling Māori aspirations for thriving and self-sustaining marae’ is an Auckland Plan priority.

Valuing marae is also a tangible way of recognising Māori perspectives and preferences in providing for their own health and welfare needs. In supporting marae and other Māori-led facilities, the council demonstrates respect for matauranga Māori (knowledge), kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and manaakitanga (hospitality).

1.3 Rationale for this research

The first phase of the Facility Partnerships Policy project included a stocktake of existing facility partnerships. During this process, fewer than five formal facility partnerships with Māori organisations were identified by council staff, out of the 300+ in our current portfolio.

The council does provide grants to marae each year through the Cultural Initiatives Fund, but we found investment provided in this way is not characterised by either the council or marae as a ‘facility partnership’. These grants are ring-fenced for capital improvements to marae buildings,
and are not tagged to the marae playing a formal role as facilities within a regional network, or delivering particular outcomes in return for the investment. Further, the Cultural Initiatives Fund does not provide for an ongoing partnership relationship with the marae alongside the grant.

In developing the new policy approach, we wanted to understand why so few marae or Māori organisations have sought formal facility partnerships with the council in the past, and make sure that the new policy properly considers any special context, barriers or opportunities for those that may be interested in them in future.

1.4 Summary of methodology

During Phase 1 of the Facility Partnerships Policy project we conducted key informant interviews related to a sample of 10 partnerships. During Phase 2, we selected an additional sample of seven marae and three Māori organisations to enable us to specifically explore a Te Ao Māori perspective.

Where possible, we also interviewed the council staff members who ‘hold’ the relationship, or who have the most in-depth understanding of their interactions with the council (past and present), to provide an internal perspective.

The project team analysed the interviews, and collectively identified common themes, issues and challenges, opportunities and benefits. We then held four findings hui to test our draft insights with a broader roopu (group). Additional issues raised at hui are incorporated into our findings.

The key stages of the research are outlined in more detail in Appendix B.

1.5 Out of scope feedback

Our conversations with Māori were wide-ranging, covering not only experiences of ‘partnering’ with the council, but broader issues around the council’s relationships with Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau.

Although some of this feedback was beyond the scope of the Facility Partnerships Policy Project, it has been captured here as a full account of what we heard, and what we committed to our informants to ‘take back’ and share with the wider organisation. Feedback that is related to a partnerships kaupapa but out of scope for the Facility Partnerships Policy specifically is included separately at the end of the Findings section, and noted in the summary (Appendix A).

This broader feedback will be of interest and value for council staff currently holding relationships or with obligations to hold relationships, for the governing body and local boards, and for the Independent Māori Statutory Board.
2 Key findings / Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

This section summarises the common themes that emerged from 11 one-on-one interviews, which were then further refined and expanded by 39 participants at four findings hui.

It is intended as an account of ‘what we heard’ from Māori we spoke to, and is not assumed to represent the views of all Māori. Although summarised and themed by staff, it is written from the perspective of our research participants.

Summary of key research findings

The research findings directly related to the Facility Partnerships Policy kaupapa have been grouped under the following key themes:

- Marae are more than just ‘facilities’.
- Māori-led facilities (especially marae) are already delivering outcomes in their communities and want more recognition and support from council.
- Partnerships should be founded on Te Tiriti principles, shared values and a long-term vision.
- Successful partnerships rely on enduring relationships.
- The relationship between mana whenua, mataawaka Māori and the council is complex and needs careful navigation.

Additional (out of scope) research findings

- Generally, council relationships with Māori need to improve, starting with better consultation and engagement.
- Māori want to be more involved in developing policy that particularly interests or impacts them.
Findings on the Facility Partnerships kaupapa

2.1 Marae are more than just ‘facilities’

For Māori, marae are at the centre of Te Ao Māori and cannot be labelled simply as ‘facilities’. The pākeha concept of a facility is seen as a very limited one, which doesn’t adequately convey the special role and significance of marae for Māori.

What we heard:

- **Marae are inseparable from the whenua, the tupuna (ancestors), their people and their history.** Marae are homes; they have mana; they are a taonga (treasure).

- **Marae often support a holistic range of functions, services and/or activities.** For example they may provide housing (papakainga) and emergency accommodation, host formal and informal gatherings, offer language and cultural instruction in a whanau-centric learning environment (e.g. kohunga reo, puna reo), act as a centre and showcase for Māori arts, and deliver or host social services.

- **Marae often hold relationships** with iwi, other marae, the wider Māori community, their local community, and also local and national organisations, central government and the council. Because of this, they often have broad oversight of issues and initiatives in their area.

- **Each marae is different.** They serve different communities in different ways, and have different tikanga, history, aspirations, capacity and governance structures.

- **The marae is turangawaewae: a place to stand for Māori.** Marae serve the needs of Māori first and foremost, and if a marae is needed by the iwi and hapu, this must take precedence.

- **Marae have specific tikanga (protocols) that must be followed** by visitors to show respect and uphold the mana of the marae. Marae contain many taonga, especially in their whareenui (meeting house), and some have uru pa (burial grounds) on site.

“Marae are being repeatedly referred to as ‘facilities’ – that is a very broad and pākeha word. Marae is the term [that] should be used.”

“For Māori, your marae is your ‘community centre’... If we have too fixed an idea of what a ‘community facility’ is, what has to happen there, or how it supports itself... we may miss the opportunity.”

“It would be silly to identify all marae as ‘the same’. Ensure this does not happen.”

“Our obligation to the community should not take precedence over our tikanga and traditional practices.”
• **Marae have a strong tradition of manaakitanga** (hospitality) and hosting guests may incur costs that are not covered by hireage fees. Traditionally, visitors offer koha voluntarily to acknowledge these efforts, but many non-Māori don’t understand or account for this. Sometimes manaakitanga appears to be unintentionally exploited by the council.

**How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:**

Any partnership arrangements with marae must fully acknowledge their place within Te Ao Māori. This includes:

• **Not defining marae as ‘community facilities’**. Marae are unique, even if they fulfil some of the same roles as facilities.

• **Committing to uphold the mana, tikanga, and matauranga Māori of marae**, including ensuring council staff understand their special role and significance. Pā sites are tapu, and visitors must respect cultural safety requirements.

• **Recognising that a marae may be needed by the iwi and hapu**, sometimes at short notice (for example to host tangi) and ensuring allowances are made for this.

• **Valuing and resourcing the knowledge, time and travel of Māori providing manaakitanga on marae**, and helping educate the wider community to do the same.

Some of these considerations may also be relevant when planning the development of facilities to be operated by Māori organisations.

**2.2 Value the outcomes that marae and Māori-led facilities are already delivering**

There is a perception that the council prefers to develop new facilities from scratch; “reinventing the wheel” rather than investing in supporting and improving what already exists.

Marae in particular are already active in the community space, and are playing an emerging role in supporting cultural learning and understanding in an increasingly diverse city. Many marae want the council to recognise the value they provide and build on

“Manaakitanga is covered by laying down koha. But traditions have changed and not everyone understands [this]. We don’t want to ask for koha, it’s embarrassing for us to ask and not in keeping with the tradition of koha... [But] it’s important that visitors understand that our words, our expertise have value and shouldn’t just be expected for free.”

“This [tangihanga] is the one thing that never changes and is the same across every marae in the nation. We can’t leave Auntie at home because someone’s already booked the marae!”

“[The council should] support the places where the people already are.”
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their strengths. This includes providing them with support and resources to fulfil their role more effectively.

What we heard:

- **Many marae have a broader focus already;** they are welcoming spaces for the whole community, not only Māori – for example working with local schools, and hosting wānanga, programmes and events.

- **Marae take pride in their manaakitanga,** and in sharing their strong connection to the whenua and mātauranga Māori with newer residents.

- **Marae fulfil work in the community that the council and other agencies do not do.** Further, some Māori feel more comfortable accessing services through their marae or a kaupapa Māori facility or provider.

- **Marae are charitable organisations run by volunteers** and it can be difficult to meet the expectations of their own people, the wider community and the council. Further, as Auckland has grown and changed, some iwi and hapu members have had to move out of their rohe (customary territory) and must travel back to look after the marae and manaaki visitors. This makes it more difficult to expand the role of the marae.

- **Marae aren’t fully reliant on the council to sustain them.** Marae rely on others within their immediate community to support each other – including ‘marae to marae’. However, the council should ensure the protection and sustainability of marae in the same way it recognises, resources and helps to maintain other community infrastructure, like sports clubs and community centres.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

- **Council needs to look for opportunities to increase the use and capacity of existing facilities** (in the broadest sense) that are serving the community – not always look to create new ones.

- **The council could play a useful role in supporting marae staff and volunteers** to build their capacity and capability,

“It would make sense to invest in marae, to build capacity and capability for each marae to deliver.”

“Marae are a one stop shop. Māori know best what Māori need and how to deliver.”

“[Ensuring] cultural health and safety is key to the operations of any marae.”

“We get to the point of exhaustion sometimes investing all this energy in hosting, in hospitality. This is a difference for marae compared to other community facilities.”

“Invest in facilities at marae. Marae-based services have high demand.”
e.g. through access to training, specialist expertise (e.g. HR, building compliance) and back office support. These non-financial forms of support would be highly valued.

- The council could also proactively notify marae of council employment and procurement opportunities in their area. This would honour the relationships, acknowledge existing skills and expertise, help to sustain the marae, and support the local economy.

### 2.3 Partnerships should be founded on Te Tiriti principles, shared values and a long-term vision

Genuine partnerships provide an opportunity for the council to honour its Treaty obligations, and give effect to commitments made to Māori. To be meaningful, a partnership must be founded in shared values and a long-term vision. Māori must have an active decision-making role if they are to exercise tino rangatiratanga.

**What we heard:**

- **Experiences of ‘partnerships’ and other relationships with the council feel unbalanced**, as “Council has all the control.” For Māori, the word ‘partnership’ implies shared power, and reciprocal relationships based on Te Tiriti. Shared power is about acknowledging the mana motuhake of Māori.

- **Under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, mana whenua should not be considered one of many ‘stakeholders’**. The relationship with, and responsibility for place that mana whenua have as kaitiaki in Tāmaki Makaurau is unique.

- **Māori are their own experts who conceive of the world through a holistic lens**. Social, cultural, environmental and economic dimensions are interconnected. This way of thinking cuts across council’s organisational boundaries, and extends before and beyond the council’s timelines — it is holistic and intergenerational.

---

“It’s not all about money, it’s about help. The council could use its power to make things easier for us... you have a massive team behind you, we don’t.”

“Marae have similar aspirations for the community, just how we get there is different.”

“Walk alongside us (don’t tell us what do do).”

“It’s not just about the marae for us, it’s about the environment, it’s everything – our thinking goes out like this, it goes out to the people, out to the land, out to the moana... We come as a whole, as opposed to a portion.”
• Shared values and aligned outcomes should always be the starting point for any partnership: alignment comes first, relationships second, working out the details third.

• To realise meaningful outcomes through a partnership, there needs to be a long-term vision and commitment. However, change on both sides is inevitable over longer timeframes, and neither side should be locked in forever.

 How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

• Partners need to be conceived of as equal and active participants, negotiating the way forward together. This aligns with the Treaty partnership and Treaty Principles.

• Facility partnership arrangements need to strongly align with the kaupapa and aspirations of the particular iwi and marae involved. In most cases iwi governance / post-settlement governance entities should be involved before detailed discussions with marae.

• Identifying shared values and outcomes should be the starting point for any partnership discussion, facility-based or otherwise.

• Opportunities to renegotiate a partnership should be planned in to allow for change over time

• Skill and talent sharing between marae, and between marae and the council, would help to improve relationships and capability. This would enable both sides to move towards genuine partnerships.

2.4 Successful partnerships rely on enduring relationships

Māori think inter-generationally and value enduring relationships. Most marae want to establish / maintain long-term relationships with the council that go beyond any particular issue, project or activity. These relationships would provide the right basis for a facility partnership discussion. Too often relationships with the council are perceived as short-term, project-based and transactional.
What we heard:

- Some longstanding relationships between Māori / marae and the council have been lost since amalgamation. Not all have been re-established, but there is a desire on both sides to do so.

- There is an uneven distribution of relationships across the council and across iwi. For example some iwi have relationships with senior leaders at the council, while others do not.

- Many marae – mana whenua and mataawaka – would like to establish closer relationships with their local board(s). Effort needs to be made to maintain these relationships through and between election cycles.

- Relationships can be lost due to turnover of key people on either side, or where the relationship has been formed around a specific project that comes to an end. These relationships aren’t always handed over well.

- Without a relationship agreement (or MOU, or other formal document) it can be more difficult to maintain the relationship when key people change.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

- The council needs to take a long-term perspective, and build enduring relationships with marae and Māori organisations. This would provide the best basis for a facility partnership.

- Initial discussions need to occur at the right level [e.g. rangatira to rangatira / chief to chief].

- The complexity of the council’s structure and its size makes the organisation difficult to navigate. It would be helpful to have one central point of contact between each marae/ iwi and the council.

- Written agreements / MOUs may help support [partnership] relationships between council and marae / Māori organisations, to provide a reference point and ensure the commitments made remain clear and will endure. This

“Mutual respect is critical to partnership, and building a deep and lasting relationship. People carry the information and knowledge between them... We don’t want tick-box, transactional relationships.”

“Council should be brokering introductions between local board leaders and marae, particularly mataawaka marae.”

“Local boards need to stick to scheduled meets with the community [and] make an effort to visit mataawaka marae.”

“Formal documents are paramount [to sustaining relationships; given there is likely to be change on both sides... enabling] succession is key.”
would reduce the impact of staff turnover and organisational change on both sides.

2.5 Navigating relationships with mana whenua and mataawaka

The relationship between mana whenua and mataawaka Māori in Tamaki Makaurau can be complicated. The Treaty creates different obligations to mana whenua and mataawaka. This space needs careful navigation, and is often not well understood by pākeha. Māori spoke of the need for the council to carefully consider how to adapt their approach to recognise and respect the differences, while fostering collaboration between the two.

What we heard:

- Mana whenua and mataawaka engagement needs to be well thought through. The council’s approach can sometimes conflate these two groups together when they should be treated separately. At other times, differentiating the two may lead to unnecessary divisions.

- The complex relationship dynamics between mana whenua and mataawaka can complicate engagement with Māori around something like facility partnerships, which are both place-based and outcome-focused.

- Mana whenua and mataawaka need to be given sufficient opportunity to discuss the right approach themselves, prior to engagement and decision-making.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

- Where appropriate, the council could resource marae, mataawaka and mana whenua to create / design their own process for working together. This approach was used successfully by Te Ora o Manukau in 2012.

- The council could look for other ways to broker opportunities for collaboration (e.g. around engagement, facilities, services) between mana whenua and mataawaka, where this is desired by Māori.
Out of scope findings

2.6 Improving relationships between the council and Māori, starting with better consultation and engagement

Generally speaking, council consultation and engagement with Māori is perceived as too fragmented, transactional and ‘one-way’, and can end up feeling like a ‘tick box’ exercise. Before the council can enter into effective partnerships with Māori, a council-wide effort is needed to build stronger relationships beyond the scope of ‘consultation’.

Through recognising Te Ao Māori, developing robust and respectful consultation procedures and empowering Māori to take a more active role in decision making, Auckland Council has the opportunity to lead the way in this space.

What we heard:

- Consultation processes appear disconnected and do not always involve the right people. Sometimes the council say they have consulted with Māori, but they have only engaged with some mana whenua groups (and not others, or mataawaka). Some groups seem to have more privileged access to the council than others.

- The council needs to get better at closing the loop after consultation: sharing how people’s feedback was used and how the council has responded to it. This ensures Māori are kept involved and their time and effort is respected.

- When marae (and Māori generally) are asked to consult again on topics they’ve previously been consulted on, this worsens the perception that their relationships with council are disconnected and transactional. This also creates frustration that previous feedback has not been properly recorded or actioned.

- Recording all interactions with marae would allow other areas of council to consult this information prior to planning engagement with Māori. This would allow other

“We are a treaty partner. Some staff still don’t grasp that concept. More education is needed, so people stop looking at us as the annoyance on the side that they have to engage with.”

“The council regularly wants us to consult — giving of our time and knowledge — but we do not get compensated. Shared power starts with koha.”

“We want to feel when we’re having a korero with somebody about an issue, that it’s actually been taken on board, and elevating to wherever it needs to go to get answers.”
teams to have the required context and understanding of any previous issues, and enable them to be better prepared.

- **Marae are well placed to disseminate information about council consultation and engagement opportunities**, and coordinate participation by their iwi and hapu. Council could better capitalise on these networks in planning and delivering engagement.

2.7 Working with Māori to develop future policy

*Some marae would welcome the chance to be more actively involved in strategic conversation and policy development related to issues that particularly interest or impact Māori.*

**What we heard:**

- **Many marae have skilled people with the right capabilities to participate in strategy and policy discussions.** Marae tend to be very well networked and can more easily discuss issues and agree collective positions with their own people than the council can.

- **Collaborative policy-making** could provide an opportunity for the council to work with Māori directly about issues that affect them. There may be a cost associated with this, in terms of supporting Māori capacity to engage.

“Local people are in the best position to know what is missing and what is needed and how to build off what’s already there, so meaningful open-minded engagement is important. These may not be quick conversations.”

“Marae development cannot and should not be dictated by council, but rather supported and led by marae.”
3 Next steps / Ngā koringa ā-muri

The insights from this work have been able to feed into the main policy development process, which has continued to run alongside the research.

The Facility Partnerships Policy responds to the findings in the following ways:

A dedicated ‘Facility partnerships and Te Ao Māori’ section:

- Outlines the relationship between this policy and the Treaty of Waitangi
- Acknowledges the special significance and role of marae for Māori
- Signals how facility partnerships with Māori, and especially marae, may need to differ from other partnerships.

Quality relationships are fundamental to the new approach, and one of the ‘six dimensions of partnership’ that shape the policy. For example:

- The policy’s emphasis on enduring, two-way relationships founded on shared goals and values.
- The need to allocate sufficient resources to support relationships and a commitment to factor this into future facility partnership decisions.

Other key ways that the policy approach addresses the findings:

- Partnerships with Māori-led organisations are an investment priority.
- A commitment to invest in existing spaces in preference to building new facilities.
- A commitment to capacity building for less experienced or lower capacity partners, for example volunteer-led organisations.
- Acknowledging that non-financial support – for example access to council expertise – is highly valuable to partners, and an important way that the council can invest.

Further detail is included as Appendix A.

This report will be provided to the Environment and Community Committee alongside the draft Facility Partnerships Policy. The findings report will also be shared with our research participants.

The out-of-scope findings will be shared with the relevant parts of the council organisation. Work is already underway to address some of these findings, for example:

- Development of a new Māori engagement portal
- Further clarification of the funding process and criteria for Marae Development grants
- Additional relationship-building activities with mataawaka marae.
## Appendix A: Summary of findings and responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS What we heard from Māori</th>
<th>POLICY RESPONSE: How the policy addresses this</th>
<th>Potential responses that are beyond the policy scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marae are more than just ‘facilities’.</td>
<td>The policy speaks directly to this finding, in order to:</td>
<td>The council could provide / improve access to guidance for staff relating to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae are taonga and inseparable from their whenua, tupuna, people and history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Demonstrate our understanding of the special significance and role of marae for Māori |  
- the special significance and role of marae for Māori |
| Marae play a more holistic role for Māori than community facilities do for pākeha. |  
- Increase staff and elected member understanding of this special significance and role |  
- the tikanga that may apply on marae |
| Marae are diverse, not a homogenous group. |  
- Outline how facility partnerships with marae may need to differ from other partnerships |  
- where staff can access support or advice when dealing with specific marae. |
| A marae’s primary responsibility is to Māori. |  
- Encourage marae and Māori-led organisations to seek facility partnerships with the council. | The council could provide more opportunities for staff to attend marae: |
| Tikanga needs to be observed on marae. |  
It is traditional for marae to manaaki visitors and although this has a cost, it tends not to be reflected in venue hire fees. |  
- in the course of their work (to increase Māori responsiveness and to build relationships with marae) |
| Marae and Māori-led facilities are already delivering outcomes in their communities. | The policy states we will invest in spaces that people already use and value, in preference to building new facilities. |  
- to build individual cultural competency. |
<p>| Many marae have a broader focus already and welcome the whole community. | Partnerships with Māori-led organisations are an investment priority. The policy encourages facility partnerships with marae in recognition of their existing and potential role. | Council could proactively work with marae to provide opportunities for staff that are culturally safe for both sides. |
| Marae do work in the community that the council and other agencies does not do. | The policy acknowledges that non-financial support – e.g. access to council expertise – is highly valuable to partners, and an important way that the council can invest in facility partnerships. | The council could better recognise the wider role played by marae and support them in this, e.g. work by the Civil Defence and Emergency Management team to explore the role of marae in building community resilience. |
| Most marae are run by volunteers with limited capacity. | | The council could also support marae in practical ways, e.g. access to training, or notification of local procurement opportunities. |
| Maraes’ existing role should be supported, like other community infrastructure. | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS What we heard from Māori</th>
<th>POLICY RESPONSE: How the policy addresses this</th>
<th>Potential responses that are beyond the policy scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Partnerships should be founded on Te Tiriti, shared values and long-term vision.  
‘Partnership’ implies shared power, with partners as equal and active participants.  
The kaitiaki role of mana whenua is unique in Tāmaki Makaurau.  
Te Ao Māori is holistic and intergenerational, which doesn’t align well with council’s organisational boundaries and timelines.  
Shared values and aligned outcomes should be the starting point for partnership.  
Long term commitment and vision is needed, but with flexibility to adapt. | The policy states that Auckland Council is committed to engaging and working with Māori in ways that are consistent with a Treaty-based relationship.  
A focus on long-term outcomes is also fundamental to the new approach. In future, all facility partnerships will be founded on shared goals and values, and this will be the focus for early discussions. | The Auckland Plan and Māori Responsiveness Plans set out principles and expectations relating to the council’s relationship with Māori under Te Tiriti.  
This includes supporting delivery of services by Māori for Māori, based on Te Ao Māori values and practices. |
| Relationships are the foundation for partnership.  
Marae see deeper, enduring relationships as the basis for facility partnerships.  
Some marae feel relationships have been lost post-amalgamation.  
There is an uneven distribution of relationships across the council and across iwi. Māori want more engagement ‘rangatiratanga’, and with local boards.  
Council has high staff turnover, and its large size makes it difficult to navigate.  
Written agreements may help support relationships by providing a reference point.  
Generally, relationships with Māori need to improve, starting with better consultation and engagement. | Relationships are fundamental to the new policy approach, and one of the ‘six dimensions of partnership’ that shape the policy.  
Resources to support enduring relationships will be factored into future facility partnership decisions, e.g. dedicated relationship holders.  
Written agreements will be prepared for all future facility partnerships. | The council could improve ‘BAU’ relationships with marae and Māori-led organisations by:  
• Nominating staff to hold and manage relationships  
• Establishing stronger relationships between marae and elected members, especially local boards  
• Supporting closer collaboration between marae  
Council could improve consultation and engagement with Māori / marae by:  
• Improving coordination of Māori engagement  
• Exploring how marae could support Māori engagement  
• Ensuring we ‘close the loop’ with Māori following consultation and engagement. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS What we heard from Māori</th>
<th>POLICY RESPONSE: How the policy addresses this</th>
<th>Potential responses that are beyond the policy scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between mana whenua and mataawaka and council is complex and needs careful navigation.</td>
<td>The policy outlines the distinction between mana whenua and mataawaka. Mana whenua, mataawaka and taurahere marae / organisations are invited to consider facility partnerships.</td>
<td>The council could provide / improve access to guidance for staff relating to the differences between mana whenua and mataawaka and the implications of this. Prior to engagement and decision-making, the council should provide sufficient opportunity for mana whenua and mataawaka to discuss the right approach and convey this to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two groups shouldn’t be conflated, or unnecessarily divided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana whenua and mataawaka want the opportunity to agree their own approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori want to take a more active role in policy-making around issues of particular significance to them.</td>
<td>The proposed decision-making process provides flexibility to umbrella facility partnerships with a broad range of Māori organisations. If needed, an alternative process taking specific account of the needs and interests of marae could be developed during implementation, in partnership with Māori.</td>
<td>The council could explore future opportunities for a collaborative policy-making with Māori. Marae are interested in supporting iwi and hapu to engage in strategic conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many marae are eager and capable to participate in strategy / policy discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be a cost associated with supporting Māori capacity to engage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Treaty Principles

Treaty principles have been recognised and expressed by the Waitangi Tribunal and a range of Courts – the Privy Council, Supreme Court and High Court. The principles bridge the two texts of the Treaty, focusing on the intent of the Treaty and the future.

The Treaty Principles will help guide how the council and Māori work together to establish, shape and manage facility partnership arrangements.

Relevant principles for facility partnerships include:

- **Rangatiratanga** – the duty to recognise Māori rights of independence, autonomy and self-determination, including the capacity of hapū, mana whenua and mataawaka to exercise authority over their own affairs. This principle enables the empowerment of Māori to determine and manage matters of significance to them.

- **Partnership** – the duty to interact in good faith and in the nature of a partnership. There is a sense of shared enterprise and mutual benefit where each partner must take account of the needs and interests of the other.

- **Active protection** – the duty to proactively protect the rights and interests of Māori, including the need to proactively build the capacity and capability of Māori.

- **Ōritetanga / mutual benefit** – to recognise that benefits should accrue to both Māori and non-Māori, both would participate in the prosperity of Aotearoa giving rise to mutual obligations and benefits. Each needs to retain and obtain sufficient resources to prosper, and each requires the help of its Treaty partner to do so. This includes the notion of equality (for example, in education, health and other socio-economic considerations).

- **Options** – recognising the authority of Māori to choose their own direction, to continue their own tikanga (customary practice) as it was or to combine elements of both and walk in both worlds. This principle includes recognition of Māori self-regulation.

- **The right of development** – the Treaty right is not confined to customary use or the state of knowledge as at 1840, but includes an active duty to assist Māori in the development of their properties and taonga (treasured items).
Appendix C: Research methodology

1. Research and advisory group formed
The research was designed, overseen and delivered by a cross-council project team with representatives from the following departments:
   - Community and Social Policy
   - The Southern Initiative
   - Operations Māori Responsiveness Hub (Nga Waka Angamua)
   - Maori Strategy and Relations (Te Waka Angamua)

2. Collated information about marae and Māori organisations, to inform sample
The team collated and reviewed information about marae in Tamaki Makaurau.
Additionally, we identified a small number of Māori organisations that have a facility-based component to their work and some form of relationship with council, comparable to the facility partnerships we researched during our first research phase.

3. Criteria developed and sample selected
A comprehensive set of criteria were developed and applied to help us select as ‘representative’ a sample as possible, acknowledging all marae and organisations would have a different experience and aspirations. We selected a sample of eight marae and four Māori organisations to provide a range of unique perspectives (refer Appendix D).

4. Representatives from selected marae / organisations and council counterparts identified
The team approached the marae / organisations to explain the research and request an interview. Seven marae and three organisations agreed to participate.

5. 11 key informant interviews held to discuss:
   - The current role of the marae / organisation in the community
   - Their aspirations for the future development of their marae / organisation
   - Their past and present relationships with the council (or its predecessors)
   - Perceptions of the strengths / advantages and challenges / disadvantages of working with the council
   - Conceptions of ‘partnership’
   - What marae / organisations would need or expect from council, if they were to enter into a ‘facility partnership’ with us.

(Refer Appendix C for a full list of questions.)

6. Interviews analysed, common themes identified and summarised
The team analysed the interviews, and collectively identified common themes, issues and challenges, opportunities and benefits. These were summarised in draft findings.

7. Draft findings taken to hui for validation

The team held findings hui at four of the participating marae to test the insights we had identified from the interviews with a broader roopu. We contracted specialist Kaupapa Māori designers from the Nga Aho collective to help design and facilitate the hui.

The hui were shaped partly in response to what we had learned through the informant interviews. For example, we:

- Participated in formal powhiri / mihi whakatau, and observed proper tikanga on the marae (including having kaikorero and kaikaranga to represent us)
- Laid down koha for our hosts in addition to venue hire fees, and offered native seedlings and kai to manaaki (show hospitality to) all attendees
- Invited staff from other council teams with a facility-related kaupapa that might have information or resources of interest to attendees (e.g. resource consents, civil defence and community grants). The intention was that they could learn from discussions, establish kanohi-te-kanohi (face-to-face) relationships and provide advice to attendees as a further form of koha for attendees’ time. A total of 20 council staff attended marae (in addition to policy staff, project team and facilitators).

Each hui was guided by our hosts and followed a different format.

A total of **39** people attended hui on behalf of marae, Māori organisations and agencies.

Although our findings were validated by the feedback we received from participants, additional issues were also raised and are captured in this report.

8. Insights from discussions and hui used to shape the Facility Partnerships Policy

9. Findings shared through this report

10. Draft Facility Partnerships Policy shared at consultation hui

Hui will be convened as part of our consultation and engagement phase, to close the loop on the research and seek feedback on the draft. Participants in this research and those who attended our insights hui will be encouraged to attend.
Appendix D: Research sample and selection criteria

There are a diverse mix of mana whenua, mataawaka and taurahere marae\(^1\) in Tamaki Makaurau, which range from small rural marae to large urban marae. Some are primarily gathering places for their iwi or hapu, or are situated within school, church and institutional settings. Others play a broader community role, for example hosting organisations, services and activities onsite.

Although every marae is unique, we worked with a cross-council team to identify a research sample that would include marae with as wide a range of characteristics as possible.

The variables we considered in selecting the sample were:

- Location – across the Auckland region, and mix of urban and rural
- Iwi affiliation – mana whenua, mataawaka and taurahere
- Use of the marae – whether the marae primarily serves the needs of iwi and hapu, or plays a wider role in the community
- Land ownership – Māori, council or privately owned
- Size of the marae (property and number of buildings / onsite facilities)
- Financial support from council (current and past)
- Age – from ancestral marae to newly established / emerging marae

Marae in our research sample

- **Hoani Watiti Marae\(^*\)**, Pan-tribal / Ngati Whatua Kawerau a Maki, Glen Eden
- **Mataatua Marae\(^*\)**, Ngati Awa ki Tamaki Makaurau te Hapu, Mangere
- **Puatahi Marae**, Ngati Whatua, Kaipara Coast
- **Paea Whanake Marae (in development)**, Ngāti Paoa, Point England
- **Ruapotaka Marae\(^*\)**, Pan-tribal / Nga Hau E Wha, Glen Innes
- **Tahuna Pa**, Waiohua Tainui, Awhitu

---

\(^1\) *Mana whenua:* Māori with territorial rights in Tamaki Makaurau, who belong to and derive power from the whenua (land), and who have authority and jurisdiction over the whenua or rohe (territory).

*Mataawaka:* Māori who are not mana whenua in Tamaki Makaurau and have not retained their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Mataawaka or ‘urban’ marae are pan-tribal, and welcome Māori of all affiliations, or none.

*Taurahere:* Māori in urban areas who retain their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Some taurahere groups have whakapapa or historical links to particular sites in Tamaki Makaurau, and have received the blessing of mana whenua to develop a marae for their Auckland-based members.
- **Umupiu Marae**, Ngai Tai ki Tāmaki, Maraetai

*Hosted findings hui*

**Māori organisations in our research sample**

- **Te Roopu Waiora**, Manukau
  
  *Te Roopu Waiora Trust is a unique kaupapa Māori organisation founded in 2001 and governed by whanau with physical, sensory and intellectual disabilities.*

- **Te Whare Wananga O Wairoa**, Howick
  
  *Te Whare Wananga O Wairoa is a whare built in the Emilia Maud Nixon Garden of Memories which hosts Māori education programmes.*

- **Tāmaki Herenga Waka Trust**, Auckland-wide
  
  *The Tāmaki Herenga Waka Trust is a charitable trust established to support the revitalisation of a visible and vibrant ‘culture’ of waka for the benefit of all Aucklanders.*

*Hosted findings hui*

**Additional marae and organisations that attended hui**

- Manurewa Marae
- Papakura Marae
- Te Atatu Marae
- Te Herenga Waka o Orewa Marae
- Papatuanuku Kokiri Marae
- Te Aroha Pā marae
- Ngai Tai ki Tamaki
- Ngā Kaitiaki Trust
- Healthy Families
- Te Puni Kokiri
- Whanau Community Native Tree Nursery
Appendix E: Informant interview discussion guide

Questions that guided our discussions with marae and Māori organisation representatives:

1. Role
   - Role in relation to this marae / organisation
   - Role in the community that marae / organisation currently plays
   - Current experience / relationships with Auckland Council [or other large organisations if no relationship with council]

2. Collaborative relationships / partnerships
   - Describe what ‘partnership’ means to you?
   - What makes a good relationship?
   - Support [your marae/org] would want to receive from council if entering a ‘facility partnership’?

3. Positives
   - What do you see as the strengths or opportunities of working with Auckland Council?
   - How can we build on / maximise these strengths?
   - What would make [your marae/org] more likely to enter into a ‘facility partnership’?
   - What strengths do you think marae offer as community facilities?

4. Challenges
   - What do you see as the challenges of working with Council? How might these be mitigated?
   - What would make [your marae/org] less likely to enter into a relationship like this?
   - What would be non-negotiable for you in entering into a ‘facility partnership’?
   - What concerns would you have in entering this kind of relationship?
   - Are there any specific things about marae that we need to consider if entering into this kind of arrangement? (i.e. Tangi getting priority, maintaining the tikanga and mana of the marae etc.).

5. How could Auckland Council play a role in supporting you in these aspirations?
   - What are the specific aspirations for [your marae/org]?
   - What would an ideal ‘facility partnership’ look like to you?
Facility Partnerships Policy

Public feedback summary
This paper provides a summary of public feedback on the draft Facility Partnerships Policy, and an overview of the activities undertaken during the consultation period.

**Key messages**

- During July and August 2018 the public had the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft Facility Partnerships Policy.

- Seventy-one responses were received online, by email and at a series of public drop-in sessions run at community venues across Auckland.

- Public feedback was highly supportive of the draft policy overall. Those providing feedback generally saw the value of having a policy for this activity, and were positive about its intent. Responses to questions about specific aspects of the policy were also strongly affirmative.

- Concerns mainly focused on how the policy will be applied and how the new approach will work in practice, rather than the content of the policy itself.

**Background**


2. During July and August 2018, Community and Social Policy staff undertook a series of engagement activities on the draft policy. The intention was to gauge support for the proposed approach, and enable the draft to be refined before final adoption.

3. Staff engaged with local boards, advisory panels, members of the public and existing and prospective facility partners to outline the proposed approach and invite feedback on the draft.

4. A total of 71 public submissions were received on the draft policy during the consultation period. Anonymised comments from survey respondents have been included in the document.

**Consultation questions**

5. Public feedback was welcomed on any aspect of the policy, but respondents were invited to answer eight specific questions that tested key aspects of the policy:

   a) Do you think the draft policy clearly outlines the **purpose and benefits** of facility partnership?

   b) Do you think the **Treaty Principles** is an appropriate way to guide facility partnerships with Māori?

   c) Do you think the combination of Track, Type and Scale is a useful way to **differentiate partnerships** and ensure our processes and requirements are appropriate?

   d) Do you think these are the right **principles to guide our investment** in facility partnerships?

   e) Do you agree with the council’s position on **commercial activities** as part of facility partnerships, as outlined on pp. 31-32? Are there any commercial activities that you think should not be allowed?
f) Do you think the Lead Relationship Broker is the best approach to ensuring the council can support quality partnership relationships?

g) Do you think the ‘Agreement’ and ‘Facility’ sections provide a helpful overview of the technical aspects of facility partnerships? What else should be in these sections?

h) Did you find the policy document easy to read and navigate? Do you have any comments on how to improve it?

Key findings

6. Public feedback was highly supportive of the draft Facility Partnerships Policy overall. The responses to all of the specific questions asked were strongly affirmative, and the majority of respondents were positive about the intent and proposed approach of the draft policy.

7. Those providing feedback generally saw the value of having a policy for this activity. Some expressed frustrations with the process of initiating or maintaining a facility partnership in the past. They hoped that the new policy would lead to better investment decisions, and ensure that partnerships work for both partners and council. People also hoped the new approach would make it easier for partners to navigate council, get good support from council staff, and cut down on bureaucracy.

8. Respondents were positive about many specific aspects of the policy, particularly the investment principles, the proposal to enable appropriate commercial activities in facilities, and the establishment of Lead Relationship Brokers. The Track, Type and Scale model was welcomed for its ability to encompass a wide range of facility partnerships, and the intention to ensure processes and expectations are proportionate to the circumstances.

9. Where some respondents expressed criticism or concerns about the policy, it was more often about how it would be applied in practice than about the policy content itself. Some people were uncertain that the policy would be implemented as intended across the council, in a supportive and empowering way. Others questioned if the policy adequately allowed for the messy reality of facility partnerships.

10. Using the Treaty principles to guide partnerships with Māori was welcomed by most, but this was acknowledged as a complex area. Other concerns identified included how the investment principles will be applied and ‘traded off’, and whether some communities will be advantaged by the new approach.

11. Respondents appreciated the effort to make the policy document visually appealing and more accessible. While a number noted the complexity of the document, respondents generally found it easy to navigate and understandable.
Analysis of feedback by question

Do you think the draft policy clearly outlines the purpose and benefits of facility partnerships?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>harvested</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Public feedback on this question was strongly positive. Of the 71 respondents 46 thought the policy clearly outlined the purpose and benefits of facility partnerships.

13. Respondents were positive about the clarity of the policy document and felt that it provided clear direction.

14. Three respondents did not agree that the policy clearly outlined purpose and benefits, and 15 thought it did so partially, while five were unsure. Comments included that facility partnerships need to work for both council and partners, but the policy tends to focus mostly on the council’s role.

15. Others recommended that evaluation of success should go both ways, with partners able to evaluate the council’s performance and hold staff accountable, as well as the other way around.

Do you think the Treaty Principles is an appropriate way to guide facility partnerships with Māori?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>harvested</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. A majority of the respondents (38) agreed that using the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi was an appropriate way to guide facility partnerships with Māori.

17. Some noted that the Treaty is central to New Zealand and that the principles had the capacity to empower everyone, not just Māori. One noted that the use of these principles ought to extend wider than facility partnerships, and across all council’s relationships with Māori.

18. Twelve respondents disagreed that the principles were an appropriate guide, while 11 had mixed feelings. A number of these respondents objected to what they saw as they prioritisation of one ethnic group over others, and felt all communities in Auckland should be treated the same.
19. One noted that partnerships with Māori will not always be marae or iwi-based. Another pointed out that a Treaty-based partnership would not begin or end with a facility, and that council will need to be responsive to non-facility issues to uphold the relationship.

**Do you think the combination of Track, Type and Scale is a useful way to differentiate partnerships and ensure our processes and requirements are appropriate?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. A significant majority of respondents (43) agreed that the Track, Type and Scale model was a useful way to differentiate partnerships and ensure that our processes and requirements are appropriate.

21. Among the reasons given for their agreement, respondents cited the model’s ability to cover a range of partnerships, the potential flexibility to move between categories over time, and the importance of having processes and expectations that are proportionate to the circumstances.

22. Five respondents disagreed that the dimensions were useful, while 13 considered them partially useful. A typical concern was that partnership arrangements are inherently complex and changeable, and this model may not be practical to implement.

**Do you think these are the right principles to guide our investment in facility partnerships?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. A significant majority of respondents (48) considered that the principles set out in the draft policy were the right ones to guide our investment. The sustainability and equity principles were particularly popular among respondents.

24. Seven respondents disagreed about the appropriateness of the principles, almost all because they considered that the principles would favour particular groups, e.g. areas with higher populations, more established sports or more affluent communities.

25. Thirteen respondents had mixed views on the principles. These included concerns about whether or how the principles would be traded off against each other, whether all parts of the council (including CCOs) would be equally committed to the principles, and how equity would be defined in practice.
Do you agree with the council’s position on commercial activities as part of facility partnerships, as outlined on pp. 31-32? Are there any commercial activities that you think should not be allowed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Forty-one respondents agreed with the council’s position that some appropriate commercial activity is reasonable in facilities.

27. Some noted that commercial activity could be complementary to the purpose of the facility, and in some cases those revenue streams would be necessary for a facility to be sustainable over time.

28. A number of respondents were not supportive of commercial activities that are potentially harmful to healthy living. Alcohol sales, gambling activities, loan sharks and sex work were specifically mentioned as activities that should not be supported in our facilities.

29. Some respondents pointed out that commercial operators would need to be willing to align their activities with the principles set out in the policy.

30. Six respondents disagreed with commercial activities in facilities. Some felt businesses had no place in community settings, and felt facilities ought to stick to ‘core services’. Others saw the proposal as council shifting responsibility for funding facilities to their partners and the community, or privatising community assets.

31. Seventeen respondents were in partial agreement, reinforcing the need for controls around the types of commercial activities to ensure that they would enhance and sustain the community purpose of the facility, and noting the importance of council doing proper due diligence in these cases. Some respondents felt community facilities shouldn’t be competing with the private sector.

32. A number of respondents pointed out the complexity of the planning rules affecting some sites, which may work against commercial activities in these facilities.

Do you think a Lead Relationship Broker is the best approach to ensuring the council can support quality partnership relationships?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The idea of appointing a lead relationship broker for each partnership was popular, with 41 respondents expressing agreement.

“It is going to be essential to have some commercial activity to allow [our] new facility to break even and encourage people through the doors... the days of single purpose fully volunteer run organisations are numbered.”

“My initial reaction was ‘no’ but I think it’s articulated quite sensibly.”

“I am fully supportive of the position on commercial activity. However, I worry that [this] policy on its own will not effect the changes required. Layers of intersecting rules and regulations remain which restrict the financial viability of community owned facilities. I think council needs to review this whole landscape.”

“Having one person who understands your facility and the community that uses it is key.”
34. Many respondents agreed that establishing a broker position would make the council much easier for partners to navigate, given its size and complexity. Many saw the role as critical to the success of ongoing partnership relationships, helping to ensure consistency of advice across departments, and streamlining communications and paperwork.

35. Nine respondents didn’t feel that the role would be useful. The most commonly expressed concern was that creating these roles meant more council staff would need to be hired, which was a waste of money, and/or that it would create additional layers of bureaucracy.

36. Sixteen respondents saw the potential of the role, but had some reservations. The most common reservation was uncertainty that the role would work in practice, and in particular if it would be properly resourced. Some respondents expressed a lack of trust in the council and questioned whether it could deliver on the intent of the role, and work in a way that genuinely supports community.

37. A number of respondents emphasised that the broker would need to have particular skills to be useful to partners, and ideally be supported by a wider team to ensure a partnership wasn’t reliant on the support and abilities of a single person. This would also help to manage transitions if council staff leave, maintaining relationship continuity.

Do you think the ‘Agreement’ and ‘Facility’ sections provide a helpful overview of the technical aspects of facility partnerships? What else should be in these sections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. These sections of the policy were intended to provide an overview of some of the considerations relating to the partnership agreement or the facility itself that will have to be considered as part of a partnership.

39. Thirty-nine of the respondents agreed that it succeeded in doing this, while six disagreed.

40. Fifteen respondents partially agreed but had some reservations. Comments included that although these sections were an improvement they still failed to reflect the messy reality, that they were too complicated, and that council decisions always took too long.

41. One respondent felt the policy ought to further clarify the difference between owning and operating a facility, and give further attention to professionalising facility management.

“[A lead broker is an] absolutely fantastic idea. We find that staff changes and a lack of knowledge of who to go to for help a HUGE CHALLENGE.”

“[The proposed broker role] needs to be resourced to do it well. Depending on the type and scale of the partnership [this] could be a significant amount of work. There WILL be a temptation to just add the workload on top of existing staff responsibilities.”

“Community groups have to go to extraordinary lengths to demonstrate a need for a facility. This process is resource-intensive. Most groups do not have access to such resources, even those that appear well-funded.”
Do you find the policy easy to navigate? Do you have any comments on how to improve it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Quite easy</th>
<th>Neither easy nor difficult</th>
<th>Quite difficult</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. A majority of respondents (35) who expressed an opinion on the ease of the policy found it either easy or very easy to navigate.

43. For a significant number of respondents (19) the policy was neither easy nor difficult to navigate.

44. Those who found the policy difficult noted its complexity, and suggested there were areas where language could be simplified. While some specifically commended the font size and style, others found the size of the font too small.

45. There was a suggestion that more examples of current partnerships could make the policy easier to navigate and understand.

“We appreciate the efforts to make the document visually appealing, less intense and more accessible. The frequent use of images and tables rather than plain text aids understanding.”
Outline of public consultation activities

46. Information about the policy and the public consultation activities were distributed through the council’s email databases of existing and prospective facility partners, community group networks and other interested parties, with encouragement to disseminate more widely.

47. The regional sports body Aktive Auckland distributed the consultation information to sports organisations and clubs on our behalf.

48. Staff attended meetings with the Ethnic People’s, Rainbow Communities and Pacific Peoples advisory panels at their request, to provide a briefing on the policy and answer questions. Panels were also provided with the consultation information to circulate to their networks.

49. A story about the policy and the public consultation was published in Our Auckland in July.

*Online submissions invited via ‘Have Your Say’*

50. Online submissions were invited on the draft policy on Auckland Council’s Have Your Say website between 29 June and 17 August 2018.

51. We also received a small number of submissions via email.

*Public drop-in sessions for face-to-face enquiries*

52. The team offered six public drop-in sessions during July and August in community venues across south, central west, and north Auckland.

53. The public drop-in sessions provided people with an opportunity to come and view the policy in large format, take printed copies away and fill in feedback forms by hand if they wished.

54. Public consultation sessions were held as drop-ins rather than presentations to make it easier for people to get across the large amount of information, while zeroing in on the parts of the policy most of interest to them.

55. More importantly, the walkthroughs gave community organisations the chance to speak to one of the team about their individual situations, and what the policy might mean for them. This was definitely the main reason most attendees chose to come and visit, and people really valued the chance to have a chat with us in person.

56. Public drop-in sessions were held in:

- Manukau
- Pukekohe
- Three Kings
- Central Auckland
- Kelston
- Takapuna
- Warkworth

57. Staff also ran a stall at the Diversity Forum in Manukau on July 24.
Characteristics of online respondents

58. Feedback was received from the majority of local board areas and was fairly evenly distributed across the city. The most responses were received from the Rodney (9), Franklin (8), Devonport-Takapuna (7), Waitakarurū (5) and Albert Eden (5) local board areas. No responses were received from the Great Barrier, Papakura, Puketāpapa and Whau local board areas.

59. We received 32 responses to the policy from men, 28 from women and two from gender diverse people. Nine respondents declined to give their gender.

60. Respondents to the draft policy were largely European. 50 of the 71 total responses were from people who identified as European. The next largest ethnic group who provided responses was Māori, at seven responses.

61. As a result, this feedback may not fully express the views of Māori, who the policy acknowledges have particular views and needs when it comes to partnering with the council, and it may also not give a complete picture of the views of other ethnic groups.

62. Feedback was received from a wide range of age groups (see table below). Those between the ages of 35 and 74 were the most likely to submit on the draft policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanks</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of the Code of Conduct

File No.: CP2018/18653

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek local board feedback on the draft Code of Conduct (code).

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The council’s initial code was prepared by the Auckland Transition Agency prior to Auckland Council commencing. It was last reviewed in 2013. The code has worked well but there have been a number of issues identified. The Governing Body agreed that the code be reviewed through the Joint Governance Working Party. Presentations were made to local board cluster meetings earlier this year.

3. Based on feedback to date, an amended code has been drafted and the Joint Governance Working Party has approved it to be reported to local boards for feedback. The proposals contained in the draft code address the issues that were identified.

4. A comparison of the draft code with the current code can be summarised as follows:
   (i) The code itself is more concise.
   (ii) Material breaches are defined.
   (iii) There are separate complaint processes depending on whether a complaint relates to a non-material breach, a material breach or conflict of interest.
   (iv) The current independent review panel is replaced by a Conduct Commissioner, who can impose sanctions.
   (v) Findings of the Conduct Commissioner (for material breaches) will be made public to assist compliance with sanctions imposed by the Conduct Commissioner.
   (vi) There is no political involvement in determining a complaint or imposing sanctions.
   (vii) Related documents are bundled in with the code and key policies and protocols and adopted with the code:
      a. Conflict of interest policy
      b. Access to information protocol
      c. Election year policy
      d. Communications policy
      e. Media protocols.

5. Local board feedback is being sought on the draft code.

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

a) provide the following feedback on the draft Code of Conduct attached to this report as Attachment A.
Horopaki / Context

What is the Code of Conduct

6. A code of conduct essentially sets out a council’s expectations about how members will conduct themselves. Every council is required to adopt a code of conduct (Local Government Act 2002, schedule 7, clause 15). It must set out:

“(a) understandings and expectations adopted by the local authority about the manner in which members may conduct themselves while acting in their capacity as members, including—
   (i) behaviour toward one another, staff, and the public; and
   (ii) disclosure of information, including (but not limited to) the provision of any document, to elected members that—
      (A) is received by, or is in the possession of, an elected member in his or her capacity as an elected member; and
      (B) relates to the ability of the local authority to give effect to any provision of this Act; and

   (b) a general explanation of—
      (i) the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987; and
      (ii) any other enactment or rule of law applicable to members.”

7. Once adopted, a code of conduct requires a 75% majority to change it.

8. Members of local boards must comply with the code of conduct that is adopted by the governing body (Local Government Act 2002, schedule 7, clause 36B).

Reasons for reviewing the Code of Conduct

9. In working with the current code the council has experienced a number of issues:
   (i) It is not easy to follow. It includes principles, descriptions of roles and responsibilities and statements about relationships and behaviours. However, a complaint about a breach can only relate to the section on relationships and behaviours.
   (ii) Although a positive aspect of the current code is a focus, initially, on resolving complaints to the satisfaction of the complainant, it is not appropriate for an allegation about a conflict of interest to be resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant – conflict of interest allegations need to be tested against the law.
   (iii) The code does not distinguish between non-material and material breaches. All allegations of breaches are treated the same.
   (iv) The final point of escalation of a complaint is to the independent review panel which comprises three members. This process is valuable but is underused because it can be expensive with three members being required.
   (v) There needs to be a requirement that a complainant has tried to resolve their complaint prior to submitting it to the formal complaint process in the code.
   (vi) The code is underused because it is seen to “lack teeth”. There needs to be a review of available sanctions.

10. PWC were commissioned to review the current code and the Governing Body agreed at its February 2018 meeting that the current code should be reviewed. The Joint Governance Working Party is overseeing the development of the code.

Engagement to date

11. Staff made presentations to local board cluster meetings and a Governing Body workshop earlier this year. Among the issues discussed, was whether a revised code should be concise and principles-based or prescriptive.
12. The approach to the draft code was discussed with the Joint Governance Working Party, whose guidance included that there should be no political involvement in the determination of complaints and the imposition of sanctions.

13. A draft was presented to the Joint Governance Working Party on 12 September which the working party approved for reporting to local boards for their feedback.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice**

**The draft code**

14. The draft code is attachment A to this report.

15. The draft code is presented as two documents:

   (i) The code itself contains:

      a. principles
      b. descriptions of material breaches
      c. the complaints process.

   (ii) The second document contains attachments which provide more detail:

      a. Policies and protocols which are adopted along with the code and are an intrinsic part of the code. Elected members must abide by the conduct set out in these documents.
      b. Description of applicable legislation which the Local Government Act requires all codes to contain.
      c. Documents which are described as “external” in the sense that they are agreed outside the code but are relevant to the conduct of members. An example is the Expenses Policy which is agreed by the Finance and Performance Committee and approved by the Remuneration Authority. It is useful to have these documents included for easy reference and to provide context to some aspects of the code.

16. The code describes two key principles – trust and respect. The principle of trust captures the expectations of the community in their elected representatives. The community trusts that members will act in the interest of the community and not their own interest, for example. This principle encompasses the ethical dimension of conduct.

17. The principle of respect captures the expectations members have of each other in terms of their conduct towards each other and towards the public.

18. The principles are written in a style which indicates personal commitment (“I will...”).

**The complaints process**

19. The draft code contains definitions of “material breaches”. This defines what the bottom line is and at what point a breach needs to be treated more seriously than other breaches. A complaint which relates to a material breach is treated differently to a complaint which relates to a non-material breach.

20. A complaint is lodged with the chief executive. A complaint must set out what part of the code has been breached, must provide evidence of the breach and evidence of attempts to resolve the breach. Where the code refers to chief executive this includes a nominee of the chief executive.

21. If the complaint relates to a conflict of interest, the chief executive will arrange for the member to receive advice from either Legal Services or Audit and Risk. The complainant has no further role. If the member does not comply with advice, the matter becomes a material breach for investigation by the Conduct Commissioner.
22. In other cases, the chief executive refers the complaint to an “Investigator”. An Investigator is appointed by the chief executive and may be a staff member or external person.

23. The Investigator conducts a preliminary assessment of the complaint and has the discretion to dismiss the complaint if it is frivolous or vexatious or without substance.

24. If the complaint relates to a non-material breach, the Investigator may make non-binding recommendations, including a recommendation to apologise or undertake voluntary mediation.

25. If the complaint relates to a material breach, it is referred to a “Conduct Commissioner”. A Conduct Commissioner is a person of the calibre of a retired High Court judge and is selected from a list of such persons which has been approved by the Governing Body.

26. The Conduct Commissioner may direct mediation or conduct an investigation which may include a hearing.

Sanctions

27. The Conduct Commissioner has the power to impose sanctions, including a requirement to apologise, withdraw remarks or make a public statement. The report of the Conduct Commissioner is formal and made public, to promote compliance with the sanctions imposed by the Conduct Commissioner.

28. The Conduct Commissioner replaces the current independent review panel, which is not used frequently due to the cost associated with it having three members.

29. Staff had been asked to investigate whether there could be financial sanctions. The Remuneration Authority was asked whether it would agree to a reduction of salary paid to a member who breached the Code. The reply included:

The Authority is often asked whether the performance of an individual or individuals is considered when making a determination. Performance does not feature in the list of criteria that the Authority is required to take into account. Therefore, it has no mandate to consider performance.

Section 14 (implementation of determinations) of the Remuneration Authority Act 1977 says that every determination issued by the Authority must be implemented according to their tenor and it is unlawful to act contrary to a determination. This prevents a council from making deductions from an elected member’s salary.

Attachments to the code

30. The attachments include:

i) Policies and protocols that are adopted along with the code:
   - Conflict of interest policy
   - Access to information protocol
   - Election year policy
   - Communications policy
   - Media protocols.

ii) A description of legislation that is required by the Local Government Act 2002.

iii) Documents that are external to the code but are included because they are relevant to conduct:
   - Guide to governance roles and responsibilities
   - Guide to working with staff
   - Expenses policy.
31. The attached policies include the Conflict of Interest Policy which has been rewritten and a new "Access to information protocol." All other documents attached to the code are from existing sources and are not new.

Conflict of interest policy
32. The Conflict of Interest Policy has been updated to reflect the current legal position relating to conflicts of interest and pre-determination, as the current policy is out of date.
33. It remedies a current inconsistency between the treatment of financial and non-financial interests (being automatically disqualified from decision-making for a financial interest, but not for a non-financial interest).
34. It includes a new section on pre-determination, which is a separate legal concept to conflicts of interest.
35. It places stronger emphasis on the interests of the council in the probity and integrity of its decisions, as the consequences of failing to manage are more commonly borne by the council.
36. It is intended to be more user-friendly and accessible.

New protocol included – Elected Member Access to Information
37. Included in the policies and protocols attached to the Code of Conduct is a new ‘Access to information protocol’. This protocol puts a framework around elected members legal right to council information under the ‘need to know’ principle. This protocol is in addition to the existing ways that elected members can gain access to information. It is aimed at addressing circumstances where there has been lack of clarity over requests for information where it is not clear if it is or is not confidential.

The need to know principle for elected members
38. In addition to rights under LGOIMA, elected members have a legal right to council information under the “need to know” principle established by the common law. Under this principle, a good reason to access council information exists if an elected member shows that access to the information is reasonably necessary to enable them to perform their statutory functions as a member of the council. In some limited cases elected members may also be able access “need to know” council information relevant to their representative duties.

Why we are proposing a protocol
39. The purposes of the draft protocol are to:
   (i) Give effect to the legal ‘need to know’ principle.
   (ii) Enable elected members to properly perform their statutory functions as democratically elected local decision-makers; and to facilitate them in fulfilling their representative duties. This promotes democratic and effective local government.
   (iii) Provide elected members with better and more efficient access to council information than is provided for LGOIMA, by reducing the number of withholding grounds that can apply to the information and the timeframes for response.
   (iv) Provide for transparent and impartial chief executive decisions on requests under this protocol, and a democratic mechanism for the reconsideration of such decisions.
(v) To provide that confidential council information will be made available to elected members in a manner that reflects the council’s legal duty to protect the confidentiality of the information and does not prejudice the interests protected by LGOIMA.

40. We have agreed with the Chief Ombudsman that we will develop a protocol to better manage elected member access to information.

41. Because this is the first time that council is adopting such a protocol, staff are suggesting that it is revisited and reviewed within 18 months of its adoption to ensure that it is working effectively, best enabling elected members to properly perform their statutory functions as democratically elected local decision-makers and facilitating them in fulfilling their representative duties.

Summary of suggested process in draft protocol

42. The protocol sets out a framework and process for elected member requests for council information. In summary, the process in the protocol is:

(i) Elected members make a request for information held by council and explain why they need the information.

(ii) The chief executive makes a decision on whether the information is reasonably necessary for the elected member to exercise their statutory functions or performance of their representative duties, and whether any of the limited reasons to withhold may apply (for example if personal information should be redacted for Privacy Act reasons).

(iii) Decision and the provision of information to the elected member (with conditions if necessary for confidential information) within 5 working days.

(iv) If an elected member is not happy with the chief executive’s decision, they can ask it to be reconsidered by the Audit & Risk Committee.

Local board feedback

43. Local board views are being sought on the proposed changes in the draft code and the supporting policies that will be adopted alongside the code. In particular:

- The principles based and positive intent in the drafting of the code.
- Defining material breaches and making the findings of complaints of a material breach public.
- Replacing the current independent review panel with an independent Conduct Commissioner, who can impose sanctions which means having no political involvement in determining a complaint or imposing sanctions.
- Support for the access to information protocol.

44. Feedback from local boards will be considered by the Joint Governance Working Party at its meeting on 31 October 2018. The working party will then recommend a final draft code to the Governing Body for adoption. Once adopted by the Governing Body, the code applies to all elected members.

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

45. Local board feedback will be reported to the Joint Governance Working Party. The code impacts local boards in that all members must abide by it.
**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

46. The code is an internal procedural document. The principles and values expressed in the document provide for inclusivity and specifically disallow discrimination.

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

47. There may be financial implications if the Investigator that the chief executive appoints is external. Escalation to the Conduct Commissioner will have lesser financial implications than referral to a full review panel as provided in the existing code, but because of the reduced financial cost, may be utilised more often.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

48. Staff will investigate how best to ensure all elected members are fully aware of the new code.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

49. The feedback from local boards will be reported to the meeting of the Joint Governance Working Party on 31 October 2018. The working party will then recommend a final draft code to the Governing Body for adoption.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**
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Introduction

Every local authority is required to adopt a code of conduct\(^1\). It must set out:

\[a\] *understandings and expectations adopted by the local authority about the manner in which members may conduct themselves while acting in their capacity as members, including—*

(i) behaviour toward one another, staff, and the public; and

(ii) disclosure of information, including (but not limited to) the provision of any document, to elected members that—

(A) is received by, or is in the possession of, an elected member in his or her capacity as an elected member; and

(B) relates to the ability of the local authority to give effect to any provision of this Act; and

\(b\) a general explanation of—

(i) the *Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*; and

(ii) any other enactment or rule of law applicable to members."

This code has two key principles: one reflecting the expectations of the community that elected members act in the community’s interest with high ethical standards and one reflecting members’ own expectations about how they will interact with each other, the public and staff. These principles are expressed positively in terms of trust and respect. The code also provides clarity about what is a significant breach.

There are various documents attached to the Code. Some of these form part of the Code and are adopted along with the Code. Members ensure their conduct is consistent with these documents. Others provide detail that is relevant to determining compliance with this Code and are not adopted as part of it.

The provisions for complaints provide for independent external assessments and judgements where appropriate. Political involvement is minimised.

Application

The code applies to elected members while acting in their capacity as elected members.

Conduct matters that arise in meetings should be dealt with under the meeting’s standing orders, however, a complaint relating to such a conduct matter, if not adequately dealt with at a meeting, may be made under the Code.

\(^1\) Local Government Act 2002, schedule 7, clause 15
1 Principles

1.1 Trust

I can be trusted to act in the community’s interest

I will:

- make decisions on their merits, in the interests of the public and unaffected by illegitimate considerations such as personal interest or other duties or relationships
- disclose all personal and outside interests, relationships and duties
- declare a conflict of interest and step aside from a decision where it might appear that I will not approach a decision on its merits, in the interests of the public and unaffected by a personal or outside interest, relationship or duty
- when making decisions, have an open mind to the views of others and to alternatives, and be prepared, despite any predisposition I may have, to change my mind
- ensure that I am not under an obligation to those that might inappropriately try to influence me in the performance of my duties
- be accountable for the decisions I make and co-operate with appropriate public scrutiny
- make an equitable contribution, including attending meetings and workshops, preparing for meetings, attending civic events, and participating in relevant training seminars
- act and make decisions openly and transparently
- be truthful and demonstrate honesty and integrity
- use council resources prudently and lawfully and not for my own purposes
- uphold the law, and promote and support high standards of conduct by leadership and example
- comply with the legislation, policies and protocols attached to this code
1.2 Respect

I will respect those I work with

I will interact with other elected members, staff and the public in a way that:

- encourages mutual respect and maintains the dignity of each individual
- recognises others’ roles and responsibilities
- is inclusive
- enables the co-existence of individual and collective responsibility
- allows for robust discussion and debate focusing on issues rather than personalities
- encourages thoughtful analysis
- maintains public confidence in the office to which I have been elected
- is open and honest
- maintains the confidentiality of information provided to me
- complies with the attached policies and protocols
2 Policies, protocols, legislation and external documents

The following are policies and protocols that provide more detail around agreed standards and procedures. These policies and protocols are adopted as part of the Code of Conduct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies and protocols</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest policy</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information protocol</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election year policy</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications policy</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media protocols</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a summary of legislation that is relevant to the conduct of members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislation relevant to the conduct of members</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are documents that exist independently of the Code of Conduct. They provide detail that is relevant to determining compliance with this Code of Conduct. These documents exist outside of the Code of Conduct and are not adopted as a part of the Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External documents</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guide to governance roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to working with staff</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses policy</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Material breaches

- Participating in a decision where the member has been formally advised through the complaints provisions of this code that a conflict of interest exists
- Breaching cl 2.19 and cl 3.7 of the Conflicts of Interest policy
- Bullying, aggressive behaviour
- Discrimination
- Undermining other elected members, staff or the public
- Intentional misrepresentation of the statements or actions of others
- Intentional disclosure of confidential information
- Intentional misuse of council resources
- Harassment, including:
  - Violent threats or language directed against another person.
  - Discriminatory jokes and language.
  - Posting sexually explicit or violent material.
  - Posting (or threatening to post) other people’s personally identifying information.
  - Personal insults, especially those using racist or sexist terms.
  - Unwelcome sexual attention.
  - Advocating for, or encouraging, any of the above behaviour.
  - Continuing with unwanted behaviour after being asked to stop.

4 Complaints

4.1 Breach of the Code

All elected members must comply with the Code of Conduct and associated policies. Not doing so, constitutes a breach of the Code.

4.2 Complaints

Where an elected member, the chief executive (including on behalf of a member of staff from the council family) or a member of the public believes that an elected member has breached the Code, a complaint may be made.

The complaint must be made in writing and lodged with the chief executive, reference the part of the Code which is alleged to be breached, provide evidence of the alleged breach and evidence of attempts to resolve the complaint.
4.3 Principles

All complaints will be considered in a manner consistent with the principles that:

- the approach for investigating and assessing a complaint will be proportionate to the apparent seriousness, nature and complexity of the alleged breach; and
- the concepts of natural justice and fairness will apply in the determination of any complaints made under this Code.

4.4 Investigator, Conduct Commissioner, mediators

General
The Investigator, Conduct Commissioner and mediator will be separate persons in the case of any specific complaint.

Investigator
The chief executive will be responsible for the appointment of a suitable Investigator. This may be a staff member or external person.

Conduct Commissioner
The chief executive will recommend to the Governing Body, for approval, a list of persons who may be called on to fulfil the role of Conduct Commissioner.

Mediators
Mediators will be external and have established skills as mediators.

4.5 Receipt of complaint

On receipt of a complaint, the chief executive will follow the process set out in cl 4.11 if the complaint relates to a breach of the conflicts of interest provision in the Code.

All other complaints will be referred to an Investigator.

The chief executive will inform:

- the complainant that the complaint has been referred to the Investigator;
- the respondent that a complaint has been made against them, as well as the name of the Investigator, and the process for dealing with complaints as set out in the Code.

4.6 Preliminary assessment

On receipt of a complaint, the Investigator will determine if the complaint is:
- frivolous, vexatious, or without substance and should be dismissed;
- outside the scope of the Code and should be redirected or dismissed;
- relates to a non-material breach of the Code; or
- relates to a material breach of the Code and a full investigation is required.

Factors that can be considered when determining if a complaint is frivolous, vexatious, or without substance include whether complaints are intended to:

- intimidate or harass another member or employee;
- damage another member’s reputation;
- obtain a political advantage;
- influence the council in the exercise of its functions or to prevent or disrupt the exercise of those functions;
- avoid disciplinary action under this Code;
- prevent or disrupt the effective administration of this code;
- or are not made in good faith.

The Investigator can make any initial inquiry that is necessary to determine the appropriate course of action.

Unless the Investigator determines otherwise, a full copy of the complaint will be provided to the respondent.

### 4.7 Dismissal of complaint

Where the Investigator decides that the complaint should be dismissed, the Investigator will inform the chief executive.

The chief executive will inform the complainant and the respondent of the Investigator’s decision.

The Investigator has full discretion to dismiss any complaint, and any decision made by the Investigator is not open to challenge.

### 4.8 Non-material breach

Where the Investigator finds that the complaint relates to a non-material breach of the Code, the Investigator will inform the chief executive and can choose to recommend an appropriate non-binding course of action for the respondent, which may include:

- seeking guidance from the Chairperson or Mayor, or other mentor;
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- attending appropriate courses or programmes to increase their knowledge and understanding of the matters leading to the complaint;
- apologising to the complainant; and/or
- participating in voluntary mediation.

The chief executive will inform the complainant and respondent of the Investigator’s decision and any recommendations. The Investigator may also choose to recommend that the chief executive inform the Mayor or relevant Local Board Chair for information purposes only.

Any decision made by the Investigator is not open to challenge.

4.9 Material breach

Where the Investigator considers the complaint relates to a material breach of the Code, the Investigator will inform the chief executive and refer the complaint to a Conduct Commissioner. The chief executive will inform the complainant and respondent.

The Conduct Commissioner will then, in his or her complete discretion, either direct that the complaint should be mediated if the Conduct Commissioner considers there is a reasonable prospect that mediation will resolve the complaint. Alternatively, the Conduct Commissioner may decide to investigate the complaint to determine whether a breach is made out and the seriousness of it.

If mediation is directed, the mediator will be independent from the Investigator and the Conduct Commissioner. If the mediation is successful, the outcome of the mediation will be reported to the chief executive. If the mediation is unsuccessful, the Conduct Commissioner will carry out a full investigation.

If the Conduct Commissioner investigates the complaint, the Conduct Commissioner may:
- consult with the complainant, respondent and any affected parties;
- undertake a hearing with relevant parties; and/or
- refer to any relevant documents or information.

The Conduct Commissioner will also determine whether or not to impose any of the following sanctions on the elected member:
- a requirement to apologise and, if applicable, withdraw remarks
- a requirement to make a public statement correcting previous remarks which misrepresented the facts;
- a requirement to undertake specified training or personal development;
- suspending the elected member from committees or other representative bodies; and/or
• seeking guidance from the Chairperson or Mayor, or other mentor.

Following the investigation, the Conduct Commissioner will provide the chief executive with a report on the findings of the investigation and any sanctions that are imposed on the respondent. The chief executive will provide the report to the complainant, respondent, and the relevant local board or governing body for information purposes only. The decision made by the Conduct Commissioner is not open to challenge.

4.10 Public disclosure of complaints and outcomes

The public interest in the accountability of elected members needs to be balanced against the requirements of natural justice and privacy. Complaints relating to non-material breaches, and their outcomes, will not normally be proactively released.

Where the complaint relates to a material breach of the Code, the Conduct Commissioner will determine whether the outcome of the investigation, or the report, should be proactively released (having regard to the Local Government Official Information and Meetings act 1987). If it is proactively released, compliance with any sanctions imposed by the Conduct Commissioner will also be publicly recorded.

4.11 Alleged breach relates to a conflict of interest:

Where the alleged breach of the Code relates to a conflict of interest, the chief executive will inform the respondent of the complaint, and arrange for the member to receive advice from legal services or internal audit on conflicts of interest.

The chief executive will inform the complainant that advice on the matter has been sought. The complainant will not have any further involvement in the complaint following this. The advice is provided to the member and to the governing body (in relation to a complaint against a governing body member), or the local board (in relation to a complaint against a member of a local board).

If the advice is that it would be reasonable for the elected member to conclude that they have a conflict of interest, they are required to declare the conflict and recuse themselves from any future decision on that matter. If the elected member does not take that action,

---

2 The decision on whether or not the report will be included on a public meeting agenda, will be made in light of the requirements of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

3 Involvement by the complainant is not required as the matter is a question relating to the existence, or lack thereof, of a conflict of interest. It does not require the complaint being resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant.

4 Or to just the mayor / chair possibly – on the basis that the chair has this information should similar decision-making come up again.
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the matter will be referred to the Conduct Commissioner for investigation as a material breach of the Code.

If the complaint is that an elected member has breached cl 2.19 of the Conflicts of Interest policy, that complaint will be referred to the Conduct Commissioner to investigate under cl 4.9 (Material breach) of this Code,
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Papakura Key Messages

File No.: CP2018/18735

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To approve the Papakura Key Messages report undertaken by Business Lab, on behalf of the Papakura Local Board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Through the Papakura Commercial Group Project, the local board commissioned Business Lab to undertake the development of key messages for Papakura and the wider local board area. The key messages will be used to highlight Papakura’s attributes and form a strong narrative for the town centre to attract new businesses and visitors.

3. The key themes that have been developed as provided in Attachment A to this report are summarised as:
   - Whanu/Family Friendly
   - Culturally rich
   - Youthful
   - New metro centre.

4. In addition to the key themes development, Business Lab provided the following recommendations to the local board to implement the key messages:
   - establish a key messages working group to enable local ownership of the messages
   - formally design the messages so that they can be used as a communication tool
   - integrate the messages into the Metropolitan Framework for Action document
   - leverage off the UpSouth content through social media.

5. The Papakura Local Board is being asked to approve the Papakura Key Messages report and commence with the establishment of a working group and the graphic design of the key message themes.

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

a) approve the Papakura Key Messages undertaken by Business Lab as provided in Attachment A to the report
b) commence with the graphic design of the Papakura Key Message themes.

Horopaki / Context
6. The Papakura Commercial Project Group was established in February 2016 with the purpose of identifying outcomes and opportunities for Papakura, and set out a number of actions that the participants in the group could deliver together. The main objective of the group is to help Papakura work towards realising the vision for the centre as one of the ten metropolitan centres in Auckland.
7. The Commercial Project Group comprises representatives from the Papakura Local Board, Papakura Business Association, local businesses from outside the Papakura Business Association area, Auckland Transport, Auckland Council departments, and Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development (ATEED). It has an independent chair and draws in subject matter expertise as required.

8. The Papakura Commercial Project Group has identified the following work stream areas to develop a series of actions to be implemented in the coming financial year:

- economic
- community participation
- connectivity and transport
- town centre planning
- sports, arts and culture.

9. As part of the town centre planning work stream, the Papakura Local Board commissioned Business Lab to develop a set of key messages to highlight Papakura’s attributes and form a strong narrative for the town centre to attract new businesses and visitors.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

10. The Papakura Key Messages has been developed with regard to the Auckland Plan 2017, the Auckland Unitary Plan, and the Local Board’s priorities for local economic development which are set out in the Papakura Local Board Plan (2017).

11. In developing the Papakura Key Messages, Business Lab sought contribution from key Papakura stakeholders via:

- 2 stakeholder workshops – one at the beginning and one at the end of the process (5 July 2018 and 15 August 2018)
- 12 stakeholder meetings
- input from the Papakura Marae 26 August 2018, and
- a call out campaign on UpSouth (a community platform for people of south Auckland) which attracted 144 posts from 86 individuals.

In addition to the above, Business Lab also engaged directly with the Papakura Local Board and the Papakura Commercial Project Group.

10. The key messages/themes that have been developed by Business Lab in their report provided as Attachment A are as follows:

- **Whanu/Family friendly**: Papakura is a whanau/family friendly place where opportunities abound through strong connections with education, sport and recreation
- **Culturally rich**: Papakura is proud of its inclusive cultural diversity, heritage and the relationship with its unique Maori communities
- **Youthful**: Papakura’s engaged youth inject innovation and creative energy into the local community through arts and culture
- **New metro centre**: Papakura offers new lifestyle choice for Aucklanders with modern living environments integrated into a progressive business centre seamlessly connected to north and south.

12. The recommendations from the Business Lab report provide a basis for highlighting Papakura’s attributes, and will help to form a strong narrative for the town centre to attract new
businesses and visitors. Therefore, it is recommended that the Papakura Local Board approves the report.

Next Steps
13. Business Lab have made recommendations on how the key messages can be implemented. In summary Business Lab recommend:
   - establishing a Papakura Key Messages working group
   - engaging a graphic designer to transform the messages into a professionally designed communications tool
   - developing a set of posters that can be utilised by the community through the working group
   - leveraging the UpSouth call out material to continue to promote the messages.

14. It is recommended that the Papakura Local Board seek to establish the working group with membership drawn from the local community, supported by the Papakura Local Board engagement advisor, and seek to appoint a graphic designer to design the messages to be utilised as a communications tool.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
15. The draft Papakura Key Messages report was presented to the Local Board at its 29 August 2018 workshop by Business Lab, and has since been amended to reflect the comments received at that workshop.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
16. There are no direct impacts as a result of this report on Māori. However, in developing the Papakura Key Messages, Business Lab have sought to engage local Maori throughout the process, predominantly through UpSouth and engagement with the Papakura Marae. In implementing the Papakura Key Messages, iwi and Maori will be engaged where as determined by the working group or the local board.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
17. The total cost for the Key Messages work was $22,000 of which $3,000 was spent on the UpSouth call out.

18. The costs of engaging a graphic designer will be met through the budget allocated to the Papakura Commercial Project group under the Local Economic Development work programme. At present there is $30,000 available to be put towards the implementation of the recommendations in this report.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
19. The delivery of the Papakura Key Messages and their success will be dependent upon their use by the Papakura Local Board and other stakeholders. There is a risk that the messages are not utilised and do not become a key communication tool to promote Papakura.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
20. Following approval by the Papakura Local Board the Commercial Project Group will work with the Papakura Local Board engagement advisor to form the working group. ATEED will in turn seek to appoint a graphic designer on behalf of the Papakura Local Board to design up the key messages.
Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
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PAPAKURA KEY MESSAGES

Key Messages and Recommendations for Medium Term Implementation
The brief for this work:

To build on the work already completed or commissioned and develop a strong narrative for the promotion of Papakura as a destination and an investment opportunity the local board would like to commission research to identify the key messages that can be used to highlight Papakura’s attributes and form a strong narrative for the town centre to attract new businesses and visitors.

Key deliverables:

• Stakeholder workshop and one workshop with the Papakura Local Board during the development of the messages.

• A set of three to four key messages that can be used to promote and advocate for Papakura town centre

• A PowerPoint presentation outlining the process of identifying the messages and the results of the engagement exercise

• Key year 1 and year 2 initiatives and next steps that can be used to operationalize the messages and deliver outcomes
Frequently asked questions:

**What is the desired outcome of this meeting?**
It is a key step in co-designing an authentic and distinctive narrative for Papakura underpinned by three to four key messages.

**What is the outcome going to be used for?**
For all parties to consistently present and tell a narrative / Papakura story that will, over time, strengthen the identity of Papakura.

**Who are we talking to?**
Customers, investors, new businesses, visitors but also the local community, potential funders (govt), new residents, professionals such as urban designers = universally applicable.
What is a narrative?

**Distinctiveness** - What makes your place unique when you compare it to other places/competitors?

**Authenticity** - in place branding is about people co-creating things that matter to them.

**Memorable** - means that the enjoyable experience at that certain place, conquered space in your mind and your heart.

**Co-creation** - will only produce the best results when it is created and maintained through a strong coalition between government, business, civil society and target markets (investors, expats, travel trade, press).

**More than a tag line** - is not about a good slogan, logo and nice promotional campaigns, a good narrative should be supported by policies, innovations, events, structures, investments and symbolic actions.
The challenge........keep it simple

I guess any simple idea that is really good will catch on quickly.

Simple ideas become obsessions, almost like a meditation.

Mary Heilmann
Engagement:

- 12 stakeholder interviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Kake</td>
<td>Papakura Marae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Ngataki</td>
<td>Ngati Tamaoho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Parkes</td>
<td>Papakura Youth Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Hoyes</td>
<td>NZ Police (Senior Sergeant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Rohs</td>
<td>Papakura High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Blakely</td>
<td>Rosehill College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noeline</td>
<td>Hodgins</td>
<td>Bruce Pullman Park Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Halverson</td>
<td>Lions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Faber</td>
<td>Rotary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>Elkington</td>
<td>Mormon Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Knott</td>
<td>Urban Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Fa'afiu</td>
<td>The Gate Community Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder workshops

Workshop 1
- 5th July 2018
- 26 people
- Local Board offices

Workshop 2
- 15th August, 2018
- 30 people
- Local Board offices
Item 21

Attachment A

Additional engagement

UpSouth Call Out
- 144 posts from 86 individuals

The Papakura Marae
- Marae dinner – 26th August
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Marae</th>
<th>Up South</th>
<th>Emerging themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community spirit supported by strong amenities</td>
<td>Culturally rich Whanau, family friendly</td>
<td>Family Friendly Accessible facilities Young and old</td>
<td>A friendly helpful community</td>
<td>Creativity, art People can connect</td>
<td>???????????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A celebration of cultural diversity</td>
<td>Progressive metropolitan centre</td>
<td>Strong connected local heart</td>
<td>The Marae – a sense of belonging</td>
<td>Business opportunities</td>
<td>???????????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An evolving metropolitan centre</td>
<td>Connected North and South</td>
<td>Historical roots – Maori, Pakeha</td>
<td>Schools and learning</td>
<td>Public transport Education</td>
<td>???????????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A haven for independent retailers</td>
<td>Community resource rich Inclusive</td>
<td>Youth – innovative and creative</td>
<td>Rich with amenities</td>
<td>Nurturing community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New affordable, modern urban living</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive and collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to everything – beach, country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to greater Auckland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive metropolitan centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>New development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY:**

**ENGAGEMENT OUTCOMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New development</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Proud suburb</th>
<th>Safe family place</th>
<th>Friendly shop keepers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to everything – beach, country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public transport</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Nurturing community</th>
<th>Access to everything – beach, country</th>
<th>New development</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Proud suburb</th>
<th>Safe family place</th>
<th>Friendly shop keepers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>Up South</td>
<td>Emerging themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community spirit supported by strong amenities</td>
<td>Culturally rich</td>
<td>Family Friendly</td>
<td>A friendly helpful community</td>
<td>Creativity, art</td>
<td>Whanau friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A celebration of cultural diversity</td>
<td>Whanau, family friendly</td>
<td>Accessible facilities</td>
<td>The Marae – a sense of belonging</td>
<td>People can connect</td>
<td>Friendly community spirit, learning &amp; education, inclusive, all ages, amenities, opportunities, safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An evolving metropolitan centre</td>
<td>Progressive metropolitan centre</td>
<td>Young and old</td>
<td>Schools and learning</td>
<td>Business opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A haven for independent retailers</td>
<td>Connected North and South</td>
<td>Strong connected local heart</td>
<td>Rich with amenities</td>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New affordable, modern urban living</td>
<td>Community resource rich</td>
<td>Historical roots – Maori, Pakeha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to greater Auckland</td>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>Youth – innovative and creative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurturing community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive and collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to everything – beach, country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive metropolitan centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>New development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emerging metropolitan centre**
- Connected, modern living business opportunities, access & lifestyle

**Cultural richness**
- Diversity, Maori, engaged youth, creativity, innovation, proud, food, languages
RECOMMENDATIONS
Key Message 1: Whanau family friendly

- Papakura is a family friendly place where opportunities abound through strong connections with education, sport and recreation

My name is eparaima and I have been in and out of living in south Auckland suburbs, but no other place has or will ever compare to my hometown Papakura. I was raised in Papakura pretty much, I've went to red hill primary, Papakura normal, and now currently in my last year of school at Papakura High School. Although Papakura is labelled to some as a bad area, it's not there are many great things to love about Papakura, the food, sports, the people, diverse culture, parks, school, etc, for me nothing could ever compare to my home.
Key message 2: Culturally rich

- Papakura is proud of its inclusive cultural diversity, heritage and the relationship with its unique Maori communities

Jerome Kaino – Auckland Blues / All Blacks
Sir Edmund Hillary – Mountaineer and explorer
Fleur Adcock – Poet
Katrina Grant – Southern Steel netballer and Silver Ferns netballer
Lance Hamilton – Cricketer
Reg Mombassa – Artist and musician
P-Money – hip-hop DJ
Blair Pocock – Cricketer
Kieran Read – All Black

Joe Rokocoko – Rugby union player
David Sabine – Cricketer
Kimberley Smith – Long-distance runner
John Walker – Olympic gold medallist
George Hawkins – New Zealand MP
Keven Mealamu – All Black
John Afoa - All Blacks
Key message 3: Youthful

- Papakura’s engaged youth inject innovation and creative energy into the local community through arts and culture

New venture inspiring Papakura’s creative talents
Key message 4: New metro centre

Papakura offers a new lifestyle choice for Aucklanders with modern living environments integrated into a progressive business centre seamlessly connected to North and South...
**The Papakura Key Messages:**

**Whanau family friendly:** Papakura is a family friendly place where opportunities abound through strong connections with education, sport and recreation.

**Culturally rich:** Papakura is proud of its inclusive cultural diversity, heritage and the relationship with its unique Maori communities.

**Youthful:** Papakura’s engaged youth inject innovation and creative energy into the local community through arts and culture.

**New Metro Centre:** Papakura offers a new lifestyle choice for Aucklanders with modern living environments integrated into a progressive business centre seamlessly connected to North and South.
Our checklist:

**Distinctiveness** - What makes your place unique when you compare it to other places / competitors?

**Authenticity** - In place branding is about people co-creating things that matter to them.

**Memorable** - Means that the enjoyable experience at that certain place, conquered space in your mind and your heart.

**Co-creation** - Will only produce the best results when it is created and maintained through a strong coalition between government, business, civil society and target markets (investors, expats, travel trade, press).

**More than a tag line** - Is not about a good slogan, logo and nice promotional campaigns, a good narrative should be supported by policies, innovations, events, structures, investments and symbolic actions.
Implementation – yr 1

- Establish Papakura Key Messages Working Group Coordinated by the PLB
- Professional design and copy tune up for key messages
- Key messages posters for positioning around Papakura
- Leverage up south call out content through social media channels
- Integrate key messages into the Papakura Metropolitan Centre framework for action document
Year one implementation

**Working group:**
- Promote local ownership of leveraging messages
- Open invitation to all who have been engaged through the project to attend a working group formation meeting
- Develop Terms of References to explain the groups role clearly
- Extra effort to ensure the following attend:
  - JOSPEH FA'AFIU
  - PAPAKURA BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
  - PAPAKURA LOCAL BOARD ENGAGEMENT REP
  - YOUTH COUNCIL REP
  - SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVES
  - THE CORNER REPRESENTATIVE

**Professional design:**
- Engage a local graphic designer to transform messages into a professionally designed communications tool – see Nelson Tasman example
- Consider the need for a professional writer to fine tune wording of key messages
- UpSouth Call Out contributors and the Corner to be considered as options for service providers
- Working group to coordinate
Year one implementation

**Key Messages Poster Campaign:**

- Once design has been completed, develop a series of stimulating posters conveying each message
- Distribute posters to schools, sport facilities, train station, bus stops, medical centres, anywhere where the community and visitors are exposed to
- Working group to coordinate

**UpSouth Call Out content:**

- Develop a social media plan that aims to leverage the creative content sourced through the UpSouth Call Out
- Implement plan in a coordinated and effective way
- Working group to coordinate
Year one implementation

Papakura Metropolitan Centre
Framework for Action:

• Work with Richard Knott to integrate the Papakura Key Messages into his Framework for Action document so that it helps transition the document from as concept document into an implementation document

• The Papakura Local Board to approve process for integration and adoption of revised document
Implementation – yr 2

- FURTHER INTEGRATION OF KEY MESSAGES INTO STRATEGIC DOCUMENTATION - PBA STRATEGIC PLAN, LB PLAN
- CLOSER PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN PLB AND PBA = SHARED VISION
- LOCAL CHAMPIONS PR CAMPAIGN COORDINATED BY WORKING GROUP
- CONTINUE TO DEVELOP ONGOING RELATIONSHIP WITH TSI – FURTHER CALL OUTS, INCREASING PAPAKURA REPRESENTATION ON UPSOUTH (TSI)
Clever Business
Pure grit and clever thinking have fashioned an extraordinary business story.

Stunning Natural Landscapes
Even on an ordinary day, we live amongst extraordinary nature.

Surprisingly Diverse
In our extraordinarily diverse city and towns we live and work together as one.

Highly Connected
It’s easy to live an extraordinary life here while being connected to each other, the rest of New Zealand and the world.

Arts & Artisans
Extraordinary depth of heritage, artists and artisan businesses.

EXAMPLE OF GRAPHICALLY DESIGNED NARRATIVE FOR NELSON TASMAN
Papakura Local Board feedback on the Healthy Homes Standards

File No.: CP2018/20131

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To formally adopt the Papakura Local Board feedback on the Healthy Homes Standards.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. In December 2017 the New Zealand government passed the Healthy Homes Guarantee Act (no. 2). The Act enables the government to create regulations that set minimum standards to create warmer, drier, rental homes (the healthy homes standards).
3. A discussion document on the proposed healthy homes standards is now available for comment. These standards will set a minimum requirement for:
   - provision of heating devices
   - level of floor and ceiling insulation
   - ventilation through provision of windows and extractor fans
   - draught-stopping
   - moisture entry and drainage.

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

a) adopt the Papakura Local Board feedback on the Healthy Homes Standards outlined in Attachment A to this report.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board feedback on the Healthy Homes Standards</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Papakura Local Board feedback on the Healthy Homes Standards

Background
In December 2017 the New Zealand Government passed the Healthy Homes Guarantee Act (no. 2). The Act enables the government to create regulations that set minimum standards to create warmer, drier, rental homes (the healthy homes standards).

A discussion document on the proposed healthy homes standards is now available for comment. These standards will set a minimum requirement for:

- Provision of heating devices
- Level of floor and ceiling insulation
- Ventilation through provision of windows and extractor fans
- Draught-stopping
- Moisture entry and drainage

Papakura Local Board Feedback

The Papakura Local Board provides the following feedback on the Healthy Homes Standards:

i) The board supports the Healthy Home Standards, covering minimum levels for heating, insulation, ventilation, draught-stopping, drainage and moisture-ingress, which will make rental homes warmer and drier without imposing excessive rules or cost.

ii) The board has a concern that to raise the minimum standard would have costs associated for the landlord who would then pass these on to the tenant.

iii) The board believes that the objective of warm and dry rental homes in New Zealand is only likely to be partially met if tenants use heating or extraction devices installed. Often tenants cannot afford to run heating devices.

iv) The board supports an education package that clearly outlines the changes that will affect the landlord, property manager or tenant of a private rental house, a boarding house or social housing.

The education package or website information should also clearly outline what assistance is available to both landlord and tenant to help to prevent confusion and enforcement action.

Brent Catchpole
Chairperson
Papakura Local Board

Felicity Auva’a
Deputy Chairperson
Papakura Local Board

Date: ________________________________
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Formally adopt the Papakura Local Board informal feedback on the Review of Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw and Code of Practice 2015.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Auckland Council is reviewing the Bylaw and supporting Code, which regulate council owned or operated cemeteries and crematoria.
3. Together the Bylaw and Code establish rules to manage:
   - interment (burial)
   - cremation
   - disinterment
   - built structures (vaults, mausolea and memorials)
   - Wāhi Tapu Māori areas
   - ground maintenance and records.
4. The Bylaw and Code rules mainly apply to operational council cemeteries. Non-operational cemeteries (local parks) are not generally managed by the Code of Practice, except where activities such as ash interments are still occurring.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) adopt the Papakura Local Board informal feedback on the Review of Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw and Code of Practice 2015, as provided in Attachment A of the agenda report.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Informal feedback on the Review of Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw and Code of Practice 2015</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27 September 2018

Papakura Local Board Informal Feedback on the Review of Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw and Code of Practice 2015

Background

1. Auckland Council is reviewing the Bylaw and supporting Code, which regulate council owned or operated cemeteries and crematoria.

2. Together the Bylaw and Code establish rules to manage:
   • interment (burial)
   • cremation
   • disinterment
   • built structures (vaults, mausolea and memorials)
   • Wāhi Tapu Māori areas
   • ground maintenance and records.

3. The Bylaw and Code rules mainly apply to operational council cemeteries. Non-operational cemeteries (local parks) are not generally managed by the Code of Practice, except where activities such as ash interments are still occurring.

Papakura Local board provides the following feedback

4. The Papakura Local Board seeks clarification of the rules for non-operational cemeteries. Papakura currently has a cemetery that is technically classified as non-operational however 80 new burial plots have recently been identified for use.

5. That the Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw be clear and specific about permitted activities at grave sites; such as large family groups sitting on or around grave sites.

6. That the Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw be clear and specific about permitted adornment or decoration of headstones or grave sites.

7. That family cultural traditions and customs are considered in all aspects of the Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw and Code of Practice 2015 review.

Brent Catchpole
Chairperson
Papakura Local Board

Felicity Auva’a
Deputy Chairperson
Papakura Local Board
Papakura Local Board input into decisions on proposed amendments to the Health and Hygiene Bylaw

File No.: CP2018/19900

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To formally adopt the Papakura Local Board input into decisions on proposed amendments to the Health and Hygiene Bylaw.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. To enable Auckland Council to decide how to respond to the findings from the statutory review of the Auckland Council Health and Hygiene Bylaw 2013 (Bylaw), staff assessed options using Local Government Act 2002 criteria.
3. The main changes to the Health and Hygiene Bylaw are:
   - require services that pierce, or risk breaking or burning tissue (not just the skin) to be licensed
   - require therapeutic massage, water play parks and splash pads to meet minimum standards
   - ban eyeball tattooing unless carried out by a qualified health practitioner
   - require licences to be publicly displayed
   - clarify rules about traditional tattooing like tā moko and traditional Pacific tattoo.

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

a) adopt the Papakura Local Board input into decisions on proposed amendments to the Health and Hygiene Bylaw, as provided in Attachment A of the agenda report.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board input into decisions on proposed amendments to the Health and Hygiene Bylaw.</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26 September 2018

Papakura Local Board input into decisions on proposed amendments to the Health and Hygiene Bylaw

Executive summary
To enable Auckland Council to decide how to respond to the findings from the statutory review of the Auckland Council Health and Hygiene Bylaw 2013 (Bylaw), staff assessed options using Local Government Act 2002 criteria

The Papakura Local Board supports:
Option 3 to further minimise health risks and cover any unanticipated future services without requiring a bylaw amendment.

The main changes are:
- require services that pierce, or risk breaking or burning tissue (not just the skin) to be licensed
- require therapeutic massage, water play parks and splash pads to meet minimum standards
- ban eyeball tattooing unless carried out by a qualified health practitioner
- require licences to be publicly displayed
- clarify rules about traditional tattooing like tā moko and traditional Pacific tattoo.

The Papakura local board requests that the following feedback be taken into consideration;

1. More stringent control over the set up for tattooing. That tattooists can’t just go to an event and set up without strict controls in place.
2. Increase the permitted age to receive a non-cultural tattoo up to 21 years of age.
3. Tattooing shouldn’t be at family events.
4. Being readily visible normalises tattooing. Tattoo outlets should be located in more discrete places.
5. That the definition of ‘qualified health practitioner’ for eyeball tattooing be clarified and clearly specified.

[Signatures]

Brent Catchpole
Chairperson
Papakura Local Board

Felicity Auva’a
Deputy Chairperson
Papakura Local Board
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To formally adopt the Papakura Local Board feedback on the Drury-Opāheke Draft Land Use Plan 2018 (Drury Structure Plan).

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
1. The Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part (AUPOP) sets out the requirements for a structure plan in the Regional Policy Statement and Appendix 1. The structure plan for Drury will become the basis for future council plan changes.
2. Council is seeking feedback on how Drury should be developed in an integrated way.
3. Council’s Future Urban Land Supply Strategy July 2017 (FULSS, 2017) sets out a programme for sequencing development of future urban land over 30 years across Auckland. Dwelling estimates for development around Drury are as follows:
   • 8200 dwellings in Opāheke/Drury (i.e: east of State Highway 1)
   • 9850 dwellings in Drury West (i.e: west of State Highway 1).
5. The remainder of the Drury Future Urban Zone is scheduled to be development ready in 2028 - 2032.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) adopt the Papakura Local Board feedback on the Drury-Opāheke Draft Land Use Plan 2018 (Drury Structure Plan) in Attachment A of this report.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board feedback on the Drury-Opāheke Draft Land Use Plan 2018 (Drury Structure Plan)</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 October 2018

Papakura Local Board feedback on the Drury-Opāheke Draft Land Use Plan 2018 (Drury Structure Plan)

The Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part (AUPOP) sets out the requirements for a structure plan in the Regional Policy Statement and Appendix 1. The structure plan for Drury will become the basis for future council plan changes.

Council is seeking feedback on how Drury should be developed in an integrated way.

The council’s Future Urban Land Supply Strategy July 2017 (FULSS, 2017) sets out a programme for sequencing development of future urban land over 30 years across Auckland. Dwelling estimates for development around Drury are as follows:

- 8200 dwellings in Opāheke/Drury (i.e. east of State Highway 1)
- 9850 dwellings in Drury West (i.e. west of State Highway 1)

The North-West sector of the Drury Future Urban Zone is scheduled to be development ready in 2018 - 2022.

The remainder of the Drury Future Urban Zone is scheduled to be development ready in 2028 - 2032.

Papakura Local Board feedback

The Papakura Local Board provides the following feedback on the Drury-Opāheke Draft Land Use Plan 2018 (Drury Structure Plan):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Papakura Local Board feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(a)</td>
<td>What do you like about the plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(b)</td>
<td>Is there anything you want changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominion Road has now become an established residential neighborhood and using that for a major expressway will cause significant disruption to the surrounding community. The community needs clarity, so they can adapt and get on with their plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(a)</td>
<td>Do you agree with the potential locations for centres A to F shown on the plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree / disagree / other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support location A on the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why: They make sense in terms of the development proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(b)</td>
<td>Please indicate which one you think should be the main centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support location A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why: Location A appears to build on the existing Drury town centre area. The board is concerned about the potential impact on the Papakura town centre in terms of the scale and amenity of the new main centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience has shown that the development of other centres has already impacted on the Papakura Town Centre, in particular developments in Takanini and most recently Takanini village which a number of Papakura Town Centre retailers have relocated to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The board is asking for reassurance that the new centres will not have a similar negative impact on Papakura Town Centre, by way of peer reviewed economic reports, along with reassurance that Auckland Council will be putting measures (including investment) in place to ensure that the regeneration of Papakura into a new metropolitan center takes place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(c)</td>
<td>What scale (high, medium or low-rise) of buildings do you think should be provided for in these centres?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High / medium / low-rise / other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why: The centre should not compromise the vision of the Papakura Metropolitan Centre, rather it should complement it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(d)</td>
<td>What do you think makes a successful centre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being able to live in a centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good access to motorways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All the above contribute to a successful community, creating a desire for people to want to eat, work and play in their local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(a)</td>
<td>Do you agree with the potential locations for business areas 1 and 2 shown in the plan? Agree / disagree / other. Why: It makes sense to link and to locate industrial areas adjacent to existing industrial areas and space them adequately across the proposed development area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(b)</td>
<td>What types of jobs do you think need to be provided for? A range of jobs should be provided for with a mix of office, trades and industrial roles which will add to the richness of the planned community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Residential neighbourhoods – where do you think apartments, terrace houses and single house residential area should be located? Apartments and terraced houses should be close to the main centre and transport hubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Streams and floodplains – Do you have any comments on the protection of streams and how they should be incorporated into development? The board is concerned how the natural streams will be dealt with. This will also be of interest to mana whenua. These streams are tributaries to the Manukau Harbour. Housing built near floodplains should be built to withstand the worst-case scenario, i.e.: ground floor levels should be raised to ensure no inundation from weather events. As global warming increase, intensive weather events become more regular. The impact of global warming should also be considered. Special care should be taken when development occurs to ensure silt run-off does not impact on the streams and the harbour. The streams should be retained in their natural state or enhanced with riparian planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(a)</td>
<td>Parks and community facilities – Do you have any comments on what sort of parks should be provided and where they should be located? The provision of open space and parks is essential where intensive housing developments occur. Amenity of a development is enhanced by the provision of parks and green spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(b)</td>
<td>Do you have any comments on what community facilities should be provided for and where they should be located? Community facilities are an important part of the community. A holistic approach should be undertaken when considering community facilities. Any provision of community facilities should consider the Community Facility Network Plan guidelines and should complement any existing nearby facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Heritage and cultural values – Are there any specific heritage or cultural sites in the structure plan area that you think should be protected? The natural streams and riparian planting should be retained. Any areas of significance to Māori should be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do you have any other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Transport</td>
<td>Priority should be given to the protection of the Mill Road route in its entirety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting the route provides surety for developers, businesses and residential home owners so they can adapt and get on with their plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is crucial that the planning document protects Mill Road stage two, (the link between Alfriston to Drury) and stage three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The board also believes a third rail line is essential as a dedicated freight route so that it eases the pressure on the passenger link. Adding a fourth line would be desirable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brent Catchpole  
Chairperson  
Papakura Local Board

Felicity Auva’a  
Deputy Chairperson  
Papakura Local Board
Additions to the 2016-2019 Papakura Local Board meeting schedule

File No.: CP2018/19182

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for a meeting date to be added to the 2016-2019 Papakura Local Board meeting schedule in order to accommodate the Annual Plan 2019/2020 timeframes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Papakura Local Board adopted the 2016-2019 meeting schedule on 16 November 2016.
3. At that time the specific times and dates for meetings for local board decision making in relation to the local board agreement as part of the Annual Plan 2019/2020 were unknown.
4. The board is being asked to approve one meeting date as additions to the Papakura Local Board meeting schedule so that the Annual Plan 2019/2020 timeframes can be met.

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

a) approve one meeting date to be added to the 2016-2019 Papakura Local Board meeting schedule to accommodate the Annual Plan 2019/2020 timeframes as follows:
   • Wednesday, 5 June 2019, 4.30pm.

b) note the venue for this meeting will be the Council Chambers, Level 1, 35 Coles Crescent, Papakura.

Horopaki / Context
5. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) have requirements regarding local board meeting schedules.
6. In summary, adopting a meeting schedule helps meet the requirements of:
   • clause 19, Schedule 7 of the LGA on general provisions for meetings, which requires the chief executive to give notice in writing to each local board member of the time and place of meetings. Such notification may be provided by the adoption of a schedule of business meetings.
   • sections 46, 46(A) and 47 in Part 7 of the LGOIMA, which requires that meetings are publicly notified, agendas and reports are available at least two working days before a meeting and that local board meetings are open to the public.
7. The Papakura Local Board adopted its business meeting schedule at its 16 November 2016 business meeting.
8. The timeframes for local board decision making in relation to the local board agreement which is part of the Annual Plan 2019/2020 were unavailable when the meeting schedule was originally adopted.
9. The board is being asked to make decisions in mid-December and early June to feed into the Annual Plan 2019/2020 process. These timeframes are outside the board’s normal meeting cycle.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

10. The board has two choices:
   i) Add the meeting as an addition to the meeting schedule.
   or
   ii) Add the meeting as extraordinary meeting.

11. For option one, statutory requirements allow enough time for these meetings to be scheduled as additions to the meeting schedule and other topics may be considered as per any other ordinary meeting. However there is a risk that if the Annual Plan 2019/2020 timeframes change or the information is not ready for the meeting there would need to be an additional extraordinary meeting scheduled anyway.

12. For option two, only the specific topic Annual Plan 2019/2020 may be considered for which the meeting is being held. There is a risk that no other policies or plans with similar timeframes or running in relation to the Annual Plan 2019/2020 process could be considered at this meeting.

13. Since there is enough time to meet statutory requirements, staff recommend approving these meetings as additions to the meeting schedule as it allows more flexibility for the board to consider a range of issues.

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

14. This report requests the board’s decision to schedule an additional meeting and consider whether to approve it as extraordinary meeting or additions to the meeting schedule.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

15. There is no specific impact for Māori arising from this report. Local boards work with Māori on projects and initiatives of shared interest.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

16. There are no financial implications in relation to this report apart from the standard costs associated with servicing a business meeting.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

17. There are no significant risks associated with this report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

18. Implement the processes associated with preparing for business meetings.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Information: Reports referred to the Papakura Local Board

File No.: CP2018/18124

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity for the board to receive reports and resolutions that have been referred from Governing Body committee meetings or forums or other local boards for information.
2. The following information was circulated to the local board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Governing Body Committee or Forum or Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Representation Review engagement analysis - proposal to split the Manukau Ward</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18 September 2018</td>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Revising the Local Board Standing Orders</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20 September 2018</td>
<td>Ōrākei Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review of the Code of Conduct</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16 October 2018</td>
<td>Waitematā Local Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) note the information from the following local board meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Governing Body Committee or Forum or Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Representation Review engagement analysis - proposal to split the Manukau Ward</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18 September 2018</td>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Revising the Local Board Standing Orders</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20 September 2018</td>
<td>Ōrākei Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review of the Code of Conduct</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16 October 2018</td>
<td>Waitematā Local Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Papakura Local Board Achievements Register for the 2016-2019 Political Term

File No.: CP2018/18126

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an updated register of achievements of the Papakura Local Board for the 2016-2019 Electoral Term.

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

a) request additions be added to the Papakura Local Board Achievements Register for the 2016-2019 political term.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Achievements Register for the 2016 - 2019 Political Term</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Papakura Local Board Achievements Register 2016-2019 Electoral Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Town Centre Makeover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the opening of the new Papakura Transitional Housing Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Kia Whai Kāinga Tātou Katoa: Regional, cross-sectoral homelessness plan for Auckland workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Drury Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Safer Community meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Networks meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association business breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Neighbourhood Support meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Youth council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Conifer Grove road connection public meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 September 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura netball special awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Watercare site visit briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August 2018</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Citizenship ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Citizens Advice Bureau AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association monthly meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Local Board on-site wastewater bylaw review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Youth connections workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the opening of the Hau exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Athletic Club working bee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the TRAG meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the AANCC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the August regional/sub-regional cluster workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended a Constituent clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended Structure Planning Political Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Auckland Plan launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Māori input into decision making meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Commercial Project Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Youth Council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Southern Local Board Chairs meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Takanini Community Hub &amp; Library Sod turning / blessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Drury Community Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association after five function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Mt Felix tapestry exhibition launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 August 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Community Networks meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Planning Committee workshop: Transform, Unlock and Support Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Representing Papakura Photography Exhibition opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 2018</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Volunteer Awards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Board Business Meeting 25 July 2018**

- requested Auckland Transport consider the quality and visibility of disability parking in the Papakura town centre business area, as part of the proposed parking survey, and that consultation with local businesses also be part of this review.
- approved the inclusion of Greenways Plan project #13 (Freelance Terrace to proposed SH1 overbridge at Pescara Point) with the delivery of Greenways Plan project #12 (Elliot Street to Freelance Terrace), as community facilities staff have advised that these two projects can be delivered within the $1.28million Local Board Capital Transport Fund (LBCTF) budget already allocated.
- requested Auckland Transport to meet with affected residents about the traffic light installation at Bellfield Road and Great South Road.
- requested the provision of T2/T3 lanes in Great South Road, as previously requested, to ease the considerable traffic congestion. The board sees this as a higher level priority than the provision of on-road cycling infrastructure.
- requested the Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson and Councillor Newman present to the Board of Auckland Transport about the local board’s concerns and priorities in relation to the removal of the cycleway and improving traffic flow on Great South Road.
- approved the amendment to clause 9.1 of the community lease dated 29 May 2013 for 76 Chichester Drive, Papakura.
- approved the amendment to clause 6.1 of the community lease dated 29 May 2013 for 76 Chichester Drive, Papakura.
- approved the sublease between Counties Playcentre Association Incorporated and Counties Manukau Kindergarten Association
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Diversity Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 July 2018</td>
<td>Papakura Art Gallery Opening - The Humans of South Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 July 2018</td>
<td>Constituent clinic held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the LGNZ conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Mana whenua Hui with local boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Commercial Project Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Local Board Chairs session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Smiths Ave site activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the local government Counties Manukau police meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 July 2018</td>
<td>Organised and attended the stakeholder workshop on developing Papakura Key Messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Networks meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Drury Community meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 July 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association after five function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June 0218</td>
<td>Attended the Matariki for Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Local Board Business Meeting 27 June 2018 | • requested Auckland Transport staff to work with Parks, Sports and Recreation to provide the rough order of costs for the development of a pathway including lighting from King Edward Road to Railway Street West through central park as identified in the BECA report with a view to utilising the Auckland Transport Local Board Capital Transport Fund.  
• requested Auckland Transport add into the 2018/2019 work programme the painting of mobility carparks in the Papakura town centre to bring the carparks in line with the New Zealand mobility standards.  
• requested Auckland Transport provide more information on how they intend to address the anti-social behaviour that may result from the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>removal of the chain across the boat ramp at Bottletop Bay and that Auckland Transport take into account the past issues in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• requested staff to report back on identified actions in the Papakura Local Board Sports Needs Assessment, Final Report May 2018, by the end of July 2018 with timetables and actions, and to provide a copy of the report to all the sports codes consulted as part of the report, with reference to page 48 of the Papakura Sports Needs Assessment, Final Report May 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• agreed to fund $20,787 for the Papakura Quick Response Round Three 2017/2018 applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• allocated $25,000 from the Papakura Local Board 2017/2018 locally driven initiative underspend as a grant to the Papakura Crimewatch towards the purchase of a replacement vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• allocated $15,213 from the Papakura Local Board 2017/2018 locally driven initiative underspend as a grant to the Kotuitui Trust for the Healthy Homes programme working in conjunction with Habitat for Humanity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved the Papakura Local Board 2018/2019 local environment work programme to be delivered by the Infrastructure and Environmental Services directorate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved the Papakura Local Board 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• allocated $150,000 from the Papakura locally driven initiative capital funding budget as a grant to Bruce Pulman Park Trust towards the installation of sports lighting on two fields at Pulman Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• requested the Community Led &amp; Locally Driven Initiative Specialist - Investigation &amp; Design team, Community Facilities and Auckland Transport staff work together to identify funding options and the further development required to complete the McLennan Park pathway network for report back to the July business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• allocated $200,000 from the Papakura locally driven initiative capital funding budget at Karaka Harbourside to extend the rock revetment seawall approximately 60 metres to the west of the existing rock revetment wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved the Papakura Local Board 2018/2019 Arts, Community and Events work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved the Papakura Local Board 2018/2019 Libraries work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved the Papakura Local Board 2018/2019 Parks, Sport and Recreation work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved the 2018/2019 Service Strategy and Integration work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved the 2018/2019 local economic development work programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Papakura Local Board Achievements Register for the 2016-2019 Political Term

#### Item 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 June 2018</td>
<td>Contributed to a video for the Manukau Harbour Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 June 2018</td>
<td>Created a video to promote the Papakura Local Board Volunteer Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended and supported the Papakura Local Board Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Pahurehure Protection Society’s Annual General Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Redhill Community Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June 2018</td>
<td>Held a constituent clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Matariki exhibition opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Manukau Harbour forum workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended the TRAG meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Commercial Project Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- approved the ongoing coordination role of the Plans and Places department in relation to the implementation of the Manurewa – Takanini – Papakura Integrated Area Plan.
- approved the new road names ‘Koiora Street,’ ‘Topora Street,’ ‘Songline Road’ and ‘Gingernut Place’ for the new roads in the Golden Harbour Development Limited subdivision at 35 Hayfield Way, Hingaia.
- approved the name ‘Ockhams Street’ for the extension to the relevant road at 55 Hayfield Way, Hingaia.
- approved the new road name ‘Cloud Way’ for the new road in the AM 2011 Limited subdivision at 45 Hayfield Way, Hingaia.
- approved the name ‘Ockhams Street’ for the extension to the relevant road at 55 Hayfield Way, Hingaia.
- recommended to the Regulatory Committee that the six sites contained in Attachment A to the report entitled “Freedom Camping Bylaw Development” be prohibited through a bylaw under the Freedom Camping Act 2011.
- recommended to the Regulatory Committee that the following restrictions be applied to the nine sites contained in Attachment B to the report entitled “Freedom Camping Bylaw Development” through a bylaw under the Freedom Camping Act 2011:
  - i) certified self-contained vehicles only
  - ii) limited numbers of vehicles
  - iii) only in identified parking spaces.
- recommended the council consider the costs of providing for and emptying rubbish facilities, due to increased use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended and supported the Children’s Forest annual planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Network Skills Update meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Drury Community meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 June 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association after five function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Business Meeting 06 June 2018</td>
<td>• acknowledged the passing of Auckland Councillor Dick Quax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• requested staff to work with Mr Glen Archibald with his concerns on Ron Keat Drive and lighting in the immediate area, as well as litter issues at Massey Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved the road name Nganui Avenue to replace Naganui Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• adopted the local content for the 10 year Budget 2018-2028 including the Local Board Agreement 2018/2019, a message from the Chair and the local board advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• adopted the local fees and charges schedules for 2018/2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• delegated authority to the Chair to make any final minor changes to the local content for the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, including the Local Board Agreement 2018/2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reallocated the 2017/2018 Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) operational expenditure (opex) budget underspend as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) $6,500 from the ‘Community Response Fund’ (N.005572.14) to the Papakura Museum as a top-up to the operational grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) $300 from the ‘Community Response Fund’ (N.005572.14) to the community grants budget line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Powhiri to welcome our esteemed Rangatira Taame Iti and Kaumatua Haare Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura combined networks meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Takanini Business Association Networking event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Northern Stars basketball game at Pulman Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended and supported Jobfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the PIPS Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association monthly meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the local board advocacy meeting on the Long Term Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended and presented at the Finance and Performance Committee workshop on the OLI (One Local Initiative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Conifer Grove Residents Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Finance and Performance Committee Corporate Accommodation Disposal Recommendation meeting advocating for a deferral of the decision on 35 Coles Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 May 2018</td>
<td>Supported and attended the opening of the Innovation Community hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Off Broadway Theatre “One Man, Two Governors” play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Get Ready Papakura community meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the TRAG (Takanini Residents Action Group) meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the memorial service for Goran Milosavljevic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Board Business Meeting 09 May 2018**

- endorsed in principle the Rates Remission and Postponement Policy subject to the following:
  i. increase the local board asset based service budgets to maintain the existing level of support for local community and sports groups in Papakura, as per paragraph 39 in the agenda report entitled “Feedback on Rates Remission and Postponement Policy”.
  ii. grant the current recipients the same proportional level of support for rates remitted, and that this be guaranteed for three years
  iii. develop an integrated approach to supporting outcomes for natural heritage, and community and sporting activities across the region.
  iv. the local grants budget increased to accommodate the Rates Remission and Postponement Policy.
- endorsed the following aspects of the Rates Remission and Postponement Policy in Attachment B to the report entitled ‘Feedback on Rates Remission and Postponement Policy’:
  i. introduction of a remission scheme for the Accommodation Provider Targeted rate.
  ii. amendments to the remission for residents of licence to occupy retirement villages and Papakānga housing to remove references to retirement villages and the Interim Transport Levy
  iii. amendments to simplify the remission for rates penalties
- approved the Board’s advocacy initiatives, including its key advocacy project, for inclusion (as an appendix) to its 2018/2019 Local Board Agreement
- delegated authority to the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson to provide feedback on the draft Development Contributions Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Commercial Project Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 May 2018</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Street Festival - StreetFest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended and supported the 5 May 2018 Ray Small Park Skate Park Skate bowl re-opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Netball parade Day and season opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the harvest of the Tongan community garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the celebration of the life of Glenys Ashby memorial service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Drury Community Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Community Network meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April 2018</td>
<td>Presented feedback on the Regional Land Transport Plan and regional fuel tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 April 2018</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Anzac Day Civic services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 April 2018</td>
<td>Supported and Attended the Drury Anzac Civic Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 April 2018</td>
<td>Attended the PIPS Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• endorsed an increase to the 21 local boards’ transport capital fund of $10 million per annum (inflation adjusted) from 1 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• endorsed the distribution of the entire local transport capital fund to be made according to Auckland Council’s Local Boards Funding Policy from 1 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• endorsed Auckland Transport receiving additional funding to provide an increased level of support to local boards in developing and assessing projects for the local transport capital fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• granted a community lease to Te Kohanga Reo National Trust Board (Nga Puawai o Wikitoria Kohanga Reo) under the Local Government Act 2002, for the land described as Part Lot 3 Deposited Plan 10784, being 1480 square meters (more or less) - NA427/165; encompassing the kohanga reo at Old Wairoa Reserve, 30 Old Wairoa Road, Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• granted a community lease to The Scout Association of New Zealand (Papakura Sea Scouts), under Section 54(1)(b) of the Reserves Act 1977, for the land encompassing the clubrooms at 21R Cliff Road, Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved the road name ‘Old Villa Way’ for the new private way created by the applicant MJ99 Ltd for the subdivision at 96 Settlement Road, Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• adopted the Papakura Local Board Community Grants Programme 2018/2019, noting the title for Attachment A should read “Papakura Local Board – Local Grants Programme 2018/2019&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the Papakura locally driven initiatives (LDI) – capital expenditure allocations 2017/2018, the board:

• approved up to $170,000 of their Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) capital expenditure (capex) financial year 2017/2018 budget to the installation of solar panel heating and new thermal pool covers for the outdoor pool at Massey Aquatic Park.

• approved up to $74,000 of their Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) capital expenditure (capex) financial year 2017/2018 budget to install an all-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weather parking surface (‘gobi block’ or grasscrete) for the Papakura City Brass Band facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved up to $6,000 of their Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) capital expenditure (capex) financial year 2017/2018 budget to provide equipment to support learning programmes at the Drury library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved up to $5,000 of their Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) capital expenditure (capex) financial year 2017/2018 budget to progress the scoping of fitness style equipment requirements across the Papakura local board area and report back to the Local Board with recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved up to $5,000 of their Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) capital expenditure (capex) financial year 2017/2018 budget to progress the scoping of water drinking fountain requirements across the Papakura local board area and report back to the Local Board with recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• requested the following Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) capital expenditure (capex) projects be reported to the May business meeting for consideration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o McLennan Park walkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Ardmore Marist rugby fields seed funding for lighting and the opportunities for funding the lighting project from the growth fund including investigation into the deficit of training fields with lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Massey Park Athletics Pavilion window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o South Park fitness equipment renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>re-allocated the unspent Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) operational expenditure (opex) budget as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $3,000 from the ‘Papakura sports needs assessment’ budget line to purchase a Papakura Local Board branded E-Z Up including a windscreen with a map of the Papakura Local Board area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $3,500 from the ‘Papakura sports needs assessment’ budget line as a contribution towards the delivery of the Proud Papakura Proud Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $20,000 from the ‘Local Planning and Development’ budget line towards the development and implementation of the Papakura Town Centre Key Messages project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $23,000 from the ‘Papakura sports needs assessment’ budget line as a contribution towards a sports coach/youth worker for one year from the ‘There is a better way Foundation’ to activate Court 2110 - Smiths Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $300 from the ‘Papakura sports needs assessment’ budget line towards the installation of the youth artwork from the Creative Souls project in the library foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $10,000 from the ‘Local Planning and Development’ budget line towards the noxious weeds management in Papakura parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | • $5,000 from the ‘Papakura sports needs assessment’ budget line
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 April 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Free Whanau Connect Community Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April 2018</td>
<td>Attended the TRAG (Takanini Residents Action Group) meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Commercial Project Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April 2018</td>
<td>Attended the PukeKiwiriki Paa Joint Management Committee meeting and workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Youth Council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 April 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 April 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Drury Community Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 April 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Community Network meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Business Meeting 28 March 2018</td>
<td>• requested Parks staff to work with the Friends of Kirks Bush to progress the extension of the boardwalk at the Rosehill end of Kirks Bush ensuring contact has been made by 15 April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• requested staff to investigate the status and the balance of the Kirks Bush Trust fund and advise the Friends of Kirk’s Bush accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• requested Parks staff investigate options to assist the Friends of Kirks Bush with the 25th Anniversary celebrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• requested the Governing Body postpone a decision on the disposal of 35 Coles Crescent until such time that options for the site have been fully investigated and analysed, and potential future sites for the service centre and local board office have been developed, noting that a sale cannot proceed until 2021, and requested the Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson and Member George Hawkins to attend the April Finance and Performance Committee meeting to present the board’s case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved a financial contribution of $160,000 from the current local board capital project fund, to support the proposed locally driven initiative for the Papakura Business Association to upgrade the existing public places safety camera system (CCTV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• requested the Local Board Relationship Manager to meet with the Auckland Transport Elected Member Relationship management staff to discuss the quality and content of reporting required to meet the board’s expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approved the road names ‘Francesco Drive’ and ‘Brianna Place’ proposed by the applicant, for the new roads created by way of subdivision at 135 and 143 Parerekau Road, Hingaia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Long Term Plan Have Your Say event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Neighbourhood Support meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Karakia – Takanini and Te Mahia Rail stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended and supported the Papakura Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March 2018</td>
<td>Supported the Neighbours Day Event, McLennan Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the PIPS Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Crimewatch Patrol meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March 2018</td>
<td>Supported the Pahurehure Free Community Event - Neighbourhood Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the LTP engagement drop in session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended and supported the Scholarship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Commercial Project Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the TRAG (Takanini Residents Action Group) meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Conifer Grove Residents Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the MIT Graduation Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Drury Community Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Community Partners meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Community Network meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended and supported the Takanini Village drop-in session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 March 2018</td>
<td>Attended and supported the Papakura Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Business Meeting 28 February 2018</td>
<td>- Requested Violet Slade from Te Whanau Hapori, be invited to attend a board workshop to present the Te Whanau Hapori’s Charitable Trust’s six month report for activities undertaken at Awhi House, Smiths Avenue, Papakura.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Papakura Local Board Achievements Register for the 2016-2019 Political Term

**Attachment A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- requested Auckland Transport to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o install yellow hatched lines at the intersections at Manuroa Road / Great South Road and the Drury round-a-bout, to discourage vehicles moving into the intersection too early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o requested Auckland Transport investigate and report back on the feasibility of installing pedestrian safety measures to allow pedestrians to cross the eastern side of the Settlement Road / Marne Road round-a-bout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o requested Auckland Transport develop a parking strategy for the Papakura town centre and its immediate surrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o requested Auckland Transport provide a rough order of costs for an electronic notice board outside the rail station, library and Farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o requested Auckland Transport provide a confirmed time for lodgement of the business case to the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) for the Papakura Train Station Park and Ride project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o requested a workshop be organised with the Auckland Transport Park and Ride and Papakura Bus Metro expansion teams to provide clarity on the delays to the Park and Ride project because of the bus station expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o requested Auckland Transport provide an update on the plans for the Hingaia and Linwood Roads and Hingaia Bridge, to deal with the congestion in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- granted a licence to occupy, under the Local Government Act 2002, to the Papakura Tongan Otu Motu Anga’ofo Society Incorporated, for the land at Keri Downs Park, 200R Dominion Road, Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- approved a new road name of Canopy Street for Road 3, within the residential subdivision at 170-190 Walters Road and 543-587 Mill Road, Takanini (previously resolved on 26 April 2017 as Heartwood Street PPK/2017/64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- approved a new road name of Branch Road for Road 4, within the residential subdivision at 170-190 Walters Road and 543-587 Mill Road, Takanini (previously resolved on 26 April 2017 as Red Beech Road PPK/2017/64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- approved a new road name of Earlywood Road for Road 8, within the residential subdivision at 170-190 Walters Road and 543-587 Mill Road, Takanini (previously resolved on 26 April 2017 as Hardwood Road PPK/2017/64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- approved a new road name of Grandifolia Road for Road 3, within the residential subdivision at 170-190 Walters Road and 543-587 Mill Road, Takanini (previously resolved on 26 April 2017 as Heartwood Street PPK/2017/64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- approved a new road name of Korokeke Road for Road 4, within the residential subdivision at 170-190 Walters Road and 543-587 Mill Road, Takanini (previously resolved on 26 April 2017 as Red Beech Road PPK/2017/64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 February 2018</td>
<td>Supported the Rosehill Community Family Fun Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 February 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Ardmore Airport Noise Control Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 February 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Crimewatch Patrol Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 February 2018</td>
<td>Funded and supported the Movies in the Park – Central Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 February 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Local Board Constituent Clinic, Central library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 February 2018</td>
<td>Attended the TRAG (Takanini Residents Action Group) meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 February 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Commercial Project Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 February 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Ladies Network Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 February 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Community Partners meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 February 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 February 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Youth Council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 January 2018</td>
<td>Funded the Public Engagement Takanini Library &amp; Community Hub – Central Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 January 2018</td>
<td>Funded and supported the Music in Parks, Central Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 January 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Drury Community Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 January 2018</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 December 2017</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Youth Council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 December 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Annual Christmas Community Morning tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 2017</td>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requested Auckland Transport to investigate the viability of the Puhurehure Protection Society (PIPS) proposal as part of the Greenways project #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requested a copy of the Papakura town centre concept plan when available, be sent to May Norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requested Auckland Transport to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o undertake an investigation into the Pararekau Road drainage project and provide an explanation for the length of time it has taken to complete the project and report this back to the board at the 28 February business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o to investigate the cost of removing the cycleway along the Great South Road altogether.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o to reduce the speed limit on Airfield Road outside the Holy Trinity School to 40 kph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o a meeting to be organised with board members, the ward councillors and Auckland Transport’s Chief Executive to discuss the application of the policy around speed limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside schools and other transport related matters in the Papakura area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Reiterated its concern at the ongoing delays being experiences in relation to Auckland Transports funding for the multi-storey park and ride facility at the Papakura train station and urgently requested confirmed timeframes for lodgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o requested an update on the timeframe for the replacement of the covered walkway panels at the corner of Averill Street and Railway Street West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Requested Auckland Transport to honour the negotiated agreement to fund the two Papakura Railway Station security guards plus the railway hut from 1 July 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- approved 11 Papakura Quick Response Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- approved the two Papakura Business Association Inc. proposed Business Improvement District expansion boundary maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reallocated $13,000 to extend the funding of the Papakura town centre security guards until 2 March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- supported funding the Papakura town centre safety co-ordinator until the end of the 2016-2019 political term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved construction of the additional public toilets into the changing rooms and toilet block at Opaheke Reserve, and requested that the $80,000 be sourced from the Opaheke Park encumbrance Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved up to $50,000 for the development of two concept plans for: Keri Downs Park and Carisbrook Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Endorsed the Papakura Local Board’s views on the proposed private plan change 6: Auranga B1 Drury West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appointed Member Felicity Auva’a as the Papakura Local Board alternate representative on the Kohuora Auckland South Corrections Facility Community Impact Forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreed to hold the following spoken interaction events during the consultation period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Drop in event, Saturday 3 March, 10am – 12pm, Takanini Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Drop in event, Friday 16 March, 10am – 11.30am, Uenuku Room, Sir Edmund Hillary Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Hearing style Have Your Say event, Wednesday 28 March, 10am -1pm, Papakura Local Board office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- delegate to the following elected members and staff the power and responsibility to hear from the public through “spoken/NZ sign language interaction” in relation to the local board agreement at the council’s public engagement events during the consultation period for the 10-year Budget 2018-2028:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Local Board Members and Chair;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) General Manager Local Board Services, Local Board Relationship Manager, Local Board Senior Advisor, Local Board Advisor; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 2017</td>
<td>Attended the Commercial Project Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December 2017</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Youth council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 December 2017</td>
<td>Attended the Annual Ardmore Airport Tenants and Community Christmas Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 December 2017</td>
<td>Supported and funded the English Language Partners Prizegiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2017</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Community Crimewatch Patrol Annual Christmas Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2017</td>
<td>Attended the CAB Christmas lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 December 2017</td>
<td>Attended the No. 4 (Ardmore) Squadron Final Parade and Prize Giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 December 2017</td>
<td>Supported and funded the Papakura Rotary Christmas Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 December 2017</td>
<td>Supported and funded the Carols in the Park event, Central Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 December 2017</td>
<td>Attended the North Island Secondary Schools Volleyball Competition, Pulman Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 November 2017</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 November 2017</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura High School Annual Prizegiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 November 2017</td>
<td>Attended the 26th Annual Sporting Excellence Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 November 2017</td>
<td>Attended the official opening of 3 x 3 basketball court – Bruce Pulman Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 November 2017</td>
<td>Attended the function with Mayor of Ichihara, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 November 2017</td>
<td>- Approved the scope and funding of $20,000 for the Papakura town centre health check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>- Approved an amendment to the masterplan for McLennan Park to enable development of a revised pathway network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provided input into the Review of the Citizens Advice Bureaux services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provided feedback on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Auckland Transport Election Signs Bylaw 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Representation arrangements – process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Remuneration Authority – Local Government Review 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Auckland Council Waste Management and Minimisation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Charter Parade and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 November 2017</td>
<td>Commercial Project Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November 2017</td>
<td>Armistice Day Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 November 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Croquet Club 100 year celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 November 2017</td>
<td>Maori Community Relationship Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 November 2017</td>
<td>CLM Free Community Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 November 2017</td>
<td>Presentation of “One Local Initiative” to the Finance and Performance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 October 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Local Sports Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 October 2017</td>
<td>Puhunui Stream Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 October 2017</td>
<td>Community Network Hui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 October 2017</td>
<td>Pukekiwiriki Paa Joint Management Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 October 2017</td>
<td>Face to face engagement within Papakura for the Safer Community Project – Train Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 October 2017</td>
<td>Jobfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 October 2017</td>
<td>Funky Friday – Smiths Avenue Community Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 September 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Innovation Event 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Adopted the Papakura Local Board Plan 2017.  
- Approved $15,000 for the Papakura Business Association BID expansion project.  
- Approved the preliminary landscape design for the Addison Reserve development and allocated funding of $1,800 to $2,500 to upgrade the bronze plaque commemorating the Walsh Bros first flight.  
- Approved various road names for the Waiau Shores subdivision.  
- Provided feedback on the Auckland Plan refresh.  
- Appointed the Chair as the Papakura Local Board representative on the Drury Structure Planning Political Reference Group.  
- Formally adopted the Papakura Local Board feedback on “Takaro – Investing in Play” discussion document. |
| 9 September 2017    | Creative Souls – Aranga Exhibition Opening                                                                                                |
| 9 September 2017    | Papakura Art Gallery Exhibition Opening – “Cast of Minds and Sorawit Songsataya’s Cabinets of Curiosities” by Joanna Fieldes                     |
| 8 September 2017    | New Zealand Rugby League’s Secondary Schools Tournament - Finals                                                                             |
| 2 September 2017    | Innovation Event 4 – 3D printing                                                                                                          |
| 23 August 2017     | - Allocated $70,000 to the Papakura Business Assn to address the safety issues in the town centre.                                            
- Allocated $33,000 for the two security guards to continue patrolling until 31 October 2017.  
- Endorsed the handover of responsibility for security in the railway station car park to Auckland Transport to manage.  
- Approved the Papakura sports needs assessment study scope.  
- Reallocated up to $80,000 to the Papakura sports codes and parks needs assessment  
- Approved 16 Papakura Quick Response Grants  
- Approved a Deed of Leave for the Redhill Superette at 152 Dominion |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 August 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Innovation Event 3 – Papakura Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 August 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Innovation Event 2 – Repair Café (Upcycling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Art Gallery Exhibition Opening – Mohi Ofi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 2017</td>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved new road name for the residential subdivision by Nagra Homes Limited at 17 Bunnythorpe Road, Papakura – Nagra Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved new road name for the residential subdivision by Pakenham Group Limited at 170-190 Walters Road and 543-587 Mill Road, Takanini – Toropapa Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Endorsed the local board feedback into the Auckland Transport Election Signs Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Endorsed the local board feedback in the proposed direction of the Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appointed the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson as the lead and alternate to take part in regional strategic priority workshops on the Long-term 2018-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provided feedback to the Auckland Plan refresh 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Delegated the provision of feedback on the ‘Takaro – Investing in Play’ discussion to workstream members Hawkins, Auva’a and Turner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Endorsed the board’s feedback on Auckland Transport’s “Roads and Streets framework”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requested Auckland Transport to review the road markings on the intersection of Great South Road and Coles Crescent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requested Auckland Transport resolve the ongoing issue with the failing chip seal on Elliot Street from the RSA entrance to Mossford Green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requested an update on progress on the repair of the conveded walkway to the train station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requested a progress report, including a full health and safety review, on the parking and speed situation in Oakleigh Avenue, Takanini by 31 August 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provided feedback on the report entitled “Airport Access” relating to proposed versions of access to Auckland Airport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provided input in the review of the Citizens Advice Bureaux services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/24/25 July 2017</td>
<td>Local Government New Zealand Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 July 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Innovation Event – Robots and Wearables – Papakura Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July 2017</td>
<td>Drury Community Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 July 2017</td>
<td>Youth Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 July 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Action Expo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June 2017</td>
<td>Opening Brylee Reserve Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June 2017</td>
<td>Signing of Relationship Agreement between Ngati Tamaoho, Manurewa, Papakura, Otara-Papatoetoe and Mangere- Otahuhu Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 June 2017</td>
<td>Mataawaka Hui – Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 June 2017</td>
<td>- Approved an operational grant of $5,000 to the family of Leona McKenzie as a contribution towards the installation of a memorial seat at Opaheke School road crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved 24 Papakura Local Board grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved 7 multi board grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved an application from Papakura Kootuitui Trust for $5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved the relationship agreement template and a process as a basis for discussions with mana whenua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved the Papakura Local Board 2017/2018 Community Facilities Work Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved in principle the Papakura Local Board 2017-2020 Community Facilities Physical Work Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supported all the provisions of community and workforce measures for year one (2017/2018) of new maintenance contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved the renewal of a community ground lease to Counties Manukau Softball Association Incorporated for the land encompassing the clubrooms at 1R Wharf Street, Papakura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provided feedback on the Auckland Plan refresh 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved a new road name for the residential subdivision by Karaka Brookview Limited at 241 Park Estate Road, Hingaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 June 2017</td>
<td>Site Visit State Highway 1 – Papakura to Bombay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 June 2017</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Support Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 2017</td>
<td>Local Board Engagement Drop-in, Takanini Sikh Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 June 2017</td>
<td>Local Board Plan Engagement – Drury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 June 2017</td>
<td>Matariki Ki Papakura Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 June 2017</td>
<td>Pasifika Fono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 2017</td>
<td>Attended Obligations and Opportunities: Maori, Te Tiriti Treaty and Auckland Council Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 2017</td>
<td>Attended Papakura CrimeWatch Patrol Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 June 2017</td>
<td>Attended Pips Meeting and TRAG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>Chair attended LGNZ Zone One Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June 2017</td>
<td>Children’s Forest Planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 June 2017</td>
<td>Careers Kiosk Opening – Papakura Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 June 2017</td>
<td>Civil Defence Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June 2017</td>
<td>Approved the allocation of $73,000 for environmental projects to be delivered by the Infrastructure and Environmental Services Directorate in 2017/2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved the Papakura Parks, Sports and Recreation draft Annual Work Programme 2017/2018 financial year with two amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved the Papakura Local Board Libraries Work Programme for 2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved the Local Board Arts, Community and Events (ACE) Work Programme 2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved the Papakura 2017/2018 Local Economic Development Work Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopted the Papakura Local Board Agreement 2017/2018 including local fees and charges schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 June 2017</td>
<td>Local Board Engagement, Papakura Marae including the Careers Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June 2017</td>
<td>Local Board Plan Engagement – Rosehill College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May 2017</td>
<td>Have Your Say Event – Papakura Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 May 2017</td>
<td>Local Board Plan Engagement – Papakura High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 May 2017</td>
<td>Careers coach at Papakura High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 May 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 May 2017</td>
<td>Approved 17 Quick Response Round Four Grant Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested Auckland Transport to provide a “Rough Order of Costs” for five local projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested Auckland Transport to investigate elements of the Papakura greenways – local path plan that could potentially be funded through the Local Board Transport Capital Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved a new road name for the residential subdivision by Packenham Group Ltd at 170 – 190 Walters Road and 543 – 587 Mill Road, Takanini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May 2017</td>
<td>Arts Facilities, including Papakura Museum, site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May 2017</td>
<td>Concluded the Parks site visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May 2017</td>
<td>Attended Jobfest which included the YouthFull Official Launch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 2017</td>
<td><strong>Extraordinary Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved the Opaheke Concept Plan prepared by Surface Design Inc, dated August 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved the allocation of the encumbrance funds ($1.75 million) to be paid by Motleon Ltd, towards the development of the southern portion of Opaheke Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adopted the final 2017/2018 Locally Driven (LDI) budgets by project, within the funding envelopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreed to advocate for grade separation of the Takanini rail crossings with Walters Road and Manuroa Road and also to advocate to Auckland Transport to develop a multi-story park and ride at the Papakura Train Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreed the board’s one key priority for the organisation to work on was to alleviate traffic congestion through building transport infrastructure before intensification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreed that a total of $300,000 for mangrove removal of the 2016/2017 Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) operational expenditure (Opex) be deferred to 2017/2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 April 2017</td>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved the Papakura Local Board Community Grants Programme 2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved a new community ground lease for Papakura City Brass Band Inc for 30 Wairoa Road, Papakura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approve a new community ground lease for Papakura Contract Bridge Club Inc for 13 Opaheke Road, Papakura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved a grant of $4,940.60 for costs incurred on development of a concept plan and a resource consent for Opaheke Park which was required by council final Reserve Management Plan for Opaheke Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- New road names approved for the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For the residential subdivision by Housing New Zealand across various sites in Papakura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For the New private roads created by various resource consents by Housing New Zealand across various sites in Papakura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recommended to the Governing Body to strike the targeted rate for the Papakura BID Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved Karaka and Drury Consultants Limited to undertake stream planting and to manage weeds and pests at Hingaia Stream Esplanade and Karaka Reserve as outlined in the landscape planting plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved for the Chair and Deputy Chair to attend the Local Government New Zealand Conference and Annual General Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Papakura Local Board**  
**24 October 2018**

### Papakura Local Board Achievements Register for the 2016-2019 Political Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 April 2017</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura and Drury ANZAC Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 April 2017</td>
<td>Attended Smiths Avenue Community Cultural Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 April 2017</td>
<td>Attended Maori Communities Engagement Follow-up Expo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April 2017</td>
<td>Attended the Launch of Takanini Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 April 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Fun Run – Bruce Pulman Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2017</td>
<td>Hauora at the Pa – Papakura Marae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March</td>
<td>Transport Forum - Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 March 2017</td>
<td>Redhill Funday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 March 2017</td>
<td>Attended Bruce Pulman Park Indoor Arena Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 March 2017</td>
<td>Attended Police Pay Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 March 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Art Gallery – Exhibition Opening – Tui Tuia with Horomona Horo and Te Kiri o Tane with Nikau Hindin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 22 March 2017      | **Business Meeting**  
  - Approved the Papakura Art Gallery Business Plan 2017-2020 with amendments.  
  - Approved 16 Quick Response Round Three 2016/2017 applications.  
  - Approved new road names for the residential subdivision by Carhart Investments and Darley Investments Limited at 889 Papakura-Clevedon Road, Ardmore being “Nola Dawn Crescent, Charles Henry Way, Te Aramanu Crescent and Huahua Crescent.  
  - Provided board feedback on Project 17: Auckland Council Maintenance Contracts.  
  - Delegated to the Chair and Work Stream Lead Member Turner to provide feedback and attend the hearings on the draft Air Quality Bylaw for Indoor Domestic Fires.  
  - Allocated up to $15,000 from the board’s Community Response Fund to the Papakura Business Association to commission a comprehensive safety review of the Papakura town centre and immediate surrounds to help inform future local board decision-making.  
  - Allocated $3,500 +GST from the board’s Community Response Fund to the Papakura Business Association to partner with the board to continue the Proud Papakura Proud Initiative for 2017. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 March 2017</td>
<td>Attended Pasifika Fono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 March 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Parks – site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 March 2017</td>
<td>Attended Maori Communities Engagement Hui at Manukau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 March 2017</td>
<td>Attended Blessing for the site where Papaka Road will be constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 March 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board “Have Your Say” Event – Papakura Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 February 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Town Centre Clean-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 February 2017</td>
<td>- Agreed to fund the cost of $5,063 from the Community Response Locally Driven Initiatives Fund to the Papakura Business Association Incorporated to support the relocation of Closed Circuit Television from the PBA premises to the Papakura Police Station to improve the monitoring by the CrimeWatch volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreed that the Chair and Deputy Chair liaise with the Papakura Business Association Inc to assess suitable sites for installation of new cameras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved a new community ground lease for Counties Manukau Kindergarten Association Incorporated (Nina Busing Kindergarten) for 13A Clevedon Road, Papakura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved a new road name for the residential subdivision by Karaka Brookview Limited at 241 Park Estate Road, Hingaia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved new road name for three private ways within the residential subdivision by Addison Development at 250 Porchester Road, Takanini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reallocated unspent events partnership funding of $22,500 to the three remaining 2016/2017 contestable funding rounds as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) $5,625 towards the Quick Response Round Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) $5,625 towards the Quick Response Round Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) $11,250 towards the Local Grants Round Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved the scope of the Hawkins Theatre Business Planning Project with the following additions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) To include a strong focus on improved promotion of the venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) To include income and options for increased revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) To include community consultation with stakeholders, and user groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agree that the Papakura Local Board Chair will initiate engagement with mana whenua groups who have registered interest in the Papakura Local Board area, to inform the Hawkins Theatre Business Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 February 2017</td>
<td>Waitangi Day Celebrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 January 2017</td>
<td>Art in the Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 January 2017</td>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Approved various road names for the residential subdivision by&lt;br&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing New Zealand at 75 Walters Road, Takanini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approved 19 Papakura Local Board Scholarship grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 January 2017</td>
<td>Keri Downs Park - Out and About Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 January 2017</td>
<td>Blessing of Pahurehure Boardwalk and esplanade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 January 2017</td>
<td>Papakura Kite Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 December 2016</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Christmas Community Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 December 2016</td>
<td>Drury Mile Post Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 December 2016</td>
<td>Papakura Christmas Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 December 2016</td>
<td>Papakura Carols in the Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2016</td>
<td>Papakura Christmas Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 November 2016</td>
<td>Attended Counties Manukau Sport Excellence Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 November 2016</td>
<td>Papakura Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November 2016</td>
<td>Attended Vector Pacific Music Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 November 2016</td>
<td>Attended Armistice Day Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 November 2016</td>
<td><strong>Inaugural Meeting</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Election of Chair, Brent Catchpole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deputy Chair, Felicity Auva’a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To present the two months Governance Forward Work Calendar to the Papakura Local Board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. This report presents the Governance Forward Work Calendar: a schedule of items that will come before local boards at business meetings and workshops over the next three months. The Governance Forward Work Calendar for the Papakura Local Board is included in Attachment A (Governance Forward Work Calendar as at 10 October 2018).

3. The calendar aims to support local boards’ 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 updated every month, be included on the agenda for business meetings and distributed to relevant council staff. It is recognised that at times items will arise that are not programmed. Board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the Governance Forward Work Calendar as at 10 October 2018.

Horopaki / Context

5. The council’s Quality Advice Programme aims to improve the focus, analysis, presentation and timeliness of staff advice to elected representatives. An initiative under this is to develop forward work calendars for Governing Body committees and local boards. These provide elected members with better visibility of the types of governance tasks they are being asked to undertake and when they are scheduled.

6. The calendar brings together in one schedule reporting on all of the board’s projects and activities that have been 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.

7. This initiative is intended to support the boards’ governance role. It will also help staff to support local boards by providing an additional tool to manage workloads and track activities across council departments, and it allows greater transparency for the public.

8. The 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 higher-level categorisation of the work local boards do. Examples of the seven governance categories are tabled below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Capex projects, work programmes, annual plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
<td>Grants, road names, alcohol bans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input into regional decision-making</td>
<td>Comments on regional bylaws, policies, plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Local board agreement, quarterly performance reports, review projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Community hui, submissions processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Briefings, cluster workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar. The calendar will be updated and reported back every month to business meetings. Updates will also be distributed to relevant council staff.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice**

10. This report is an information report providing the governance forward work programme for the next three months.

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

11. All local boards are being presented with Governance Forward Work Calendars for their consideration.

**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 will be updated monthly. 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 in consultation with board members and will report an updated calendar to the board.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
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Papakura Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on Wednesday, 05 September 2018, commencing at 1.00pm.

PRESENT

Chairperson: Brent Catchpole
Deputy Chairperson: Felicity Auva’a
Members:
- Katrina Winn
- George Hawkins
- Michael Turner (from 2.00pm)
- Bill McEntee (from 1.05pm)

Also present:
- Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)
- Victoria Hutt (Senior Local Board Advisor)
- Lee Manaia (Local Board Advisor)
- Paula Brooke (Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board general business</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Landowner approval application - mobile trading van application at Puiman Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local board feedback on the governments proposed phasing out of single-use plastic bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood Street – broken yellow lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kiwi build houses in McLennan Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council Environmental Project – Pahurehure Inlet Estuary (in conjunction with PIPs) or the Papakura Stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Declarations of interest – proposal to include a table of members’ interests in the agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mill Road changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Corner update**

Kiri McCutcheon
(Specialist Advisor, Community Empowerment)

Natalie Hansby
(Operations Manager, Community Empowerment)

Setting direction / priorities / budget

Staff updated on The Corners activities to date and to discuss the future of The Corner after the six month trial end in November.

Staff put forward options for consideration to fund The Corner going forward. The board will be asked to make a decision at the 26 September business meeting.

**Actions:**

1. Staff to provide details on “the Deal” which Creative Souls have implemented for outside hours use.
2. Staff to present a report for the September...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Auckland Waters Strategy**                                                 | Define the boards position | Staff presented on the Auckland Water Strategy and water quality improvement projects.  
  **Water strategy project**                                                 |                       | This is a long project estimated to go through to 2025, with an estimated start in June 2019.  
  Outcomes fit into the Unitary, Auckland, Long Term and local board plans. A joined up narrative with Watercare and other key stakeholders is a focus.  
  **Water Quality improvement project**                                       |                       | Water quality is funded by the environmental targeted rate - the majority will be spent on the western isthmus water quality improvement programme which is managed directly by Watercare.  
  **Actions:**                                                                 |                       | 1. Staff to provide the water quality data for Hunua Falls.  |
| Cliff Wilton (Senior Healthy Waters Specialist, Infrastructure and Environment Services) |                       | Staff provided an update on the Southern Corridor Improvements projects as well as the Southern Structure Plan progress.  
  **Southern Corridor Improvements project**                                   |                       | Project benefits are incremental for walking, cycling and driving. The additional southbound lane from Hill Rd and the new Takanini southbound off ramp areas have had the noise walls installed. 80% of the residents have agreed to have their original fences removed.  
  The Takanini on-ramp is to be completed in December 2108.  
  Erection of Pescara Bridge will be in early 2019.  
  At the end of 2019 the additional north bound Papakura lane will be in place.  
  **Structure Planning**                                                       |                       | Once the Structure Plan work is completed, council need to make a decision whether it will undertake a plan change to give effect to the structure plan.  
  The project is about the future urban land supply |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sarah MacCormick</strong> (Engagement Lead - North, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
<td>strategy in the south with a Drury and Pukekohe / Paerata focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Craig Cairacross</strong> (Lead Planner, Chief Planning Office)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Supporting Growth programme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andy Huang</strong> (Owner Interface Manager, Supporting Growth, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Since the business case was signed off, a number of changes have occurred with more focus on public transport, safety with walking and cycling and Unitary Plan changes which have all added to the growth challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Supporting Growth Project is a 5 year work programme and is at the start of this. 2019 the design of the corridors will be progressed and in 2020 the team will commence the hearings process followed by design implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Staff to set up a separate meeting for the supporting growth team to inform the board more fully after consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. AT Staff to update the board via a memo on Porchester Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Action Youth and Drugs (CAYAD) synthetics findings report</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Staff presented on the CAYAD team’s synthetic findings report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jordyn Johnston</strong> (CAYAD Advisor, Community Empowerment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The CAYAD team is in place to respond to community need with action planning, education etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joy Davidson</strong> (CAYAD Advisor, Community Empowerment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>This report is a snapshot report where the motivation stemmed from recent deaths associated with synthetic drug use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff to present to the Youth Council – local board staff to connect the two groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5.20 pm
Papakura Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on Wednesday, 12 September 2018, commencing at 1.00pm.

PRESENT

Chairperson: Brent Catchpole
Deputy Chairperson: Felicity Auva’a
Members:
Katrina Winn (from 1.04pm)
George Hawkins
Michael Turner (until 4.10pm)
Bill McEntee

Also present: Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)
Victoria Hutt (Senior Local Board Advisor)
Lee Manaia (Local Board Advisor)
Paula Brooke (Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veolia and Watercare quarter update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Veolia staff provided an update on their quarterly activities. Veolia is responsible for the water and wastewater in Papakura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda Oosthuizen</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Veolia implement a process that ensures they inform residents about owner responsibility of the water pipe if there are water leaks when fibre is installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Customer Services, Veolia)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Laughton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Veolia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watercare were not present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Messages feedback</td>
<td>Define the boards position</td>
<td>Colin Bass provided an overview of the Key Messages project and provided next steps scenarios for the boards review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Bass (Bizlab)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayla Hoata (UpSouth, TSI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Norman - via Skype</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strategic Planner, ATEED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board general business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Members discussed the following topics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Declarations of interest</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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Available land for sale in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Volunteer awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Papakura Museum business plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Museum funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Representation Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Land owner approval – Auckland War Memorial Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Media process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Members medical conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Papakura Youth Pathways and Excellence grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Papakura Sports awards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Opāheke Park development update and Sport and Recreation Partnership Fund grants criteria | Define the boards position | **Opāheke Park**  
Staff updated on the Opāheke Park (Bellfield) revised concept plan.  
**Sport and Recreation Partnership Fund grants criteria (line item 720)**  
Staff stated there are 53 recommendations from the Sports Needs Assessment agreed in June 2018.  
Staff will implement the proposed approach recommendations over the next few months, working with various council teams to progress these. |
| Debra Langton  
(PSR Portfolio Manager, Parks, Sports and Recreation) |                | |
| Kate Richardson  
(Parks Planner, Parks, Sports and Recreation) |                | |
| Rose Ward  
(Sport and Recreation Lead, Parks, Sports and Recreation) |                | |
| Neil Coventry  
(Sport and Recreation Team Leader, Parks Sports and Recreation) |                | |
| 3 Te Napi Drive update | Keeping informed | **3 Te Napi Drive update**  
Staff took the board through the 3 Te Napi Drive submission on the fully notified resource consent, for the boards review. |
| Lee Manaia  
(Advisor, Local Board Services) |                | |

The workshop concluded at 4.53 pm
Papakura Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on **Wednesday, 19 September 2018, commencing at 12.30pm.**

**PRESENT**

Chairperson  
Brent Catchpole  
Deputy Chairperson  
Felicity Auva’a (until 4pm)  
Katrina Winn (until 4pm)  
George Hawkins  
Michael Turner (from 12.40pm)  
Bill McEntee (from 12.43pm)

Members:

Also present:  
Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)  
Victoria Hutt (Senior Local Board Advisor)  
Lee Manaia (Local Board Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Residential Speed Management - Rosehill**  
Kenneth Tuai (Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport)  
Pragati Vasish (Traffic Engineering Team Leader, Auckland Transport)  
Matthew Tansey (Traffic Engineer, Auckland Transport) | Oversight and monitoring | Staff presented the proposed safety and traffic calming measures for the Rosehill area.  
This area has been identified as an area where traffic regularly speeds. It is tracking higher than the national average, and is one of the priority areas in Auckland for speed calming.  
**Next steps:**  
- Open days will be held – location and timing to be advised.  
- A letterbox drop.  
**Pararekau Road**  
People on mobility scooters are using the middle of the road and this is a safety issue.  
Kenneth advised that work cannot be undertaken until the weather has improved.  
**Papakura Park and Ride**  
Kenneth has been contracted by the cycling and walking team. All the projects have impacted on the area. Kenneth advised that over the next year or two there will be a lot of activity.  
Cycling and walking team are now looking at connectivity in the Papakura area, i.e. linking to the train station, linking to Pescara Point project. |
<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 work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Staff provided an update on the Arts, Community and Events work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Edwards (Arts and Culture Advisor, Community</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Movies in Parks</strong> - event planned for 9 March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment Unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Events</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiya Irvine (Senior Events Organiser, Events)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Brooke advised that she has the draft of the South Events calendar and will circulate it shortly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Hainsworth - Fa’afo'o (Strategic Broker,</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Papakura Museum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Empowerment Unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Representing Papakura 2018 #KuraReps2018 project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff advised that the project next year will be expanded to be a six month project and the criteria will be extended to be all age groups and include other areas in addition to sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community Empowerment Unit update</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board general business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Members discussed the following topics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Kauri Reserve Fun Day – 27 October 2018 at 10am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Music in Parks – regional funding is rotated every three years – no event in Papakura in the 2018/2019 financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Momo catering land owner approval – Pulman Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Volunteer Awards 2018/2019 - Tuesday 2 July 2019 at the Hawkins Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Waikato District Plan submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Health and Hygiene Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cemetery and Crematoria Bylaw Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 Te Napi Drive through road to Brylee Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Staff provide an overview of the Development Contribution Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Cairns (Head of Investigation &amp; Design, Community</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kauri Heart Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim presented the concept plan for Kauri Heart Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community Facilities Update</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff provided an update on the community facilities work programme.</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>
<tr>
<td>(Financial Policy, Financial Strategy and Planning)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Leases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Graham</td>
<td>(Senior Advisor, Financial Policy)</td>
<td>Jenny Young provided an update on the community lease work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Hannah</td>
<td>(Manager Project Delivery, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichola Painter</td>
<td>(Stakeholder Advisor, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Ewens</td>
<td>(Senior Maintenance Delivery Coordinator, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Young</td>
<td>(Community Lease Advisor, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Pizaro</td>
<td>(Manager Project Delivery, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine Samuel</td>
<td>(Community Led and LDI Specialist, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison Research – a case study of the lived experience of medium density housing in Auckland</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Staff provided an overview of the Addison Research case study of the lived experience of medium density housing in Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Jennings</td>
<td>(Lead Planner, Plans and Places)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Leddra</td>
<td>(Planner, Plans and Places)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Papakura Metropolitan centre Framework for Action</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for</td>
<td>Richard Knott presented the draft Papakura Metropolitan Centre framework for action plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Knott</td>
<td>specific decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Richard Knott Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5.30pm
Papakura Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on Wednesday, 3 October 2018, commencing at 12.45pm.

**PRESENT**

Chairperson: Brent Catchpole  
Members: Bill McEntee (from 1.12pm)  
George Hawkins (until 1.20pm, then from 2.44pm)  
Michael Turner (from 12.55pm)

**Apologies**  
Felicity Auva’a  
Katrina Winn

**Also present:**  
Victoria Hutt (Senior Local Board Advisor)  
Lee Manaia (Local Board Advisor)  
Jacqueline Pryor (Local Board acting Advisor)  
Paula Brooke (Local Board Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment – Targeted Rate, Kauri Dieback and the Regional Pest Management Plan</td>
<td>Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>Staff updated the board on the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR), Kauri Dieback and the Regional Pest Management Plan (RPMP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriana Knox (Relationship Advisor, Democracy Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Spooner (Innovation and Partnership Specialist, Environmental Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gael Ogilvie (Manager Environmental Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Winiata (Biosecurity Advisor, Plants, Environmental Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Environment Targeted Rate**

The targeted rate will raise an additional $311 million over 10 year period (Capex and Opex). 10 work programmes have received the funding with the bulk (85%) allocated to 3 of the programmes.

A lot of work has been done on the bio-database which links all biodiversity data with the region through community networking.

Looking to work with community groups to enable a co-design approach.

Want to work with local board’s to ensure the right priorities are highlighted and worked on together.

Staff asked the board to review the criteria and see if they fit into the local board plans to ensure the targeted rate is allocated appropriately.

**Regional Pest Management Plan timeline**

Staff last reported to the board end of 2017 to update on key regional issues – and the board were supportive of these.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Attachment D Item 30                             | Governance role | Consultation began early 2018 and now analysis and local board workshops are underway. Formal feedback is being sought from local boards throughout October/November. The plan will be formally adopted March next year. 21 responses were received from the Papakura area. Views followed the trend, apart from cats, in that local residents do not see cats as a pest.  
**In summary** – A formal report will come to the board in November seeking the boards approval for the RPMP. NETR – feedback is sought on key local projects, and then evaluated against specific criteria for regional priorities.  
The board asked if the community groups were invited to the consultation rounds and staff replied yes. 1700 regional community groups were contacted.  

**Unitary Plan (AU(OP)) road rules in new subdivisions**  
Sanjay Bangs – via Skype (Planner, Plans and Places)  
Information dissemination  
Staff covered the points raised in the email about road rules in new subdivisions.  
Staff said consent has to comply with width and gradient rules as outlined in the Unitary Plan.  
Any subdivision with 10 or more proposed dwellings is then assessed as restricted discretionary consent. This has seen poor outcomes because of the way the Unitary Plan is structured. Staff replied that a project has been implemented to review the Addison model.  
Plans and places and the Auckland Design Office are aware of this development problem.  

**Youth Connections programme moving to the Southern Initiative**  
Sally Angelson (Youth Empowerment Manager, Arts, Community and Events)  
Keeping informed  
Staff provided an update on the Youth Connections programme recent transfer from the Community Empowerment to the Southern Initiative (TSI) / The Western Initiative (TWI) area of council and proposed next steps.  
The transition means an internal move in council, along with budget transfer. All current projects will continue. 1 November 2018 is the formal transition date.  
A new focus for the programme is ensuring support for an individual for longer to ensure a better success rate. Also focusing on entrepreneurship and skills improvement.  

Tania Pouwhare (TSI Social Intrapreneur, Southern Initiative)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Hainsworth-Fa-fo (Strategic Broker, CEU)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The primary focus is to drive up incomes and rights. Building young people’s social capital. Future work research and innovation e.g. drug use co-design challenge. Focusing on construction and allied trades as these are sustainable markets. TWI will work with the board to deliver the 2018/2019 programme from 1 November with a new advisor. The board expressed their concerns that the intent of reviewing the Jobfest model to move to a local event, is a step backward. Staff replied the return on investment warrants a review – the decision has not been made yet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ngati Tamaoho updating on plans in Papakura | Engagement | Christine updated the board on Ngāti Tamaoho’s plans in Papakura, along with the group’s activities. Papakura has the largest population of Ngāti Tamaoho descendants. Ngāti Tamaoho have just finalised their treaty settlement. Christine shared some of the projects Ngāti Tamaoho were considering for the Papakura area. Current Papakura projects:  
  - Mobile museum  
  - Cultural heritage centre including a carving school.  
  - Specialist library collection, space for learning etc. |
| Massey Park Pool and the Papakura Leisure Centre Annual report | Keeping informed | Staff provided an update on the active recreation facilities (CLM) highlights over the last year. Council are in the 4th year of a 5 year contract with CLM which is up for review in 2020. Staff will come back to the board with recommendations for a new supplier. **Leisure centre** - all programmes are tracking well. A lot of memberships go to debt collection, an on-going challenge. Working with Papakura Marae to utilise their space for programmes as the centre is at capacity. CLM awards – the leisure centre received three awards this year. **Massey Pools** – day and night wave raves going well. Swim school is doing well. Most of the local schools are involved. Asian water safety programme |
## Workshop Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Board General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>went well. Had complaints it was racist but explained it was funded by the Asian community. A lot of disability swim lessons are held which are going well. Swim school numbers building up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members discussed the following items:
- Diversity Forum
- Takanini - Clarice Place
- Papakura Music in the Park
- Papakura Youth Pathways & Excellence Grant Celebration
- Opaheke Pony Club
- Board walk egress
- Healthy Homes Standards

The workshop concluded at 5pm
Papakura Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on **Wednesday, 10 October 2018, commencing at 1pm.**

**PRESENT**
- **Chairperson:** Brent Catchpole (from 1.47pm)
- **Deputy Chairperson:** Felicity Auva’a (stood in as Chair until 1.47pm)
- **Members:**
  - Katrina Winn
  - George Hawkins (until 4.40pm)
  - Michael Turner (from 2.09pm)
  - Bill McEntee

**Also present:**
- Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)
- Victoria Hutt (Senior Local Board Advisor)
- Jacqueline Pryor (acting Local Board Advisor)
- Paula Brooke (Local Board Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft Code of Conduct</strong></td>
<td>Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>Manoj presented to the board the draft code of conduct, which will be adopted by the governing body after local board feedback has been sought. The report is on the October business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manoj Ragupathy</strong> (Relationship Manager, Local Board Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td>All elected members are bound by the code. Two key principles underpin the code - trust and respect. The key changes are that the document is more precise, includes material breach definitions, expense policy. Duty to disclose interests and LGO/MA. Any board feedback will be incorporated into the board’s submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board general business</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The following items were discussed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Papakura Reps images in the store windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Drury Structure Plan board feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakeholder morning tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pukekiwiriki Paa committee meeting Friday 11am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board Round One 2018/2019 Multi-Board grants applications</strong></td>
<td>Local initiative/ preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Staff presented the Local Board Round One 2018/2019 Multi Board Grants applications for the board’s review.</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>
<tr>
<td>Helen Taimarangai (Senior Grants Advisor, Commercial and Finance)</td>
<td>Local initiative/ preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Staff presented on the Papakura Open Space Network Plan (OSNP) project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It’s a strategic plan for parks and open spaces in the local board area. The plan takes into account existing renewals. The board gets to support or recommend the use of open space in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papatkura Open Space Network Plan (project)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papakura is experiencing a huge rate of growth and is one of the top five local boards for growth. This document will enable that the open space is used appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Noon (Principal Policy Analyst, Parks and Recreation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The project is in the initial stages of defining the scope, with expected completion by June 2019. Then staff will present the final plan to the board as a 10 year programme of work for the boards elevation into work programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Street and O’Shannessey Street proposal</td>
<td>Local initiative/ preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Staff updated on developments with the 36 Coles Crescent and O’Shannessey Street carpark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Webb (Strategy Portfolio Manager, Panuku)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochelle Killey (Portfolio Specialist, Panuku)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiata Shores Manukau Golf Club Pocket Park development</td>
<td>Local initiative/ preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Staff updated on the Waiata Shores Manukau Golf Club Pocket Park development for landscaping and acceptance of the ongoing maintenance costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimouk Hannan (Senior Parks Planner, Parks Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Developer is proposing to develop in total four pocket parks and need the boards approval to commence with 2 pocket parks now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 4.55pm
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Papakura Local Board

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1 Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua – Tranche 1: Plan Changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) and Auckland Council District Plan - Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the plan change has been approved for public notification.
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Our Bureau

- Papakura Bureau opened in September 1974
- Our aims and objectives remain unchanged.
- We ensure that individuals are not disadvantaged or suffer through ignorance of their:
  - Rights
  - Responsibilities
  - The services available or an inability to express their needs effectively.

Our Staff

- Manager
- Information Officer
- 5 JPs
- 23 trained Volunteer Interviewers
- The Board

We are an absolute necessity in our Community

Our Bureau

Our Staff

Our 23 volunteers come from a wide ethnic base:
- Malay
- Chinese
- Jamaica
- UK
- Maori
- New Zealanders

We are a diverse community

We reflect diversity in our Community

ACABx Purpose

The purpose for which ACABx is established:
- The distribution of funding granted by Auckland Council to 29 sites within the Auckland Council area.
- Works with Auckland Council developing the strategic direction for the provision of CAB services within the Auckland Council area.

Thank You

Auckland Council
for our funding

Thank You

To our Local Board
for your ongoing support
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Our Service Area

- We successfully deliver:
  - free confidential information
  - support across the Challenges and Problems
  - professional services

- Our Information is sourced from:
  - CABNET Database
  - Brochure Library
  - google search engine
  - Information resources
  - Collaboration with other staff.

Our Service

- A new service has been introduced where we receive calls from prisoners at:
  - the Win Women’s facility
  - the Men’s facility

- Provide advocacy and mediation services.

- Support illiterate clients.

- Write letters for clients.

Our Knowledge

- Family
- Housing and Land
- Emergency Accommodation
- Consumer
- Finding Legal Assistance
- Finance and Benefits
- Employment
- Immigration
- Community
- Health
- Education
- Counselling

and many other subjects...

Our Service

- Recent Mystery Shopper review commissioned by CABNZ.

- Papakura Bureau results are excellent.

We are very proud of our volunteers.

Our Service

- We use our knowledge of local services and our community to help people to help themselves.

- We provide office space for external services
  - Legal Clinics and Community Law
  - Age Concern
  - Problem Gambling

- We work for positive social change within the community and our wider society.

- Languages Connect provides CAB services in more than 20 Languages.

Statistics – Top 10

- Relationships
- Conditions of Employment
- Legal Services
- Rental Housing
- Budgeting and General Financial Difficulties
- Citizenship and immigration
- Consumer Law
- Law Enforcement
- Death
- Neighbourhood Problems
- Disputes Pressure Groups
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Statistics – Categories

Top 10 Categories 2017-18

Statistics – Age of Clients

2017-2018

Statistics – Interviews

2017-2018

Statistics – Ethnicity

2017-2018

Statistics – Time

Total Services 2017-2018
1001 Interviews – 1398 Services

Data Recording

- All client interactions are entered into our CAYENET system.
- Short forms are generally for bureau services and short client interactions.
- Standard forms provide in-depth information that is analysed and used to create policies for social change.
- Figures are prepared to meet standardisation criteria required by Auckland Council.
Our Future

- New premises.
- CAB hub in Takanini.
- Future development into Franklin.
- New version of CABNET - ‘Go Live’ in April 2019.

Car Parking

- We have a complaints register that records numerous comments about a lack of parking.
- Verbal promise from Auckland Transport of creating a 90 or 120 minute parking zone in Chapel street with 2 disabled car parks.
- Buses’ will be moved to Opapeke Road only.

Our door is open but the community can’t get in!

Car Parking

- We are receiving a large number of complaints from our clients about the lack of parking.
- This is making it difficult for the community to access our services and is having a detrimental effect on our visitor statistics.

Our door is open but the community can’t get in!

Statistics

September 2017

291 Excluding JP Visits

Statistics

September 2018

225 Excluding JP Visits
New Premises

- We acknowledge and appreciate the Local Board's generosity to date, in providing the cottage for the CAB services.
- A more central location with parking would serve the community needs better.
- We would like to be involved in the Review of Central Park 2019.

Citizens Advice Bureau

Ngā Pou Whakawhirinaki o Aotearoa

Address: 4A Opaheke Rd
Phone: 09 299 6411
Email: papakura@cab.org.nz
Hours: 9:00am – 4:30pm Mon – Thurs
       9:00am – 4:00pm Friday

Thank You