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1 Welcome

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

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 11 December 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 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki 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.

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

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:

"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."
Governing Body Member's Update

File No.: CP2019/00922

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board an update on local activities that the Governing Body representative is involved with.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Opportunity for the Governing Body representative to update the Maungakiekie- Tāmaki Local Board on projects, meetings, events and issues of interest to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board and its community.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
   a) receive the Governing Body Member’s update.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairperson's Report
File No.: CP2019/00925

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To keep the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board informed on the local activities that the Chairperson is involved with.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Providing the Chairperson with an opportunity to update the local board on the projects and issues they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
   a) receive the Chairperson’s report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To keep the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board informed on the local activities that the local board members are involved with.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Providing board members with an opportunity to update the local board on the projects and issues they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
a) receive the board members report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for the request to lodge a publicly notified resource consent for the
demolition of the Waikaraka Park grandstand and the erection of temporary seating and
toilet blocks around the speedway track.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. On 16 June 2016 the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board resolved to demolish the
Waikaraka Park grandstand (MT/2016/94).
3. The resolution was not actioned due to heritage values associated with Waikaraka Park and the
existing grandstand having been identified. These are likely to impact on council’s ability to
secure resource consent for demolition of the grandstand and the timeframe required to
consider a resource consent application for demolition.
4. The condition of the existing grandstand is an impediment to progressing on-site
improvements at the Waikaraka Park speedway, granting a new lease for the Waikaraka
Park speedway track and facilities, master planning the Waikaraka Park reserve and
providing a safe and secure spectator facility for speedway patrons.
5. A broad range of options for physical works to the grandstand were presented to the
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board at a workshop on 16 October 2018. These options
included to abandon, demolish, repair, refurbish, replicate, replace or relocate the
grandstand.
6. Staff recommend option E; for the local board to approve lodging resource consent
requesting public notification to demolish the existing grandstand and include provision for
installing up to 3000 temporary seats and up to 4 toilet blocks around the speedway track.
This meets the immediate need for seating and toilet facilities and provides future flexibility
for spectator facilities with a permanent or temporary stadium.
7. Resource consent costs for a publicly notified application depend on several variables,
including the need for and length of a hearing, expert evidence required, etc. It is estimated
that the costs for the resource consent will be between $50,000 to $150,000.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
a) approve the request to lodge a publicly notified resource consent to seek demolition
of the Waikaraka Park grandstand and the erection of temporary seating of up to
3000 seats and four toilet blocks around the speedway track.

Horopaki
Context
8. On 16 June 2016 the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board resolved to demolish the
Waikaraka Park grandstand (MT/2016/94). The resolution was not actioned due to heritage
values associated with the existing grandstand.
9. During 2017 and 2018 Regional Facilities Auckland investigated the possible investment of some $10 million in Waikaraka Park’s speedway and stock car racing track and facilities. This was one option of a number of alternative sites to move speedway from Western Springs. The removal and replacement of the grandstand was considered as part of the investigation.

10. In June 2018 council entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to investigate the opportunity for Springs Promotions Limited and its speedway events to relocate from Western Springs Park to Colin Dale Park in Manukau, shifting funding away from Waikaraka Park.

11. The board now need to reconsider the physical works of the grandstand, in order for other matters to progress.

The 1938 Grandstand at Waikaraka Park

12. Waikaraka Park has been the home to ‘Speedway and Stock Car’ racing since the 1960’s. Waikaraka Park is recognised as a Motorsport sub-precinct in I101.6.3 of the Auckland Unitary Plan.

13. The Auckland Stock and Saloon Car Club is the incumbent leaseholder of the speedway facility at Waikaraka Park. The club owns their clubroom building and other improvements within their leased area of the park. The concrete grandstand is owned by council.

14. The heritage listed 1938 reinforced concrete grandstand is considered a ‘derelict asset’. It was closed in September 2014 after specialist condition reports found the grandstand to be structurally unsound, at seismic risk and did not meet minimum New Zealand standards.

15. A structural review by Babbage Consulting (Attachment A) notes that widespread concrete damage has been observed on site. Most of the wall damage is found at the northern end of the western grandstand wall. A considerable amount of damage is due to water penetration through the eastern edge of the upper deck, which is used as a storm water gutter to collect surface water on the upper deck. The storm water penetrates the slab causing severe corrosion damage to the slab as well as to the supporting beams. An illustration of a tension crack is shown below in figure 1.

![Figure 1 from the Babbage report: tension crack due to rebar corrosion.](image)

16. The grandstand has two functional purposes, for seating and toilet facilities.

17. There is no specific allocated seating in the grandstand; however it is estimated to seat 3250-4000 people over the two levels. Since the grandstand has been closed, approximately 1900 temporary seats have been erected on site (in front of the existing grandstand on the western side of the ground and on the eastern side of the ground).

18. The toilet facilities beneath the grandstand are large, but are in a substandard condition. Since the grandstand has been closed, two transportable toilet blocks have been installed behind the existing grandstand.
19. The grandstand is the impediment to:
   - progressing on-site improvements at the Waikaraka Park speedway
   - granting a new lease for the Waikaraka Park speedway track and facilities
   - master planning the Waikaraka Park reserve (including cemetery, playing fields and undeveloped south east corner), and
   - providing a safe and secure spectator facility for speedway patrons.

Heritage

20. Waikaraka Park is listed in Schedule 14.1 of the Auckland Unitary Plan as a Category B Historic Heritage Place.

21. A Heritage Impact Assessment (Attachment D) prepared in February 2018 by Matthews and Matthews concluded that the grandstand itself had considerable historical, social, and context value, and a moderate level of physical attribute and aesthetic value. The Heritage Impact Assessment supports the retention and refurbishment of the grandstand. The Heritage Impact assessment also states that: “a replacement grandstand would mitigate the loss of the function of the building…”

22. Council’s heritage staff have provided a position memo (Attachment C) outlining their perspective on the range of options, which are included in this report. It states that they would not be able to support demolition options, and any demolition application would need to be thoroughly justified by council and require appropriate mitigation.

23. A resource consent lodged for demolition of the grandstand will potentially lead to an adversarial public process, with departments of council having contrasting opinions to the resource consent application. It could be a lengthy and expensive process. Resource consent could be refused based on adverse heritage effects.

Lease

24. The leaseholder of Waikaraka Park speedway track and facilities has been the Auckland Stock and Saloon Car Club since the 1960s. The current lease commenced in September 2004 and has a final expiry date of 23 September 2019.

25. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board resolved on 26 September 2017 to grant a lease variation to reduce the rent from $24,400 +GST per annum to $1 per annum for the duration that the grandstand is inoperable or until final expiry of lease in September 2019 (MT/2017/173).

26. The variation was granted as the closure of the grandstand in 2014 has affected the clubs operations. The club saw a drop in attendance as a result of the reduced seating capacity. Rent savings are used by the club to provide required facilities.

27. Under the terms of the lease council is not required to repair the grandstand. The current lease has no specific provision for a required number of seats or toilets that council must provide.

28. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board has discretion to support the Auckland Stock and Saloon Car Club by provision of facilities or by subsidy, if it so chooses.

29. Regional Facilities Auckland investigated the possible investment of some $10 million in Waikaraka Park’s speedway and stock car racing track and facilities. This was one option of a number of alternative sites to move speedway from Western Springs.

30. This would have co-located Springs Promotions Limited, a commercial speedway car event operator, with the Auckland Stock and Saloon Car Club as joint leaseholders at Waikaraka Park, creating a regional motorsports facility. It would also have necessitated the removal and replacement of the 1938 grandstand.

31. In June 2018 council entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to investigate the opportunity for Springs Promotions Limited and its speedway events to relocate from
Western Springs Park to Colin Dale Park in Manukau, shifting funding away from Waikaraka Park.

32. The Auckland Stock and Saloon Car Club is now in a state of uncertainty for speedway facilities at Waikaraka Park.

Key Issues

33. There are three immediate outstanding issues for speedway at Waikaraka Park:
   a) the state of the 1938 grandstand
   b) spectator seating
   c) toilet amenity

34. The most complex and costly of these is the grandstand, considering the heritage overlay, seismic and structural condition.

35. Other matters, such as future race track improvement and site rationalisation, and integrated master planning for the complete reserve, require these issues are resolved to progress.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

36. Twelve broad options were considered for the grandstand, which were refined to six for further feasibility:
   a) repair fully
   b) refurbish with a new top tier
   c) full demolition and replace with a full replica grandstand
   d) full demolition and replace with a permanent lightweight grandstand
   e) full demolition and replace with temporary seating
   f) abandon with seating and toilets provided elsewhere

37. Information and advice prepared to inform these options include:
   • a structural review of the grandstand by Babbage Consulting, dated 5 October 2018 (Attachment A)
   • a geotechnical review by Holmes Consulting group, dated November 2015 (Attachment B)
   • a heritage memo by Tanya Sorrell (Team Leader Built and Cultural Heritage Policy), dated 1 October 2018 (Attachment C)
   • a heritage impact assessment by Matthews and Matthews, dated 22 February 2018 (Attachment D)
   • a cost analysis (over 10 years) by Synergine, reviewed by Warren Perkins (Principal Quantity Surveyor, Community Facilities) (Attachment E)

38. Given the information prepared, the following is considered relevant:
   • a combination of the options in whole or parts could be considered. Some options could be seen as a short-term solution while longer term options are further investigated.
   • some options can be acted upon relatively quickly and some options will take considerable time to further investigate, design, consent and construct or deconstruct.
   • any option chosen will have a significant impact on the grandstand. Any option to repair, refurbish or demolish will require significant (or all) parts of the building to be removed and replaced. In this regard, any option (aside from abandon) will require resource consent.
- the existing grandstand has recognised heritage values and is a primary feature of Waikaraka Park. Any option for demolition would result in heritage effects.
- the option to abandon the grandstand (either in the short term or long term) will result in continued deterioration of the grandstand, further reducing any future ability to repair or refurbish the building.
- any option chosen must be able to be certified for public use. Any option to repair or refurbish will require this as a design standard and there is a major unknown around this due to the Babbage report noting the uncertainty over concealed damage in the existing structure. This is identified as the predominant risk to options A and B.

Options Recommended for Further Consideration

39. An analysis of the six short-listed options (A to F) is detailed below. The cost estimates for these options are provided in Attachment E, including contingency allowances.

40. These options have not yet been discussed with any users of the park.

41. An options evaluation has been undertaken to evaluate the six options available. This provides an overall rating. The options evaluation is provided below.
### Item 14

**Waikaraka Park Grandstand**

**Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board**
**26 February 2019**

**Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHIEVABLE and BUILDABLE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSENTABLE - certainty of outcome?</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE CONSENT RISK – time and money justified within the level of uncertainty?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL APPROVAL PROCESS RISK – are the approval processes navigable and will they provide a certain positive outcome?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL COST LEVEL - below $2.0M?</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT COST LEVEL - below $4.0M?</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING AVAILABLE?</td>
<td>Very challenging</td>
<td>Very challenging</td>
<td>Very challenging</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRUDENT USE OF PUBLIC MONIES?</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL BENEFIT RATIO – what benefits are accrued for the investment cost of both construction and peripheral/process costs?</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST OF TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION – particularly the cost of demountable seating during demolition/construction</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEFUL AMENITY – how useful will the end result be for the ASSC and for any foreseeable replacement activity?</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCEMENT OF WAIKARAKA PARK - Will Waikaraka Park as a whole be enhanced or compromised as a result?</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEISMIC AND STRUCTURAL PERFORMANCE – once completed will the building be completely reliable and structurally capable for the long term</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACTOR AVAILABILITY - will suitable capable contractors be available to complete the various sections of work?</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSET LIFE and Maintenance costs – will the asset be durable and the maintenance cost compare with similar Council assets?</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE MITIGATION – meet the AUP Waikaraka Park Motorsport Sub-precinct noise constraint requirements at the 14 Alfred St monitoring site</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERITAGE VALUE AND APPROVALS - will the result create ‘Heritage value’ and meet statutory heritage criteria for approval?</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY APPROVAL - is it likely to have broad community support?</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score**

| Score | 9 | 9 | 23 | 84 | 58 | 22 |

**Overall Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42. In review of the options, the following assessment is provided:

- Options A and B to fully repair or refurbish the existing grandstand are challenging to achieve, with significant risk in their constructability. This challenging construction is reflective of the high cost estimates to achieve the full repair or refurbishment. The structural review by Babbage notes that widespread concrete damage has been observed on site. Most of the wall damage is found at the northern end of the western grandstand wall. A considerable amount of damage is due to water penetration through the eastern edge of the upper deck, which is used as a storm water gutter to collect surface water on the upper deck. For the benefits achieved, both are costly options however, both options have better heritage outcomes by retaining the form and scale of the existing grandstand.

- Option C to replace the existing grandstand is more cost effective than either option A or B. However, further detailed evaluation would be required to determine if this option is affordable in the medium to long term. This option has low heritage outcomes as it includes demolition of the existing grandstand, but form and scale of the existing grandstand would be replicated.

- Options D to demolish the grandstand and replace with a lightweight grandstand is a cost effective option and would provide a medium to long term more permanent solution for a grandstand. This option has poor heritage outcomes as it includes demolition of the existing grandstand, but some form and scale of the existing grandstand would be replicated.

- Option E is a cost-effective option for seating and toilet replacement following demolition of the existing grandstand. The seating and toilets would be like that currently on site with temporary seating made of scaffolding and relocatable toilets. In the short to medium term this is considered an appropriate solution to enable continued use of the site. Longer term options could be further investigated in discussions with the Auckland Stock and Saloon Car Club. Therefore, it is recommended that the resource consent application for demolition of the existing grandstand include the provision for up to 3000 temporary seats and four temporary toilet blocks. While all of this seating and toilet blocks might not be realised, it provides flexibility for Auckland Council and the leaseholder to address the short term need to provide amenities, similar to what is present on site. Option E has poor heritage outcomes for the grandstand by demolishing the existing grandstand with limited form and scale of the existing grandstand replicated.

- Option F to abandon the grandstand (either in the short term or long term) will result in continued deterioration of the grandstand, further reducing any future ability to repair or refurbish the building. This option presents a health and safety risk and is not recommended as an appropriate asset management response.

43. On balance, staff recommend proceeding to lodge resource consent requesting public notification to demolish the grandstand as per option E. As part of this option, staff also recommend that the resource consent application include provision for installing up to 3000 temporary seats and up to 4 toilet blocks around the speedway track in a similar way that seating is currently provided at Waikaraka Park. This meets the immediate need for seating and toilet facilities and provides future flexibility for spectator facilities with a permanent or temporary stadium.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

44. The Heritage team has been consulted and their views are reflected in attachment C of the report.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

45. The options were presented to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board at a workshop on 16 October 2018. The local board indicated their support for the demolition of the grandstand, and to work with the Auckland Stock and Saloon Car Club and other park users to find a solution to seating and toilet provision for Waikaraka Park.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

46. Mana whenua have not been consulted with to date. Engagement will occur as part of the preparation of the resource consent application.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

47. Funding of $400,000 from the renewals budget has been allocated to the project. Investigation and feasibility study work to date has cost approximately $80,000. Funding of approximately $320,000 remains available for further work, including preparation and lodgment of the resource consent.

48. Resource consent costs for a publicly notified application depend on a number of variables, including the need for and length of a hearing, expert evidence required, etc. It is estimated that the costs for the resource consent will be between $50,000 to $150,000.

49. The balance of the funding can be used for physical works (if resource consent is granted). The cost to complete physical works for demolition will be investigated further.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

50. There is a risk that there will be a loss of heritage values if the grandstand is demolished. A list of potential mitigation has been prepared, ordered from most essential to least essential with approximate costings provided:
   - full documentation of the structure, including original and as-built drawings, archival and current photographs, from multiple angles. The purpose is to enable future generations to reconstruct the grandstand if they ever wanted to do so ($5,000 - $15,000).
   - interpretive signage that describes and illustrates the history of the park and the grandstand in the context of that history ($5,000 - $15,000).
   - retention of the concrete slab so the original location, length and depth of the grandstand can be appreciated by the public (no specific cost but could limit future development options).
   - contact the NZ Centre for Earthquake Resilience (QuakeCoRE) to see if there is potential to coordinate a research project to further scientific knowledge and/or provide educational opportunities provided by the demolition of the grandstand (no specific cost).
   - refurbishment of other historical features in Waikaraka park, particularly those features that relate to park development in the 1930s and its use for sporting activities (e.g. the walls and ticket booth) (no specific cost detailed, but could be $10,000 to $100,000+ and can be further investigated).

51. There is a risk that the resource consent application may not be supported by regulatory services and the application could be refused by independent commissioners.

52. There is a risk that the cost for the resource consent could be significant if further information or reporting is required, or if a lengthy hearing is required.
53. These risks can be mitigated by ensuring a robust resource consent application is prepared and by offering mitigation for the loss of the grandstand.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

54. The resource consent will be prepared and lodged as soon as possible following approval by the board. Preparation of the resource consent will include engagement with the Auckland Stock and Saloon Car Club, Heritage New Zealand, mana whenua, the Onehunga Historical Society and other reserve users.

55. Timeframes for processing the resource consent vary depending on any further information requested, the number of submissions received, and the need for a hearing. It is estimated that the resource consent process will take between five to nine months from lodgment.

56. Quotes for the cost to demolish the grandstand will be obtained, options for the future provision of seating and toilet facilities on site will be investigated and funding will need to be allocated in financial year 2018/2019.

57. Consideration is given to master planning Waikaraka Park, building on the concept plan previously developed.

58. The new lease for the Auckland Stock and Saloon Car Club will progress in due course.

59. Physical works as per option E will be investigated further in parallel with the resource consent application.
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Dear Warren,

Review of Waikaraka Park Grandstand

1. Introduction

Babbage Consultants Ltd has been engaged by Auckland Council to carry out a review of the Waikaraka Park Grandstand. The review includes a site visit, a partial set of structural drawings and a Seismic Assessment Report prepared by Holmes Consulting.

2. Basis for the Review

The structural review has been based on the following information:

- Existing structural drawings – a partial set of drawings including the seismic strengthening drawings dated 10 January 1996;
- Holmes Consulting Group report dated November 2015;
- A verbal brief given on site as the grandstand should be designed to have a seating capacity of 1,500 people.

The review is also based on the following guidelines:

- The grandstand is assumed to have an Importance Level of 3;
- Both the Ultimate Limit State (ULS) and the Collapse Limit State (CLS) should be considered in the review;
- The likely collapse mechanism should be considered in the review.

The overall plan, elevation and typical details of the grandstand are shown as follows:

Fig 1: Aerial Photo
3. Background

The grandstand was built in the 1930s with some strengthening work carried out in 1984. It is approximately 67m long and 10.5m wide with an upper level and a lower level. The access to the upper level is via two ramp/stairs at the northern and southern ends of the building. In 1984, two additional stairs were built at the back of the grandstand i.e. western side.

In 2015, Holmes Consulting Group was engaged to prepare a Detailed Seismic Assessment (DSA) report for the grandstand. In the report, the grandstand was identified to be “potentially earthquake prone” under the Building Acts Classification. It approximately has 10 to 20% New Building Standard (NBS) at Ultimate Limit State (ULS). In the report, it also listed four local structure vulnerabilities:

1) Stair detailing for drift not present;
2) Inadequate confinement of columns to accommodate Collapse Limit State (CLS) drift;
3) The ability of the tiered seating slab to act as a diaphragm;
4) The durability and condition of the existing concrete.

On the 10th September 2018, a joint site inspection was carried out with representatives from Auckland Council, Synergine and Babbage Consultants. The purpose of the inspection was...
to carry out an assessment of the grandstand to provide technical advice to Auckland Council on the required remedial work to enable the re-opening of the grandstand for public use.

4. Site Observations

Widespread concrete damage has been observed on site as shown in Appendix A. Most of the wall damage is found at the northern end of the western wall. Considerable amount of damage is due to water penetration through the eastern edge of the upper deck, which is used as a storm water gutter to collect surface water on the upper deck. The storm water penetrates the slab causing severe corrosion damage to the slab as well as to the supporting beams.

Usually concrete provides long term protection to reinforcement bars because of its alkaline property. As long as this alkaline property is maintained, the corrosion of the reinforcement bars will not take place. As concrete ages, it subjects to weathering and environmental effects. It allows chlorides, carbon dioxide and oxygen slowly permeates the concrete to reach the reinforcing bars. By then, the concrete alkaline property is neutralised and the reinforcement bars starts to be corroded. As the corrosion products, i.e. rust develops, it increases its volume more than five times of the base material, i.e., steel. The expansive forces generated by the volume change leads to tensile cracking of the surrounding concrete as shown in Fig 5.

![Tension crack due to rebar corrosion](image.png)

Fig 5: Tension crack due to rebar corrosion

The important issue is that when a tension crack appears, there are likely to have many more places where reinforcing bars are in the process of being corroded in a lesser extent which may not be able to be detected from surface. In other words, the tension crack is shown only at the final stage of corrosion process.

The concern is not only the loss of tensile strength of the corroded reinforcing bars, but more importantly, the loss of bonding between the reinforcing bars and concrete. When the bonding loss occurs, the concrete structure loses most of its strength, and it will be difficult to estimate the extent of its loss of strength by calculation. Extensive intrusive investigation is required to estimate the likely remaining strength of the concrete structure.
5. Discussion Based on Site Observation and the Review of the DSA Report

Based on our site observation and the review of the DSA report, we concur with the four structure vulnerabilities identified in the DSA report. Due to these vulnerabilities, if the grandstand is to be strengthened, then the following strengthening strategy is recommended:

1) The seismic strengthening should be carried out to prevent collapse in Collapse Limit State (CLS);

2) The torsional vibration mode has to be controlled to minimise drift demand to the column support of the upper deck;

3) The beam/column joint under the upper deck is to be strengthened to enhance its capacity to match the rotational demand to prevent potential collapse of the upper deck;

4) The upper deck needs to be strengthened and new weatherproof measure is to be applied to prevent any further corrosion damage to the upper deck;

5) Any additional stiffening element installed should be installed at more than one place to avoid high level localised load transfer through the upper deck;

6) The first flight of the upper deck and the eastern balustrade are to be replaced as it seems to be beyond repairable;

7) Extensive intrusive investigation should be carried out to verify the exact damage and the strength of the remaining structure prior to seismic strengthening work is being designed.

6. Discussion about the Queries from Auckland Council

There are a number of queries from Auckland Council subsequent to the issue of the Babbage Consultants Limited draft report. These queries are:

1. Given your comments about the cracking occurring at the end of the corrosion process, what would the remaining life of structure be after any repairs?

2. Given also that it may not be possible to repair 100% of the buried corrosion, what would the effect of that be? Would the buried corrosion continue?

3. If the structure was repaired, what confidence would you have (as the Structural Engineer providing the repair methodology) to provide a Certificate of Public use?

4. In Section 7.0 you say that Option 1 ‘requires a certain degree of compromise on public safety’. What is the compromise?

5. Can the structure still be used for intended purpose?

6. What is your view on the close proximity of the temporary seating to the front of the structure and the public toilets to the rear? Is there a danger to the public in those areas if the structure was to collapse?

7. Is the Grandstand a dangerous building under the Building Act?
8. It is noted that the temporary seating and WCs are in the ‘fall zone’ of a moderate earthquake. Under normal circumstances is allowing public access to the temporary seating and toilets to the rear of the grandstand a safety issue?

In order to answer these queries, it is necessary to understand the corrosion assessment and the remaining structural strength of a structure with corroded reinforcement bars.

In order to carry out appropriate repair work for the damaged grandstand, an extensive intrusive investigation has to be carried out to identify the damage. It is unnecessary to capture 100% of the corrosion damage in reinforcements in the repair scheme. As long as the concrete structure can be effectively protected from weather, for reinforcement bars with only minor corrosion damage, the corrosion will be greatly slowed down but it is unlikely to have it completely stopped. This means the investigation work is only to target the significant corrosion damage.

To understand the statement “certain degree of compromise on public safety”, Auckland Council needs to understand that, in New Zealand, there is no commonly acceptable assessment method for structural strength of concrete building with corroded reinforcement.

There has been significant amount of research work been carried out in America. An empirical procedure has been developed to access shear strength of a column with corroded reinforcing in ASCE/SEI 41-31, but, the empirical equation for flexural strength has yet to be developed. In general, for localised corrosion rate less than 5%, the loss of strength is not significant. The corrosion rate can be defined by minimum residual diameter of reinforcement bars, or average residual diameter as defined by measurement procedure in ASTM G1-03. It involves taking enough sample of corroded reinforcement bars for measurement in an intrusive investigation. The empirical equation developed has a relatively large deviation because it is based on the test results of large range of experiment samples. To give a certainty of the load capacity of the grandstand as an Importance Level 3 structure, we have to use a relatively conservative approach, i.e., providing an extra safety margin for the capacity estimated. This means the estimated load capacity will likely to be very low and unlikely to be worth the trouble to have the grandstand upper deck strengthened. The more practical approach is to either remove the upper deck or to build a new grandstand. Since the damage in lower deck is not significant, it will be highly likely that it can be restored and strengthened as an IL3 structure for public use.

In the DSA report, the torsional mode dominates the dynamic behaviour of the grandstand. It is our opinion that its collapse mode is likely to be coupled with torsional twisting. This means, if it is not repaired or strengthened, then, in a moderate earthquake event, the grandstand will likely collapse onto the temporary seating to the front and the public toilets to the rear because of their close proximity to the grandstand.
Attachment A

Item 14

Whether this is an issue or not is dependent upon Auckland Council. It is the same issue that other Earthquake Prone (EQP) buildings are subject to under Auckland Council’s Earthquake Prone Policy. Currently, Auckland Council allows EQP building owners 35 years in which to have a building strengthened. There is however no restriction on their right to have the building occupied for its normal use during that period. Only if the building is deemed to impose an immediate risk to its occupants and to public, Auckland Council take necessary step to remove the danger in accordance with the Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings Policy.

It is our opinion that the grandstand shouldn’t be occupied unless it is repaired and strengthened. Whilst the grandstand can be categorised as a ‘Dangerous Building’ under the 2004 Building Act, it is difficult to determine whether it can be considered as immediately dangerous or not in terms of its potential risk to the temporary seating and toilet. This is because there is no clear guideline on the definition of “immediate danger” from IPENZ or Auckland Council.
7. Summary

After reviewing the grandstand and the DSA Report, it is our opinion that there are three possible options:

1) Strengthen the existing grandstand and it may include:
   (a) Replace/strengthen the north end of the west wall;
   (b) Replace the northern and southern access ramp/stairs;
   (c) Strengthen the upper deck to match the diaphragm demands;
   (d) Install additional structural element to minimise torsional effects on the building, e.g. Install Buckling Restrained Braces (BRB) or Tectonus RSFJ connectors etc., at some bays in the front of the grandstand to stiffen and to damp out seismic energy;
   (e) Strengthen the upper deck beam and beam column joints;
   (f) Strengthen the foundation and the back walls at grid 6 and 7;

   This option allows the existing structure to be retained, but, it is a very expensive option. It also requires certain degree of compromise on public safety because the strengthened structure is unlikely to be as safe as a new structure, due to the uncertainty of the nature of the corrosion damage, i.e., hidden and difficult to detect the loss of bonding of the re-bars. Theoretically if the structure was fully repaired it could be certified for Public use as an IL3 Building however uncertainly over concealed damage would make this practically and financially unviable.

2) Remove the upper deck and repair the lower deck. This is a more cost effective option and it also provides a higher level of certainty on public safety. It will however result in significantly reduced viewing spectrum.

3) Demolish and replace the grandstand.

   It is our opinion that while Option 1 and 2 are theoretically achievable, they impose either significant practical or financial constraints that make them difficult to support. It is therefore likely that there is no reasonable practicable alternative to Option 3

If you have any queries, please feel free to contact us at (09) 379 9980.

Yours faithfully

Prepared By:                                  Reviewed By:

......................................................  ......................................................

Victor Lam                                  Gerard Ball

Principal (Structural)                      Principal (Building Surveyor)
Babbage Consultants Limited                 Babbage Consultants Limited
APPENDIX A:

Photo record taken on 10th September 2018

Fig 6: Northern column of the western wall

Fig 7: Inside view of the Western wall

Fig. 8: Typical inside view of Western wall damage

Fig 9: Northern end wall tension crack

Fig 10: Wall damage shown in Fig. 8

Fig 11: Upper deck beam crack
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Fig 18: Upper deck ramp beam damage

Fig 19: Upper deck slab damage

Fig 20: Upper deck slab damage

Fig 21: Upper deck slab damage

Fig 22: Upper deck slab damage

Fig 23: Upper deck balustrade bottom edge
Fig 24: Lower deck slab tension crack

Fig 25: Damage shown in Fig 22

Fig 26: Lower deck slab damage

Fig 27: Lower deck balustrade corrosion

Fig 28: Lower deck slab damage

Fig 29: Lower deck slab damage
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Holmes Consulting Group LP have been commissioned to evaluate the likely seismic performance of the existing Waikaraka Park grandstand. A quantitative assessment has been undertaken to determine the overall extent to which the building complies with the current building standards in relation to its seismic performance.

The grandstand located at Waikaraka Park, Onehunga is located adjacent the club rooms which is accessible via a bridge at level 2 of the grandstand. The grandstand has two suspended levels and is approximately 67.0m long by 10.5m deep and 11.6m high.

Existing buildings are generally assessed against the Design Basis Earthquake (DBE), also called the New Building Standard (NBS), which is the earthquake hazard level for which an equivalent new building constructed on the same site must be designed for under the current building standards. For the grandstand at Waikaraka Park the DBE is based on an earthquake with a 1000 year return period. This corresponds to the current Importance Level 3, (IL3) use of the building as a grandstand.

Two performance limit states are considered for seismic design of new buildings. These are the Ultimate Limit State (ULS), and Collapse Limit State (CLS) which is based on a seismic event much larger than ULS. A new building designed in accordance to the current Building Act has the following minimum performance objectives;

- At ULS, significant damage to the structure occurs, but some margin against either partial or total collapse remains.
- At CLS, substantial damage to the structure occurs, and the building is on the verge of partial or total collapse.

To determine the extent to which the building complies with new building standards a series of three dimensional linear elastic dynamic analyses were carried out using Microstran and ETABS, both of which are commercially available analysis software programmes. Based on a series of analyses at various levels of seismic loading, it was determined that the building has a capacity equivalent to approximately 10-20% DBE at ULS and is considered to be “potentially earthquake prone” under the Building Act classification for the assessment of buildings subject to seismic actions.

In accordance with Building Act 2004 a building is deemed to be earthquake prone if its ultimate capacity (strength) would be exceeded in a “moderate earthquake” and it would likely to collapse causing injury or death, or damage to other property. A moderate earthquake is defined as one that would generate loads one-third as strong as those used to design an equivalent new building, or 33%DBE.

For buildings defined as earthquake prone the Territorial Authority may issue notice under Section 124 of the Building Act and restrict occupancy, or require the building owner to strengthen or demolish those elements which are considered earthquake prone.
The overall building strength for the existing Waikaraka Park Grandstand is primarily governed by the ability of the structure to resist the seismic actions from the upper tier. In the east-west direction, two walls exist which act to resist the seismic response of the upper tier and also act to resist torsion in the structure. One of the full height walls is supported by a column below the lower tier which has been identified as a key critical structural weakness that limits the structure’s overall ability to resist seismic loads. However, strengthening of this wall alone may not be sufficient alone to raise the %DBE rating to above 33%. There are also the performance of various other elements, as discussed in the body of this report, that would likely limit the %DBE to below 33%.

The Waikaraka Park grandstand resilience measured as the building’s ability to resist CLS loads based upon realistic strengths as opposed to probably strengths which are used to assess ULS is also expected to be low. New buildings are expected to have a resilience in the order of 1.5.

Four local structure vulnerabilities were identified as part of this assessment.

1. Stair detailing for drift not present
2. Inadequate confinement of columns to accommodate CLS drift
3. The ability of the tiered seating slab to act as a diaphragm
4. The durability and condition of the existing concrete

The first two vulnerabilities noted above exist due to the high level of expected drift. As opposed to strengthening these elements for the level of expected drift it is recommended that the seismic load paths and torsional stiffness of the existing structure are improved to reduce the drift demand on these elements.

There are several strengthening options for the building owner to consider as discussed within the body of this report. To achieve a %DBE rating between 33-67% the building owner would need to consider a combination of these strengthening schemes. There is also the option for partial or complete demolition of the structure which may be the preferred method, depending on the long-term vision for Waikaraka Park.

Along with strengthening of the structure other element such as the balustrades, gravity support to the stairs and durability need to be addressed. Therefore if a seismic retrofit is the preferred option, strengthening of the balustrades and stair supports along with addressing other defects affecting the durability of the structure would need to be included as part of the work. For further information with regards to the durability and temporary remedial work refer to the previous Holmes Consulting Group LP letter regarding the condition of the structure and immediate public safety issues, dated December 2014.

The seismic evaluation has been restricted to the structural performance of the grandstand at Waikaraka Park. Continued operability of a building after an earthquake is not assured in the absence of structure damage as damage to components, services and content may impair functionality. The seismic resistance of these items has not been assessed.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Following an initial assessment for the condition of the Waikaraka Park Grandstand, Holmes Consulting Group LP were commissioned by Auckland Council to complete a detailed seismic assessment of the primary structure. This detailed seismic assessment includes a linear elastic computer analysis of the Waikaraka Park Grandstand structure, accompanied with hand calculations where appropriate to determine the performance of the primary structure relative to a Design Basis Earthquake (DBE).

1.2 SCOPE OF WORK

The evaluation is restricted to a detailed assessment of the lateral load resisting system and does not explicitly consider the gravity load capacity of the floors nor the performance of non-structural components and contents.

Stages involved in completing this scope of work are:

1. Conduct a qualitative site survey to gather relevant information with regards to geometry of the structure, characteristics of structural members and to identify any alterations made that are not reflected in available existing documentation.

2. Develop a computer model for the building with use of available existing documentation and qualitative site survey information. Models have been developed both in Microstran and ETABS as linear elastic structures using an equivalent static analysis procedures for the review.

3. Evaluate the seismic response of the models in terms of the requirements of NZS1170 (loadings standard), NZS3101 (concrete materials standard for detailing) and NZS3404 (steel materials standard for detailing).

4. Determine the existing seismic performance of the structures as a percentage of the current loading requirements (%DBE).

5. Prepare a detailed seismic analysis report. This report summarises the technical aspects of the assessment and any assumptions made. The report also includes modelling parameters, results and discussion of any vulnerabilities identified.

6. Identify primary structural systems which may require strengthening to improve the seismic performance of the global structure.
1.3 INFORMATION USED FOR THE EVALUATION

The following information was used for the analysis:

- A set of original structural drawings sourced from work completed in 1984 and 1995
- A low-resolution copy of some of the original structural drawings from the 1940's

Where information was not available, assumptions were made based on typical configurations of buildings of this vintage.

Some of the key missing information and assumptions made include the following:

Missing information includes, but is not limited to:

- Actual material strengths for concrete, reinforcing and structural steel.
- Exact detailing of reinforced concrete beams, reinforced concrete columns, reinforced concrete shear walls, reinforced concrete diaphragms and structural steel column connections.
- Diaphragm shear wall reinforcing starters and reinforced concrete frame reinforcing starters.
- Allowable bearing capacity of soil.

Assumptions made include, but are not limited to:

- Material strengths were assumed based on era of construction
- Nominal reinforcing which may be reasonably expected based on era of construction and member sizes have been assumed.
- Based on the geometry and seismic resisting systems it has been assumed that the diaphragm detailing is sufficient to distribute seismic loads to the seismic resisting elements.
- A safe ultimate bearing pressure has been assumed based on existing information for adjacent structures.

1.4 THE BUILDING

Located at Waikaraka Park the grandstand is to the west of the racing circuit. The grandstand has two levels of bleachers and public facilities beneath the lower tier.

Figure 1-1 Waikaraka Park Grandstand (Google Maps)
The structure is approximately 67.0m long by 10.5m deep and 11.6m high measured from the ground floor slab to the height of the concrete/masonry wall forming part of the rear balustrade structure above the top tier. There is a construction/separation joint central to the longitudinal direction which effectively splits the grandstand into two separate structures. The following figure illustrates the location at which the grandstand is separated. The building is therefore treated as two separate structures, the north grandstand and south grandstand. The structure is located on flat ground.

Figure 1-2 Plan of North & South Grandstand structures

1.5 STRUCTURAL DESCRIPTION

1.5.1 Foundation

Foundations consist of reinforced concrete footings bearing on soil/rock below. Geotechnical information is contained in a previous report for a neighbouring site, titled “Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Onehunga Sports Club at Waikaraka Park, Onehunga” by Soil Engineering Ltd., dated 20th July 2001. Based on this report the site subsoil would likely be considered class D in accordance with Section 3 of NZS1170.5:2004.

The geotechnical investigation has taken samples from locations adjacent the site which relates to the area occupied by the Sports Club building. Generally, the site is underlain by a thin layer of fill (~0.3m) with natural volcanic soils between 0.3-2.6m of varying strength and alluvial material comprising of stiff grey clayey silts to a maximum depth of 4.8m. The depth to the basalt rock surface was highly variable, ranging from less than 1m to over 4m in depth below the ground surface.

1.5.2 Basement Floor Slab

The basement floor appears to be a reinforced concrete slab on grade supported directly by subgrade materials.

1.5.3 Suspended Floors

The suspended floors, or bleachers, appear to be 100mm reinforced cast in-situ concrete slabs formed to the tiered profile of the bleachers.

1.5.4 Frames

The primary seismic resisting system in the transverse (East-West) direction is a combination of reinforced concrete walls and reinforced concrete frames. The frames also form part of the primary gravity support structure. The frames have been assessed as elastic due to the limited information with regards to the detailing and based on assumptions given the era of construction.
1.5.5 Structural Walls

The primary seismic resisting system in the longitudinal (North-South) direction is reinforced concrete shear walls. Shear walls also comprise part of the primary seismic resisting system in the transverse (East-West) direction. These reinforced concrete shear walls span between primary concrete columns and are present throughout the height of the building. Shear walls have been assessed as elastic in both shear and flexure in accordance with the appropriate material standards.

1.6 LIMITATIONS

Findings presented as a part of this report are for the sole use of Auckland Council. The findings are not intended for use by other parties, and may not contain sufficient information for the purposes of other parties or other uses. Our professional services are performed using a degree of care and skill normally exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable consultants practising in this field at this time. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice presented in this report.

Our observations have been visual only and have been restricted to structural aspects only. Intrusive works have not been carried out to ascertain structural details not available from drawings or visual observations.

Conclusions relate to the structural performance of the building under earthquake loads. We have not assessed the live load capacity of the floors, nor have we assessed the performance of non-structural components or building contents (including the stairs) under earthquake loads.

1.7 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

In the consideration of existing buildings, the relevant sections of the Building Act 2004 are:

- Section 112: Alterations to existing buildings. Essentially, this section of the Act requires that a building will comply no less after the alteration than before. This precludes weakening, or the addition of significant mass without a proportional increase in strength. However, no structure need be stronger than required by code, so a structure with excess reserves of strength may be weakened.

- Section 114: Change of Use of buildings, etc. This requires that when a building’s use is changed, it shall comply with the structural requirements of the code, “as nearly as is practically possible to the same extent as if it were a new building”.

- Section 122: Meaning of Earthquake Prone Building. Section 122 of the Building Act 2004 deems a building to be earthquake prone if its ultimate capacity (strength) would be exceeded in a “moderate earthquake” and it would be likely to collapse causing injury or death, or damage to other property. The associated Building Regulations 2005 define a moderate earthquake as one that would generate loads one-third as strong as those used to design an equivalent new building.

- Section 124: Powers of Territorial Authorities (TA’s) in relation to exercise of powers. This allows the TA’s to take into account a number of criteria in considering the extent to which they may enforce their powers under the Building Act. Included are factors such as use, numbers of occupants, heritage value, etc.

- Section 131: Earthquake Prone Building Policy. This section of the Building Act requires all Territorial Authorities to adopt a specific policy on dangerous, earthquake prone, and unsanitary buildings.
2. EVALUATION PROCEDURE

2.1 MICROSTRAN ANALYSIS

The seismic evaluation utilises a computer model of the building to simulate the effects of horizontal earthquake forces. This model is developed using information from the original structural drawings of the building and likely properties of materials used at the time of construction. It also incorporates known modifications to the building since the time of construction which may have a significant effect on building structural response. The building model includes the main structural members and in particular those which make up the primary lateral force resisting system. As a minimum this includes the beams, columns, walls, braces and floor plates of the building.

![Figure 2-1 Perspective View of Microstran Analytical Model](image)

Microstran is an industry standard structural analysis package for linear elastic equivalent static analysis. The simulated equivalent static loads are scaled to meet the minimum requirements of the chosen building standard. For this project the forces are scaled in accordance with the New Zealand loadings standard, NZS1170.5:2004.

One of the objectives of this assessment is to determine the extent to which the building complies with the current building standard (reported as a percentage of the Design Basis Earthquake - % DBE). As such, various scale factors are iterated through to arrive at the approximate seismic strength relative to the above-mentioned standard.

For each load case investigated, equivalent static forces are applied to individual elements to represent a horizontal acceleration which results from a seismic excitation applied at the base of the building. The amplitude of the acceleration is dictated by the fundamental period of vibration of the building along its two principal axes. Tall flexible structures have long periods, whilst short stiff buildings have short periods. As can be seen in Figure 2-2 following, the longer the period of a structure is, the lower the corresponding horizontal acceleration. For a building period of less than 0.4 seconds the corresponding horizontal ground acceleration in accordance with NZS1170:2002 is 0.51g, compared to a building period of 0.8 seconds where the horizontal acceleration is approximately 0.39g.
2.2 ETABS ANALYSIS

ETABS is an industry standard structural analysis package for linear elastic dynamic modal response spectrum analysis. The simulated dynamic loads are scaled to meet the minimum requirements of the chosen building standard. For this project the forces are scaled in accordance with the New Zealand loadings standard, NZS1170.5:2004 and the relevant material standards NZS 3101:2006, Concrete Structures Standard and NZS3404:1997 Steel Structures Standard.

Due to the torsional nature of the building ETABS was used in additional to the Microstran analysis to ensure accuracy of results. Structures are generally designed to ensure fundamental modes exists in the two orthogonal directions for the structure. Structures may then be designed for equivalent static forces which relate to the stiffness in either orthogonal direction. In the case of this structure and the idealised Microstran model the fundamental modes are torsional and therefore the stiffness in the two orthogonal directions may be an inaccurate means for determining equivalent static loads for the actual response of the building. The ETABS model also incorporates the wall at Grid 6 which has the effect of increasing the torsional stiffness.

Figure 2-3 Perspective View of ETABS Analytical Model
The ETABS model includes the expected stiffness of the structure and from this the dynamic response resulting from the imposed accelerations can be determined. Since most structures for which this type of analysis is undertaken have a number of periods or modes, the output is made up of a combination of these. Statistical methods are used to combine these results to determine the overall building response.

Typical analysis output will include earthquake induced member forces (in beams, columns, walls and braces), as well as floor-to-floor and overall lateral displacements (shifts). These member forces are subsequently checked against expected strength and detailing requirements, while building drift is a good indicator of potential damage at the given level of load.

2.3 GLOBAL PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

The performance criteria used to evaluate the building in this assessment are a combination of displacement or building drift criteria stipulated by the loadings standard, and building detailing and strength criteria stipulated by the relevant materials standard. In this case the building is predominantly constructed of reinforced concrete and structural steel such that NZS 3101:2006, Concrete Structures Standard and NZS3404:1997, Steel Structures Standard are the relevant material code of reference.

The New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE) recommendations suggest that any building with a capacity below 67%DBE be regarded as an ‘earthquake risk’ building and that every effort should be made to improve the structural performance of these buildings to 100%DBE where possible, or at least 67%DBE. Table 2-1 taken from the NZSEE recommendations indicate the relative seismic risk of a building based on the assessed %DBE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%DBE</th>
<th>Relative risk</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>&gt;1 times</td>
<td>High risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>1-2 times</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-80</td>
<td>2-5 times</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-67</td>
<td>5-10 times</td>
<td>Moderate risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-33</td>
<td>10-25 times</td>
<td>High risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>&gt;25 times</td>
<td>High risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-1 NZSEE Recommendations Relative Risk

The NZSEE has recommended the following classifications in the assessment of buildings subject to seismic actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>A+ Excellent</th>
<th>A Good</th>
<th>B Good</th>
<th>C Potential Earthquake Risk</th>
<th>D Potential Earthquake Prone</th>
<th>E Potential Earthquake Prone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%NBS</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>67-79</td>
<td>34-66</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-2 NZSEE Building Classifications

The Auckland Council’s guidelines for strengthening of earthquake prone buildings require building owners to strengthen to a minimum of 34% NBS.
2.3.1 Building Drift

Inter-storey drift is the relative horizontal displacement of vertically adjacent floors in a building. Drift is a good indicator of structural performance as damage to both structural and non-structural building components can be related to drift. The maximum inter-storey drift allowed by NZS1170 under ULS earthquake loads is 2.5% of the storey height being considered.

2.3.2 Structural Ductility

Ductility is a measure of a building or its individual components ability to undergo sustained inelastic displacements whilst maintaining sufficient residual strength to carry load. The term inelastic refers to actions beyond the base yield strength of the building or component being considered. The more ductile a building, the more energy it is able to dissipate. Since ductility inherently requires building structural components to be stressed beyond yield there will be some permanent damage associated with this form of energy dissipation.

By considering available building ductility, the magnitude of the seismic forces for which the building is being assessed are able to be reduced to capture the effect of the energy dissipation. Structural ductility is highly dependent on the type of building and the individual member detailing. Highly ductile concrete members for example need to be well confined with closely spaced reinforcing ties in order to maintain their residual strength as they hinge or become damaged.

Member detailing for ductility is a relatively modern concept. As such many older structures have little to no inherent ductility and are therefore considered elastic or nominally ductile and will not be expected to perform as well under higher levels of load. Certain materials also exhibit brittle or non-ductile behaviour such as unreinforced masonry. For analysis of this structure, no ductility has been allowed for due to the age, condition, materials and detailing used/assumed.

2.3.3 Component Strength

The individual members which make up the earthquake load resisting system are assessed for strength and detailing requirements. Component strengths are determined in accordance with the current edition of the applicable materials standard for the component being evaluated.

2.3.4 Material Properties

The properties of the building were based on the dimensions and materials noted in the structural drawings. Historic material strengths have been sourced from original construction drawings where possible, however information is very limited. As such, material strengths have been based on typical construction practices of the era.
3. DEVELOPMENT OF LINEAR ELASTIC MODELS

3.1 BUILDING CONFIGURATION

The building lateral load system is reinforced concrete shear walls in north-south direction and reinforced concrete frames and concrete shear walls in the east-west direction. The typical flooring consist of cast insitu 100mm thick concrete reinforced slab supported by concrete beams. In order to accurately predict the building response the computer model includes all of the above mentioned structural elements modelled in varying accuracy as stipulated by the limitations of the analysis software.

![Figure 3-1](image)

**Figure 3-1** Perspective View of Microtran Analytical Model with indication of wall locations

3.2 COMPUTER MODELS

Two programmes were used for the analysis of the structure. Each programme has limitations. The Microtran model more accurately models the frames in terms of stiffness but provides a poor estimate for the overall building stiffness and response. The ETABS model provides a more accurate overall building stiffness and response but is limited in that the height of each floor cannot be modelled with a slope and therefore does not provide the correct flexural demands.

The following information contained in Section 3 refers to the ETABS model.

Whilst ETABS commercial software provides the analysis engine, the linear elastic analysis models are built using a Holmes Consulting Group LP proprietary input excel spreadsheet called DuctileIN. This allows the rapid assembly of the basic building geometry and for the element properties (section sizes, stiffness and material types) to be defined.
3.3 GEOMETRY

The model geometry is described by a series of column numbers to identify the plan location of structural members while elevations are defined to model elements in the vertical plane. Each node represents the geometric location of a beam, column, wall, brace or floor element.

A total of three levels for the building were defined in the vertical direction, as listed in Table 3-1 below. Level elevations are based on dimensions from the original drawings. The basement floor has been included to allow for modelling of foundations to better model the axial stiffness of the supporting shear walls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Identification (Top Down)</th>
<th>Number of Levels</th>
<th>Storey Height (m)</th>
<th>Floor Area (m²)</th>
<th>Seismic Weight (kPa)</th>
<th>Seismic Mass (t)</th>
<th>Seismic MMI (t·m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL LEVELS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.755</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>2984.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.105</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2440.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-1 ETABS Elevations and Floor Mass

*the above table refers to the ETABS model in which the slope of the floors cannot be modelled and therefore inter-storey heights reflect an average height of the storey.

3.4 SECTION PROPERTIES

Properties were determined from a near complete set of original structural drawings, however information is limited and therefore assumptions were made based on the era of construction.

- The minimum concrete compressive strength was assumed at 25MPa with a probable concrete strength of 30MPa.
- The probable yield strength of reinforcing steel was assumed to be 300MPa.
- Because this analysis is being undertaken to assess the capacity of the existing building probable strengths have been used for analysis as opposed to characteristic strengths which is typical for the design of new buildings.

For the columns and beams used to assemble the model, individual member area, second moment of inertia, section modulus and other geometric properties are explicitly calculated. The specific column, beam and wall elements are defined in Table 3-2, Table 3-3 and Table 3-4 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Section Name (ETABS)</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Shape Code</th>
<th>Material ID</th>
<th>Major Dimension</th>
<th>Minor Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L01</td>
<td>530x305 COL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305x305 COL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305x250 COL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305x250 COL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305x250 COL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305x250 COL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305x250 COL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305x250 COL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250x320 COL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2 Column Properties
Table 3-3 Beam Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Section Name (ETABS)</th>
<th>Library Shape Code</th>
<th>Material ID</th>
<th>Depth Below</th>
<th>Depth Above</th>
<th>Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>760x460 BEAM</td>
<td>1 RECT</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460x305 BEAM</td>
<td>2 RECT</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460x150 BEAM</td>
<td>3 RECT</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305x150 BEAM</td>
<td>4 RECT</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200x100 BEAM</td>
<td>5 RECT</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400x400 FOUND</td>
<td>6 RECT</td>
<td>RECT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-4 Wall Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Material ID</th>
<th>Wall Thickness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MEMB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MEMB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 MASSES AND WEIGHTS

The seismic weight of the buildings was assembled from element self-weight (explicitly defined beams, columns and walls) plus distributed floor weights. The floor seismic weight for each level is based on the average self-weight of the floor systems, plus an allowance for secondary structural elements including infill masonry walls and secondary steel beams, plus a superimposed dead load of 0.25kPa, plus an average seismic live load over the total floor area. This provides a total superimposed seismic weight for each floor. The seismic floor weights for each level are included in Table 3-5 below.

Table 3-5 Seismic Weight for each Floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Loads</th>
<th>EQ Wt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fini Floor</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravity load case weights are calculated separately and evaluated in combination with the earthquake induced actions in the output spreadsheet DuctileOUT.

3.6 PERFORMANCE OUTPUT

The results of the ETABS analysis are processed by the Holmes Consulting Group LP proprietary post processing Excel spreadsheet, DuctileOUT. The results can then be displayed visually to show demand/capacity ratios which reflect the ability of individual elements to resist actions equivalent to 100%DBE loading.
Table 3-6 illustrates the colour code used in the 3D output to represent the level of utilisation of the capacity of individual elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D/C ratio</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1.10</td>
<td>i.e. capacity is exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10-1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95-0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90-0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80-0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70-0.5</td>
<td>i.e. well within expected capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50-0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-6: Demand/Capacity Ratio Colour Code on 3D Output

Refer to Figure 5-4 and Figure 5-5 for the 3D outputs from DocileOUT.
4.1 NEW BUILDING IMPORTANCE LEVELS

The magnitude of seismic design loads in the current loadings standard NZS1170 is a function of the type of structure, as listed in Table 4-1 below. The Waikaraka Park Grandstand has been evaluated as an Importance Level 3 structure, which is appropriate for this type of structure as it may contain crowds of greater than 300 people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Earthquake Annual Exceedance Probability</th>
<th>Risk of Exceedance in 50 Year Design Life</th>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (IL1)</td>
<td>1/100</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Structures representing a low degree of hazard to life and property.</td>
<td>Small structures, farm buildings, fences, masts, walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (IL2)</td>
<td>1/500</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>&quot;Normal&quot; structures and structures not in other importance levels.</td>
<td>Hotels, offices, apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (IL3)</td>
<td>1/3000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Structures that may contain people in crowds or contents of high value to the community.</td>
<td>Schools, emergency medical and other emergency facilities but not essential post-disaster healthcare facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (IL4)</td>
<td>1/2500</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Structures with special post-disaster functions.</td>
<td>Designated civilian emergency facilities, medical emergency facilities with post disaster functions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1 Building Performance Levels

4.2 EXISTING BUILDING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

Existing buildings are generally assessed against the Design Basis Earthquake (DBE), also called the New Building Standard (NBS), which is the earthquake hazard level for which an equivalent new building constructed on this site must be designed for under the current building standards. For this building the %DBE is based on an earthquake with a 1000 year return period (Importance Level IL3) as highlighted in Table 4-1 above. This corresponds to the current use for the building, where crowds of greater than 300 may congregate.
Two performance limit states are considered for seismic design of new buildings. These are the Ultimate Limit State (ULS), and the Collapse Limit State (CLS) which is based on a seismic event much larger than ULS. A new building designed in accordance to the current Building Act has the following minimum performance objectives:

- At ULS, significant damage to the structure occurs, but some margin against either partial or total collapse remains.
- At CLS, substantial damage to the structure occurs, and the building is on the verge of partial or total collapse.

New buildings are generally designed to resist ULS loads and there is no specific requirement to check CLS. New buildings are however required to satisfy stringent detailing provisions which provide the buildings with resiliency, giving a sufficiently low probability of collapse under a seismic event in excess of 150% DBE at CLS. The CLS performance of new buildings is therefore implicit in the current building standards.

The earthquakes in Christchurch have emphasized the need to ensure that all buildings have a sufficient margin against partial or total collapse beyond ULS (often termed resilience). The Engineering Advisory Group (EAG) which was formulated after the February 2011 earthquakes has recommended that CLS be specifically checked when reviewing existing buildings, especially when existing buildings do not satisfy the stringent detailing provisions of the current building standards.

Table 4-2 below shows the recommended earthquake hazard levels for both new and existing buildings (as a percentage of the DBE). The earthquake hazard levels at the ULS are in accordance with the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering recommendations (NZSEE, 2006). The earthquake hazard levels at the CLS have been determined by providing a margin of 1.5 above that used for the ULS. This margin has been adopted on the basis that it is at the lower end of the range that would be expected for a new building designed in accordance with AS/NZS1170.

The Building Act also defines a building as earthquake prone (EPB) if it will have its ultimate capacity exceeded in a moderate earthquake (defined as a level of earthquake one-third that required for an equivalent new building), and would be likely to collapse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Performance Level</th>
<th>Earthquake Hazard Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Limit State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ultimate Limit State (ULS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building - Minimum Legal Standard</td>
<td>100% DBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Building - Recommended Target</td>
<td>67% DBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Building - NZSEE Interpretation of EPB</td>
<td>34% DBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Building - Legal Minimum</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2 Existing Building Performance Objectives

4.3 SEISMIC LOADS

The DBE seismic loads are based on the requirements of NZS1170.5:2004. For modal response spectrum analysis, the standard specifies a minimum base shear to be applied. The base shear coefficient is a function of building period, structure ductility and the site geology, including proximity to known fault lines. The assumed seismic parameters for the Grandstand structure at Waikaraka Park are as listed in Table 4-3.
The soil category has been determined on the basis of geotechnical information contained in the Soil Engineering Ltd geotechnical report for a neighbouring site titled “Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Onehunga Sport Club at Waikaraka Park, Onehunga” dated 2001 and in accordance with Section 3 of NZS1170.5:2004.
5. SEISMIC RESPONSE OF EXISTING BUILDING

5.1 DYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS

A dynamic analysis using Microtran was undertaken to ensure the building has been modelled accurately. Generally, it is expected that the first three fundamental modes with the greatest mass participation correlate to a mode in either principal axis and a torsional mode. The torsional mode is generally expected to have the lowest mass participation for the lowest three modes, although in highly torsional buildings this may not be the case.

Due to the limitations of Microtran the diaphragms and walls have been idealised as rigid elements. Microtran does not have the capabilities of modelling a plate element. However, this idealisation is considered appropriate for an equivalent static analysis and is expected to have minimal impact on the accuracy of the results. This does however suppress the fundamental modes in the principal axes and therefore only the torsional mode has been computed. The torsional mode from Microtran has a period of 0.79s.

![Image of displacement profile](image)

**Figure 5-1 Displacement profile for torsional mode from Microtran analysis**

It is generally expected that buildings with short shear walls have fundamental periods in the x and z direction <0.4s, however because the structure is highly torsional the first fundamental mode is a torsional mode with a period of 0.79s.

Further analysis was undertaken in ETABS to better determine the likely torsional response for the structure. Six modes of similar mass participation was calculated by the ETABS analysis. These 6 modes correspond to two modes in the orthogonal directions and one torsional mode for each bleacher level. The ETABS model includes the wall supporting the stair at Grid 6, which has the effect of increasing the stiffness of the structure thereby reducing the period of each fundamental mode. The first three modes are illustrated below.
Table 5-1 First three fundamental modes from ETABS Model 1 Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode 1</th>
<th>Mode 2</th>
<th>Mode 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>0.20s</td>
<td>0.11s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eff. Mass X</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Eff. Mass X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the lateral stiffness between level 1 and level 2 is greater than that assumed in the microstran model the period for the torsional mode is lower. However, because the column supporting Wall 5 has been identified as a critical structural weakness and will likely fail at a low level seismic event, a second ETABS model was created to determine the response of the structure without support of this wall. The following figure illustrates the difference between the two ETABS models.

Figure 5-2 Difference between the 2 ETABS model

The following table are the results from the second ETABS model:

Table 5-2 First three fundamental modes from ETABS Model 2 Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode 1</th>
<th>Mode 2</th>
<th>Mode 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>0.69s</td>
<td>0.11s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eff. Mass X</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Eff. Mass X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results from the 2nd model would tend to suggest that for a seismic event in the Z direction the modal base shear should be scaled to the base shear calculated from an equivalent static analysis with a period of 0.69s. However, upon further investigation it has been deemed more appropriate to derive the wall shear forces based on an equivalent static force for the fundamental periods in the x and z direction of less than 0.4s as per the 1st model. The forces in the frames should also be based upon the 2nd model with a fundamental period in the x and z direction of 0.4s.

The reason for the difference in results between the 1st and 2nd model is the change in seismic load path. The torsional response from the upper bleachers is resisted by two stiff walls in the 1st model and one stiff wall and a series of flexible frames in the 2nd model. Torsion at the lower bleacher level in both models is resisted by stiff walls around the perimeter of the structure. Therefore the 2nd model has a very low torsional stiffness for the structure supporting the upper bleachers and a very high torsional stiffness for the structure supporting the lower bleachers.

5.2 GLOBAL BUILDING PERFORMANCE

The global building performance and %DBE will be based predominately upon the first ETABS model. However the performance of individual elements, particularly the second level moment resisting frames will be based upon the 2nd ETABS model as the failure of the column supporting Wall 5 is expected and therefore the design forces derived from the 2nd model need to be considered.

In the case of the moment resisting frames the 2nd model will result in the most adverse response.

The below figure is a representation of the lateral resisting elements for the south grandstand. Beams which form part of the seismic resisting frames as illustrated in green, whilst the yellow lines represent the diaphragms connectivity.

![Diagram of Wall Layout for the South Grandstand](image-url)

Figure 5.3 Floor Plans of the Wall Layout for the South Grandstand
5.2.1 Building Drift

The following maximum building drifts described henceforth correspond to the 2nd ETABS model. This is considered a more appropriate measure of the actual drift that could occur under a 1/1000 year seismic event.

The lateral load resisting system in the north-south direction consists of reinforced concrete shear walls which is a stiff structural system. In the north-south direction the building displacements were found to be in the order of 50mm at 100% DBE loading, giving the maximum recorded inter-storey drift of 1.2%.

The lateral load resisting system in the east-west direction consists of moment resisting reinforced concrete frames and a stiff concrete shear wall which is required to resist torsion. In this direction the maximum building displacements were found to be in the order of 165mm at 100% DBE loading, giving a maximum recorded inter-storey drift of 3.8%.

The drift is therefore greater than the limit of 2.5% stated in the Loadings Standard NZS1170.5:2004.

5.2.2 Evaluation of Concrete Beams and Columns

The evaluation of the concrete beams and columns comprises two parts, the analysis of the column supporting Wall 5 based upon the response/output of the 1st ETABS model and the analysis of the main seismic resisting frames based upon to response/output of the 2nd ETABS model.

The column supporting Wall 5 has been identified as a critical structural weakness. This column is required to resist the overturning forces of Wall 5. Wall 5 comprises part of the primary seismic load path and accordingly the axial forces in the column supporting Wall 5 are substantial. It is expected that the capacity of this column will be exceeded in a seismic event equivalent to 10-20%DBE loads.

The results from the 2nd ETABS model along with the Microtran model have been used to determine the performance of the frames. The following figure illustrates the demand/capacity ratios for the structural elements at a seismic load equivalent to 30%DBE. This figure shows that the central bays which are required to resist a greater proportion of the torsional forces are exceeded at approximately 10%DBE. This would suggest that upon failure of the column supporting Wall 5 a global failure of the upper level can be expected.

Figure 5-4 Analytical Model displaying Beam and Column Demand/Capacity Ratios
The columns which support the upper level comprise a “100mm Steel Column” and a 300x300 concrete square encasement. The existing structural drawings provide no information on the actual size and thickness of the steel column or any information in regards to the end plate details. Existing structural drawings also show a circular concrete encasement with 6-HD16 longitudinal reinforcing bars, whereas the as built encasement is 300mm square. For the purposes of this exercise the columns have been analysed with an equivalent reinforcing layout as per the circular encasement shown in existing structural and assumptions have been made in regards to the baseplate detail based upon information gained by a site visit.

Based upon our assumptions in regards to the end plate detail, the end plate is insufficient to develop the moment capacity of the column and would require strengthening to ensure better performance of the frames.

5.2.3 Evaluation of Concrete Shear Walls

The concrete shear walls generally perform well under 100%DBE loads. The below model illustrates the demand/capacity ratio for the concrete shear walls under 100%DBE loads based on the 2nd ETABS model output. Based on this analysis the capacity of Wall 3 is exceed at seismic loads equivalent to 75%DBE.

![Analytical Model displaying Shear Wall Critical Demand/Capacity Ratios](image)

However, the above model does oversimplify the geometry of Wall 1. The actual geometry of Wall 1 is shown in the figure below.

![Actual Geometry of Wall 1 vs Modelled Geometry](image)

In terms of the shear distribution to the seismic frames and transverse walls the oversimplification of Wall 1 would have little impact on their response and therefore the design forces provided by the ETABS output are considered appropriate. However the actual shear force resolved by Wall 1 below the lower tier is overestimated in the ETABS model. Hand calculation have been undertaken to
determine a more realistic design shear force for Wall 1 below the lower tier. Hand calculations suggest that because the stiffness of Wall 2 is much greater than the stiffness for the actual geometry of Wall 1 the diaphragm would act to transfer shear between Wall 1 and Wall 2. Although this type of response is acceptable it is recommended that the stiffness of Wall 1 is increased to avoid this type of response.

Another weakness is the detailing of the diaphragm ties for Wall 5. In the 1st ETABS model Wall 5 is required to resist shear forces from the upper tier and transfer this shear force back into the diaphragm at the lower tier. This creates large tie forces which are currently not allowed for in the detailing of Wall 5, again suggesting that Wall 5 does not have the ability act as a reliable load path beyond low level seismic events.

5.2.4 Evaluation of Floor Diaphragms

Because of the tiered shape of the diaphragm its ability to transfer seismic forces is expected to be poor. Major diaphragm transfer forces occur at level 1 from Wall 1 and Wall 5. This is because the stiffness of both Wall 1 and 5 vary with height and the diaphragm is required to transfer the shear forces from the upper portion of Wall 1 and 5 to more stiff elements at the lower tier level. The below figures illustrate the expected shear transfer at the lower diaphragm from these walls.

![Figure 5-7 Diaphragm Shear transfer from Wall 1 to Wall 2](image)

![Figure 5-8 Diaphragm Shear transfer from Wall 5 to Wall 4](image)

As opposed to strengthening the diaphragm it is recommended that the stiffness of Wall 1 and 5 are increased at the lower level to prevent shear transfer forces through the diaphragm.

5.2.5 Evaluation of Foundations

The foundation pads form part of the seismic resisting structure and are required to resist the overturning actions from the shear walls. By inspection the critical seismic design actions for the foundations will correspond to the response of Walls 3, 4, 5 and 6.
However, without further information regarding the soil conditions it is difficult to determine the seismic performance of the foundations. In order to gain an indication of the likely allowable ultimate bearing pressure a gravity assessment of the foundations has been undertaken for long-term serviceability and ultimate limit state loads. For the purpose of this assessment, it has been assumed that the allowable ultimate bearing capacity is 300kPa. It is also assumed that the basement slab bears upon the soil directly below and does not contribute to the axial force on the foundation pads.

Based on these assumptions the foundation capacity is exceeded at 75% of the long-term serviceability gravity load and 42% of the ultimate gravity load. These performance ratios relate to the central columns which support both the upper and lower tiers. With exception of these central columns the foundation pads generally perform well under gravity loads.

The results of the gravity analysis suggest that the ground conditions are more favourable than predicted. It is possible that the structure has been constructed on well compacted engineered fill, underlain by bedrock.

It is therefore recommended that a geotechnical engineer is engaged to confirm the ground conditions and site seismic soil category. Pending the geotechnical investigation the seismic coefficient may need to be revised, which would potentially have a favourable effect on the expected seismic performance of the structure based on our analysis.

For example, if the results of a geotechnical investigation deem it is more appropriate to use the subsoil classification B the seismic coefficient that needs to be considered for design would be 63% of that which has been currently considered. By crude interpolation if the site subsoil classification was updated to category B the expected seismic performance of the structure would be in the order of 15-30% DBE and would therefore still be considered “Earthquake Prone”.

5.3 LOCAL STRUCTURAL VULNERABILITIES

The following local structural vulnerabilities were identified as part of the assessment:

1. Stair detailing for drift not present
2. Inadequate confinement of columns to accommodate CLS drift
3. The ability of the tiered seating slab to act as a diaphragm
4. The durability and condition of the existing concrete

The first two local structural vulnerabilities arise due to the high level of drift expected at ULS and CLS loads. This high level of drift is directly related to the torsional response of the global structure. Therefore, by reducing the drift of the global structure the potential hazard of these vulnerabilities is greatly reduced. To reduce the level of drift for the global structure the torsional stiffness and seismic load paths need to be improved.

The ability of the tiered seating diaphragm to transfer seismic performance is expected to be poor. It is therefore recommended that the potential shear transfer in the diaphragm is reduced by strengthening selected walls to ensure a more even distribution of seismic forces.

If a seismic retrofit is undertaken, other defects affecting the durability of the structure need to be addressed in order to extend the expected lifetime of the structure. For further information with regards to the durability and temporary remedial work refer to the previous Holmes Consulting Group LP letter regarding the condition of the structure and immediate public safety issues, dated December 2014.
5.3.1 Stair detailing for drift not present

There are two sets of existing stairs attached to the structure. The first set of stairs were constructed with the original structure and are attached to the ends of the grandstand whilst the second set of stairs were constructed in 1984 along with the addition of the walls at grids 6 and 7.

The stairs constructed with the original structure are constructed of reinforced in situ concrete. These stairs are directly attached to the end frames which have infill walls. Although there is a potential for these stairs to act as a brace to resist the seismic forces of the global structure the risk of collapse is low. This is because the stairs are attached to a stiff element where the drifts are relatively low. The stairs are however supported by tall slender concrete columns which may require further strengthening for maintaining gravity support and to improve the long-term durability.

The second set of stairs are supported by Wall 5 and the steel stringers which form the stairs act to support Wall 5 out-of-plane. It is not recommended that these stairs are relied upon to brace Wall 5 and further strengthening is recommended. The support of Wall 5 may also be achieved by introducing bracing elements anchored to the main structure which is the preferred method.

5.3.2 Inadequate detailing of gravity columns to accommodate CLS drifts

The columns which form part of the primary gravity frames are inadequately detailed for the expected drift at both ULS and CLS drift. This is however more a function of the structure's inability to resist torsion at the upper tier. It is expected that if the seismic load path and torsional response of the building is remedied that the amount of drift would be significantly lower and the drift demand on these columns would be minimal. So although these columns are considered a local structural vulnerability under the current global seismic load path, with appropriate strengthening the drift demands on these columns could be significantly reduced and strengthening of the columns for drift may not be required.

5.4 BALUSTRADES

Although the primary purpose of this report is to determine the seismic performance of the structure it was also noted that the balustrade at the upper level appeared poorly detailed. Further investigation of the performance for the balustrade to resist loads from crowds is recommended. Based on a site review of the current connections between the balustrades and the primary structure, strengthening is required. It is recommended that strengthening of the balustrade is undertaken as part of any seismic retrofit.
6. POSSIBLE STRENGTHENING OPTIONS

The following are considered possible strengthening options.

6.1 PROVIDE LIMITED ACCESS

An option to reduce the risk from local or global damage to the structure would be to limit access to the building. It is recommended that at a minimum occupancy of the lower tier is prevented due to the significant risk for collapse of the upper tier in a minor seismic event. Short-term occupancy of the upper tier may be considered by the building owner. In deciding whether to allow short term occupancy of the upper tier the building owner must however understand the significant risk. It is recommended that at minimum strengthening of Wall 5 and its supports is undertaken prior to considering whether to allow short-term occupancy of the upper tier.

6.2 STRENGTHEN EXISTING STRUCTURE

The following strengthening schemes are qualitative concepts, based on the results of the seismic assessment for the existing building, no specific analysis of these schemes has been undertaken. Therefore, the information provided with regards to strengthening is only sufficient to provide an initial concept for the type and extent of work that may be required. Further analysis would be needed to determine the required strengthening to meet the desired 0.35% DPE. However, prior to further analysis, a more accurate geotechnical assessment of the grandstand site and intrusive materials testing of the existing structure is recommended.

The options listed henceforth are loosely ordered in terms of the cost/benefit.

Strengthen existing structure

i) Infill Wall 5 and strengthen corresponding foundations
ii) Infill Wall 5, construct internal walls adjacent Wall 5 and strengthen corresponding foundations
iii) Strengthen foundations of transverse walls
iv) Strengthen Wall 1 below the lower tier
v) Brace the upper tier to the lower tier transverse walls
vi) Strengthen balustrades, stairs and address durability issues
vii) Introduce additional structural elements to further improve the seismic performance

Partial demolition

i) Remove the upper tier, including stairs and retain the lower tier structure. Potentially a new upper tier could be designed and constructed.

Complete demolition and rebuild

i) Completely demolish the existing structure and build from new.
Many of the problems that exist in the current structure can be resolved by improving the seismic load paths and increasing the stiffness of the global structure supporting the upper tier through additional walls.

The strengthening options described below typically address a particular element or issue and individually would have little impact on the overall building performance. Therefore, a combination of these strengthening schemes would need to be considered to improve the performance of the structure as a whole. For example, one method of improving the performance of the structure would be to increase the stiffness of Wall 1 below the lower tier, extend Wall 5 to ground level, introduce additional transverse walls and improve the foundations for overturning actions. It is also suggested that out-of-plane support of Wall 5 is provided by braces anchored to the main structure as opposed to relying on the steel stairs to provide this support.

6.2.1 Infill Wall 5 and strengthen foundations

This would be considered the minimum strengthening that would be needed to improve the performance of the structure. As previously mentioned the column supporting Wall 5 is a critical structural weakness and is therefore a principal element that requires strengthening.

This scheme would involve extending Wall 5 to ground level by constructing an in situ reinforced concrete infill wall and improving the foundations which support Wall 5. Improvement of the foundation would likely comprise constructing either a posthole or pile which is anchored in solid rock below. Refer Figure 6-1 below.

![Figure 6-1 Strengthening of Wall 5: Grid 6 and 7](image)

Although strengthening of Wall 5 does address the performance of the column supporting Wall 5 it would have little impact on the overall global performance (%DBE) of the structure. To improve the global performance of the structure beyond addressing the critical structural weakness further strengthening is required.

6.2.2 Infill wall 5 and internal walls adjacent Wall 5 and strengthen foundations

The first stage of improving the global performance whilst also addressing critical structural weaknesses would be improving the lateral load path along Grid 6 and 7. Given the current structural layout of transverse lateral resisting elements, Wall 5 is required to transfer the shear force from the upper tier into the lower tier. This shear force is then transferred through the diaphragm to other transverse lateral resisting elements.
The following strengthening creates a direct load path from the top tier to ground which prevents a shear transfer in the diaphragm. The introduction of new foundations would also resist the overturning actions imposed by Wall 5. Refer Figure 6-2 below.

![Figure 6-2 Strengthening of Wall 5 and adjacent walls and foundations: Grid 6 and 7]

This scheme would require the construction/improvement of reinforced concrete walls along Grid 6 and 7 and construction of new foundations with postholes/piles at each end of the lower tier wall along with an additional strip footing. The postholes/piles would need to be founded on solid rock or be constructed to a depth that’s required to resist the actions from overturning.

6.2.3 Strengthen additional transverse walls for overturning

Although the previous two strengthening options address the issues with the transverse walls along Grid 6 and 7, various other transverse walls which provide lateral resistance also lack the required foundations to resist significant overturning actions. Therefore, strengthening for overturning is required. Refer Figure 6-3 below.

![Figure 6-3 Strengthening of transverse walls for Overturning: Grid Varies]
This scheme would involve the strengthening the foundations of all transverse walls which act to resist lateral loads by introducing postholes/piles at each end of the wall along with the addition of a strip footing along the length of the wall. Again, the postholes/piles would need to be founded on solid rock or be constructed to a depth that’s required to resist the actions from overturning. In some instances it is recommended that penetrations in these transverse walls are infilled for strength. Further investigation is required to determine the extent of infill required.

6.2.4 Strengthen Wall 1 to improve diaphragm performance

The aforementioned strengthening schemes typically address the seismic response in the transverse direction. However strengthening to the longitudinal direction is also required, specifically in regards to reducing the shear transverse in the diaphragm. As opposed to strengthening the diaphragm it is recommended that Wall 1 is stiffened by providing reinforced concrete infills along its length. This would result in a more even shear distribution and reduce the forces through the diaphragm.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 6-4** Improve the Stiffness of Wall 1 via Reinforced Concrete Infill Walls

This scheme would involve constructing in situ reinforced concrete infill walls in selected penetrations throughout Wall 1 to improve its stiffness. To determine the extent and number of reinforced concrete infills further analysis is required.

6.2.5 Brace upper tier to lower tier

Along with some of the aforementioned strengthening for the response in the transverse direction, additional braces may also be introduced at intermediate grids to improve the overall 50%DBE for the global structure. This could be in the form of steel braces or reinforced concrete infill walls. Refer Figure 6-5 below.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 6-5** Brace Upper Tier to Lower Tier via Steel Braces: Grid Varies
In the previous figure the location of the steel brace is shown to align with a lower tier transverse wall which is needed to create a direct load path from the upper tier to ground. The above figure also depicts a steel brace which would act both in tension and compression and is restrained in the minor axis by a steel rod. The practicality and exact arrangement for the option of installing steel braces requires further analysis and it may be more practical to instead construct reinforced insitu concrete walls.

The concept of bracing the upper tier to the lower tier is to address issues with regards to the torsional response of the upper tier. Although this scheme will improve the performance of the upper tier the performance of the lower tier is not fully addressed.

6.2.6 Strengthen balustrades, stairs supports and address durability issues

As part of any strengthening work the balustrade, stair support and durability issues need to be addressed. Based on our qualitative site review the upper tier steel balustrade detailing appears insufficient for crowd loading. It is recommended that opposed to strengthening the existing balustrade it is instead replaced with a new balustrade.

Although no specific gravity analysis for the stairs was undertaken, from our review of the existing structural drawings it is recommended that the concrete columns which support the weight of the stair are strengthened. This will however, be dependent on the expected drift for the strengthened structure and further analysis is required to determine the extent of work.

As previously mentioned, other defects affecting the durability of the structure need to be addressed in order to extend the expected lifetime of the structure. For further information with regards to the durability and temporary remedial work refer to the previous Holmes Consulting Group LP letter regarding the condition of the structure and immediate public safety issues, dated December 2014.

6.2.7 Introduce additional structural elements to further improve the seismic performance

To further improve the %DBE beyond the strengthening options already mentioned, additional structural elements including reinforced concrete walls, steel braces, diaphragm ties and foundations can be introduced at both the upper tier and lower tier in each direction. The nature of this work would be similar to that already mentioned. The extent of this work will depend on the target %DBE desired by the building owner.

6.3 PARTIAL DEMOLITION

Partial demolition of the structure would involve removing the upper tier and stairs whilst retaining the lower tier structure. By removing the upper tier the structure would no longer have a pronounced torsional response and the overturning actions on the transverse shear walls will be reduced. In considering this option it is recommended that an analysis of the lower tier structure is undertaken to determine the performance (%DBE) of the lower tier alone. In order to improve the performance of the lower tier alone some minor strengthening to the foundations may be required. A new upper tier could be designed and constructed.

6.4 COMPLETE DEMOLITION AND BUILD FROM NEW

Pending the financial viability of strengthening the structure, and considering the long-term vision for Waikaraka Park, the preferred option may be to demolish or demolish and rebuild.
7. CONCLUSIONS

Holmes Consulting Group LP have been commissioned to evaluate the likely seismic performance of the grandstand at Waikaraka Park. To determine the extent to which the building complies with new building standards, a three dimensional linear elastic dynamic analysis was carried out using Microstran and ETABS, commercially available analysis software programmes.

7.1 EXISTING CAPACITY

Based on a series of analyses at various levels of seismic loading, it was determined that the existing building has a capacity equivalent to approximately 10-20% DBE at ULS and would be considered earthquake prone. The overall building strength is governed by the overall layout and capacity of the concrete shear walls supporting the upper tier and several identified critical structural weaknesses.

Due to a lack of information with regards to the soil conditions it is recommended that a geotechnical engineer is engaged to undertake an investigation of the site and confirm an appropriate site subsoil classification.

7.2 ADDRESSING LOCAL STRUCTURAL VULNERABILITIES

The assessment also identified critical structural weaknesses and local structural vulnerabilities for the structure. The following two items are considered critical structural weaknesses:

1. The global torsional stiffness of the structure supporting the upper tier
2. The support of Wall 5.

Both of these items would need to be addressed in any strengthening scheme for the structure.

The following four items were identified as local structural vulnerabilities:

1. Stair detailing for drift not present
2. Inadequate confinement of columns to accommodate CLS drift
3. The ability of the tiered seating slab to act as a diaphragm
4. The durability and condition of the existing concrete

The potential hazard of the first two local structural vulnerabilities as mentioned above, are directly correlated to the level of expected drift. A strengthening scheme that would reduce the expected drift of the structure would greatly improve the performance of these items.

It is also recommended that the potential shear transfer in the diaphragm is reduced by strengthening selected walls to ensure a more even distribution of seismic forces. Further strengthening of the diaphragm may be required pending further detailed analysis. Other defects affecting the durability of the structure should also be addressed in order to extend the expected lifetime of the structure.
For further information with regards to the durability and temporary remedial work refer to the previous Holmes Consulting Group LP letter regarding the condition of the structure and immediate public safety issues, dated December 2014.

7.3 POSSIBLE STRENGTHENING OPTIONS

There are a several strengthening options for the building owner to consider as discussed within the body of this report. To achieve a %DBE rating between 33-67% the building owner would need to consider a combination of these strengthening schemes. There is also the option for partial or complete demolition of the structure which may be the preferred method depending on the long-term vision for Waikaraka Park.

The performance of the structure is predominately governed by its ability to resist torsion at the upper level and the ability of Wall 5 to act as a seismic load path. Therefore, one possible method for improving the torsional performance of the structure, and the performance of Wall 5, is to extend Wall 5 to ground level and improve its foundations.

Along with strengthening the global structure other structural elements such as the balustrades, gravity support to the stairs and durability also need to be addressed.

Further analysis work would be needed to determine the required strengthening to meet the improved %DBE target desired by the building owners. Along with further analysis, a more accurate geotechnical assessment of the grandstand site and intrusive materials testing of the existing structure would be needed to develop an appropriate strengthening scheme.
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Memo

1 October 2018

To: Graham Hooper, Community Facilities
cc: Rebecca Fogel, Built Heritage Implementation Team
From: Tanya Sorrell, Team Leader Built and Cultural Heritage Policy

Subject: Waikaraka Park Grandstand – Heritage Perspective on Options

I have been asked to develop a high-level heritage view of several proposed options for the renewal of Waikaraka Park Grandstand. The purpose of this is to assist with the scope of options being considered and to provide strategic advice on reducing and avoiding adverse effects on the heritage place, regardless of the option which is ultimately chosen.

Background

Waikaraka Park is included in Schedule 14.1 of the Auckland Unitary Plan as a Category B Historic Heritage Place. The extent of the scheduled place encompasses the entire park and cemetery, with the acknowledgement of several exclusions from scheduling. The park is also subject to archaeological controls, which relates to the cemetery in particular but applies to the entire park. No primary features have been formally identified, but the evaluation lists a number of heritage features, including the stone walls, old cemetery and soldiers’ memorial, grandstand, ticket booth, toilet blocks from the 1930s and 1940s, a 1942 caretaker’s cottage, and sports fields.

The grandstand was built in 1938 by the Onehunga Borough Council as part of a wider programme of works to develop the reserve into a sports park, with cricket and football fields, a ticket booth, toilet blocks, a caretaker’s cottage and other improvements. The entire park was occupied by New Zealand and American military personnel during World War II. Before and after the war the grandstand supported the cricket season in the summer and rugby in winter. From 1967 onward the grandstand has been used for the Waikaraka Park stock cars speedway.

The grandstand was designed in a simple modern style using reinforced concrete and has sustained few alterations since construction. In 1986 remedial work was required to address issues with the concrete and to renew the support rooms under the grandstand.

While the grandstand is included as a feature of the scheduled reserve, its heritage values have been clarified by a supplemental assessment prepared in 2018. The assessment concluded that the grandstand itself had considerable historical, social, and context value, and a moderate level of physical attribute and aesthetic value. These values are affected in different ways by the options examined below.

---

1 Schedule ID 1755, "Waikaraka Grounds and cemetery, including military cemetery." List of Exclusions: Post-1970s buildings; power pylons; buildings along Captain Springs Road on the street side of the 1930s park wall
2 D17 explains that identification of primary features for Category B places will be done over time, and that until they are identified it is considered that all features within the extent of place are considered primary features. (Explanations, page 2)
3 Sheldon, Katherine. Waikaraka Reserve Evaluation, prepared by the Auckland Council Heritage Unit 2013.
5 ibid.
Grandstand Issues

In October 2015, Auckland Council ordered a suspension of public use of the grandstand, after advice from seismic experts that without additional strengthening it posed a considerable safety risk. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board decided on 16 June 2016 that the grandstand should be condemned and demolished. Inspections had revealed that areas previously repaired were failing, and the building showed general age and materials deterioration.\(^6\)

It is understood that the grandstand has been assessed as earthquake prone and that further concrete failure has been noted since closure. Further assessment of the composition of the reinforced concrete and underpinning of the structure is underway as well.

Since the structure has been closed, the stock car club that holds the site lease has accommodated spectators in temporary grandstands. It is unclear what the service need for grandstand seating will be in the long-term future of the park.

Commentary on Options

I have reviewed the summary of options being investigated for addressing the grandstand’s issues.\(^7\) These are characterised as twelve options:

1. Do Nothing
2. Demolish without replacing
3. Demolish and reuse foundation slab (demountable seating)
4. Demolish and reuse foundation slab (permanent seating)
5. Demolish upper tier only and don’t replace (or temporary upper tier)
6. Demolish the upper tier and replace with new lightweight upper tier
7. Refurbish with new top tier
8. Full Refurbishment of both tiers
9. Demolish and Replicate
10. Demolish and Replace
11. Relocate Service within Park
12. Relocate Service outside Park

I will address these options in order, commenting on the relative impact of each on the heritage values of the grandstand and wider scheduled park. My comments are generally based on an understanding of the objectives and policies of Chapter B5 (RPS-level) Chapter D17 (District Plan level) of the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part), namely the policies that address modifications, demolition, and seismic strengthening of Significant Historic Heritage.\(^8\) These comments are not comprehensive and do not take the place of a more detailed heritage impact assessment for the purposes of obtaining resource consent.

1. Do Nothing

While this option does not have an immediate effect on the heritage value of the place, leaving the grandstand to deteriorate further for ten years will ultimately have an adverse impact. It is likely that further deterioration will mean that less of the grandstand could be rehabilitated in the future. However, there is the possibility that during that time new methods for strengthening will become apparent, or that a compelling new use is found that justifies the costs of full rehabilitation.

\(^6\) ibid

\(^7\) Waikaraka Park Project draft options summary – 30 August 2018.

\(^8\) B5.2.2 (6), (7), (9) and D17.3(8), (9), (10), (14)
This option would only require resource consent under D17 as it relates to the establishment of new temporary seating structures within the scheduled extent of place. It is probably not an acceptable outcome from a perspective of public safety or park amenity or community leasing in any case.

2. Demolish without replacing

This option would result in the complete loss of the grandstand as a feature of the scheduled Waikaraka Park. This would be a significant adverse effect on the scheduled place and should be avoided if possible. Demolition of a primary feature of a Category B place is a discretionary activity and is strongly discouraged by D17.3(14). Council’s Heritage staff would not be able to support it.

If the demolition of the grandstand is thought to be unavoidable, then measures to partly mitigate the loss of the grandstand would still need to be developed.

3. Demolish to slab with detachable lightweight seating
4. Demolish to slab with permanent lightweight seating

These options have similar impacts to option 2, though the impact to the wider park is somewhat mitigated by the retention of the slab, so that the original location and dimensions of the grandstand could at least be understood. It is preferable to option 2 but still not an option that could be supported by Heritage staff.

5. Demolish upper tier, don’t replace (possible temporary upper tier)
6. Demolish upper tier, construct new lightweight upper tier

This partial demolition of the grandstand is understood to address a large share of the safety issues, which are associated with the upper tier. A crude estimate of the volume of the grandstand lost in this option is about 40-50%, which is considered partial demolition, still a discretionary activity under D17.

This option retains the location, dimensions, and some of the volume of the original grandstand, which makes it superior to options 2-4. However, it does completely alter the historical form of the grandstand, thereby diminishing its moderate physical attribute and aesthetic values. It would no longer be an intact grandstand from the first half of the 20th century and it would no longer express its substantial presence in the surrounding park. For these reasons the Heritage Staff would struggle to support this option, particularly if a superior option was possible.

7. Refurbish with new top tier
8. Full refurbishment of both tiers

Option 8 retains the most heritage fabric and therefore has the least effect on the heritage values of the place overall. It is conceivably possible that the entire refurbishment could be done under the permitted activity standard for repairs and maintenance, but it’s more reasonable to assume that repair work would necessarily involve significant demolition of deteriorated fabric and would therefore require consent as modifications. It would nonetheless be supported. It is understood that the upper tier may be beyond repair, meaning it should be considered alongside option 7, which would reconstruct the top tier from new materials. Option 7 would involve the loss of the top tier, but is assumed to mean the new top tier closely resembles the original in form, materials, and overall design. This is the next best option from a heritage perspective, since it retains as much of the original fabric as possible.
9. Demolish and Replicate

This option makes no attempt to keep the original fabric of the grandstand (or keeps a minimal amount like the foundation slab) but reconstructs the entire grandstand. It would still require resource consent as a total demolition, with the mitigation being a complete reconstruction. While it would maintain a moderate degree physical attribute and aesthetic values, it would lose much of its historical and social value due to the complete loss of original fabric. It would no longer be a historical feature of the park. For these reasons it wouldn’t be supported by Heritage staff.

10. Demolish and Replace

From a heritage perspective, this option is really no different from option 2, and would be considered a complete demolition with all the attendant consent issues that would entail.

11. Relocate Service within Park
12. Relocate Service outside Park

Since these options do nothing further with the existing grandstand it is considered equivalent to option 1 (do nothing) and shares all its attendant risks and opportunities.

Additional options

I consider that there is one other option worth considering, which was alluded to in the option assessment. An option that demolished half of the grandstand (perhaps leaving the foundation slab) and retained the other half with the aim of refurbishing the top and bottom tier (accepting that the top tier may need substantial reconstruction) should be investigated. This would enable the form and design to be appreciated, and a sense of its scale could still be appreciated to some degree. Mitigation could include marking out the full original dimensions of the grandstand on the ground and interpretive signage that would share historical information about the grandstand’s original construction and design. Lightweight or temporary seating could be placed alongside the retained half, potentially using the original slab. Subject to its physical condition, the best half to retain would be the north half, so that the view from the Neilson street side of the park was less affected.

This option would be considered a partial demolition and therefore a discretionary activity under D17. But provided there was justification for the demolition and adequate mitigation in place to address the adverse impacts, this option could be supported by Heritage Staff if Options 8 or 7 are not feasible.

Notification

Resource consent for restricted discretionary activities (such as modification) are considered without public or limited notification under section D17.5, unless special circumstances exist. Options 7 or 8 are therefore unlikely to require public notification should resource consent be required. Any options involving demolition are subject to the standard tests for Notification under section 95A of the Resource Management Act. Since these options are likely to generate public interest and their impact on heritage will likely be more than minor, it is reasonable to assume for planning purposes that any resource consent required would be notified.

Mitigation

The options involving demolition would require measures that mitigate to some degree the adverse impact of losing part (or all) of the grandstand. While such mitigation does not always reduce the impact to a level that is less than significant, it is nonetheless important to do as much as possible to remedy and/or mitigate adverse effects which cannot be avoided.
Relevant mitigation for the grandstand would include on-site interpretation that would help park or speedway visitors understand the history of Waikaraka Park, the history of the grandstand, how it relates to other structures from the 1938 sports park project, and details on its original size, materials, design, and methods of construction. Additionally, prior to any demolition work the grandstand should be fully documented with measured drawings and archival photographs, with these materials placed in Council’s archives. Greater loss of the original form and dimensions of the grandstand would also necessitate more ways to convey those details in the landscape, perhaps through the use of salvaged concrete to mark the original perimeter of the grandstand.

Justification

Any option involving partial or total demolition will need to be thoroughly justified by Council as the applicant, and not just on the relative cost compared to alternatives. A good guideline is to consider the matters contained in D17.3(14):

(14) Avoid the total or substantial demolition or destruction of:

(a) the primary features of Category A* and Category B scheduled historic heritage places;
(b) the non-primary features of Category A and A* scheduled historic heritage places; and contributing features within Historic Heritage Areas; unless:

(i) the demolition or destruction is required to allow for significant public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved; and
(ii) the significant public benefit outweighs the retention of the feature, or parts of the feature, or the place; or
(iii) the demolition or destruction is necessary to remove a significant amount of damaged heritage fabric to ensure the conservation of the scheduled historic heritage place.

References:

Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part)

Section B5:

Section D17:

Schedule 14.1 Historic Heritage Places


Sheldon, Katherine. Waikaraka Reserve Evaluation, prepared by the Auckland Council Heritage Unit 2013.

Waikaraka Park Project draft options summary – 30 August 2018.
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HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT – PROPOSED DEMOLITION
WAIKARAKA PARK GRANDSTAND

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has been commissioned by Auckland Council to determine the potential impacts that demolition of the grandstand would have on the heritage values of the Waikaraka Park and Cemetery.

In October 2015, Auckland Council ordered a suspension of public use of the grandstand, after advice from seismic experts that without additional strengthening it posed a considerable safety risk.\(^1\)

The Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board decided on 16 June 2016 that the grandstand should be condemned and demolished, based on inspections which had revealed that areas previously repaired were failing and the building was in deteriorated condition.\(^2\)

The condition of a place does not generally influence its significance. A place can be in poor condition but still be of cultural significance due to the heritage values associated with that place. Condition will be a consideration in determining the long term policies for a place and will need to be considered.

This assessment deals only with the impact of demolition on the heritage values of the Park and Cemetery. The issue of condition and associated costs and benefits of retaining or demolishing the building are separate matters that need to be separately assessed and considered.

We have not assessed any alternatives to the demolition proposal. We understand preliminary design of strengthening options had been prepared. We are not aware of any assessment on heritage values of these proposals.

We understand redevelopment of the park is being considered by Auckland Council but we have not reviewed or assessed any proposal or how they may impact or mitigate the proposed demolition of the grandstand.

1.1 Background

Waikaraka Park and Cemetery is included the schedule of historic heritage places, Scheduled 14.1 in the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part (AUP OP) as a Category B scheduled historic heritage place (item 1755).

Waikaraka Park, including the grandstand, is scheduled for its significant values including A) Historic values, B) Social Values and H) Context values.

The grandstand is identified as one of the key features within Waikaraka Park included in the heritage evaluation prepared by Auckland Council dated September 2013.

Post-1970s buildings, power pylons and all buildings along Captain Springs Road on the street side of the park wall are excluded from the scheduling.
Demolition of a primary feature or activities within the scheduled extent of place of Category B scheduled places is a discretionary activity and therefore requires discretionary resource consent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Demolition or destruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary feature Category A places</td>
<td>Primary feature Category A* places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assessment of effects in relation to built heritage values includes:

- Summary information about the scheduled historic place affected by the proposal
- Zoning
- Ownership and Use
- Overview of the significance of the scheduled historic heritage place
- Description of the site and building
- Description of the proposal
- Review of effects in relation to heritage values
- Consideration against relevant Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria

This evaluation considers the impact of demolition on the heritage values of the scheduled place. It does not consider why demolition might be considered physically necessary. No proposal for a replacement structure has been reviewed.
Figure 1: Aerial photograph, 2015. Auckland Council Geomaps. The location of the Grandstand in Waikaraka Park is circled in red.
1.2 Historic Heritage Place Affected by the Proposal

Heritage Protection

The Waikaraka grandstand is located in Waikaraka Park at 175-243 Neilson Street, 21 Waikaraka Road and 60 Captain Springs Road, Te Papapa. Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part.

Waikaraka Grounds and Cemetery is scheduled in Category B in Schedule 14.1 of the AUP OP.

The grandstand is identified as a key feature within Waikaraka Park, included in the heritage evaluation prepared by Auckland Council dated September 2013. It is not separately scheduled but rather covered as a single listing for the entire Park and Cemetery.

Section B5.2 of the Unitary Plan Operative in Part, sets out the objectives and policies relative to heritage. The Policy at 5.2.2 (1) is to identify and evaluate places of historic heritage value against a range of factors.

The relevant factors for which Waikaraka Park, including the grandstand, is scheduled for its significant values including:
(a) historical: the place reflects important or representative aspects of national, regional or local history, or is associated with an important event, person, group of people, or with an idea or early period of settlement within New Zealand, the region or locality;

(b) social: the place has a strong or special association with, or is held in high esteem by, a particular community or cultural group for its symbolic, spiritual, commemorative, traditional or other cultural value;

(h) context: the place contributes to or is associated with a wider historical or cultural context, streetscape, townscape, landscape or setting.

Post-1970s buildings, power pylons and all buildings along Captain Springs Road on the street side of the park wall are excluded from the scheduling.

Auckland Council’s historic heritage evaluation for Waikaraka Park and Cemetery should be referred to in conjunction with this heritage impact assessment. Further research, information and assessment of the grandstand specifically has recently been undertaken in conjunction with this heritage impact assessment. A separate Heritage Assessment (Draft February 2018) has been prepared for the Grandstand building.

The scheduled extent of place covers the following properties:

- PT ALLOT N45 Small Lots ONEHUNGA,
- PT ALLOT N46 Small Lots ONEHUNGA,
- PT ALLOT N61 Small Lots ONEHUNGA,
- PT ALLOT 47 Small Lots ONEHUNGA,
- PT ALLOT 48 Small Lots ONEHUNGA,
- PT ALLOT N44 Small Lots ONEHUNGA

This is as shown on the Auckland Unitary Plan maps (see below).

Waikaraka Park and Cemetery is not listed by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.

Zoning

The Waikaraka Park Grandstand is located in the Open Space- Sport and Active Recreation Zone. Waikaraka Cemetery is included in the Special Purpose Zone.
Ownership and Use

Waikaraka Park is owned by Auckland Council for sport and recreation purposes.

1.3 Significance of the Scheduled Historic Heritage Place

Waikaraka Park (including a Rifle Range and Cemetery) was the earliest designated space for recreation in Onehunga, acquired by the Onehunga Borough Council in 1883. Waikaraka Park has played an important role as a public space as well as in the history of sport and recreation in Onehunga. Waikaraka Park was used for meetings of the Onehunga Racing Club as well as for football, cricket, cycling and running.⁵

In 1936 Onehunga Borough Council extended the Waikaraka Cemetery through reclamation at the foreshore.⁶ Redevelopment of the reserve was also undertaken at a similar time to construct the grandstand, caretaker’s cottage and improve the playing fields and other facilities.

Plans for the grandstand were drawn up by the Onehunga Borough’s engineer, Hubert Reynolds Bach (1904-1995) in 1937.
Tenders were invited for the construction of the grandstand in reinforced concrete in September 1937. The grandstand had two tiers of seating with capacity for 3520 spectators. On the ground floor were separate dressing rooms and one large room for juniors. Following amendments to the specifications, fresh tenders were called for and the successful tenderer was well-known building contractor from Otahuhu, Thomas Clements. Construction was complete by the opening of the 1939-1940 cricket season in October 1939.

As noted above the place is considered to be of significance in terms of the following values: A) Historic, B) Social, and H) Context.

Based on information contained in the heritage evaluation prepared for Waikaraka Park and Cemetery by Auckland Council, and a further Heritage Assessment report (Draft February 2018) for the grandstand specifically, the significance of the grandstand is summarised below.

A) Historic Significance:

The Waikaraka Park grandstand is of considerable local significance for its historical values; constructed as part of the planned development of Waikaraka Park for recreational use by the Onehunga Borough Council in the 1930s. It was part of development plans announced by the Onehunga Borough Council in 1936 which included six football and cricket fields, a grandstand, a caretaker’s cottage, ambulance station and other modern equipment at Waikaraka Park. The grandstand is the most substantial structure built within the park and was opened in 1939 for the start of the cricket season. The grandstand served spectators of cricket in summer and rugby in winter for many decades before becoming dedicated to stock car speedway racing in 1967.

The Waikaraka Park grandstand has considerable local historic significance for its association with an important theme in the history of the Onehunga; representing the development of Waikaraka Park for sports and recreation by the Onehunga Borough Council in the 1930s.

B) Social Significance

The Waikaraka Park grandstand is of considerable local significance for its long association with sporting activities in Waikaraka Park, which was the home of the Manukau Rugby Club, the Onehunga Soccer Club and the Onehunga Cricket Association. Following the development of the stock car speedway in 1967 the grandstand has a long and well-known association stock car racing in Auckland.

H) Context

The Waikaraka Park grandstand is of considerable local significance in terms of its context values, contributing to the landscape designed for recreation at Waikaraka Park by the Onehunga Borough Council in the 1930s. It is a substantial building within the park and relates to other nearby structures including the Ticket Booth and stone walls. It is a significant component of the overall park.
Within the Auckland region it provides an example of a reasonably rare building type dating from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. A number of grandstands from this period in Auckland have been demolished, destroyed by fire or replaced through redevelopment over time.

The grandstand is noted as a ‘key feature’ within the Heritage Assessment for Waikaraka Park prepared by Auckland Council in October 2013, together with the ticket booth, the Waikaraka Cemetery and Soldiers Memorial, the 1942 Caretaker’s Cottage, relict entrances to the 1930s/1940s toilet block, sports fields, the 1948 toilet block and stone walls.

No conservation plan has been prepared for Waikaraka Park and Cemetery or the grandstand.

1.4 Description of the Site and Building

The late-1930s Waikaraka Park grandstand was designed in a simple modern style, suited to its reinforced concrete construction. Its design is stream-lined with shallow detailing in concrete; the form of the building expresses its function.

The Waikaraka Park grandstand is approximately 67 metres long by 11 metres wide (220 feet x 36 feet wide). It provides seating on two open tiers, with the ground floor used for dressing rooms and service areas.

Shallow pilasters divide the west elevation into 11 bays, which are each divided into three parts. The end elevations express the slope of the tiered seating, and the building was designed with a set of concrete stairs at either end.

Additional egress stairs have subsequently been provided to the west side of the grandstand.

The area beneath the lower tier of seating provides space for toilets, storage and other service area. The concrete structure to the underside of the seating is expressed and painted in these areas. Some walls are lined with tongue and groove timber linings or sheet linings. In other areas the concrete walls are expressed and painted.

A more detailed description is included in the Heritage Assessment (Draft February 2018)

1.5 Description of the Proposal - Demolition

Demolition of the grandstand is proposed due to its deteriorated structural condition. This includes the entire structure down to ground level. The existing slab and foundations are to be left in place. Any material that can be salvaged such as windows, doors and timber panelling will be retained and recycled.

It is proposed that the concrete structure and steel will be recycled where possible.
2.0 REVIEW OF EFFECTS AND IMPACT

The AUP OP notes in D17. Historic Heritage Overlay that:

Category B Places are historic heritage places that are of considerable significance to a locality or greater geographic area. Most scheduled historic heritage places are Category B

Objectives and Policies contained in section D17 of the AUP OP encourage the protection, maintenance, restoration and conservation of historic heritage places.

Policy 13 is:

(13) Avoid the total or substantial demolition or destruction of features (including buildings, structures or archaeological sites) within scheduled historic heritage places where it will result in adverse effects (including cumulative adverse effects) on the overall significance of the scheduled historic heritage place to the extent that the place would no longer meet the significance thresholds for the category it has been scheduled.

Policy 14 is:

(14) Avoid the total or substantial demolition or destruction of: (a) the primary features of Category A* and Category B scheduled historic heritage places;

Demolition of a primary feature of a Category B place, or Demolition within the scheduled extent of place of category B places are Discretionary Activities.

2.1 Consideration the Proposal against relevant Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria

Section D17.8. Assessment sets out the matters of discretion to be considered for restricted discretionary activities as set out below:

(Note: There are no separate Matters of Discretion for Discretionary Activities so its assumed that the Matters of discretion for restricted discretionary activities apply)

D17.8.1. Matters of discretion

The Council will restrict its discretion to the following matters when assessing a restricted discretionary resource consent application:

(1) for all restricted discretionary activities in Table D17.4.1 Activity table – Activities affecting Category A, A* and B scheduled places, Table D17.4.2 Activity table - Activities subject to additional archaeological rules and Table D17.4.3 Activity table – Activities in Historic Heritage Areas and for activities that do not meet one or more of the standards in D17.6:

(a) effects on the known heritage values of a historic heritage place from the scale, location, design, (including materials), duration and extent of the proposal, the construction methodology and associated site works;
(b) effects on the inter-relationship between buildings, structures and features within the place;

(c) effects of the proposal on the overall significance of the place;

(d) effects on the inter-relationship between contributing places within a Historic Heritage Area, including the views to, within or from the place or area;

(e) the purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered;

(f) effects of the proposal on the long-term viability and/or the ongoing functional use of the place;

(g) the provisions of a conservation plan where one has been prepared for the scheduled historic heritage place.

Section D17.8.2. of the AUP OP, sets out the assessment criteria the Council will consider for restricted discretionary activities.

Consideration of the proposed demolition is set out below in relation to these criteria:
Understandably, demolition does not avoid or mitigate adverse effects on heritage values.

(1) for restricted discretionary activities in Table D17.4.1 Activity table — Activities affecting Category A, A+ and B scheduled places, Table D17.4.2 Activity table - Activities subject to additional archaeological rules and Table D17.4.3 Activity table – Activities in Historic Heritage Areas:

(a) whether the proposed works will result in adverse effects (including cumulative adverse effects) on the heritage values of the place and the extent to which adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated;

The grandstand was identified as a key feature in the heritage evaluation prepared for Waikaraka Park and Cemetery. It is of heritage value in itself and as such contributes to the overall significance of Waikaraka Park in terms of its historic, social and context values.

The grandstand was planned and constructed as a key element within the larger park development and the historic and social values are derived from that association.

Its use in association with the sporting activities for which the park was planned and developed, also contributes to the historic and social values of the grandstand.

The grandstand is the principal built structure within the park, formed as part of a comprehensive 1930s site development, with a group of interrelated built elements. The value the grandstand makes to the overall site context and grouping of historic structures would be compromised with its removal. It is a key component of a collection of structures within the park, contributing to the overall significant of the place.
(b) whether the proposed works will maintain or enhance the heritage values of the place, including by:

(i) avoiding or minimising the loss of fabric that contributes to the significance of the place;

The total demolition of the grandstand will result in loss of fabric, in this case a building that contributes to the identified heritage values of Waikaraka Park. The grandstand was built as part of the Onehunga Borough Council’s development of the park for sport and recreation in the late 1930s.

(ii) removing features that compromise the heritage values of the place;

This is not relevant. Demolition of the grandstand is not removing a feature that compromises heritage values. It was identified as a key feature of Waikaraka Park in the historic heritage evaluation prepared by Auckland Council.

(iii) avoiding significant adverse effects on the place, having regard to the matters set out in B5 Built heritage and character;

B5 sets out the issues, policies and objectives relative to the identification, protection and of historic heritage (as well as the management and special character). The Explanation B5.4 notes there are two key components in managing historic heritage places and areas:

1. the recognition of their significance, which may include multiple values, and protection of items with significant values through restrictions on demolition and modification;

This has been achieved through the process of evaluation and scheduling of the park.

2. the protection of their values through appropriate use of them (including adaptive re-use) and appropriate management of their context, including other activities which may affect them.

The heritage values associated with the park are required to be protected. As noted above and set out in the heritage assessment, the grandstand contributes to these values. Therefore it is difficult to conclude that the total demolition of the grandstand would not have significant adverse impacts on the overall cultural significance of the park.

Demolition of the grandstand does not avoid significant adverse effects on the scheduled Waikaraka Park and Cemetery, in regards to matters set out in B5 Built Heritage and Character.

Demolition does not protect values through appropriate use.

(iv) complementing the form and fabric which contributes to, or is associated with, the heritage values of the place;

and
(v) recovering or revealing the heritage values of the place.

Neither of these criteria are relevant.

(c) whether the proposed works will compromise the ability to interpret features within the place and the relationship of the place to other scheduled historic places;

The park was designed and laid out based on a comprehensive development proposal in the 1930s. The location of the grandstand and the other built elements including the ticket booth and enclosing walls are interrelated and connected.

Demolition of the grandstand removes the ability to interpret that particular built structure within Waikaraka Park, and its relationship to associated structures such as the ticket booth and stone walls surrounding the park.

(d) whether the proposed works, including the cumulative effects of proposed works, will result in adverse effects on the overall significance of the place such that it no longer meets the significance thresholds for which it was scheduled;

Demolition of the grandstand could contribute to a cumulative adverse effect on the historic heritage values of Waikaraka Park, because it was the most substantial structure built in the 1930s and 1940s associated with the sporting and recreational use of the park.

(e) whether the proposed works will be undertaken in accordance with good practice conservation principles and methods appropriate to the heritage values of the place;

As it is proposed to demolish the building this criteria is not relevant.

(f) whether the proposal contributes to, or encourages, the long-term viability and/or ongoing functional use of the place;

The grandstand has contributed to the long term use of Waikaraka Park initially as a sports ground and more recently as a speedway venue. A replacement purpose-built grandstand would mitigate the loss of this function. This application does not include proposals for the ongoing use or development of facilities.

(g) whether modifications to buildings, structures, or features specifically for seismic strengthening:

This is not applicable.

(i) consider any practicable alternative methods available to achieve the necessary seismic standard that will reduce the extent of adverse effects on the significance of the place; and

(ii) take into account the circumstances relating to the ongoing use and retention of the place that affect the level of seismic resilience that is necessary to be achieved.
(h) whether the proposed relocation of features, within or beyond scheduled extents of place, in addition to the criteria above;

(i) is necessary in order to provide for significant public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved; and

(ii) the significant public benefit outweighs the retention of the feature in its existing location within the extent of place.

This is not applicable.

3.0 CONCLUSION

Demolition of the grandstand will inevitably result in the complete loss of the late-1930s building which formed an important part of the development of Waikaraka Park by Onehunga Borough Council for sport and recreation at this time.

The grandstand is identified as a key feature in the scheduling of Waikaraka Park, together with other buildings and structures including the caretaker’s cottage, ticket booth, toilets, cemetery and Soldiers Memorial and stone walls.

While no proposal for replacement grandstand structure has been reviewed, a replacement grandstand would mitigate the loss of the function of the building, which has contributed historically to the use of Waikaraka Park.

Notwithstanding the condition of the building and likely cost to retain it, on balance we believe the demolition of the grandstand would have a significant adverse impact on the cultural significance of the park and cemetery as it is an important component of that place.

Matthews & Matthews Architects Ltd, 22 02 2018
APPENDIX 1: Photographs Matthews & Matthews Architects Ltd 2017

West elevation. MMA December 2017.

South Elevation

Left: View towards the tiered seating. Right: View along tiered seating MMA December 2017.

Toilets and storage areas located below tiered seating. MMA December 2017.
View towards the east side of the grandstand. MMA December 2017.
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#### Item 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue options</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Full Repair**
- **Replace**
- **Use Present Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPGRADE INVESTMENT</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT</th>
<th>REMOVAL</th>
<th>REMOVAL</th>
<th>UPGRADE INVESTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Meaningful use only**
- **Replacement**
- **Removal**
- **Meaningful use only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REMOVAL</th>
<th>REMOVAL</th>
<th>REMOVAL</th>
<th>REMOVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Upgrade Involves**
- **Replacement**
- **Removal**
- **Upgrade Involves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REMOVAL</th>
<th>REMOVAL</th>
<th>REMOVAL</th>
<th>REMOVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Option 1**
- **Option 2**
- **Option 3**
- **Option 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Waikaraka Park Grandstand**
- **Meaningful use only**
- **Removal**
- **Meaningful use only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waikaraka Park Grandstand</th>
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Taniwha Reserve concept design
File No.: CP2019/00419

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval for Taniwha Reserve Concept Design (Attachment A) and to approve the preparation of developed design and resource consent applications for the concept design.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. A concept design has been completed for the redevelopment of Taniwha Reserve, Glen Innes (Attachment A).
3. This reserve upgrade is required to support the proposed residential intensification planned in the Tāmaki area over the coming years.
4. Public consultation, mana whenua and local board views have been sought and included as part of the development of the concept design.
5. Budget of $2.48 million is available for implementation of the concept design and cost estimates indicate the design is deliverable within budget.
6. This report seeks approval of the concept design and approval to prepare developed design and resource consent applications for the concept design.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) approve the Taniwha Reserve Concept Design (Attachment A)

b) approve the preparation of developed design and resource consent applications for the concept design.

Horopaki
Context

7. Taniwha Reserve is located in the Tāmaki Regeneration area, which is a spatial priority area identified for growth. It requires redevelopment to support the anticipated increase in population and to support water quality outcomes for Omaru Creek.
8. This reserve is the first in a number of reserves proposed for redevelopment and is able to be delivered in a coordinated approach, alongside the first stage of the Tāmaki Regeneration residential developments.
9. Taniwha Reserve is one of three reserves which follow Omaru Creek in an arc around the north eastern side of the Glen Innes town centre, with Eastview Reserve immediately upstream and Maybury Reserve downstream. These reserves all provide a stormwater function for the area, as well as connecting adjacent neighbourhoods and providing off-road walking/cycling connections.
10. The local board endorsed the feasibility phase design in September 2017 allowing for the public consultation and concept design phase to proceed (MT/2017/186).
11. In July 2018 the board endorsed two land exchanges, subject to completion of the required statutory process, that result in parts of the existing Taniwha Reserve being developed for
residential uses, in exchange for areas of existing residential land being incorporated into the reserve (MT/2018/117). These land exchanges will enable improved safety and surveillance through provision of wider, more open street frontages, better sight lines through the reserves and the establishment of better relationships between built form and open areas.

12. The Planning Committee approved public notification of the plan changes in November 2018 (PLA/2018/129). The statutory process for these land exchanges is currently progressing, with a final outcome expected within the next six months.

13. The Taniwha Reserve development is able to proceed without the proposed land exchanges, however, significant improvements in safety and surveillance would be achieved if they did proceed.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Local board input into concept design development

14. A draft concept design was presented to the local board at a workshop on 30 October 2018 for discussion and feedback, resulting in a number of minor changes including:

- removal of fruit trees from the concept design
- maximising the open space on Taniwha Street.

15. These changes were incorporated into the concept design in preparation for the public consultation phase.

Public input into concept design development

16. Public consultation on the concept design was undertaken between 1 November 2018 and 30 November 2018. The aim of the consultation was to raise awareness of the project, to explain the key objectives of delivering a well-connected and safe public space, and to provide the opportunity for public input into the design to ensure the final concept design reflected their needs and aspirations.

17. Feedback was received from a small number of submitters, and was generally supportive of the concept design. No specific changes to the concept design were made as a result of the consultation process.

18. The outcome from the consultation process was presented to the local board in early February 2019 and the full response is attached to this report (Attachment B).

Final concept design for approval

19. Following the consultation phase and a value engineering exercise to bring the project in line with available budgets, the concept design has been finalised and is attached to this report: Taniwha Reserve Concept Design (Attachment A).

20. Key features of the concept design include:

- A new shared cycle/pedestrian path network that improves connectivity through the reserve, between adjacent neighbourhoods and to the Glen Innes town centre and train station.
- Improvements in stormwater management, including the establishment of a stormwater wetland that will lead to benefits in water quality, biodiversity and stream health as well as providing additional capacity for the proposed residential development. These benefits will have a flow-on effect to water quality in reserves downstream – in particular Maybury Reserve, which it is noted is a high local board priority for redevelopment.
- Landscaping, furniture and signage that will help to improve the open space quality of the reserve as well as aiding in wayfinding and encouraging public use of the
reserve. This in turn will lead to benefits in safety through an increase in passive surveillance.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe**

**Local impacts and local board views**

21. The concept design reflects key local board objectives as stated in the local board plan including:
   - Outcome 1: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community
   - Outcome 2: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is a community that cares about its environment
   - Outcome 4: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has quality infrastructure to match growth

22. Benefits include:
   - improved pedestrian connectivity through the reserve and between adjacent neighbourhoods
   - improved safety and surveillance through land exchanges, vegetation management and provision of lighting
   - improved stormwater capacity and management through development of the stormwater wetland
   - improved water quality, biodiversity and ecological function through riparian planting
   - improved general amenity values and cultural heritage through the provision of park furniture, landscaping and interpretive signage.

23. The entire reserve is likely to be fenced off during the construction period for health and safety reasons. This will impact the general public for the duration of the physical works phase preventing use of and access through the reserve.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

24. Parks and heritage is of fundamental importance to mana whenua and their culture and traditions. The development discussed in this report will benefit Māori and the wider community through increased access to recreational opportunities, and improved connections between local communities.

25. Additionally, and of primary importance to both mana whenua and to this development, is the restoration of the Omaru Creek along with significant stormwater management solutions, which are intended to improve the water quality and biodiversity of the stream and riparian environment.

26. Engagement with mana whenua included presentation of this project at the south/central mana whenua forum, as well as a site walkover with interested iwi.

27. Mana whenua engagement is ongoing allowing for the incorporation of a cultural layer into the design detail as well as ensuring cultural aspirations especially with respect to environmental outcomes and kaitiakitanga are respected.

28. Interpretive signage is being developed with mana whenua, which will address environmental outcomes as well as local history and will be placed in key locations throughout the reserve.
Financial implications

29. The following budget has been approved for this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget source</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities (local park growth)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy waters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,560,000</td>
<td>1,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmaki Infrastructure Investment Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,484,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Cost estimates for the concept design indicate that it can be delivered within the available budget.

Risks and mitigations

31. Failure to secure approval for the proposed land exchanges will impact on the ability of this development to improve overall safety and surveillance in the reserve.

32. Timing of project delivery is aimed to coincide with the significant residential development underway by TRC. Any major hold-ups will result in the new residents moving in with sub-optimal recreational facilities.

Next steps

33. Following local board approval of the concept design, resource consent will be lodged followed by developed and detailed design phases.

34. Physical works is anticipated to commence late 2019.
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Taniwha Reserve Public Consultation

Public consultation on the proposed Taniwha Reserve concept design was undertaken between 1 November and 30 November 2018. The aim of the consultation was to raise awareness of the project, to explain the key objectives of delivering a well-connected and safe public space and to provide the opportunity for public input into the design to ensure the final concept design reflected their needs and aspirations.

Feedback was sought through the following methods:

Online presence
- draft proposals, summary of project and questionnaire for public feedback posted on:
  - ‘Have your say’ website
  - Local Board facebook page
  - Neighbourly website.

Local Board office and Glen Innes Library
- draft proposals, summary of project and questionnaire for public feedback available as hard copy or directed to online platform.

Public Open Day
- sausage sizzle and ‘meet and greet’ at Grace International Church opposite Taniwha Reserve where proposals were discussed with the public
- draft proposals, summary of project and questionnaire for public feedback available as hard copy or directed to online platform.

Key stakeholders
- draft proposals, summary of project and questionnaire emailed directly to key stakeholders with the offer of face to face meeting if required.

Overall we had a small response from the public consultation however the outcome generally supported our proposals as summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Design provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What activities do you use the reserve for?</td>
<td>• Walking</td>
<td>• Shared pedestrian/cycle paths providing multiple access points, choice of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Walking the dog</td>
<td>routes through the reserve and providing opportunity to engage with the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cycling</td>
<td>• Restoration of the stream including riparian planting and significant tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enjoying the natural environment</td>
<td>planting to establish improved ecology and habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recreational activities</td>
<td>• Flat grassed open spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relaxing/sitting/sunbathing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you like most about the reserve?</td>
<td>• I love the ability to be in nature, get out of suburbia for a little</td>
<td>• Restoration of the stream including riparian planting and significant tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>while, enjoy the bird songs and the beautiful views and peace of it</td>
<td>planting to establish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• That it’s a green space that follows the river,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Is there anything about the reserve you would like to see improved?** | **Taniwha Reserve concept design**  
allowing users to connect with nature, you can follow the river for quite a way, and this has the potential to be a real asset to the area. The reserve is only a short walk from the GI town centre with all of its challenges, but it could be a world away. I like the name too.  
- Dog friendly  
- Creek and trees - established growth and potential for a diverse ecology  
- Path - Access point from Epping St to Line Rd and Taniwha St.  

| **Improved ecology and habitat** | **Attachment A**  
- Shared pedestrian/cycle paths providing multiple access points, choice of routes through the reserve and providing opportunity to engage with the stream  

| **The nature of Taniwha Reserve does not support providing formal playground facilities. However, an open gathering space could be provided. How might you like to use this space?** | **Item 15**  
- The quality of the planting - more natives, less pest species! But also the maintenance of the vegetation: Planting for bird life. Canopy coverage is needed too.  
The quality of the waterway - allowing for improved habitat for aquatic life - yes please. It could be such a cool area, and it feels like it has been forgotten or ignored for a long time.  
- Sightlines into the reserve. Connection to the other reserves. I walkbike with my dogs from Eastview reserve and the driveway I use to come down has no grate over the drain. I know about this problem but people who don’t would hurt themselves. The connection between the reserves is dummy and not pedestrian/ bike friendly.  
- Water cleanliness  
- Better walk ways.  
- Safer environment.  
- Accessibility and lighting  
- Rubbish and vegetation removal  

| **Restoration of the stream including riparian planting and significant tree planting to establish improved ecology and habitat** | **Taniwha Reserve concept design**  
- Development of wetland to manage significant stormwater events, improve water quality and create natural habitat  

| **Establishment of greenway through reserve which will continue upstream through Eastview Reserve and downstream into Maybury Reserve when these reserves are developed – approach to road crossings between these reserves are being discussed with AT** | **Item 15**  
- Lighting to the main greenway route through the reserve  

| **Establishment of viewing points with outlook over the wetland and stream including a range of seating options** | **Taniwha Reserve concept design**  
- Flat open grassed area proposed at both Taniwha Street and Epping Street entrance  

- Could be good for picnics and concerts.  
- I really support the idea of seating, picnic and viewing points especially focussed towards the river - the hero of the reserve and the reason the park exists. The main way I would use it is a spot to eat lunch and take in the bird life.  
I think the bridge is a really strong idea to draw attention to the area. It will be great to create connections and linkages both for housing in local area, but also for people using the river route for recreation. I love the wider paths to allow for improved circulation for cycling.  

- This would not be a good idea without the support of improved sightlines. The only space I have seen is behind the flats on the corner of Line Road and Taniwha Street. This could decrease privacy for those residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have any other comments about Taniwha Reserve and/or the proposed upgrade?</th>
<th>Item 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any other comments about Taniwha Reserve and/or the proposed upgrade?</td>
<td>Engagement with mana whenua will see the development of interpretation signage to be included in the reserve at key locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Picnics or football</td>
<td>• Keep dog owners happy and interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family picnics. Set up a dog only fenced area so dog owners can have their dogs off lead and socialising in a safe and secure space.</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A nice place to rest</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It feels like a missed opportunity to not have some sort of playground facilities there.</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, for an open gathering space, benches should be provided for the public to feel invited in. This could be used potentially for picnics or personal training activities (Bootcamp). The re-design of the reserve is going to need to some serious thought, in order to make it feel like a valuable and usable green space in the area.</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the idea of additional interpretation or histories for the park. Often people need a bit of a prompt - it gives visitors and users of the park a talking point.</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not a big fan of lighting as a solution to security issues. There is enough light pollution in the world already. Nature needs down time, just as people do.</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d like to see the introduction of pollution (rubbish) filters for the awa as is used in other wetlands - to stop litter from making its way to Tamaki Estuary.</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I think it is overdue but I am grateful for this work.</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People and pet friendly environment. Cleaner reserve and water ways.</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure parking alongside the areas and lights for safe use</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remove the large vegetation (or preferably all vegetation) from alongside the creek to make it more visible from the path. This would also allow the mowing contractors to keep these areas maintained and prevent dumping rubbish into the creek and people congregating in these areas and leaving rubbish. Ensure any broken branches are removed so the mowing contractors can mow rather than going around them, which then creates unsightly areas. Remove vegetation from alongside the fence lines. I have noticed where there is no vegetation in these areas the dumping of rubbish is minimal or non-existent.</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extremely happy this is going to be upgraded. Whilst it is a shame that no playground facilities are going to be put in I appreciate that there are going to be playgrounds at Maybury and other reserves. If this is the case can Auckland Council and Auckland Transport please consider safe pedestrian crossing options on Taniwha Street.</td>
<td>• Provide seating faces the creek and reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concept Plan - Update
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board to name a new private road, being a jointly owned access lot, at 105 Taniwha Street, Glen Innes (Fenchurch 3B) (Special Housing Area).

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. Auckland Council has Road Naming Guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across the Auckland Region.

3. The Applicant, Tāmaki Regeneration Company ("TRC"), has proposed the following names for consideration by the local board:

PREFERRED NAME:
- Parbhubhai Makan Lane

POOL OF ALTERNATIVE NAMES:
- Makan Lane
- Patel Lane
- Tupuna Lane
- Lumanai Lane

4. The proposed road names have been assessed to ensure that they meet Auckland Council’s Road Naming Guidelines and the National Addressing Standards for road naming. Mana whenua were also consulted.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) Approve the name (local board to insert chosen name) for the new private road created by way of subdivision at 105 Taniwha Street, Glen Innes (Fenchurch 3B) in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 (resource consent reference BUN60078179, SUB60225329-A).

Horopaki

Context
5. Resource consent BUN60078179, SUB60225329-A was issued 23 November 2018 for the construction of 20 new houses, 5 of which will be state, between Taniwha Street and Fenchurch Street, under the Housing Accords and Special Housing Area Act 2013.
6. In accordance with the National Addressing Standards for road naming (the AS/NZS 4819-2011 standard), the JOAL requires a road name because it serves more than 5 lots.

7. Site and location plans of the development can be found in Attachments A and B respectively.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

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

9. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect one of the following local themes, with the use of Maori names being actively encouraged:
   – a historical or ancestral linkage to an area;
   – a particular landscape, environmental or biodiversity theme or feature; or
   – an existing (or introduced) thematic identity in the area.

10. **Theme:** The application has selected names that reflect the current cultural diversity and community history of this neighbourhood in Glen Innes.

11. **Te Reo names:** The application would like to note that since redevelopment of Glen Innes and Pt England under TRC’s remit (including the transfer of Housing New Zealand Corp subdivisions, but excluding Northern Glen Innes with Creating Communities Ltd as developer), 38 new road names have been required to date. Of those 38 new roads, 17 are named in Te Reo with another two named after former Māori residents. Eight of the 38 roads are in Pasifica languages (Cook Island Maori or Samoan) or derived from a former Pasifica resident. The balance of 11 new roads have English names, which includes five that retained existing road names due to being an extension of a road. Te Reo Māori is therefore represented by exactly half of the existing new roads within Tāmaki Regeneration’s current developments.

12. The Applicant’s proposed names and meanings are set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road reference</th>
<th>Preferred Name</th>
<th>Meaning (as described by applicant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOAL</td>
<td>Parbhubhai Makan Lane</td>
<td>The personal name of a (deceased) local business owner and operator whose family businesses have been run in the same location in Glen Innes for almost 40 years. This proposed name is preferred by the applicant as it provides uniqueness over a common Indian surname. This name adds weight to the positive character of diverse culture in Tāmaki not otherwise seen on Tāmaki’s street names. Written support acknowledging Mr Parbhubhai Makan Patel’s sponsorship for community schools and groups can be found in Attachment C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. TRC has provided a pool of names that can be used as alternatives for Fenchurch 3B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Name</th>
<th>Meaning (as described by applicant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makan Lane</td>
<td>Alternative name for the preferred proposed name (above) supporting acknowledgement of a long-standing businessman and supporter of the local community. Suggested by the relatives of Mr Patel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patel Lane</td>
<td>Alternative name for the preferred proposed name (above) supporting acknowledgement of a long-standing businessman and supporter of the local community. Suggested by the relatives of Mr Patel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tupuna Lane</td>
<td>Te Reo Māori word meaning: (noun) ancestors, grandparents [western dialect variation of tipuna]. Submitted by a member of the community: “to remember who stayed on these lands before time”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumanai Lane</td>
<td>[Lumana’i] Samoan word meaning: “the future’, (verb) to have before one, to have in prospect, either of time or place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. **Assessment:** The names proposed by the Applicant have been assessed to ensure that they meet Auckland Council’s Road Naming Guidelines and the National Addressing Standards for road naming.

15. **Confirmation:** Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) has confirmed that all of the proposed names are acceptable and not duplicated elsewhere in the region.

16. **Road type:** ‘Lane’ is an acceptable road type for the new private road, suiting the form and layout of the road, as per the Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines.

17. **Iwi Consultation:** All relevant local iwi were written to (via email) and invited to comment. Te Kawerau a Maki and Te Ahiwaru Waiohua both support the name ‘Tupuna’, as they commented that they preferred Te Reo names. Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara, Te Kawerau a Maki, and Manuhiri Kaitiaki responded to defer their interests to the other Ngāti Whatua entities, who in turn provided no further responses or comments.

18. No objections or additional comments were raised by mana whenua for any of the other proposed names.

19. **Community Consultation:** Proposed road names have been produced via consultation with the community and key stakeholder groups, such as TRC’s Community Liaison Committee, Lalaga Pasifiki, the Glen Innes and Panmure Business Associations, and other community organisations.

20. **Permission:** from relatives has been obtained for the use of the name Parbhubhai Makan.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views**

21. The decision sought for this report has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report’s advice.
22. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate impact on the community.

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

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

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

26. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand who records them on their New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by councils.
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Attachment A: Site Plan for Fenchurch 3B

Fenchurch Master Plan
Site Plan for Fenchurch 3B
December 10, 2018 ---

Roselle Busmussen

Project Coordinator

Tamaki Regeneration

Dear Roselle and Local Board

Thank you for your email. The Patel family’s desire to have the JOAL named after our grandfather.

Late Mr Patel In 1951 he went to Uganda. On his first voyage with his mother, he helped his father setting up a small electrical store in Kampala. In 1955 he went back to India and married Kashiben returned to Uganda and continued running the shop.

In 1973 they had to leave Uganda under duress leaving their business and possession behind.

The family under British citizenship went to England after spending about six months they decided to come and settle in New Zealand. The Patels arrived in Auckland in 1973, as refugees escaping Ugandan dictator Idi Amin’s regime. In 1974 Mr Patel bought a fruit shop in Herne Bay which he ran with the family till 1982. The family purchased a second business in Glen Innes which they currently own and operate Fenchurch Street

Mr Patel coming to New Zealand and with nothing was the father figure and his commitment and dedication ensured that the family remain united and happy over the years. Mr Patel has achieved many things and left behind a huge legacy for the rest of the family to continue and enhance. The business is now run by the three Patel brothers, Morris, Vas and Praf and Sons Rupesh and Prashant. The respect the family has built up during its long history in the community the family sponsors more than 20 local sports teams and community groups. The Family always willing to help out. The family future developments of their properties surrounding the Fenchurch Conner shops are under way and working with current developers and Tamaki Redevelopment to make a community friendly shopping and apartment complex. The Property will be retained for family investments.

Family always heart been in Glen Innes and all the kids grown up in the community. Family all ways willing to help in the community. Having a street named after Mr Patel would be in great remembrance of him and the family that’s been in the area for 37 years. Will continue to be here for a long time coming.

On behalf of the Estate Of late Mr Parbhubhai Makan Patel. We family members and trustees of trusts of Mr Patels are all for Naming the JOAL.

Names the Family have suggested are: 1)Makan Street, Way, Cres or Patel Street, Way, Cres ect.
Yours Sincerely

Rupesh Patel
DDI: (09) 215 8475 or (09)215 8474
Phone: (09)276 8185
Fax: (09)270 2021
Email: rupesh@falcon.co.nz

Signed from family members below.

1. Kashiben Parbhubhai Patel
2. Manher Patel
3. Vasant Patel
4. Praful Patel
5. Kanchan Patel
6. Lataiben C Patel
7. Falguniben K Patel
8. Rupesh Patel
9. Deepika Patel
10. Bindiya Patel
11. Prashant Patel
12. Anjali Patel
13. Priyal Patel
14. Krisha Patel
217 Riddell rd
Glendowie
Auckland

15 November 2018

To Whom it may concern

Support from Fenchurch Superette and Liquor

I know the owners of Fenchurch from 1998 when I arrived here in Auckland. Glendowie is one of the local schools in the area that Fenchurch support.

We get all our soft drinks and water sponsored at every Weetbix tryathlon (this was more than 20 tryathlons) as well as at the Auckland marathon for kids. We also had bread and other drinks at cost. With our recent athletics championship we had water bottles sponsored for the officials. Last year I was given a bowling machine and cricket equipment to support our cricket skills here at school.

Our Parent association also get sponsorship with about all the functions they run. I also know that Fenchurch do reach out to all other schools and communities around the Bay/East area.

I can just reiterate the awesome support we get from Fenchurch every time we need something or help.

Please accept this letter on behalf of all our 650 students and parents of this school and community. Many thanks Fenchurch and your team!!!

Kind regards

Peter Kloppers
Sport and Property Manager / Staff Rep / Health and Safety Rep / Bay Suburbs Sport Chairman / Eastern Zone Year 7/8 Sports Chairman
15th November 2018

Dear Rupesh and the team at Makan

I want to thank Makan for being a part of the Special Children’s Christmas Party, both financially and supplying product, for a number of years.

Our event is not possible without the support of companies such as Makan. Your loyal support for many years has helped me to put big smiles on thousands of little faces each and every Christmas!

These children haven’t had the best start to life, so we give them a day where they feel like the lucky ones for a change. Children who are suffering from life-threatening illness, physical or mental impairment or under-privileged backgrounds...our day gives them a day many of them don’t normally receive, but one that they truly deserve.

I love the fact that you have personally attended the event as a sponsor, so you have seen what your sponsorship achieves, but you have also managed to see what a difference your support has made for these children.

Thank you not only from me, but more importantly on their behalf!

Kind Regards

Darren Bailey
Area Manager
NZME & SKY Television Special Children’s Christmas Party
Special Children’s Christmas Party Facebook link
www.scepnz.co.nz
27th November 2018

To whom it may concern

Support for Street Name after the family

Please accept this letter as endorsement from Sport Waitakere for the Makan Group and family application for a street name after the family.

Sport Waitakere has been serving the West Auckland community since 1991, with the key aims of both increasing participation in sport and recreation, as well as improving the capability of sport/recreation providers (such as clubs, schools and community organisations), for the direct benefit of our community. Part of my role at Sport Waitakere as the Community Access Scheme Project Manager is focused around enabling the community to access school facilities including bike tracks, swimming pools and courts/sport spaces. The other part of my role is being the Project Manager for The Trusts Sport Waitakere Excellence Awards.

The Makan Group has supported Sport Waitakere over the past 5 years by donating multiple trays or Flow Water for our community events that are held in schools and parks across West Auckland. More recently the donation of Flow Water for The Trusts Sport Waitakere Excellence Awards 2018.

Please feel free to contact me for any further information.

Yours sincerely

Deepika Unka
Community Access Scheme Project Manager

96 Swanson Road, PO Box 21065, Henderson, Auckland 0850
Tel: +64 9 966 3120 Fax: +64 9 912 2991
www.sportwaitakere.nz
16 November 2018
Letter of support for Fenchurch Liquor

To whom it may concern

I would like to formally write in support of Fenchurch Liquor and the Patel family. I have known the family for approximately 17 years in a number of roles within the Liquor industry. I have had both a personal and professional relationship with them.

The family have long been an icon business within the Liquor industry and also within the local community. They have continually supported the local community in all aspects ... from sponsorship of local school events through to business and sport support. I have been a recipient of their support myself with representative touch teams in the wider Auckland catchment.

The family have always acted in a very professional manner within the liquor industry and have always adhered to the laws that we are governed by within this trade. They have provided employment opportunities and also provide a very safe work environment and have a number of long terms employees which I believe is testament to this.

I would be more than happy to provide verbal reference to this should it be required.

Yours sincerely

Joe Kurukaanga
North Island Traditional Liquor Sales Manager
Hancocks Beer, Wines and Spirits
Email – joek@hancocks.co.nz
Mob – 021 821437
To whom it may concern

My name is Viv James and I run the Race4Life Trust. This fabulous registered charity fulfils the wishes of Palliative Care Patients throughout New Zealand. We are a volunteer-based organisation. All of the funds we raise go to the Wish Service if you have a moment please do take a look at our website and Facebook Page to read some of our beautiful stories.

http://facebook.com/race4lifetrust
www.race4life.co.nz

Plus, Race4Life put on an annual event for patients at Hampton Downs Raceway. It is a hoot of a day with 70 patients and 300 volunteers descending on the raceway for a day full of high-octane rides!
Have a look at the video. (a good distraction from work!)

https://www.dropbox.com/s/oh6e6qicjcbim2/RACE4LIFE%20Hampton%20Downs%202018%20over.3.mp4?dl=0

I am writing to you regarding Fenchurch Liquor and the part that Praf and his team, have played over the years in supporting the work we do. The Trust is involved in many fundraisers and patient events, throughout the calendar year. There has never been an occasion where Fenchurch have let us down. The discounts they offer for special patient or stakeholder events are unmatched, and they reflect the compassion and kindness which runs deep in the culture of their business.

As a local in the area, I do notice the consistency by which they operate. The Fenchurch crew respect all their customers and staff and very community conscious. Race4Life Trust enjoy our relationship with Fenchurch Liquor and feel very safe in the knowledge that we are dealing with good people who are doing all they can to make a difference in our community.

If you would like further comment, please do not hesitate to contact me on 021883669

Viv James
General Manager
Race4Life Trust
Dear Jarel family,

Thank you for letting me know about wanting to have a street, lane or road named after your father.

You all are part of Glen Innes and have been for 38 years. You support our community schools, families, helping out where ever you can.

It would be a loving tribute to your mother, father and family should this come about.

On behalf of myself and my family we support you and wish you all the best.

Aroha nui,
Julia Thompson (Nan)
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board with an integrated quarterly performance report for quarter two, 1 October – 31 December 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report includes financial performance, progress against work programmes, key challenges the board should be aware of and any risks to delivery against the 2018/2019 work programme. This is a retrospective report intended to provide a transparent overview and reflect the progress of how the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board work programme is tracking at the end of quarter two 2018/2019.

3. The work programme is produced annually and aligns with the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan outcomes.

4. The key activity updates from this quarter are:
   • the local board allocated $23,387 through its second local community grant round
   • funding has been secured from the Community Empowerment Unit (CEU) Innovation Fund, to capture the history and stories of Ruapotaka Marae, as well as learnings from the redevelopment project
   • the Strategic Partnerships Broker was appointed, and expressions of interest have been received for the first round of the strategic partnerships fund
   • funding agreements were signed with Synergy Projects and the 312 Hub to deliver youth initiatives in the Maungakiekie area
   • the community response fund has been completely spent and now has a nil balance
   • the Youth Connections activity has been permanently transferred from the Community Empowerment Team to The Southern Initiative to deliver.

5. There are some activities in the local board’s 2018/2019 work programme (Attachment A) that are below budget. This funding is available to be reallocated to the following activities:
   • local community grants
   • local civic events
   • industry pollution prevention programme.

6. All operating departments with agreed work programmes have provided a quarterly update against their work programme delivery. Most activities are reported with a status of green (on track), amber (some risk or issues, which are being managed) or grey (cancelled, deferred or merged).

7. The financial performance report compared to the 2018/2019 budget is attached. There are some points for the local board to note:
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
26 February 2019

Item 17

- The 2017/2018 approved operating expenditure carry forward has now been included in the revised budget. Further project details are available in the Quarter 2 Work Programme (Attachment A)
- The overall operating result is five percent below budget due to higher operating revenue and lower operating expenditure
- Revenue is above budget due to miscellaneous income from libraries, community leases and Te Oro Music and Arts Centre
- Operating expenditure is four percent below budget, mainly in locally driven initiatives (LDI) expenditure as projects are still in progress
- Capital expenditure is above budget by 280 percent.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive the performance report for the financial quarter ending 31 December 2018.

b) reallocate the following 2018/2019 locally driven initiative operating expenditure budgets to the activity, local community grants:
   i) $7,000 from the activity, youth connections;
   ii) $3,500 from the activity, local events programme – Onehunga Christmas Lights event.

c) reallocate the following 2018/2019 locally driven initiative operating expenditure budgets to the activity, local civic events:
   i) $7,000 from the parks, sport and recreation service provision budget.

d) reallocate the following 2018/2019 locally driven initiative operating expenditure budgets to the activity, Industry Pollution Prevention Programme:
   i) $20,000 from the activity, community awareness and community led riparian restoration.

Horopaki

Context

8. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board has an approved 2018/2019 work programme for the following operating departments:
   - Arts, Community and Events;
   - Parks, Sport and Recreation;
   - Libraries and Information;
   - Community Services: Service, Strategy and Integration;
   - Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew;
   - Community Leases;
   - Infrastructure and Environmental Services;
   - The Southern Initiative;
   - Plans and Places.
9. Work programmes are produced annually, to meet the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board outcomes identified in the three-year Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan. The local board plan outcomes are:

- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is a community that cares about its environment
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is the place to be
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has quality infrastructure to match growth.

10. The graph below shows how the work programme activities meet Local Board Plan outcomes. Activities that are not part of the approved work programme but contribute towards the local board outcomes, such as advocacy by the local board, are not captured in this graph.

Graph 1: work programme activities by outcome

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Local Board Work Programme Snapshot

11. The work programme activities have two statuses; RAG status which measures the performance of the activity (amber and red show issues and risks); and activity status which shows the stage of the activity. These two statuses create a snapshot of the progress of the work programmes.

12. The graph below identifies work programme activity by RAG status (red, amber, green and grey). It shows the percentage of work programme activities that are on track (green), in progress but with issues that are being managed (amber), and activities that have significant issues (red) and activities that have been cancelled/deferred/merged (grey).

Graph 2: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Work Programme by RAG status
The graph below identifies work programme activity by activity status and department. The number of activity lines differ by department as approved in the local board work programmes.

Key activity updates from quarter two

14. **Local community grants:** the local board completed its second local grants round of the financial year. A total of $23,387 was allocated, leaving $37,865 for the final local grants round of the financial year.

15. **Riverside Community Centre programme delivery:** a trading room has been set-up for the local community. This is a space where the community can contribute and take clothing and household goods.

16. **Ruapotaka Marae support:** funding has been secured from the Community Empowerment Unit (CEU) Innovation Fund, to capture the history and stories of Ruapotaka Marae, as well as learnings from the redevelopment project, using pūrākau methodology.

17. **Strategic Partnerships:** the Strategic Partnerships Broker has been appointed and expressions of interests have been received for initiatives to be supported by the strategic partnerships fund. Staff will be bringing their recommendations for the first round of partnership funding in quarter three. Funding agreements were signed with Synergy Projects and the 312 Hub to deliver youth initiatives in the Maungakiekie area.
18. **Ready to Rent**: a series of pilot workshops will be delivered in Oranga in quarter three. These workshops will be adapted to other Maungakiekie-Tāmaki communities in quarter four.

19. **Community response fund**: the remaining $6,000 budget was used to write off arrears owed by the Panmure Squash Rackets Club Incorporated. This budget has been completely spent and now has a balance of nil.

20. **Youth Connections**: this activity has been permanently transferred from the Community Empowerment Team to The Southern Initiative to deliver.

21. **Experiential learning and action for water in schools**: there is a delay in delivery due to procurement. Programme delivery is still in progress and expected to remain on track.

22. **Healthy Rentals**: the end-of-year report was provided to the local board in November. This project is now complete.

23. **The following Community Facilities projects are now complete**:
   - Glen Innes Library – renew CCTV system
   - Jellicoe Park and Onehunga War Memorial Pools – renew paving
   - Onehunga Bay Reserve – implement concept plan
   - Panmure Community Centre – refurbish interior
   - Panmure Wharf – renewal
   - Mt Wellington War Memorial – renew sand field in training area
   - Panure Basin – renew jetty and rock wall
   - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki – renew advance pavements
   - Oranga Community Centre – renew CCTV system.

**Activities on hold**

24. The following work programme activities have been identified by operating departments as on hold:
   - **Community awareness and community led riparian restoration**: this project is currently on hold, with significant risks due to procurement issues. To mitigate the risk of this budget not being spent within the current financial year, staff have recommended that this project’s budget of $20,000 be reallocated toward an Industry Pollution Prevention Programme. If approved by the local board, this programme will be delivered in quarters three and four.

**Changes to the local board work programme**

**Deferred activities**

25. These activities are deferred from the 2018/2019 work programme:
   - **Mt Wellington War Memorial Park – provide new dual toilet facility**: this project is deferred due to ongoing discussions with the club utilising this park. Staff will recommend a way forward for this project once discussions have completed.
   - **Mt Wellington War Memorial Park – installation of lighting on fields 4 & 5**: this project is deferred due to re-prioritisation of scheduled projects. This will be discussed further at a workshop at a future workshop.
   - **Panmure Stone Cottage. 1 Kings Road, Panmure – Lease to Panmure Historical Society Incorporated**: this lease is deferred due to the property being
on the seismic study programme. This lease will be reviewed in early 2019 and an update will be provided from the Asset Management Intelligence Support Team.

- **Jellicoe Park, Quadrant Road Onehunga – Lease to Onehunga Fencible and Historical Society Incorporated:** this lease is deferred due to the property being on the seismic study programme. Further progress will be made once the Asset Management Intelligence Support Team have completed their study.

- **Jordan Park, 17A Cameron Street Onehunga – Lease to Tongan Health Society Incorporated:** this lease is deferred as a feasibility study on the future use of this site is required. Panuku will undertake the feasibility study and present their findings to the local board.

**Budget reallocation**

26. The following activities in the local board’s 2018/2019 work programme (Attachment A) are below budget and at risk of not being delivered in the financial year:

- youth connections
- local events programme – Onehunga Christmas Lights event
- parks, sport and recreation service provision
- community awareness and community led riparian restoration.

27. Staff recommend that this funding be reallocated to the activities outlined below.

**Local community grants**

28. The local board funds a community grants programme consisting of three granting rounds during the financial year. The board has completed two granting rounds, the first in quarter one allocating $58,748, and the second in quarter two allocating $23,387. This leaves $37,865 for the last granting round.

29. Local board grants are a way for the board to support local initiatives that align with the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan 2017.

30. Staff have indicated that the third granting round will benefit from extra funding and enable the local board to further support local initiatives that align with the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan 2017.

**Local civic events**

31. Local civic events are events funded by the local board that celebrate public openings of council facilities, sod turnings, blessings and conferences in the local board area.

32. In quarter one, the local board hosted an opening for Sir Woolf Fisher Park, leaving a remaining budget of $4,882.

33. In quarter three, ongoing works on the Tāmaki Path and Waikaraka Cemetery are due to be completed. The local board have indicated that they would like to host an opening event for both projects.

34. Staff have indicated that the remaining local civic events budget is not adequate to deliver both events, as the Tāmaki Path opening will be a Regional event, celebrating an expansive path that connects the communities of Panmure through to Glen Innes.
Item 17

Industry Pollution Prevention Programme

35. As a result of procurement issues, the activity: ‘Community awareness and community led riparian restoration’, is on hold with significant risk of non-delivery by the end of the 2018/2019 Financial Year. To mitigate this risk, staff recommended at a workshop in February for the local board to reallocate this budget to the activity: Industry Pollution Prevention Programme.

36. In the 2015/2016 Financial Year, the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board funded the Industry Pollution Prevention Programme.

37. The board have indicated their interest in revisiting the businesses that participated in the 2015/2016 Industry Pollution Prevention Programme and evaluating the outcomes from the prior programme, including whether the prior recommendations were implemented.

38. This new activity will be delivered by the end of the financial year, utilising the entire ‘Community awareness and community led riparian restoration’ budget.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

39. Staff leading the activities proposed to receive budget reallocations have agreed to the recommendation and have indicated the ability to deliver within the 2018/2019 Financial Year.

40. The proposed decision has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report’s advice.

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

41. This report informs the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board of the performance for the quarter ending 31 December 2018.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

42. The local board remains committed to integrating and supporting work that contributes to outcomes for Māori. This includes enhancing partnerships and collaborative ways of working with mana whenua and mataawaka.

43. In June 2018, the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board signed a relationship agreement with Ngāti Pāoa.

44. Some of the activities in the local board’s 2018/2019 work programme (Attachment A) have specific impact on the wider Māori community, this includes:

- continued collaboration with Ruapotaka Marae and their marae redevelopment
- a committee to govern Te Oro that includes mana whenua and community representation. Te Oro is a multi-purpose arts and cultural centre aimed at empowering youth in the local community. In quarter two Te Oro held raranga (weaving) workshops for Māori Language Week
- supporting the 312 Hub, a youth-led art gallery and creative studio conceptualised on Treaty Principles and embedded with Mana Moana Oceania methodologies. In December 2018, the board funded the 312 Hub to deliver youth initiatives in the Maungakiekie area
Item 17

- all three libraries in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area are committed to ‘celebrating Te Ao Māori and strengthening responsiveness to Māori’. Each of the libraries have delivered Kia Māia te Whai / Dare to Explore 2018/2019, a summer reading programme offering challenges in Te Reo Māori. Glen Innes Library has also continued their outreach to the local kohanga reo, providing story times in Te Reo Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

45. As indicated in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Financial Performance report (Attachment B), some activity lines are currently below budget with risk of non-delivery prior to the end of the 2018/2019 Financial Year.

46. Staff have indicated in the work programme commentary (Attachment A) where budget is not required to deliver the activity and can be reallocated. The recommended reallocations are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reallocate to:</th>
<th>Reallocate from:</th>
<th>Amount:</th>
<th>Total amount reallocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>Local community grants</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Local events programme – Onehunga Christmas Lights event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>966</td>
<td>Youth connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Local civic events</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Parks Sports and Recreation svc provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>Community awareness and community led riparian restoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Performance

50. Revenue from libraries, community leases and Te Oro Music and Arts centre is $62,000 above budget.

51. Expenditure is below budget by $25,700, mainly in LDI opex funded projects. This is due to delays in starting new initiatives such as the Integrated ACE activity and Ready to rent, which are now in progress.

52. Capital spend is ahead of budget as renewals of coastal assets in Dunkirk Reserve and the Tāmaki Path construction continue from the 2017/2018 Financial Year.

53. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Financial Performance report is Attachment B.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

54. While the risk of non-delivery of the entire work programme is rare, the likelihood for risk relating to individual activities does vary. Capital projects for instance, are susceptible to more risk as on-time and on-budget delivery is dependent on weather conditions, approvals (e.g. building consents) and is susceptible to market conditions.
55. Information about any significant risks and how they are being managed and/or mitigated is addressed in the 'Activities with significant issues' section

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

56. The local board will receive the next performance update following the end of quarter three (March 2019).

Ngā tāpirihanga
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### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept/ Unit or COO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Local Events Programme - Maungakiekie and Tamaki (Externally Delivered Events)</td>
<td>- Grow in the Park $10,000 (Maungakiekie Community Trust)  - Orange Community Event $5,000 (Orange Community Centre)  - Riverside Community Event $6,000 (Riverside Community Centre)  - Onetwanga Festival $25,000 (Onetwanga Festival Committee)  - Matatea Light Trail $30,000 (Glen Innes Business Association)  - Paremata Family Fun Day $15,000 (Paremata Business Association)</td>
<td>Confirm events and funding amounts.</td>
<td>CS: ACE Events</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Grant recipients have been advised that they have received funding; next step is to have them apply for their grants online and draw up the funding agreements.</td>
<td>Funding agreements have been completed for four events with $25,000 either paid out across the four or currently awaiting payment. This includes: Grow In The Park $10,000 Orange Christmas Festival $5000 Onetwanga Festival $25,000 Paremata Fun Day $15,000 The funding for the Matatea Light Trail ($35,000), is expected to be paid out in Q3 or Q4. ACE recommends is we have sufficient programming budget already allocated to deliver programmes for the Riverside Community Centre - $5300 unspent. The local board has confirmed that $2,300 of this money will be used to pay for an event survey of the Matatea Light Trail. The event related expense to be reallocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Local Events Programme - Onetwanga Christmas Lights Event (Internally Delivered Event)</td>
<td>Deliver a Christmas Carols event ending with the lighting of the tree at Jaclise Park.</td>
<td>Confirm plan and expenditure budget. Note: There is $15,000.00 in Community Facilities who will be doing the installation of the lights - the funding for this Local Event Programme is $30,000.00 shared between two departments</td>
<td>CS: ACE Events</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Event date confirmed for 30 November 2018 at Jaclise Park. Onetwanga with permit application submitted. Programming is led by the community and will focus on engaging local participation, activities and food stalls to complement. Lighting of the Christmas tree will take place at the end of the event.</td>
<td>CF to confirm their involvement. The event was cancelled on the day due to bad weather. A detailed draft report will be presented in Q3. The temporary two lights installation is organized by Community Facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremonies - Maungakiekie, Tamaki</td>
<td>Deliver an annual programme of citizenship ceremonies in conjunction with the Department of Internal Affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS: ACE Events</td>
<td>$24,088</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The Civic Events team delivered four citizenship ceremonies, on three separate occasions during Q1 with 317 people from the local board area becoming new citizens.</td>
<td>The Civic Events team delivered three citizenship ceremonies on three separate occasions during Q2 with 267 people from the local board area becoming new citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Local Civic Events - Maungakiekie-Tamaki</td>
<td>Deliver and/or support civic events within the local board area The following decisions are required: Confirmation of programmes and activities that are to be supported by this line</td>
<td>CS: ACE Events</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Sir Colin Tizard Park was opened on 7 July 2018 with 100 people attending. Free food and sport activities were offered to the public.</td>
<td>No civic event was delivered in Q2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept/ Unit or CEO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Local Events Programme - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki (Mows in Parks)</td>
<td>Programme and deliver two Regional Mows in Parks series events. 1. Approve budget increase of $1,300 per mow. 2. Confirm additional operational costs. Provision has been made for sponsorship at $21,000/18 levels. 3. Choose delivery package from options available. This includes pre-movie entertainment. 4. Consider partnering opportunity with Tāmaki Regeneration to extend PI England event to be signature and largest event of the series.</td>
<td>CS: AEC; Events</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>Low; Opeak</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Programming and delivery planning for two Regional Mows in Parks series events is underway.</td>
<td>Planning for Mows in Parks is on track with pre-entertainment booked and event permits issued for Ferguson Domain screening Saturday, 23 February 2019. Mows in Park England screening Thursday, 18 April 2019. Pre-movie entertainment will be sourced locally during Q2 for engagement and activation by those from within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Dunkirk Road Activity Centre, Funding Agreement</td>
<td>A three-year agreement with Dunkirk Road Activity Centre incorporated to facilitate and deliver work plan outcomes, including activities and programmes at Dunkirk Activity Centre for the years 2018-2021, commencing 1 July 2018 and terminating on 30 June 2021. Operational funding amount to be adjusted annually in accordance with Auckland Council’s agreed inflationary mechanism once confirmed.</td>
<td>The local board has an oversight and monitoring role. Q4: Workplan for funding decision in 2019/2020 term</td>
<td>CS: AEC; Community Places</td>
<td>$45,249</td>
<td>ABS; Opeak</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During Q1, the 2018/2019 financial year funding agreement was signed and paid. Planning for the Regional Hui has started and this is scheduled for 5 December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Dunkirk Road Activity Centre - Three Year Licence</td>
<td>A three-year term with Dunkirk Road Activity Centre incorporated for operation of the Dunkirk Road Activity Centre: 15 Wellington War Memorial Reserve, 14-50 Dunkirk Road, Mt Wellington, being PL Lot 260 DP 39426 for the years 2018-2021, commencing 1 July 2018 and terminating 30 June 2021.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated for FY2018/2019.</td>
<td>CS: AEC; Community Places</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ABS; Opeak</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Licence to Occupy and Manage was executed a quarter earlier than anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>Riverside Community Centre - Transition to Community-Led</td>
<td>Continue to develop and support the transition of Riverside Community Centre to community-led, through ongoing partnership with the Panamasian Community Group.</td>
<td>CS: AEC; Community Places</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ABS; Opeak</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Capacity and capability building has commenced with the Panamasian this quarter. A team of council staff alongside Good Seeds Trust is working to advise, guide and deliver opportunities to increase capacity and capability with the Panamasian. A plan of action has been developed, leading to meetings with key stakeholders and contribution to ensure development of the Panamasians progressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Page 136
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit / Group</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>Riverside Community Centre Programme Delivery</td>
<td>To strengthen existing community relationships and initiate programme activities from the Riverside Co-design Project to increase community engagement and participation. Scope potential partners to deliver programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS: ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$22,000 LD: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Council staff are actively engaged with the Panamanian Community Group to build governance capacity. Goodwill Trust and Council staff are supporting operational development and the activation initiatives of the Panamanians.</td>
<td>Activation and programming of the centre has progressed this quarter. The Trading Room has been set up for local people. This has a variety of clothing and household goods bought by local people and displayed in one of the rooms. People can come and bring goods, and take goods that will be useful for them and their family. This is becoming known in the community and is being used regularly. There has been two Community Connect meetings to support people from the community connecting with one another in a positive environment. There are a core group of local people to continue this in 2019. Food Garden at Te Neheun, the local Tongue church came to clean up the grounds and plant the gardens, have a meal and the youth celebrated with singing and dancing. They have planted the gardens and will look after them and make the produce available to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>Onehunga Community Centre programme delivery</td>
<td>Plan, develop, deliver and evaluate a programme of activities in Onehunga ($72,804) that aligns to the outcome area “Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community,” with a strong focus on delivering for young people, promoting the wellbeing and safety of our communities and celebrating diversity. - ensures community participation - enables more residents to feel connected to their community - encourages participation to learn, grow and come together to have fun.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS: ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$72,804 ABS: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In Q1, activities have been delivered within the Young People, Wellbeing and Diversity programme streams. The Onehunga Community Expo was a highlight, with more than 24 community and service providers coming together at the expo. More young people and diversity based activities will be developed in Q2.</td>
<td>In Q2, the centre programme activities have progressed to plan with Synergy Projects and Harmony Trust delivering the Ready for the Road and Triple X Young people capacity building and wellbeing activities. For the Diversity programme, our key highlights included the joint Diwali celebrations with Onehunga Library. The event featured cultural performances and Indian sweets giveaways. The event was well received with 90 people attending the celebrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>Venue Hire Service Delivery - MT</td>
<td>Provide, manage and promote venues for hire, and the activities and opportunities they offer by: - managing the customer centre booking and access process - continue to develop and deliver service improvement initiatives - aligning activity to local board priorities through management of the fees and charges framework. These include whether activities contribute to community outcomes offered by not-for-profit and community groups</td>
<td>G4 - Local board to approve fees and charges schedule for 2019/2020</td>
<td>CS: ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$0 ABS: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During Q1, the initial satisfaction survey shows that 81 per cent of hirers would recommend the venues they have visited. Participant numbers have increased by 6 per cent compared to the same period last year. Booking hours have decreased 1 per cent compared to the same period last year. The top three activity types during quarter one are meetings, special interest and religious activity. A focus for staff in quarter two will be promoting our network through Google and Facebook channels.</td>
<td>During Q2, hirer satisfaction remains high with 83 per cent of hirers indicating that they would recommend the venues they have visited. Participant numbers have increased by 3 per cent and booking hours have decreased by 9 per cent due to a drop in regular hirers. The statistics are based on the first five months of 2018/2019. In Q3, staff will be working with communities in preparation for the 2019/2020 booking calendar opening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>Local community grants</td>
<td>Controllable grant funding to support local community groups. This will be administered through three rounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local board to allocate funding to community groups</td>
<td>$120,000 LD: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The local board has completed Local Grants Round One and Multi-board Round One 2018/2019, allocating a total of $38,948. This leaves a total of $51,052 for the remaining two grant rounds.</td>
<td>The local board has completed Local Grants Round Two 2018/2019, allocating a total of $23,387. This leaves a total of $37,965 for the remaining grant round.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CEO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>961</td>
<td>Apply the empowered communities approach – connecting communities (MIT)</td>
<td>Broker strategic collaborative relationships and resources within the community This includes five key activity areas: 1. Engaging communities – reaching out to less accessible and diverse groups – focusing on capacity building and inclusion – supporting existing community groups and relationships. 2. Strengthen community led placemaking and planning initiatives - empowering communities to provide input into placemaking initiatives - influence decision-making on place-based planning and implementation. This includes urban revitalisation activities, collaborating with relevant council departments and council-controlled organisations. 3. Enabling council supporting groups to gain access to operational and technical expertise and identify and address barriers to community empowerment. 4. Responding to the aspirations of mana whenua, maharau, marae and town organisations - to not replace or duplicate any stand-alone local board Marae responsiveness activities. 5. Reporting back - local board members in progress in activity areas 1 - 4</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: ACE - Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>LDI: Open</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In Q1 the strategic broker activities included: Working together with Night Plate to discuss the possibility of helping with pre-entertainment for Mixies in the Park. Participating in the planning of the Oranga Community Open Day with Panuku, Housing New Zealand, Homes Land and Community and the Community Empowerment Unit. With the future transformation of the Oranga Community. The Oranga Collective will play an integral part well into the future. There will also be opportunities for the community to have input into the places making with the green spaces. The Mt Wellington Collective has been formed with the support of the local board. We have had 3 meetings with 10 organisations attending. The Collective agreed to have a Google page where each member can keep each other informed of future events. Attending the Dunblane Activity Centre monthly meeting for Parnell Park group. We discussed the positive affects of the meeting with Parnell community and compared how they operate with the other collectives in Maungakiekie Tamaki. Continuing monthly meetings with staff to discuss alignment of their work supporting more integrated work programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>Raupotake Marae support</td>
<td>Support Raupotake Marae in progressing the marae rebuild and relocation project by working with their members, and relevant council staff and stakeholders to identify needs, and provide capability building/professional advice/services as required (e.g. liaison coordinator, funding advisor)</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: ACE - Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>LDI: Open</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During Q1, the key role for CEU in the Raupotake Marae Redevelopment Project was to facilitate discussions between marae representatives and other council staff about the marae's application for Land Owner Approval (LOA), marae's expectations and council's requirements, ensuring council is responsive to the marae's aspirations and respectful of tikanga. In July 2018, Raupotake Marae applied for LOA for the area they intend to lease. Raupotake Marae representatives expressed interest in participating in the design of the wetland planned for Maybury Reserve. On 19 September 2018, staff met with a cross-council team to discuss opportunities for the marae's involvement in the design of the wetland and the integration of both the wetland and new marae buildings designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Further Decision Points</td>
<td>Lead Dept/ Unit/CFO</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q1 Commentary</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>Broker strategic partnerships and leverage investment that will deliver projects and programmes that achieve local board plan outcomes. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is a community that cares about its environment. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is the place to be. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has quality infrastructure to match growth. Components: Strategic Partnership Broker (SPB)/Support business associations for events (SBA)/Strategic Partnership Funding (SPF/Ex)/Operational Brief: Use the Board’s discretionary budget (S339k) to broker partnerships and leveraging investment that will deliver projects and programmes that achieve local board plan outcomes. Outcomes: 1. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community; 2. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is a community that cares about its environment; 3. Environmental leadership; 4. Clean water and beautiful waterfronts; 5. Heading towards zero waste; 6. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is the place to be; 7. Thriving local economy; 8. Quality urban environment; 9. Destination areas of Onehunga, Parnure, Glen Innes, Sylvia Park and Mt Wellington. Results: 1. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has quality infrastructure to match growth. 2. Safe and improved community facilities. 3. Good quality open spaces. 4. Better connections and transport infrastructure. 5. Keeping up with growth and development.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: ACE, Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>$567,000</td>
<td>LR: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS Broker. On 7 August 2018, staff workshoped the purpose, outcomes, milestones and KPIs of the Strategic Partnerships Broker role with the local board, and are currently evaluating organisations and individuals to determine which ones are best placed to deliver the desired outcomes. Unleashing services will be in place and staff will workshop the programme of activity for the 2018/2019 financial year with the local board in Q2. Business Associations: The funding agreements with the Onehunga, Parnure and Glen Innes business associations have been processed. The Onehunga and Glen Innes business associations provided a programme of activity the funds will help support. Youth Initiatives: Staff, local organisations and government agencies working in Maungakiekie have mapped the resources available, current initiatives and needs and discussed quick wins and long-term ideas. In the Tāmaki subdivision, staff met with representatives of Flipping East to discuss local board expectations. Flipping East’s aspirations, opportunities and how their work aligns with the Tāmaki Youth Wellbeing Strategy. Options for delivery of this work programme item will be workshoped with the local board in Q2. Staff will present on the distribution of 2019/2019 financial year community safety funds at a workshop in early Q2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>Operational priorities - Te Oro (Council Facility)</td>
<td>Operate Te Oro as a music and arts centre for youth.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: ACE, Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>$365,898</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Dump Q1. Te Oro received a total of 43,592 visitors, delivered 52 programmes with 5,982 participants, 19 of which had Māori outcomes, and staged 34 performances to 9,988 attendees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>Oranga Community Centre - A programme delivery</td>
<td>Plan, develop, deliver and evaluate a programme of activities that - aligns to the outcome area, “Maungakiekie – Tāmaki is an active and engaged community”, with a strong focus on delivering for young people, building capacity in our communities and celebrating diversity - ensures community participation - enables more residents to feel connected to their community spaces - allows participants to learn, grow and come together to have fun.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: ACE, Community Places</td>
<td>$33,991</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Quarterly 1 work programme is underway with activities being delivered within the Young People, Wellbeing and Diversity programme streams. More Wellbeing and Diversity based activities will be developed in Q2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit / CCO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Penamate Community Hall Programme Delivery</td>
<td>Plan, develop, deliver and evaluate a programme of activities that, aligns to the consumption area “Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community”, with a strong focus on delivering for young people, promoting the wellbeing and safety in communities and celebrating diversity. - ensures community participation - enables more residents to feel connected to their community spaces allows participants to learn, grow and come together to have fun.</td>
<td>CS: ACE: Community Places</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In Q1, activities were delivered within the Young People, Wellbeing and Diversity programme streams. In Q2 planning for the Tāmaki i-City Community Expo will commence.</td>
<td>The Q2 11 programmes were delivered. A highlight was the Tāmaki Children’s Market which encourages children to strengthen their entrepreneurial skills and host 30 children’s stalls at the monthly Penamate Community Hall market. The Market collaborated with Penamate Business Association to host a space at the Penamate Christmas Street Party with Te Oro for the Christmas Market. Te Penamate Community Expo planning is now well underway, and this will be held in Q2. During Q2, staff held a stakeholder engagement workshop with the local board. A community engagement workshop has been scheduled for Q3 and a plan has been developed to engage with users of the facility during Q3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td>Te Oro Business Plan and Governance Review</td>
<td>The local board will be updated at key points in the project, including approval of the updated business plan.</td>
<td>CS: ACE: Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A stakeholder engagement workshop with the local board has been scheduled for Q2. The community engagement plan will be presented at this workshop for feedback.</td>
<td>Planning commenced in Q2. Scheduled for Q4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Anzac Services Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Support and/or deliver Anzac services and parades within the local board area.</td>
<td>CS: ACE: Events</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Scheduled for Q4. Planning will commence in Q2.</td>
<td>Planning commenced in Q2. Scheduled for Q4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2718</td>
<td>Ready to Rent</td>
<td>Work with local community organisations to support tenants becoming ready to rent.</td>
<td>CS: ACE: Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In July 2018, staff workshoped the Ready to Rent concept with the local board. The aim of the workshop was to capture input from members to inform development of draft outcomes for the programme. Since then staff have engaged with various experts to seek advice about the most effective contribution the programme could make to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki community. The advice received was that while focusing on preparing tenants to be desirable tenants and understanding their rights and responsibilities and complemented with budgeting advice will bring benefits, there is still a power imbalance between tenant and landlord, which only a change in legislation can address. A proposed programme is being prepared for presentation to the local board in Q2. The development process aims to engage with community groups and agencies with local focus, scoping a steering group, and developing a programme outline to identify specific deliverables that will have tangible outcomes for vulnerable tenants.</td>
<td>Conversations with Oranga Community Centre focused on the opportunity to pilot an adaptation of the Hawke’s Bay DBD Ready to Rent model within the Oranga community. This programme aims to improve access to the private rental market for vulnerable renters. Increase knowledge around renting privately and to provide practical tools and skills to assist in knowledge around focusing. A working group was formed, a local project coordinator was appointed and the Oranga Rent Smart project was launched on 8 December 2018 during the Oranga Community Christmas Day. A series of pilot workshops will start in Q3, targeting Oranga vulnerable renters. These workshops will be adapted to other Maungakiekie-Tāmaki communities in Q4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2719</td>
<td>Te Oro Programme Delivery</td>
<td>Provide a programme of activities including support for housing engagement at Te Oro (approximately $117,000) that align to the Te Oro Charter and Business Plan.</td>
<td>CS: ACE: Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Programme highlights included the Te Oro Precincts, series workshops which included the theatre productions “Shit Boy” by Rob Mokoreka, “Guru of Chai” and “Ko Aue Tai”, and the delivery of a Youth Wellbeing Conference in partnership with Kahu Te Kaha and Tamaki College. This event was attended by approximately 200 youth throughout the day.</td>
<td>During Q2, programme highlights included the Oranga (sewing) workshops that were led by Ngati Pao artist Lorna Rihana as part of Māori Language Week. The Bradley Lane Project and Artists Take, and the Te Oro Presents production of “Auntie” and “Double Donkets.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2869</td>
<td>Community Response Fund - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Discretionary fund to respond to community issues as they arise during the year.</td>
<td>CS: ACE: Advisory</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The local board provided $16,000 to the Tamaki Open Space Network Plan Engagement (MT2018/131).</td>
<td>MT2018/131 - $10,000 for the Tamaki Open Space Network Plan Engagement. MT2018/162 - $0 to write off the amount accrued by the Penamate Squash Rackets Club Incorporated. Balance: Nil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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| 966 | Youth Connections (MCY) | Youth Connections will provide:  
- Quality advice and expertise on youth employment. Locally, this is done through community-led solutions that identify and create jobs for youth, particularly those who are furthest from the job market.  
Note: the 2018/2019 budget figure shown for this activity includes the $20,000 originally approved plus $5,000 deferral from 2017/2018.  
- Local opportunities to improve social and economic development outcomes. Aiming for all youth to be meaningfully engaged in education, employment, or training, and have clear employment pathways.  
- An extensive network of stakeholders in the youth employment space throughout the council family and the business community.  
- Tools to build an enabling environment for young job seekers and youth-friendly employers. | Local board to approve Youth Connections youth employment initiatives to be delivered by The Southern Initiative from 1 November 2018. | CS: ACE - Community Empowerment | $50,000 | LD: Opex, External funding | In progress | Green | Of the 15 young people Synergy Trust supported between April and July 2018, three have secured permanent employment and four are training and delivering in Youth Advocate roles. Eight are seeking further employment and education opportunities. In September 2018, Synergy Trust began working with a further nine young people from Onohanga and will begin to build youth numbers in Otara in Q2. OTEC Academy trained six young people in Q1. Sixteen young people have been trained from April 2018. Six, of the 16, have secured casual employment, one of which was previously not in employment, education or training. Fifteen of the 16 trained have entered or remained in education or training. Staff updated the local board at a recent workshop to on the up-coming Youth Connections programme transition from the Community Empowerment Unit to The Southern Initiative. Staff are working towards transitioning the programme to TSI as of 1 November 2018. | Programme transferred to The Southern Initiative on 1 November 2018. The transition of the programme included responsibility for programme delivery and local board investment to support youth employment initiatives. An update on Q2 programme activity refer to The Southern Initiative/The Western Initiative local board work programme Q2 report. |
| 714 | Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Full Facilities Contracts | The Full Facilities maintenance contracts include all buildings, parks and open space assets, sports fields, coastal management and storm damage. | No further decisions anticipated | CF: Operations | $4,140,179 | ABS: Opex | In progress | Green | The first quarter has been spent largely remediating the remainder of the April storm responsive work orders. The winter months were unusually wet, however, the proactive planning for managing the winter months has had a positive result. The contractor ensured weekly cyclone reports were in place for every site, informative signage was installed on the wet sites, and weekly wet areas reviews were provided to inform elected members. Conscious of the seasonal change into the dryer months, the contractors have started prioritising tasks that need immediate attention, to ensure they are fit for public use. There is an increase of usage in our open spaces, as the temperate warms, in particular along the foreshores, the contractors are working in this area of the early end quickly, so as not to inconvenience the public. A considerable amount of time has been spent collaborating with stakeholders in the planning and preparation for the strand development contracts running over to Community Facilities in 2019. Full playground condition assessments have been completed across all sites, any maintenance works and renewal programming required is now underway. | | | The second quarter of the year has seen a slower than usual spring flush, contractors have managed to deal with the necessary increase in grass growth. Weekly cycle visits and informative signage continued to be used for those few areas that remained particularly wet. A continued focus for our team is the clearing of public facilities, including libraries and toilets, focusing on buildings to ensure they are well maintained and any remedial works are undertaken promptly. This includes implementing temporary solutions to bring buildings up to a required level. Also ensuring the necessary removal of fallen trees in reserves focusing on Glen Innes, we have been working alongside our Arbourists to ensure this is prioritised work. The team have been working hard in planning and preparation for the strand development contracts coming over to Community Facilities in 2019. |
| 716 | Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Arboreculture Contracts | The Arboreculture maintenance contracts include tree management and maintenance. | No further decisions anticipated | CF: Operations | $386,096 | ABS: Opex | In progress | Green | The first quarter was influenced by remedial work after the April storm. The continued storm clean up was balanced against addressing deferred requests prior to the storm, and higher priority new requests received. Outstanding work is now limited to sites where access has been restricted due to ground conditions. It is anticipated these sites will be accessible shortly into the second quarter, weather dependent. The scheduled works programme was delayed as a consequence of the storm and deferred works, but is now on track. Replacement planting of trees removed throughout the year has been completed during the quarter. | | | The second quarter continued to be influenced by wet weather, limiting access to many locations, with remaining material from the April storm only being able to be cleared during December 2018. As conditions improve we see a general movement from primarily street tree-focused activities to a summer parks free maintenance programme. As weather improves, a close watch will be kept on the need for watering of new trees planted during winter. |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ecological Restoration Contracts</td>
<td>The Ecological Restoration maintenance contracts include pest plant and animal pest management within environmentally significant parks and reserves.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF, Operations</td>
<td>$100,494</td>
<td>ABS, Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During this quarter, the annual update of the Site Assessment Report, a large portion of the pest animal monitoring, and the majority of the first pulse of the rat control programme have been completed. Various unscheduled activities were completed which included a mixture of pest animal control and pest plant control. Request for service work orders received, continue to be seasonally normal, with an increasing trend in activity becoming apparent during the later stages of the quarter. Works during the second quarter have predominantly been undertaken in High Value sites. The first pulse of the rat control programme has been completed and now moving to the second pulse. High Value pest plant control remains high on the agenda throughout the summer months. Request for service work orders received are trending slightly above average for the season. It is anticipated that requests for waip control will likely pick up in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2125</td>
<td>Dunkirk Activity Centre - replace roof and renew interior</td>
<td>Overview - replace the roof including new framing, flashings, guttering and downpipes. Interior works to include G10 ceiling, insulation, floor coverings, painting and minor carpentry.</td>
<td>Options to be presented to the board for consultation and approval</td>
<td>CF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>$152,200</td>
<td>ABS, Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Consultants have been engaged to carry out the preliminary and investigation phase of the design work. An asbestos management survey report and an asset management plan have been completed for Dunkirk Activity Centre. Next steps: Complete preliminary design and lock scope of works for the Dunkirk Activity Centre roof replacement and options for removal of public toilets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2126</td>
<td>Glen Innes Community Hall - Citizens Advice Bureau - refurbish interior</td>
<td>Overview - reconfigure and refurbish the interior of the Glen Innes Community Hall to ensure it for purpose for the relocation of the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB). Current status - stage one - concept design and procurement for professional services. Stage two - undertake detailed design in consultation with the local board and stakeholder engagement. Stage two - deliver physical works. This is a multi year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/18 programme (previous SP18 ID 2331). Estimated completion date is yet to be established.</td>
<td>Options to be presented to the board for consultation and approval</td>
<td>CF, Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>ABS, Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Project manager met with Citizens Advice Bureau and they are very close to getting a final agreed plan. Final design and budget estimate is now being done to ensure a functional plan and remains within the budget. A legal agreement will then be drawn up to formalise the agreement for Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) to move to new premises and demolition on their existing accommodation can occur. Next steps: Design, consent and physical works can then commence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2127</td>
<td>Glen Innes CCTV system</td>
<td>Renewal the CCTV system of the library. This project has been requested as an addition to the work programme by the Auckland Council Security Manager.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF, Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>ABS, Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Initial scope has been reviewed. A meeting with facility manager and security manager is required to provide a more detailed list of requirements. Next steps: Set up meeting and compile preferred detailed scope. Develop business case for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128</td>
<td>Glen Innes Poor drainage comprehensive renewal</td>
<td>Renewed includes carpark marking, pot holes, post covers, office carpet, skimmer grates, replacement of title and interconnector report. Replace P.A system in the facility and install CCTV cameras in car park, renew roof and spa heat pump. Stage one - investigate, design and scope physical works (including options to propose to the local board for assets that may benefit from an increased level of service). Stage two - physical works commence. This is a multi year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/18 programme (previous SP18 ID 2331).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF, Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>ABS, Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Investigation of roof repairs required is underway. Next steps: On receipt of the quote documentation will be completed for commencement of physical works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>2129</td>
<td>Jubilee Park and Orakei Road War Memorial Path - renew paving</td>
<td>Overview - renew asphalt footpaths at Jubilee Park and Orakei Road War Memorial Path.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2130</td>
<td>Jubilee Bridge - upgrade bridge</td>
<td>Overview - renew and upgrade Jubilee Bridge which includes the design, construction, consultation, consents, tender and construction of a new bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status. Developing art work design with artists, engineering design and scope physical works. Detailed design options will be consulted with the local board for approval in advance of physical works. Stage two - deliver physical works. Construction to include demolition of existing bridge and reinstatement where required. This project is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 3344). Estimated completion is yet to be established.</td>
<td>Current status. Developed design completed, value engineering by either improving the function or reducing costs proceeding to reduce costs while maintaining art work and bridge aesthetic. Next steps. Value engineering and costs assessment to be completed for review late January, early February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2131</td>
<td>Lagoon Pool - comprehensive renewal</td>
<td>Overview - comprehensive refurbishment of the pool facilities to include the refurbishment of the outdoor pool and the pool surrounds, renewal of the pool deck change rooms, replacement of the sauna, renewal of the fire system, retiling of the pools and renewal of the flooring. Options for heating the outdoor pool will be investigated and presented to the board for LDF funding consultation and approval. Current status - stage one completion tender evaluation and select the preferred contractor to deliver the renewal works.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status. Stage two tenders are being evaluated with an intention to have a recommended contractor identified by early October 2018 for tenders. Stage two works contract to be awarded outdoor pool physical works to be undertaken between mid-October and late November. Indoor pool physical works to be undertaken between 14 - 27 January 2019 during annual maintenance shut down period.</td>
<td>Initial investigation work was incomplete - project has now been split into two stages to address facility risks. A third stage may be required and budget will need to be evaluated. Current status. Work required to be undertaken prior to summer 2018/2019 was completed by maintenance contractors and the indoor pools are now open. Next steps. Indoor Pool works have been re-tendered and are planned to be undertaken in January 2019 during the annual maintenance shut down period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>2132</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew libraries, furniture, fittings and equipment FY18+</td>
<td>Overview - renew furniture, fittings and equipment for the following libraries: Onehunga Library, Glen Innes Library and Panmure Library. Current status - stage one - investigate design and scope the works required (including options to propose to the local board for assets that may benefit from an increased level of service). Stage two - plan and deliver the physical works. (This project is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation from the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2232). Estimated completion is yet to be established.)</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF. Project Delivery</td>
<td>$150,000 ABS Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status. This project encompasses three libraries in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local board area - Panmure Library, Onehunga Library and Glen Innes Library. Panmure Library is also scheduled for a comprehensive renewal in the next financial year. This project will be unbundled and the budget identified for the renewal of Panmure Library will be combined with the comprehensive renewal which will take into consideration the future of the library. The other two libraries will be separated into two independent projects for delivery. New furniture items are being ordered for Glen Innes Library and an architect has been engaged to specify the replacement furniture items for Onehunga Library. Next steps: Procure the replacement furniture items for Onehunga Library.</td>
<td>Current status. This project is in the process of being unbundled and will be reviewed from the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew libraries, fittings and equipment FY18+ to “Onehunga Library furniture fittings and equipment renewal”. Procurement is underway for Onehunga Library. The renewal for Glen Innes Library furniture, fittings and equipment (previously included in the bundled project) are now being completed under a new project “Glen Innes Library furniture fittings and Equipment renewal” Furniture and fixture renewals for Panmure Library (previously included in the bundled project) have been excluded at this stage, if required, a new project can be created. Next steps: Procure furniture for Glen Innes Library under the new project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2133</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew paving, car park and structure FY18+</td>
<td>Renew paving, carparks and structures at various sites. Priority sites identified as follows: Onehunga Reserve, Eastview Reserve, Ferguson Domain, Harrison Reserve, Jokoni Reserve, Manuia Reserve, Main-Palade Reserve, Neil Bergress Reserve, Panmure Basin, Point England Reserve, Redfield Reserve, Bapska Reserve, Savage Park, Tanerua Reserve and Thompson Park. (This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2381).)</td>
<td>Sites to be prioritised by the local board</td>
<td>CF. Project Delivery</td>
<td>$30,000 ABS Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status. Footpath pavement, carpark pavement and structural renewals within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area are currently being scoped for implementation in the 2019/2019 year. Next steps: Complete scoping and undertake contractor procurement for footpath pavement, carpark pavement and structural renewals to be completed within the 2018/2019 year.</td>
<td>Current status. Pavement and structural renewals within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki have been scoped for implementation in the 2019/2019 year. Next steps: Procure physical works contractor and carry out footpath pavement and structure renewals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2134</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew park/road and car parks FY18+</td>
<td>Renew car parks and park roads at various sites. Priority sites identified as follows: Car Parks: Almond Reserve, Ber Therson Park, Constitution Park, Harry Park, Jender Park, Maybury Reserve Park Roads; Beacon Reserve, Hockstetter Pond (The Grotto Wetland); Maybury Reserve Stage one - investigation (including options for sites that would benefit from an increased level of service to propose to the local board), mapping and physical works. Stage two - physical works.</td>
<td>Sites to be prioritised by the local board</td>
<td>CF. Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$10,000 ABS Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status. Condition assessment is underway. Consultant engagement in early November.</td>
<td>Current status: Scope of work is yet to be determined. Putting together a list of category three to five ‘potentials’ assets or equipment that would benefit from an increased level of service over the next financial year and subsequent two financial years based on current council staff data. Teams are being organised for site visits and business case developments. Next steps: Site visits and business case developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2135</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew play spaces FY18+</td>
<td>Renew play equipment at various sites including playgrounds, skate, half courts. Priority sites identified as follows: Ferguson Domain, Fong Reserve, Horomihuri Reserve, Jellisco Park and Onehunga War Memorial Parcs, Moresey Reserve, One Teia Hill Domain, Onehunga Bay Reserve, Panmure Ecovolunteers, Savage Park, Playground Glen Innes, Shops. Stage one - investigation and design (including options for sites that would benefit from an increased level of service to propose to the local board). Stage two - physical works.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF. Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$10,000 ABS Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status. Condition assessment is underway to confirm priorities. Next steps: Present options to local board for approval before proceeding to consultant engagement.</td>
<td>Current status: Scope of work is yet to be determined. Putting together a list of category three to five ‘potentials’ assets or equipment that would benefit from an increased level of service. Teams are being organised for site visits and business case developments. Next steps: Site visits and business case developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2136</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve - renew seawall wall</td>
<td>Mount Wellington War Memorial Reserve seawall renewal. Renewal of the coastal structures at Dunkirk Reserve and Riverhead Reserve. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2132).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF. Project Delivery</td>
<td>$550,000 ABS Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status. Dunkirk Reserve coastal rock revetment - Construction works are underway between the Meriit cubicles and the end of Dunkirk Reserve Watercare pump station. Next steps: Complete construction works on the Dunkirk Reserve rock revetment section by end of November 2018. While the construction works on the rock revetment will be completed, this section won’t be open to the public until the Tamaki path and planting has been completed.</td>
<td>Current status: Construction works are almost complete. Planting along the cliff face, between the rock revetment and the edge of the Dunkirk Reserve will be carried out during winter planting season. Next steps: Complete construction works on the Dunkirk Reserve rock revetment section and open the area for public use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>2137</td>
<td>Onehunga Bay Reserve - implement</td>
<td>Implement concept plan - hard landscaping, car park, footpaths - The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board adopted the Onehunga Bay Reserve Concept Plan in August 2012. Some of the projects were brought forward and prioritised to coincide with Taurama Park development. This project aims to deliver the remaining projects which have been prioritised with the number one priority as the play space development followed by the skate-park and basketball projects, peripheral apron amenity enhancements and improved signage.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>$220,000 ABS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Construction works are complete.</td>
<td>Project completed: September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2140</td>
<td>Onehunga War Memorial Pool</td>
<td>Comprehensive Upgrade, including yearly paint and refurbishment. Auto dosing system - the water quality is questionable if not treated as per the norms it will soon turn out to be a health &amp; safety risk to the users. Full replacement of pool pumps. - Replace 2 x spa circulation pumps and 1 main outdoor pool circulation pump and its Variable Speed Drive unit. Gulf and retil outdoor changing rooms. - return shower, toilet, and paint all surfaces. Refurbish swim club building. Upgrade air con system. Upgrade changing rooms. Upgrade fire panel. The current alarm/security system only allows for one main entry and exit code which is a risk. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP16 ID 2133). This project also includes $50,000 of the local board's discretionary fund to investigate and propose a new roof top to install heating in the outdoor pool.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>$365,000 ABS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Stage two tenders are being evaluated with an intention to have a recommended contractor identified by early October 2018. Next steps: Stage two works contract to be awarded outdoor pool physical works to be undertaken between mid-October and late-November; indoor pool physical works to be 28 January - 10 February 2019 (during annual maintenance shut down period).</td>
<td>Investigation work was incomplete: project has now been split into two stages to address facility risks, however a third stage may be required and budget will need to be evaluated. Current status: work required to be undertaken prior to summer 2019/2019 was completed by maintenance contractors and the outdoor pools are now open. Next steps: Indoor pool works have been re-tendered and are scheduled to be undertaken in January - February 2019 during the annual maintenance shut down period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2141</td>
<td>Pararema Basin - new play space</td>
<td>Renew the playground including the T Bar swings. Stage one - investigate, design and scope physical works (including options to propose to the local board for assets that may benefit from an increased level of service). Stage two - physical works commence. This project is a multi-year funded project to be initiated as part of the 2018/19 programme.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF, Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$5,000 ABS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Concept designs are being drafted for local board approval and consenting.</td>
<td>Next steps: Present the final concept to the local board for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2142</td>
<td>Penmore Community Centre - refurbish interior</td>
<td>Internal renewal of ventilation system; main hall / stage area, both side rooms and kitchen, entrance foyer and lobby areas. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP16 ID 2334).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>$180,000 ABS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Initial price to allow for roof clearing to enable a full inspection of roof leaks and remedial works required.</td>
<td>Next steps: Award works to be completed December 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2143</td>
<td>Penmore Library - retil building and replace partial roof</td>
<td>Comprehensive building work, including carpet and vinyl in both public and staff areas. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP16 ID 2336).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>$65,890 ABS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Watertightness repairs to the roof have been tendered and initial remedial works scoped as part of works to allow for further investigation.</td>
<td>Next steps: Award tender for September works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2144</td>
<td>Penmore Wharf - renewal</td>
<td>Penmore Wharf Reserve wharf renewal. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP16 ID 2372).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>$260,000 ABS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Construction works are underway. Note - while the project has completed detailed design and consenting for the wharf renewal and piers, the current allocated budget and scope of works is limited to renewal of the wharf. There has been a delay of two weeks on this project due to the poor condition of the structures that were to be removed and the need to repeat these before the new wharf could be laid.</td>
<td>Next steps: Construction for the Penmore Wharf renewal is expected to be completed by 12 October 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>2145</td>
<td>Pearce Street Community Hall - refurbish interior</td>
<td>Interior refurbishment requires renewal of flooring, walls, doors, bathrooms and kitchen. Year one - investigation (including options for sites that would benefit from an increased level of service to propose to the local board), scoping and physical works, year 2 - physical works.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$5,000 ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current Status: Interior refurbishment will be combined with the Ardmore Recreation Centre interior works for tendering and physical works, due to the similarity in works required and proximity of location. Next steps: Combined tendering is estimated to begin in late November 2019.</td>
<td>Current status: Scoping of interior refurbishment complete, preparing priorities for interior refurbishments and expected costs. Next steps: Complete scoping and gain approval for extent of refurbishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2146</td>
<td>Riverside Community Centre - renew signage and renew fence</td>
<td>Replace the sign and renew the fence which is falling due to a tree encroachment.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$50,000 ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: A price for the physical works was received but was deemed to be unacceptably high. The works were subsequently re-tendered and new pricing has been received which is currently in the final stages of being negotiated. Issues around programme for delivery, due to the hall being occupied by a day care centre, is currently being worked through. Out of hours work or a staged approach may be required so the contract has not yet been awarded as there is potential for minor variation in pricing. Next steps: Finalise programme with affected stakeholders and the contractor. Receive the final pricing, review and award contract. Begin manufacturing the fencing components.</td>
<td>Current status: The contract has been formally awarded. Physical works have been delayed due to an issue with the location of an existing tree in relation to the line for the new fence. An application for Tree Asset Owner Approval to remove the tree was lodged on 10 December 2018. The fence cannot be replaced within Auckland Council’s property boundary without removal of the tree. Next steps: If Tree Asset Owner Approval to remove the tree is granted, an application for a tree resource consent will be lodged. If granted, the tree will be removed and physical works will commence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2147</td>
<td>Stone Cottage - renew roof and joinery</td>
<td>Renew roof and joinery to ensure weather tightness. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2290)</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$20,000 ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Project is currently on hold due to seismic investigations. Next steps: Seismic team will indicate the way forward.</td>
<td>The seismic team will undertake an investigation and recommend a way forward for this project. Current status: Options to repair a minor leak in the roof have been investigated to ensure the building remains watertight until a decision is made on the long term future of the building. Agreement has been reached with the internal heritage specialist team to repair the chimney flashings and adjacent cedar tiles. A specialist contractor will be engaged in early January to undertake this work. It is expected that this will be undertaken on site in March due to availability of the contractor. Next steps: Finalise procurement with the contractor for the roof repair and undertake works. Reach a decision on the wider renewal project and the buildings future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2148</td>
<td>Waitakere Park - improve sports park and extend fields 6, 9 and 10</td>
<td>Three soccer playing fields - two artificial turf fields and one sand carpet field, floodlighting to sports fields. Toilet block and changing facilities. An additional 100 car parking spaces; One children’s playground; and build and cycleway connections to the adjacent coastal cycle and walkway, the neighbouring cemetery and Waitakere Park. Bundled project: Sports field upgrades and improvements - concept and phasing plan. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2373).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$200,000 ABS: Capex - Development ABS: Capex - Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Working with Healthy Wales team to understand the issues associated with the site and inform professional services scope of works. Starting topographical survey of site. Land currently has a notice of requirement from New Zealand Transport Agency for the East West Link motorway project. Next steps: Present the concept plan to the local board.</td>
<td>The land currently has a notice of requirement from New Zealand Transport Agency for the East West Link motorway project. Physical works are currently deferred. Develop a new concept design subject to New Zealand Transport Agency approval. Physical works budget deferred to financial year 2019/2020. Next steps: Consultant engaged to start work on site investigation and development of a concept plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2149</td>
<td>Waitakere Park Cemetery - renew paving and furniture</td>
<td>Waitakere Park Cemetery paths, roads, seeds and table tennis redevelop. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2375).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$197,200 ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Scoping of the Waitakere Cemetery access road network renewal is complete and resource consent is currently being sought to carry out the work. Deferral of the New Zealand Transport Authority road corridor development on the Manukau Harbour boundary of the cemetery means the entire access road network has been identified for renewal. Next steps: Obtain resource consent and procure a contractor to carry out the access road pavement renewal works as scoped for the 2018/2019 year.</td>
<td>Timing of a roadway development resolved - works now progressing. Current status: Survey, design and consenting of the Waitakere Cemetery access road is currently being undertaken. Next steps: Complete design and construction documents, procure a contractor to carry out the access road pavement renewal works as scoped commencing April 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Further Decision Points</td>
<td>Lead Dept/ Unit or CFO</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q1 Commentary</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2150</td>
<td>Tamaki Greenways - develop a shared path</td>
<td>Creation of a shared path from Patumahoe Wharf to Waroake Nature Reserve. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2374).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$100,000 ABS: Capex - Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Construction works underway. Pathway on the southern side is in progress, with several sections in the south, including the Point England Road to Rite Road, Rite Road to Anderson Road and part of Riverside Reserve pathways, opened for public use. Works on the northern section have also started next steps: Complete physical works by the end of March 2019, subject to weather conditions.</td>
<td>Current status: Construction works underway. The southern side is largely complete and open for public use. Boardwalks behind the Marie Cell Boys' Rugby Club and the path between Anderson Avenue and Riverside Reserve are still under construction and will be closed off to public access until early February 2019. Path between Pt England car park and the old Ormara Creek bridge is complete and open for public use. The new Ormara bridge is still under construction and expected to be open for use in mid-February however this could be delayed further and works are underway on the Karori Place path link. Next steps: Complete physical works by the end of March 2019, subject to weather conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2151</td>
<td>Tamaki Reserve - general park development</td>
<td>Develop park as part of the Tamaki Regeneration. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 315)</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$50,000 ABS: Capex - Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Developed design and consultation underway, expected completion of this phase by November 2018. Next steps: Lodgement of resource consent November 2018.</td>
<td>Current status: Concept design and consultation complete. Next steps: Local board workshop February 2019 followed by business meeting to seek approval of concept design to enable resource consent to be lodged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2152</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - LDO minor capex fund 2018/19</td>
<td>Funding to deliver minor capex projects throughout the financial year as approved by the monthly local board workshops.</td>
<td>Options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$50,000 LDO: Capex</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Scoping the project to determine priority projects to be funded from the locally driven initiative minor capex funding. Next steps: Workshop with the local board to confirm scope and progress the priority projects.</td>
<td>Current status: No minor capex projects identified in quarter two. Next steps: Workshop with the local board any projects that may be identified in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2153</td>
<td>Onehunga Bay Reserve - build skatepark</td>
<td>Construct a new street style skate facility that will complement the existing vert ramp and increase the range of play style provision. The provision of a new street style skate facility will appeal to a broader range of users and age groups which will increase participation and usage. Phase one - investigate, design and scope physical works (including options to propose to the local board for assets that may benefit from an increased level of service). Phase two - physical works commence. This project is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme $400,000 of the board’s discretionary funding was allocated to this project in 2017/2018.</td>
<td>Design options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$600,000 LDO: Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Scoping the project to refine the design brief, so that the work can start on the design and consenting for the skate park. Next steps: Workshop with the local board to confirm the scope and progress through the concept design stage by the end of November 2018.</td>
<td>Current status: Scoping project to refine the design brief so that work can start on the design and consenting for the skatepark. Next steps: Workshop with the local board to confirm scope and progress through the concept design stage by end of March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2154</td>
<td>Ferguson Domain - renew and upgrade courts to multi-purpose courts</td>
<td>Renew and increase the level of service of the courts by upgrading to multisport courts</td>
<td>Options to be approved by local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$10,000 LDO: Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Condition assessment is underway. Next steps: Consultant engagement in early November.</td>
<td>Current status: Conditional assessment is in progress. Next steps: Consultant engagement is underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2158</td>
<td>Wellington War Memorial - renew sand field in training area</td>
<td>Sand add drainage and irrigation. The project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 3112).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$260,000 ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed.</td>
<td>Project completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2750</td>
<td>East View Reserve - develop general park</td>
<td>Develop park as part of the Tamaki Regeneration priority projects. (Details to be provided before the end of the calendar year)</td>
<td>Options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$250,000 ABS: Capex - Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Business case approved and documentation for professional services procurement underway. Next steps: Procurement for professional services for design anticipated in November 2018.</td>
<td>Current status: Procurement of professional services for design underway. Next steps: Engagement of professional services and commencement of design anticipated by February 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2760</td>
<td>Hochstatter Pond - install interpretation signage</td>
<td>Complete investigation and design phase and install interpretation signage for Hochstatter Pond</td>
<td>Options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$15,000 LDO: Capex</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: The assets under this category will be assessed to determine the scope for the renewal. Next steps: Once the assessments have been completed the options for the renewal will be recorded for consideration and prioritisation.</td>
<td>Current status: Assessment underway for the signage at Hochstatter Pond, also known as the Grates. Next steps: Engage the community and local board with proposed ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2761</td>
<td>Commissioned Playground - renew play space</td>
<td>Renew play space. Stage one - investigate, design and scope physical works (including options to propose to the local board for assets that will benefit from an increased level of service). Stage two - physical works commence. This project is a multi-year funded project to be initiated as part of the 2018/19 programme.</td>
<td>Options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>LDI: Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Concept designs are being drafted for consultation with the community next steps. Consult with the local community and present the final concept to the local board by end of October 2018. Current status: Design has been finalised with the community and will be presented to the local board for funding approval in February 2019. Next steps: Receive local board approval to proceed to detailed design and consenting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2762</td>
<td>Maungakiekie Reserve - develop general park</td>
<td>Develop park as part of the Tamaki Reconnection priority projects. (Details to be provided before the end of the calendar year).</td>
<td>Options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Draft concept design and business case underway and expected to be complete by October 2018. Next steps: Consultation and procurement for professional services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2777</td>
<td>Waio-Tapu Nature Reserve - develop nature trail</td>
<td>Investigate the options for a nature trail and present to the local board with cost estimates for further decision making</td>
<td>Design to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>LDI: Capex</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Scoping the project to refine the design brief so that options can be presented to the local board in October 2018. Next steps: Workshop with the local board to confirm scope and progress through the concept design stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2778</td>
<td>Panmure Basin - implement masterplan priorities</td>
<td>Implementation of Panmure Basin masterplan. This project is a continuation of the 2017/18 programme (previous SP18 ID 2371).</td>
<td>Design to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Design and consenting for path widening near the Waitapuna Hotel and Petersen Road maximising grass / pcicn area near the jetty is complete. Procurement for physical works is currently underway and a contract for physical works will be awarded shortly. Next steps: Complete physical works by end of February 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2795</td>
<td>Jellicoe Park - install tree lighting</td>
<td>The installation of permanent tree lighting at Jellicoe Park is in the investigation and design phase. The intention is to establish a permanent lighting installation prior to Christmas 2019. Stage one - investigation and design. Options will be presented to the local board for review prior to stage two - physical works commencement.</td>
<td>Options to be reviewed by the local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>LDI: Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2796</td>
<td>Ian Shaw Reserve - renew carpark</td>
<td>Renew the carpark at Ian Shaw Reserve. This project is a multi-year funded project to be initiated as part of the 2018/19 programme. The board will seek additional funding from their parking reserve fund for the physical works required.</td>
<td>Design options to be reviewed and approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals, External funding</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Scoping has not yet begun. Resource required to begin scoping of options. Next steps: Assign project to project manager to begin investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2883</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tamaki - upgrade fire systems and electrical switchboards - community centres and parks</td>
<td>Upgrade fire alarms systems and electrical switchboards, including installation of fire-safety building work. This project was carried over from FY2017/2018, previous SP ID 3089</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$36,194</td>
<td>ABS: Development</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2885</td>
<td>Maungakiekie - upgrade fire systems &amp; electricals</td>
<td>Upgrade fire system and electrical switchboards. This project was carried over from FY2017/2018, previous SP ID 3088</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2920</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew signage</td>
<td>MT Signage Renewal This project was carried over from FY2017/18, previous SP ID 3087</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$52,273</td>
<td>ABS: Capex</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Delay due to waiting for final sign design templates from Auckland Council to be confirmed. Current status: Update and concept complete, final steps: Confirm sign proofs for local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2958</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve - open space improvements</td>
<td>Upgrade park furniture, signage and connections. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP ID 2388)</td>
<td>Design to be agreed with local board</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$283,997</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Current status: Design and consulting phase is complete. Physical works to start in late January 2019. Next steps: Completion of installation of the new toilets by March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2962</td>
<td>Glen Innes Pool - install CCTV cameras in car park, renew roof &amp; spa heat pump</td>
<td>Install CCTV cameras in car park, renew roof &amp; spa heat pump. This project was carried over from FY2017/18, previous SP ID 2985</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$18,917</td>
<td>ABS: Capex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Project completed September 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2975</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial Park installation of lighting on fields 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Installing lighting on field 4 and 5. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP ID 3111).</td>
<td>Design to be agreed with local board</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$36,462</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Current status: Due to re-prioritisation, budget has been pushed out for delivery later in the 10 year programme. Next steps: Project will be discussed further during three year work programme workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2991</td>
<td>Parnure Basin - renew jetty &amp; rock wall</td>
<td>Project includes renewal of Parnure Basin Jetty and Parnure Basin Wall. This project was carried over from FY2017/18, previous SP ID 3815</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>ABS: Capex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Project completed August 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2992</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew advance pavements</td>
<td>Enshane Reserve, Ferguson Domain, Korim Reserve, Patia Reserve, Sansom Reserve, Smaill Reserve, Tamares Reserve, Tia Kawa Reserve, Thompson Park path, car park and road renovations. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP ID 2386).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$64,336</td>
<td>ABS: Capex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Project completed September 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3033</td>
<td>T-Bar Swings - replace in central area MT</td>
<td>Replace T-Bar Swings. This project is carried over from the 2017/18 programme (previous ID 3345).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$32,587</td>
<td>ABS: Capex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Current status: Target sites for upgrade have been completed except for Cryde Park which is on hold due to being involved in a wider playground renewal project. Next steps: Project can be considered to be complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3043</td>
<td>Onehunga War Memorial Pool - remove tree &amp; renew boundary wall</td>
<td>Remove tree, renew boundary wall. This project is carried over from the 2017/18 programme (previous ID 3152).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$30,750</td>
<td>ABS: Capex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Current status: Building consent has been granted. Pricing for wall construction is underway. Next steps: Due to outdoor swimming pool opening time, physical work had been scheduled for April 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3084</td>
<td>Jordan Recreation Centre - refurbish stadium and changing room</td>
<td>Refurbish the stadium to ensure the facility remains fit for purpose. Change room refurbishment to male and female change rooms in stadium. This project was carried forward from FY18/19, previous SP ID 2345.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$86,948</td>
<td>ABS: Capex</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Delivery has been delayed and will be carried forward in financial year 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3104</td>
<td>Pt Wellington War Memorial Park - provide new dual toilet facility</td>
<td>This project will provide a new dual toilet facility. This project was carried over from FY2017/18, previous SP ID 2365.</td>
<td>Design to be agreed with local board</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$129,300</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Ongoing discussions are occurring with the rugby club about the location and layout of the toilet block. This is likely to be a grant payment to the club as per the previous agreement. Current status: This project has been deinvested from financial year 2018 to financial year 2019, as there are no ongoing discussions with the club and a proportion is a grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3107</td>
<td>Oranga Community Centre - renew CCTV system</td>
<td>Renew CCTV system. This project was carried over from FY2017/18, previous SP ID 2333.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$21,830</td>
<td>ABS: Capex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Project completed September 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
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<th>Budget</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3192</td>
<td>Gernard Benson Place - demolition toilet block</td>
<td>Overview - Demolish the toilet block which is no longer a functional asset and is a health and safety concern for the local community. Current status - stage one - toilet block has been demolished. Stage two - concrete slab to be removed with approval from Auckland Transport.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$50,000 Regional</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Current status: Surface remediation to the excavated areas has not yet been undertaken, although the building slab has now been removed. The operational maintenance team are investigating whether Auckland Transport wish to take ownership of the land to re-purpose as parking space. Next steps: Obtain feedback from the operational maintenance team regarding discussions and negotiations with Auckland Transport. Next step: Report to be presented to the local board at a workshop on 19 October 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3217</td>
<td>Waipatiki Park - Grandstand - demolition</td>
<td>Demolition of grandstand</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$350,000 ABS Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>QT commentary not captured for Carry Forward projects.</td>
<td>Current status: Options for the grandstand were presented to the local board at a workshop on 19 October 2019. Next step: Report to be presented to the local board for a decision regarding the future possibilities for the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Services: Service Strategy and Integration

| 1399 | Investigate community facility requirements in Glen Innes and Panmure to support TEC and Panuku programmes | Improve Glen Innes Hall as part of the future implementation of the Raupoota Reserve Master Plan and investigate possible connections with Te Oro. Investigate provision of library facilities in this area giving consideration to facility condition and scope. Options identified for preferred option to inform business case. | Oversight of options identified for preferred option to inform business case | CS: Service Strategy and Integration | $0 Regional | In progress | Green | Scope was workshoped with the local board on 7 August 2019, and confirmed by memo after the workshop. Staff are progressing Phase One of the project including review of information on the council community facilities within scope, and will come back to the board to workshop community engagement in October/November 2018, ahead of implementation in November 2019 - February 2019. | A draft community engagement plan was workshoped with the local board in November and revised as a result of feedback. The plan will include the Panmure Community Action Group and staff will attend the Panmure Fun Day on 10 February to support engagement. Q3 deliverable: Implement the community engagement plan in preparation for a Local Board workshop in quarter four. |  |

### Infrastructure and Environmental Services

| 777  | Community Awareness and riparian and iwi engagement activities | Continue to support the development of MAO Ave. An Auckland Council officer will project manage, along with MAO Ave Community Group and a technical contractor, to support volunteers to continue to protect, enhance and restore the ecological health of the Omaha catchment. Riparian restoration will be delivered in Easiview Reserve and Paddington Reserve. This will include community-led weeding and planting events, with an aim of 15-100 people participating at each event. The project will also support the River Turtles event. | No further decisions are anticipated | IAES: Healthy Waters | $20,000 LDI Opex | On Hold | Amber | A procurement process has stopped the planning and implementation of this project. A workshop will be scheduled in quarter two with this local board if a solution cannot be found. | There have been some procurement issues that are being worked through with the supplier and other relevant council departments to ensure the project can still be delivered within the financial year. An workshop has been scheduled with the local board in February 2019 to discuss options for this project and confirm next steps for project delivery, as this has not yet started. |  |
| 874  | Water Quality Monitoring Follow Up | To continue to deliver water quality testing in the following areas: | No further decisions are anticipated | IAES: Healthy Waters | $5,000 LDI Opex | In progress | Green | The Panmure Basin, Ian Shaw Park, and the Panmure Wharf Reserve are now part of the Watershed programme. The board agreed following a workshop in August 2018 to invest the budget in microbial source tracking for the three sites as well as two additional ones, Onehunga Lagoon - Beachcroft Ave and Taumaru Reserve. This will identify E. coli origins in order to implement interventions to address water quality issues. This testing will be undertaken during quarters two, three and four. | Water testing began in quarter two. The testing of the five sites, Panmure Basin, Ian Shaw Park, Panmure Wharf Reserve, Onehunga Lagoon - Beachcroft Ave and Taumaru Reserve will be completed in quarter three. Following the testing the results will be presented to the local board in quarter four. |  |
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Point</th>
<th>Lead Dept/ Unit/ CCD</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>904</td>
<td>Tamaki Estuary Environmental Coordinator - Maungakiekie - Tāmaki</td>
<td>To see Te Wā te Tahu (the Tamaki Estuary) as a thriving, dynamic, and healthy ecosystem that is loved and used by the community and which positively enhances and connects with the Manukau Harbour, the Waterekia Harbour and the Hauraki Gulf (Tamaki with Clean Environment vision). Specifically this budget will fund a coordinator at 12 hours per week to support the Tamaki Estuary Environmental Forum (TEEF), and support groups in progressing the above vision for the Tamaki estuary. TEEF operate as a collaboration between five local boards, and several community organisations, to advocate for the Tamaki catchment. This year will see exploration of additional funding sources and sponsors to support aspirations of the group. TEEF also hopes to partner with academic institutions to discover more about the environmental issues and social interactions of communities within the Tamaki catchment.</td>
<td>No further decisions are anticipated.</td>
<td>IAES Healthy Waters</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>LDQ, Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During quarter one, elected co-chairs Julie Chambers representing the community and Carmel Cladding representing local boards established a monthly forum meetings. The chairs have undertaken visits to four of the local boards that support the forum to present on recent activities and the proposed direction of the forum for the 2018/2019 financial year. The fifth presentation will be provided at the Manukau-Ohaku Local Board’s November 2018 business meeting. The forum’s coordinator contract has been extended to the end of June 2019. The next forum meeting is scheduled for 25 October 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>Manukau Harbour Forum Maungakiekie - Tāmaki</td>
<td>To implement the Manukau Harbour Forum work programme. The proposed work programme includes a governance review, communications plan, symposium, and an education project.</td>
<td>No further decisions are anticipated.</td>
<td>IAES Healthy Waters</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>LDQ, Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>At the August 2018 business meeting, the forum agreed to allocate its $81,000 operational expenditure budget towards the delivery of the following projects in the 2018/2019 financial year: • governance and management support review ($22,000) • symposium and community event ($20,000) • communications plan ($14,000) • industry education programme ($10,000) • youth leadership programme ($5,000) During quarter one, two forum newsletters were produced and distributed to the stakeholder list. An interview with the forum chair was published on Our Auckland and shared via local board social media. The video footage taken last financial year is currently being added into promotional videos of the Manukau Harbour. Planning for the youth leadership programme, symposium and community event, and the governance and management support review is underway. An industry education programme has yet to be developed and will be discussed at the forum’s October 2018 workshop.</td>
<td>In quarter two the forum: • provided feedback on projects to be considered under the natural environment targeted rate • presented to the Environment and Community Committee on the small sites ambassador report advocating for more funding for sedimentation and pollution regulatory activity • distributed the October-November 2018 forum newsletter • supported the proposed industry education programme which will deliver a constructed wetland day event in either Drury or Takapuna in quarter three • supported a proposal to expand the symposium and community event into several staggered components, including a stand at the 2019 Otehanga Festival, support for March 2019 Sea Week, and a symposium in quarter four. In quarter three the next issue of the forum’s newsletter will be distributed; the governance review will begin and the promotional videos will be ready for publication. The youth leadership programme workshop is scheduled for quarter four in April 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>Love Your Neighbourhood (Ecobricks, Environmental Trust)</td>
<td>• Provide rapid response assistance up to a value of $500 to support volunteer driven practical environmental initiatives, e.g. environmental clean ups and restoration, community planting and food growing. • Includes providing practical assistance to not-for-profit preschools to enable environmental education initiatives, in particular edible gardens and water saving/collection devices. • Promote the availability of the assistance through appropriate networks across the Maungakiekie - Tāmaki Local Board area. Respond to requests from the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board to support community action.</td>
<td>No further decisions are anticipated.</td>
<td>IAES Environmental Services</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>LDQ, Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A funding agreement was established with Ecobricks Environment Trust for the delivery of the Love Your Neighbourhood initiative. Three applications were supported in quarter one, totalling $1,500. The recipients of the grant are The Salvation Army Early Childhood Education Centre, Mt Willis Pre-School in Mount Wellington and Dynamic Kids in Onehunga, enabling vegetable gardens and compost systems to be established at each site. Further promotion for the Love Your Neighbourhood initiative is scheduled for quarter two.</td>
<td>Six applications were approved in quarter two, a substantial increase from quarter one, resulting in a total of $4500 allocated from the initiative to date and $4000 remaining. Initiatives supported in quarter two included an Onehunga primary school which received funding to support their Waste-Busters programme. The funding enabled the entire school to divert compostable food scraps and paper, and also paper recycling from landfill. Previously, 75% of food scraps were going to landfill and 45% of paper was going to landfill (statistics from June 2018 waste audit). All teachers and all children in the school are now involved in checking and emptying waste from our new bins. This represents a significant step forward for the environmental education of the whole school community. Further promotion for the Love Your Neighbourhood initiative is scheduled for quarter three to encourage more applicants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>Low Carbon Living - Maungakiekie - Tāmaki</td>
<td>The project has two objectives: to reduce residential energy use and associated carbon emissions and also improve resident health by keeping houses warmer and drier. Insulation, ventilation and efficient heating are critical to improved health outcomes in poor quality homes in Auckland. Efforts to improve insulation, ventilation and heating along with the use of more efficient appliances are key to making homes warmer whilst lowering domestic energy use. The project involves a door-to-door provision of home energy advice and/or energy saving devices to residents, including new migrants, in high priority locations within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area as determined via census data. Follow up survey of participants to evaluate effectiveness of action taken as a result of the provision of advice, information and/or targeted energy efficiency devices for use in the home.</td>
<td>No further decisions are anticipated.</td>
<td>IAES Environmental Services</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>LD/ Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Procurement has been completed with Ecological Associates secured as the vendor. Area selection will commence in quarter three with door knocking starting in quarter four. The bulk of the delivery is scheduled to be completed in quarter four, as home energy efficiency initiatives are most successful when delivered in winter. Once the project is complete, an Our Auckland story is planned celebrating success and give thanks to the board for supporting the project.</td>
<td>Area selection will commence in quarter three with door knocking starting in quarter four. The bulk of the delivery is scheduled to be completed in quarter four, as home energy efficiency initiatives are most successful when delivered in winter. Staff are exploring the potential to include a waste element into the door knocking component of this project. Delivery of this project is on track, scheduled to be completed in quarter four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>Experiential learning and action for water in schools</td>
<td>This school project focuses on students connecting to the environment (water focus) through experiential learning resulting in students undertaking actions in their local community.</td>
<td>No further decisions are anticipated.</td>
<td>IAES Environmental Services</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>LD/ Opex</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Initial conversations have been held with two schools about the project and potential contractors have been identified. Contracts will be finalised in quarter two and delivery is scheduled to begin quarter three.</td>
<td>There is a delay in delivery due to difficulty identifying suitable contractors. However, the programme delivery and spend is expected to remain on track. A closed tender for programme delivery has gone out to three potential providers. The successful provider will start the development of the education and experiential sessions in quarter three and deliver them in quarters three and four. Further communication regarding the programme has gone out to all schools in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>Pest education and management for schools</td>
<td>This project focuses on educating and empowering school students to undertake pest management in their schools and households to improve biodiversity (focus on rats and moth plant).</td>
<td>There are no further decisions required for 2019/2019.</td>
<td>IAES Environmental Services</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>LD/ Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Initial conversations have been held with schools about the project and potential contractors have been identified. Contracts will be finalised in quarter two and delivery is scheduled to begin in quarter three.</td>
<td>A closed tender for programme delivery has gone out to three potential providers. The successful provider will start the development of the education and experiential sessions in quarter three and deliver them in quarters three and four. Further communication regarding the programme has gone out to all schools in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>2654</td>
<td>Healthy Rentals (Maungakiekie- Tāmaki)</td>
<td>The healthy rentals project aims to improve the quality of rental housing and improve household energy efficiency. The programme is targeted at private rental properties with low housing quality, low income tenants, or tenants who have health conditions related to cold, damp housing. Landlords receive assistance to meet their obligations under the recent changes to the Residential Tenancies Act and provides incentives to install insulation, clean heating and interventions to control dampness. The project: Provides landlords with free, independent, technical assessment of their rental property using a housing WOF model. Offers subsidies to landlords to make improvements that increase the overall energy efficiency and health of the rental home. The subsidy adds to existing schemes such as the Envirosafe Home program. For example, landlords can improve the health of their homes and save money on energy bills through behaviour changes which they can take with them to future rental properties. Tenants are provided with a gift pack of items to support the goals of the programme. Note: the budget for this activity is deferred from 2017/2018.</td>
<td>No further decisions are anticipated</td>
<td>IAES, Environmental Services</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The 2017/2018 healthy rentals project was completed during quarter one with the carrier funds used to continue the project throughout the winter months. The project evaluation was commenced with surveys developed to gather feedback from tenants and landlords to see what improvements they have made as a result of the recommendations provided. A project wrap-up and evaluation report will be presented to the board at the beginning of quarter two.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1139 | Provision of Library Service - Maungakiekie- Tāmaki | Deliver a library service - Help customers find what they need, when they need it, and help them navigate our services and digital offerings. Providing information, library collection lending services and e-resources as well as support for customers using library digital resources, PCs and WiFi. Hours of service: - Glen Innes Library for 52 hours over 6 days per week ($244,177) - Onehunga Library for 52 hours over 7 days per week ($317,774) - Panmure Library for 56 hours over 7 days per week ($489,399) | No further decisions anticipated | CS: Libraries & Information | $1,341,520 | ABS: Opex | In progress | Green | Usage of the Libraries' digital resources remains strong with access to these offerings available 24/7 with digital eCollections continuing to grow with a 12 per cent increase in issues when compared to the same quarter last year. Overall visitor numbers are down 10 per cent when compared to the same quarter last year. Issues were down 5 per cent for the quarter however the number of active patrons continues to grow with a 13 per cent increase recorded. |

1190 | Preschool Programming - Maungakiekie- Tāmaki | Provide programming for preschoolers that encourages early literacy, active movement, and supports parents and caregivers to participate confidently in their children’s early development and learning. Programmes include: Wriggle and Rhyme, Rhymetime, Storytime. | No further decisions anticipated | CS: Libraries & Information | $0 | ABS: Opex | In progress | Green | A bi-lingual Storytime has started at Panmure Library to very positive feedback. This initiative was a result of a co-design project and is run in collaboration with the Panmure Community Hall. Over the first quarter there have been 103 preschool sessions delivered with a total of 466 attendees. |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td></td>
<td>Children and Youth Engagement - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Provide children and youth services and programming which encourage learning and social interaction. Engage with children, youth and families across 10-15 years of age.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ABS Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In collaboration with the Panmure Community Hub, the Panmure Library supported a group of young women from Tāmaki College to lead the Youth in the Phenomenal Young Women’s event. Over 300 young girls and women participated. A Māori study group at Panmure Library is now reading 50-60 students per week, while Code Club Aotearoa has restarted and continues to be popular. School holiday programmes in April meant all the Libraries were busy with activities being held both inhouse and through outreach. A total of 27 events were held with 657 children attending for the quarter. A special storyline themed on dialing 111 and the work of St John’s was held at Onehunga Library. Planning is underway for Kia Māia te Whāriki to Explore 2018/19 summer reading programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1142 | | Support Customer and Community Connection and Celebrate Cultural Diversity and Local Places, People and Heritage - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki | Provide services and programmes that facilitate customer connection with the library and empower communities through collaborative design and partnerships with Council and other agencies. Celebrate local communities, cultural diversity and heritage. Gather, protect and share the stories, old and new, that celebrate our people, communities and Tāmaki Makaurau. | No further decisions anticipated | CS: Libraries & Information | $0 | ABS Opex | In progress | Green | Pasifika Language Week provides a great opportunity to celebrate our diversity. Cook Islander and Tongan events were well attended and provided unique opportunities to learn and appreciate different cultures. English language classes at Panmure Library continue to attract new students. They now average 20-25 learners per week. A similar number attend the Aru Chinese Club at Onehunga Library regularly. This programme combines library elements and also two external groups in to deliver sessions that meet the needs of the community. Glen Innes Library celebrated Heritage Week - “Growing up in Glen Innes”. Current and past residents enjoyed looking back as well as acknowledging the present. Panmure and Onehunga Libraries created a “memory board” where customers shared photographs and memories of the area. Comicon Book Month proved very popular with robotics sessions, special displays and at Glen Innes Library graphic drawing classes held on Saturdays were enjoyed by adults and children. Winter Reading Movies nights for adults at Onehunga Library have been well attended. Glen Innes Library started a new ESOL group for Chinese people, run by a local resident. Glen Innes and Panmure Libraries celebrated Diwali in collaboration with community groups and our business associations. Amongst other activities, both libraries held gala events that attracted a total of over 230 participants and showcased local businesses and community members. The Onehunga Library foyer hosted Santa with face painting, balloon twisting and a special storytime and Panmure Library reached hundreds of residents at the Panmure Christmas Street Party. Glen Innes Library held Japanese Storytelling in the library foyer. Panmure Library celebrated Filipino food and culture through hosting a book launch for several Maria Sita titles. The presentation and food tasting was attended by almost 100 participants, including local library members and MPs. Panmure Library acknowledged the support of our partners and volunteers with an end of year celebration. |

| 1143 | | Celebrating Te Ao Māori and Strengthening Connections to Māori - Wharekōti i te reo Māori - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki | Celebrating to Te Ao Māori and programmes in all areas of the library with events and programmes, including council events. | No further decisions anticipated | CS: Libraries & Information | $0 | ABS Opex | In progress | Green | Glen Innes Library celebrated Kōhanga Reo week with a variety of activities including Te Reo storytimes, crafts and talks. A Māori Kai and gardening Kiwi Māia te Wha, Māoritanga and Māori Language Week. Engaging with iwi and Māori organisations Wharekōti i te reo Māori - champion and embed to rei Māori in our libraries and communities. Glen Innes Library continues their outreach to the local Kōhanga Reo with staff providing storytimes in te reo. With the growing interest in, and demand for, bilingual knowledge the Kōhanga Reo service to Explore 2018/19 also offered challenged in Te Reo. |

| 1144 | | Learning and Literacy Programming and Digital Literacy Support - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki | Provide learning programmes and events throughout the year. Support our customers through our digital collections, while literacy in the communities that need it most. Help customers and whānau learn and grow, and provide opportunities for knowledge creation and innovation. | No further decisions anticipated | CS: Libraries & Information | $0 | ABS Opex | In progress | Green | Glen Innes Library has collaborated with Adult Literacy Tāmaki Auckland students to assist them to adapt their literacy to digital formats. Lift highlighting other collections and services that are useful for the learners. Adult Learnings Week was celebrated at Panmure Library with collaborations with Age Concern, Love Food, Hate Waste and Gemherrow Financial Literacy running sessions. Panmure and Glen Innes libraries are working with Spark with their “Jumoo” initiative providing a cheap internet option for learning at home. Interest in digital literacy continues to grow at all libraries, with the high demand Panmure Library has increased the number of classes held, including ones in Tāmaki. The three libraries hold a total of 38 Book a Librarian sessions this quarter. The number of customers signing up for after-hours internet browsing via Spark Jump continues to grow through word of mouth promotion at Glen Innes Library. A divers licence course was trialled at Glen Innes Library in association with a local provider and the Police. Geneherrow Financial Literacy held a very successful screening of the short film “Intervention”, created by Dr Janine Randolph from AUT, about water quality issues in the Manukau Harbour, followed by discussions and a children’s activity on pollution. Through November Panmure Library hosted a workshop series run by Low Food Hate Waste, where participants created affordable households presents, decorations, and Christmas treats. |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>MT Future Giant Tree Planting Programme</td>
<td>Phase 1: Complete Service Provision Assessment to inform specimen tree planting to improve amenity, landscape and biodiversity with a focus on playground shade provision (PSR led, nil LDI GP EX requirement). Assessment will be workshopped with the local board before being implemented. Phase 2: Implement specimen tree planting in parks to improve amenity, landscape and biodiversity with a focus on playground shade provision (CF led, $250k LDI GAP EX requirement).</td>
<td>G2 workshop to confirm the final sites for planting.</td>
<td>CS: PSR: Park Services</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>LDI: Caper</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A workshop is being held with the board in early October to further discuss scope and timeline. Tree planting will be delivered by Community Facilities in May/June 2019.</td>
<td>A workshop was held in October 2018 at which a list of potential planting sites were presented to the board; this list will be further refined and confirmed with the board before planting is undertaken by Community Facilities in May/June 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>MT Community Gardens Service Assessment</td>
<td>Complete Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Community Gardens network review and service provision assessment to provide a strategic level view of current provision and identify potential improvements that could be made to the network. Delivery mechanism: Community accessing local board controllable grant allocation process.</td>
<td>Workshop in Q3 to discuss final options.</td>
<td>CS: PSR: Park Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A workshop is being held with the board in early October to further discuss scope and timeline.</td>
<td>A workshop was held in October 2018 to refine the scope and timeline for this project. The assessment will focus on identifying parks plus schools that have capacity and potential to accommodate a community garden and/or orchard. The assessment will be presented to the board in Q3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>MT Parks Dog Exercise Service Assessment</td>
<td>Dog exercise network and needs assessment to provide a strategic level view of provision. This will also include the current provision and current usage. The assessment will identify future improvements that could be made to the network in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.</td>
<td>Workshop in Q2 to discuss scope of assessment.</td>
<td>CS: PSR: Park Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A workshop is being held with the board in early October to further discuss scope and staff will report back with a list of potential dog off leash sites for the Board's consideration.</td>
<td>A workshop was held in October 2018 to refine the scope and timeline for this project. The assessment will focus on identifying parks that could provide &quot;off leash&quot; areas where provision is low or improvements to existing &quot;off leash&quot; areas. This assessment will be presented to the board in Q3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>MT Specific Implementation plan for Auckland’s Urban Forest (Higarene) Strategy</td>
<td>To identify a local board area programme to deliver Auckland’s Urban Forest (Higarene) Strategy, urban forest protection, provision and management for public and private landowners. The initial activity for this, the first year, is to complete spatial mapping of the existing tree canopy cover on public and private land in the local board areas, to determine the extent, type, and age of urban higarene. This information will be used to develop options and identify any funding required for the following programmes in this first or in years two and three. Growing - find space for planting new trees using partnerships including community groups and schools; Protecting - direct and indirect methods for the community to nominate and protect trees.</td>
<td>G4 workshop to discuss the draft local Higarene assessment report.</td>
<td>CS: PSR: Park Services</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>LDI: LDI</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Workshop with board members in September to share the programme and note their feedback. Preparing for the next steps. the planning phase. Background analysis of the UDAR mapping is underway to determine early indicators on the extent and condition of the local board area tree cover.</td>
<td>Continued analysis of the data released from the regional UDAR mapping. Initial drafting of the local Higarene Assessment Report is in progress. At Q2 workshop the local board reviewed their Q1 workshop feedback and confirmed the key deliverables for the Higarene-Knowing programme. This will inform the planning options for Phase 2 Growing for delivery in FY2019-2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>MT Ecological volunteering and environmental programme FY19</td>
<td>Programme of activity supporting volunteer groups to carry out ecological restoration and environmental programmes in local parks including: -Community planting events; -Pest and animal pest eradication; -Fire and green waste removal; -Contract Support; -Tools and Equipment; -Beachstream Clean Ups; -Maintenance</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: PSR: Park Services</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>LDI: LDI</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Volunteer activities in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local parks this quarter focused on rubbish clean-ups, weed control and ongoing animal pest control.</td>
<td>Volunteer activities in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Parks focused on ongoing restoration work. Planning for next seasons community tree planting and rubbish clean-ups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td>Glenites Times Pool</td>
<td>Operate Glenites Pool &amp; Leisure Centre in a safe and sustainable manner, through a management agreement with the YMCA. Deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. These services include: fitness; group fitness; learn to swim; aquatic and recreation services. Along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: PSR: Active Recreation</td>
<td>$0 ABS: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Glenites Times Pool and Leisure The pool has been a popular free opportunity with local community groups this term, including Marit Boys Rugby, Saint Mary College, Somerville Special School and Auckland University. There was an increase in customer satisfaction (measured by NPS survey) from the previous quarter. The NPS score for Quarter 1 is 37.5. This is a 5.2 increase from the previous quarter. Activation this quarter 8%. increase in centre visits 17% increase in pool visits 10.3% increase in ticket sales 18% increase in social media engagement 16.6%.</td>
<td>Active visits Sept-Nov = 60,707 , an 11% increase on the same period last year. With the largest increase in adult pool visits. Customer satisfaction (12-month average to end Q2, measured by Net Promoter Score (NPS)) increased from Q1, from 37 to 40 (Council average = 31).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Lagoon Pool &amp; Leisure</td>
<td>Operate Lagoon Pool &amp; Leisure Centre, in a safe and sustainable manner, through a management agreement with the YMCA. Deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. These services include: fitness, group fitness, learn to swim, aquatic and recreation services. Along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: PSR: Active Recreation</td>
<td>$0 ABS: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Lagoon Pool and Leisure Lagoon’s swim school manager Helen Yarn was awarded the New Zealand swim teacher of the year. For access and inclusion lessons at the AUSTSWIM awards. Customer Satisfaction There was a slight increase in customer satisfaction (measured by NPS survey) from the previous quarter. The NPS score for Quarter 1 is 31.3, this is a 1.2 increase from the previous quarter. Activation this quarter 17% decrease in centre visits, this is largely due to the fitness visits.</td>
<td>Active visits Sept-Nov = 46,781, a 5% decrease on the same period last year. Customer satisfaction (12-month average to end Q2, measured by Net Promoter Score (NPS)) increased from Q1, from 39 to 42 (Council average = 31). The slight increase in centre visits is largely due to more frequent fitness member activity, other over visits are unchanged from the same period last year. Lagoon indoor complex will be closed for three weeks in January for annual maintenance which will include a full re-tile of the indoor complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Lagoon Stadium</td>
<td>Operate Lagoon Stadium in a safe and sustainable manner, through a management agreement with the YMCA. Deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. This includes: fitness; group fitness; and recreation services, along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: PSR: Active Recreation</td>
<td>$0 ABS: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Lagoon Stadium Activation this quarter 52% decrease in centre visits</td>
<td>Active visits Sept-Nov = 9,249, no significant change on the same period last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451</td>
<td>Onahua War Memorial</td>
<td>Operate the centre in a safe and sustainable manner, through a management agreement with the YMCA. Deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. This includes: fitness, group fitness, and recreation services, along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: PSR: Active Recreation</td>
<td>$0 ABS: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Onahua War Memorial Pool and Leisure YMCA Auckland and Plunket collected a merit certificate for their collaboration to help deliver after-schools to our local communities across the NZWA Waves conference. YMCA Onahua have the naming rights to the Mangere Bridge Fun Run. Staff have been working with the organizing team and with access to the YMCA database they have helped ease participation from ‘100’ last year to over 300 this year. There was a slight decrease in customer satisfaction (measured by NPS survey) from the previous quarter. The NPS score for Quarter 1 is 19.7, this is a 3 decrease from the previous quarter. Activation this quarter 2% increase in centre visits, 19% increase in 18 and under visits.</td>
<td>Active visits Sept-Nov = 8,831, a 16% decrease on the same period last year. Customer satisfaction (12-month average to end Q2, measured by Net Promoter Score (NPS)) increased from Q1, from 20 to 25 (Council average = 31). Onahua indoor complex is due for their annual maintenance in January 2019, when customers can use the outdoor pool instead. There will be an extended closure of the spa, sauna and steam room due to the refurbishment work in the same area. There has been a slight decrease in centre visits, this is largely due to the disruption caused by the damage to, and replacement of, the sky-bridge over the pool and group fitness/childcare room. The outdoor pool was opened in December and has seen high visitor numbers due to the warmer weather this year. December visit data will be presented in the next quarterly report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2855</td>
<td>MT Parks, sports and</td>
<td>Initiate to improve service provision, by increasing access and utilisation of park, sport and recreation facilities. This is a detail for the remainder of the FY17/18 activity #1104 for budget $21,600.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: PSR: Park Services</td>
<td>$21,600 LDI: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Discuss options and prepare a brief in Q2.</td>
<td>MTUS via resolution MT15/18/1 for 27 November 2018 allocated $17,477 from this budget towards the arrows owing by theunnamed Squash Rocklet club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1432</td>
<td>Mt Wellington planning</td>
<td>Investigate the need (issues and opportunities) and potential benefits of local spatial planning for the Mt Wellington area during 2018/19 only. This may lead to identification of future planning scope and/or a local spatial plan to be prepared in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CPO: Plans and Places</td>
<td>$0 Regional</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This activity has been scheduled for the third and fourth quarters and hence has not been commenced.</td>
<td>This item will be discussed at a forthcoming workshop for staff to obtain further clarity from the Local Board on what is being sought through this work programme item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>966</td>
<td>Youth Connections (MCT)</td>
<td>Youth Connections will provide quality advice and expertise on youth employment. Locally, this is done through community-led solutions that identify and create jobs for youth, particularly those who are furthest from the job market. Note: the 2018/2019 budget figures shown for this activity includes the $50,000 originally approved plus $5,800 deferral from 2017/2018. Local opportunities to improve social and economic development outcomes. Aiming for all youth to be meaningfully engaged in education, employment or training, and have clear career pathways. An extensive network of stakeholders in the youth employment space throughout the council family and the business community. Tasks to build an enabling environment for young job seekers and youth-friendly employers.</td>
<td>Local board to approve Youth Connections youth employment initiatives to be delivered by The Southern Initiative from 1 November 2018.</td>
<td>TSI The Southern Initiative</td>
<td>$55,800 LDR: Opac, External funding</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Of the 15 young people Synergy Trust supported between April and July 2018, three have secured permanent employment and four are training and delivering in Youth Advocate roles. Eight are seeking further employment and education opportunities. In September 2018, Synergy Trust began working with a further nine young people from Onehunga and will begin to build youth numbers in Oranga Q2. DINE Academy trained six young people in Q1. Sixteen young people have been trained from April 2018. Six, of the 16, have secured casual employment, one of which was previously not in employment, education or training. Fifteen of the 16 trained have entered or remained in education or training. Staff updated the local board at a recent workshop on the upcoming Youth Connections programme transition from the Community Empowerment Unit to The Southern Initiative. Staff are working towards transitioning the programme to TSI as of 1 November 2018.</td>
<td>DINE Academy supported 10 young people into part-time education/training and 5 have obtained casual employment in hospitality. Synergy Trust are running a Youth Mentoring and Work Readiness programme. The first leg of the programme ran at the Onehunga Community Centre with the second leg starting in January 2019 at Oranga Community Centre. Two out of 15 registered entrants to the programme-9 candidates fully graduated the programme-3 in full time employment-3 in self-employment-2 in work experience/apprenticeship training-1 in full time tertiary studies As Job Fest 2018 was cancelled, Synergy have built relationships with local businesses directly. Two options for 2018-19 were submitted to and approved by the local board 1. $30,000 for a collaboration with HLC regarding the Oneanga development. Agreement in principle, subject to further detail of $10,000 for a partnership with Toll Group. This leaves a total of $7,000 to be reallocated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept/Unit or COO</th>
<th>CL: Lease Commencement Date</th>
<th>CL: Right of Renewal</th>
<th>CL: Final Lease Expiry Date</th>
<th>CL: Annual Rent Amount (excluding GST)</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>47 Hill Street, Onehunga. Lease to Auckland Playcentres Association Incorporated - Onehunga</td>
<td>Renew lease to Auckland Playcentres Association Incorporated - Onehunga</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/10/2008</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>30/06/2023</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter two.</td>
<td>Site visit scheduled for quarter three. This renewal will be processed using the streamlined approval process. A memorandum will be sent to the local board for approval after completion of a site visit, and review of the renewal lease application. The group’s lease application was received in December 2018. This will be workshopped with the local board in February 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Ion Swale Reserve, 252A Panana Rd, Mount Wellington. Lease to Auckland Rowing Club Incorporated</td>
<td>New reserve lease to Auckland Rowing Club. New sublease for premises from Auckland Rowing Club to Kings College</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>21/12/2003</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>21/11/2018</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A site visit and inspection have been completed. The club is working on their application for a new lease. Will follow this up in quarter two.</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter three. This lease project is not due to commence until quarter three. This lease project will commence in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>Mount Wellington War Memorial Reserve, 59 Duncle Road, Panmure. Lease to Mt Wellington Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Renew ground and building lease to Mt Wellington Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/01/2009</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>31/12/2023</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter three.</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter three. This lease project will commence in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>3 Rowe Street, Onehunga. Lease to Shari Hines Charitable Trust Incorporated</td>
<td>Renew ground and building lease to Shari Hines Charitable Trust</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/02/2014</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>31/12/2024</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter three.</td>
<td>This lease project will commence in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>101 Church Street, Onehunga. Lease to The Asian Network Incorporated</td>
<td>Renew ground and building lease to The Asian Network Incorporated</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>25/09/2013</td>
<td>1 x 5 years</td>
<td>24/08/2023</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The club is currently working on their application for renewal. Will follow this up in October. A site visit is planned once the club has submitted their completed application form.</td>
<td>A site visit was completed in October, and application for renewal has been received from the club. This will be reported in January 2019 using the streamlined approval process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td>Waitakarua Park, 246 Hamilton Street, Onehunga. Lease to Auckland Canine Agility Club Incorporated</td>
<td>New community ground and building lease to Auckland Canine Agility Club Incorporated</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/04/2004</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>31/03/2019</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter three.</td>
<td>This lease project will commence in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>Waitakarua Park, 175-243 Nelson Street, Te Papapop. Lease to Onehunga Combined Sports Trust</td>
<td>New community ground and building lease to Auckland Combined Sports Trust</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>2/01/2004</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>31/08/2018</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A meeting between the Trust and Community Facilities was held in July to discuss maintenance cost options, for the use of the Trust’s bathrooms and changing rooms by the public. The Trust will provide a unit cost proposal for this, and their application for a new lease will be workshopped with the board once this information is received. The Trust advised in August that they are awaiting advice from their accountant on the unit cost proposal, before being able to submit the information.</td>
<td>Follow-up requests for application information were made in October and November 2018. The Trust advised in December that they are still awaiting proposed maintenance cost information and will send this once received. This property is on the seismic study programme managed by the Asset Management Intelligence Support Team. This application for a new lease was received in December 2018 from this group. This will be reviewed in early 2019 and because this property is on the seismic study programme, an update from the Asset Management Intelligence Support Team will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>Penmore Stone Cottage, 1 Kings Road, Penmaur. Lease to Penmaur Historical Society Incorporated</td>
<td>New community lease for operation and management of Penmore Stone Cottage to Penmaur Historical Society Incorporated</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/01/2009</td>
<td>1 x 5 years</td>
<td>31/12/2018</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>Savage Park, 10 Haddrad Road, Mount Wellington. Lease to Scout Association of New Zealand. Maungakiekie Scout Group</td>
<td>New community ground lease to Scout Association of NZ. Maungakiekie Scout Group</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/04/2014</td>
<td>1 x 5 years</td>
<td>31/03/2019</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter four.</td>
<td>This lease project will commence in quarter four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>134 Ellison Avenue, Point England. Lease to Te Aro Hoi Community Chilcare Centre Incorporated</td>
<td>New ground and building lease to Te Aro Hoi Community Chilcare Centre Incorporate</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/12/2003</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>30/11/2023</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter two.</td>
<td>A site visit was conducted in November 2018 and the lease application was received from the group in December 2018. This will be reviewed in January 2019 and workshopped with the local board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Department</th>
<th>CL: Lease Commencement Date</th>
<th>CL: Right of Renewal</th>
<th>CL: Final Lease Expiry Date</th>
<th>CL: Annual Rent Amount (excluding GST)</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2552</td>
<td>Kauri Park, Waiohua Road, Eketahuna Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
<td>New community lease to Eketahuna Tennis Club incorporated. Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/09/2003</td>
<td>2x 5 years</td>
<td>31/12/2017</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A site inspection has been completed, and a meeting with the club was held in August to go through their queries relating to their application for a new lease. Presentation work in progress for tenant engagement with the Mania Whenua forum, and correspondence with relevant iwi was completed in October. Public notification was also completed in November. The club's application along with feedback from iwi was workshopped with the local board. A formal report seeking approval for the new lease will be completed and presented to the March 2019 business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2555</td>
<td>Jellicoe Park, Quadrant Road, Orihuna Fencible and Historical Society Incorporated</td>
<td>New community lease to Orihuna Fencible and Historical Society Incorporated. Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>22/06/1989</td>
<td>Indefinite 7 year intervals</td>
<td>21/08/2017</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Site visit completed in August. This lease project is proposed to start in quarter four to enable the seismic evaluation being undertaken on collages to be completed. This project is a group that will commence in quarter four. Have sought an update on this from the Specialist Technical Statutory Advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2557</td>
<td>Panmure Basin, 100A Inland Road, Panmure - Renueal lease to Panmure Lagoon Sailing Club Incorporated</td>
<td>New lease Panmure Lagoon Sailing Club Incorporated. Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/09/2007</td>
<td>2x 5 years</td>
<td>31/08/2022</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Application sent to Land Information New Zealand on 30 January 2018 under the Maritime Coastal Area Act 2011 for Sections 1 and 2 SO 31754 to be declared Crown land under the Land Act 1948. The Department of Conservation approval to declare Sections 1 and 2 under the Land Act to be set apart as a recreation reserve and under the Reserves Act 1977, to classify Sections 1 and 2 as a recreation reserve and to vest in the Auckland Council, in trust for recreation purposes, in a lengthy process with an unknown time frame. Council staff will continue to monitor this in quarter two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2558</td>
<td>Hatte North Reserves, 38A Edith Avenue - Model Aero Club Incorporated</td>
<td>New lease To Tamaki Model Aero Club Incorporated. Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/04/2006</td>
<td>2x 5 years</td>
<td>31/02/2021</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Office has confirmed that a renewal of lease may be progressing for this lease. No new lease should be granted beyond the final lease expiry date 30 June 2022. Settlement negotiation is anticipated to be finalized by end of 2019. A site visit will be conducted to the site in quarter two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2559</td>
<td>Waipatika Reserve, 9G 135 Lint Rd, Glen Innes - Lease to RNZ Plunket Society - Glen Innes</td>
<td>New lease to RNZ Plunket Society - Glen Innes. Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/04/2001</td>
<td>2x 5 years</td>
<td>31/03/2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A site inspection was completed. Presentation work in progress for attending the Mania Whenua Forum. It is to take place at the end of September 2018. Tenant engagement is required before granting of a new lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2560</td>
<td>Orange Community Centre, 5/7 Watiahi Road, Onehunga - Lease to RNZ Plunket Society - Orange/Cornwall</td>
<td>New lease to RNZ Plunket Society - Orange/Cornwall. Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/04/2006</td>
<td>2x 5 years</td>
<td>31/03/2021</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease renewal is not due to commence until quarter two. Tenant engagement is occurring with Plunket to resolve outstanding account balances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2562 | Panmure Community Hall, 7-13 Pinkington Road, Panmure - Renewal lease to RNZ Plunket Society - Panmure | New lease to RNZ Plunket Society - Panmure. Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme. | CF: Community Leases | 1/09/2005                  | 2x 5 years           | 31/05/2020                 | $250.00                              | In progress | Green | Ongoing discussions in progress between Community Places and the group on the internal structure of the new office. Once this has been completed the new lease application will be progressed. This matter is under Community Places for completion of the internal structure works.                                                                 apologized for this.
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Programme</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dec Unit or CCO</th>
<th>CL- Lease Commencement Date</th>
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<th>RAG</th>
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<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2564</td>
<td>90-10W Live Road Glen Innes, Lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Glen Innes</td>
<td>New community lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Glen Innes (Ruapataki Reserve). Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>06/01/2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>06/01/2019</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Ongoing discussions internally and with the group are still in progress. It is anticipated that the group will sign a formal agreement to confirm their move out of the current space and relocation into the new offices at the Glen Innes Community Hall before the end of 2018. Modification work on the new offices is underway. It is anticipated that relocation and the processing of the new lease application will take place at the beginning of 2019.</td>
<td>Ongoing discussions between staff and the group on the occupation of the area in the community centre are progressing. Legal are preparing an agreement for Citizens Advice Bureau to confirm they accept the offer of space before renovation works are commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2566</td>
<td>Onehunga Community Centre, 911 Church Street, Onehunga, Lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Onehunga</td>
<td>New community lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Onehunga. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>06/01/2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>06/01/2019</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter four.</td>
<td>The draft lease is with council’s solicitors for review following input from CAG and council staff. If no further issues are raised, the revised deed will be sent to CAG for execution and any renewals under the lease can be progressed. This is anticipated to be finalised in quarter four. Board still to approve multi-tenants lease before this can be progressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2568</td>
<td>Panmure Community Centre, 7/31 Wellington Road Panmure, Lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Panmure</td>
<td>New community lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Panmure. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>06/01/2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>06/01/2019</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter four.</td>
<td>The draft lease is with council’s solicitors for review following input from CAG and council staff. If no further issues are raised, the revised deed will be sent to CAG for execution and any renewals under the lease can be progressed. This is anticipated to be finalised in quarter four. Board still to approve multi-tenants lease before this can be progressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2573</td>
<td>Ruapataki Reserve, 106 Line Road Glen Innes, Renewal lease to Ruapataki Mars Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Renewal lease to Ruapataki Mars Society Incorporated. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>18/12/1981</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>17/12/2014</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Ongoing discussions internally and collaboration between Auckland Council and the mars will continue into quarter two. This is a significant project which was carried over from the previous year’s work programme.</td>
<td>Discussions and collaboration between Auckland Council and the mars are in process. This is a significant project which will take time to finalise details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2576</td>
<td>Pointers Reserve, 112 Blenheim Avenue, Glen Innes. Renovation lease to Tāmaki Model Aero Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Renewal lease to Tāmaki Model Aero Club Incorporated. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/03/2007</td>
<td>2x5 years</td>
<td>28/02/2022</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Office have confirmed that the lease renewed for this site may proceed. Settlement negotiations are expected to reach resolution at the end of 2018, and a new lease may not be granted after the expiry of the current lease in 2022. This lease project will start in quarter three after settlement negotiations have been resolved.</td>
<td>This lease project will commence in quarter four. A site visit was completed in October 2019. The airspace lease renewal application has been received and reviewed. This lease renewal will be reported using the streamlined process. A memorandum will be sent to the local board for their approval during this quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2577</td>
<td>All Saints Reserve, 50-52 Allenby Road Panmure, Lease to The Scout Association of NZ - Panmure Scout Group</td>
<td>New community lease to The Scout Association of NZ - Panmure Scout Group. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/07/1997</td>
<td>1x5 years</td>
<td>30/06/2017</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter three.</td>
<td>This lease will be progressed in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2578</td>
<td>Jordan Park, 17A Cameron Street, Onehunga. Lease to Tāmaki Health Society Incorporated</td>
<td>New community lease to Tāmaki Health Society Incorporated. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/07/2010</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>30/06/2015</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Local board have confirmed for the group to remain on a monthly roll over lease until Panuku complete the feasibility study for the property and report back with advice on the future of this site to the local board.</td>
<td>This matter is with Panuku to complete the feasibility study and advise the local board on the future of this site. Panuku is to complete the feasibility study, and present findings and advice on the future of the site to the local board. The club is in discussions with Park Sports and Recreation staff to confirm the details of their move to the new location, and the future use of Harmin Fort site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2579</td>
<td>Harmin Park, 19 Harmin Road Mt Wellington. Lease to Wellington Cricket Club Incorporated</td>
<td>New community lease to Mt Wellington Cricket Club Incorporated. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF - Community Leases</td>
<td>1/08/1979</td>
<td>1x12 years, 1x9 years</td>
<td>31/07/2003</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Local Board confirmed that the club will remain on a monthly rollover until future planning related to the site has not been addressed by Community Services who are in ongoing discussions with the club.</td>
<td>The club has been relocated to Mt Wellington War Memorial Park as resolved by the local board in December 2019. The club is in discussions with Park Sports and Recreation staff to confirm the details of their move to the new location, and the future use of Harmin Fort site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Operating performance financial summary

#### Operating performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(000's)$</th>
<th>FY2019 Quarter 2</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net operating expenditure</td>
<td>6,486</td>
<td>6,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenditure</td>
<td>6,772</td>
<td>7,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services</td>
<td>5,526</td>
<td>5,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental services</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes Asset Based and LDI

#### Commentary

The net operating expenditure at $6.486 million is 5 per cent ($318,000) below the budget.

**Operating revenue** is above the budget by $62,000 and is mainly from miscellaneous income from libraries, community leases and Te Oro Music and Arts centre.

**Operating expenditure** at $6.772 million is below budget by 4 percent ($257,000) and mainly in Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI). Several projects are in progress with delivery in the next 6 months.

Watching brief for key projects that are behind budget are:

- Integrated ACE activity including broker community activation. This is the first year of implementing a new programme and various parts of the programme are work in progress. The Partnership Broker has been appointed in October 2018 and Expression of Interest for initiatives to be supported by the partnership fund will close in January 2019.

- Ready to rent - a series of pilot workshops will start in Quarter three, targeting Oranga vulnerable renters with other workshops planned for Quarter four.

- Youth Connection — programme delivery has been transferred to The Southern Initiative in November 2018 and initiatives need to be confirmed.

- Community led Riparian restoration – to discuss options for this project with the local board in February.

Note that the 2017/2018 approved operating expenditure carry forward has now been included in the revised budget. Further project details are available in Quarter Two Work Programme update.

#### LDI by activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating expenditure</th>
<th>471</th>
<th>706</th>
<th>235</th>
<th>1,496</th>
<th>1,365</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community services</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LDI Operating Expenditure – all projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Year To Date ($000)</th>
<th>Full Year ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE LDI Staff allocation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZAC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building programme/Ready to rent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community placemaking initiatives/ Funding broker community activation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Places programme LDI top up/ Riverside Community Centre Programme delivery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community response operating fund</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological volunteers environmental programme</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local civic functions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community grants</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local events fund</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panmure hall activation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks response fund</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Sports and Rec svc provision</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruapotaka Marae support projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Communities to Lead - Integrated ACE activity</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forest (Ngahere) strategy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Co-design events</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth connections across Auckland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Community services</strong></td>
<td>455</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>Year To Date ($000)</td>
<td>Full Year ($000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon reduction initiatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community led Riparian restoration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco City activation/ Love Your Neighbour</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy homes project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau Harbour Forum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau Harbour water quality impr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Schools Project / Pest education &amp; management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Est/Panmure Basin water quality impr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Estuary environmental forum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality monitoring</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Environmental services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review existing concept/masterplans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruapotaka Reserve precinct impl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Planning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment B

### Item 17

#### Capital expenditure summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$000's</th>
<th>FY2019 Quarter 2</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditure</td>
<td>8,062</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>(5,932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services</td>
<td>8,052</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>(5,932)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes Asset Based and LDI

#### Commentary

Capital expenditure at $8,052 million is 280 per cent ($5,934 million) above budget and mainly in:

- Local asset renewals programme $3,514 million include coastal wall renewal and Panmure wharf, renewal of the Lagoon pool, upgrade of Onehunga pool and Panmure library.
- General park development $1,057 million spent in the Panmure basin, Onehunga Bay Reserve and Taniwha Reserve.
- Greenway and walkway development $3,344 million for the Tamaki Estuary coastal walkway.

**LDI capex.**

The full year’s revised budget for LDI capex is $935,000 and the actual year to date expenditure is $27,000.

LDI capex projects under Investigation and Design include:

- Onehunga Bay Reserve – to confirm scope and progress the concept stage by end of March 2019.
- Wai-o-Taiki Nature Reserve – scoping to refine the design brief with the board in February 2019.

LDI minor capex $50,000 – to identify projects that require funding

Parking Reserve Fund $509,000 – to identify parking projects for allocation.

Further project details are available in Quarter Two Work Programme update.
## Capital Expenditure – all projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Year To Date ($000)</th>
<th>Full Year ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local asset renewals programme</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally driven initiatives (LDI Capex)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General park development</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway and walkway development</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportspark Development (Waikaraka Park)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage one development (Sir Woolf Fisher Park)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade (Jubilee bridge)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playscape development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Community services</td>
<td>8,052</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,052</td>
<td>2,118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek local board feedback on the draft *Increasing Aucklanders’ participation in sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039*.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. To respond to population growth and demographic change, Auckland Council has developed a plan for how it will invest in sport for the next 20 years.

3. The *Increasing Aucklanders’ participation in sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039* seeks to:
   - increase participation in sport by targeting communities of greatest need and addressing disparities
   - deliver a broad range of programmes, services and facilities that respond to the diverse needs of Auckland’s communities
   - address population growth and changing sport preferences through regular assessments of, and changes to, programmes, services and facilities to maximise participation.

4. The draft plan was endorsed by the Environment and Community Committee in December 2018 for public consultation [CP2018/07771].

5. This report invites local boards to formally indicate their support for the draft plan and any additional feedback on the draft plan they would like the committee to consider prior to the plan’s adoption.

6. Staff have engaged with local boards informally at various stages throughout the development of the plan. Local boards members’ views and concerns have helped shape the key components of the plan.

7. A summary of consultation feedback will be prepared for the Environment and Community Committee for consideration. Final decision on the adoption of the plan will be sought in May 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) endorse the draft *Increasing Aucklanders’ participation in sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039* and provide any additional feedback for consideration of the Environment and Community Committee.

Horopaki
Context
The plan sets out a new investment approach, which better responds to growth and the changing needs of Aucklanders
8. Auckland is experiencing rapid population growth and social change. Our diverse communities have different preferences and requirements for sport and recreation activities.

9. The draft *Increasing Aucklanders’ participation in sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039* is the council’s response to these changes. It sets out a new approach to regional investment in sports facilities, programmes and services for Aucklanders over the next 20 years.

10. The plan will:
   - target communities of greatest need and address disparities
   - deliver a broad range of programmes, services and facilities that respond to the diverse needs of Auckland’s communities
   - address population growth and changing sport preferences through regular assessments of, and changes to, programmes, services and facilities.

11. The draft plan has three main sections:
   - Section one: ‘Why we invest’ explains the reasons for having an investment plan and the strategic context.
   - Section two: ‘What we invest in’ explains the outcomes sought from the council’s sports investment, the scope and focus of that investment and the principles that will guide future investment decisions.
   - Section three: ‘How we will work’ explains the investment framework that will be adopted to achieve the outcomes.

12. The development of the draft plan involved several Governing Body decisions, local board engagement, public consultation and research. The attached draft plan provides the chronological timeline for developing the plan.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

**Adoption of the plan will contribute to multiple strategic outcomes**

13. Sport is one of the key areas the council invests in to deliver on the ‘Belonging and Participation’ outcome in *Auckland Plan 2050*.

   **Belonging and Participation**
   - **Focus Area 7** – Recognise the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life
   - **Direction 1** – Foster an inclusive Auckland where everyone belongs
   - **Direction 2** – Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing disparities in opportunities.

14. The draft plan focuses on delivering a single outcome: increasing Aucklanders’ participation in community sport. This aligns with the vision of the *Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan 2014-2024*: ‘Aucklanders: more active, more often.’

15. The multiple benefits delivered to local communities through increased sport participation will also contribute directly to the health, social and economic outcomes for Aucklanders as set out in the local board plans.

**Achieving the desired outcomes requires putting people at the heart our investment**

16. The plan sets out a targeted, people-centric approach to increase sport participation in Auckland. Future sport investment will focus on meeting the needs of three distinct groups of people:
1. **People who already play sport:**
   There will be more fit-for-purpose facilities and programmes to keep them actively involved in sport.

2. **People who play a new sport (like futsal)**
   Currently there are limited opportunities to play, but in the future, there will be more fit-for-purpose facilities and programmes that cater to new and emerging sports.

3. **People who currently do not participate in sport**
   Auckland Council will create more opportunities and make it easier for them to take up sport.

17. A key step towards increasing sport participation rates in these targeted groups is through addressing disparities.

18. Decision-makers will use a set of principles to prioritise multiple investment projects. ‘Equity’ has the highest weighing to ensure all Aucklanders enjoy the same outcomes. The full list of principles includes:
   - **Equity (40 per cent of assessment)** – Sport investment should ensure equity of outcomes across the population regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status or where people live.
   - **Outcome-focused (30 per cent)** – There needs to be a clear line of sight between each investment and the outcomes it delivers.
   - **Financial sustainability (30 per cent)** – Investment decisions need to be financially sustainable for council and sports organisations.
   - **Accountability (10 per cent)** – Auckland Council has responsibility to act in the best interests of Auckland.

**There will be changes to the way we currently invest in sport**

19. The draft plan sets out four key shifts in our approach as illustrated in Figure 1 below.

**Figure 1: Key shifts**
20. Figure 2 below explains the reasons for these key shifts, the problems they will tackle and the benefits for Aucklanders.

Figure 2: Intervention logic map
21. The plan will ensure robust, evidence-based decision-making and ongoing monitoring of benefits delivered to our communities.

22. Performance data will be collected to measure the return on investment. This will be shared with investors and ratepayers.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views**

23. Once adopted, the plan will have a direct impact on council’s internal investment processes, particularly regarding how future projects will be assessed and monitored.

24. Parks, Sport and Recreation staff have been engaged throughout the development of the draft plan. Their feedback, particularly regarding how the proposed changes can be adopted in practice, has helped shape the investment framework and the scenarios in the draft plan.

25. Parks, Sport and Recreation staff have also facilitated the council’s engagement with the sport sector through Aktive, the council’s strategic partner for sport. The general feedback is supportive of the new investment approach to improve participation and deliver better outcomes for Aucklanders.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

The local boards have an important role to play in shaping the draft plan

26. The local boards have an important role to play in the council’s sport investment. They:
   • set outcomes and priorities for local sport investment through local board plans
   • identify local sports facility and programmes needs and advocate for investment through the Long-term Plan and Annual Budget processes
   • have allocated decision-making responsibility for local sport facilities and initiatives including:
     - the specific location, design, build and fit-out of new local sports facilities within budget parameters agreed with the Governing Body
     - the use of local sport facilities and initiatives including leasing and changes of use
     - local recreation and sports programmes
   • manage local and sub-regional facility partnership relationships, funding or lease agreements and performance reporting
   • work together to support facilities that benefit several local board areas.

27. Staff have engaged with local boards informally at various stages throughout the development of the draft plan. Local boards members’ views and concerns have helped shape the key components of the plan.

Previous engagement with local boards showed general support for an investment plan

28. Staff met with local boards between February and April 2018 and sought informal feedback on the key components of the plan.

29. Feedback from local boards was generally supportive of a new investment plan for sports facilities to ensure consistency, efficiency, transparency and outcome delivery.

30. Challenges relating to population growth, land supply and budgetary constraints were highlighted. Local boards also noted challenges specific to their areas and populace.

31. Feedback showed a strong preference to have a flexible approach to accommodate diverse local needs.

Formal local board feedback is sought between February and March 2019

32. Staff are seeking to understand local boards’ views on the draft plan and request a formal decision at local boards’ business meetings during February and March 2019.

33. Staff would particularly value local board feedback on the following parts of the draft plan (refer Attachment A), which are likely to have the most bearing on local board decision-making:
   • the key shifts in the council’s future investment approach in sport (page 4)
   • the benefits of sports to Auckland communities, particularly Te Ao Māori (page 9)
   • the difference between equity and equality in the context of sport investment (pages 22-23)
   • the proposed investment framework (pages 24-36).

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

34. Sport participation contributes directly to the following ‘Māori Identity and Wellbeing’ outcome in Auckland Plan 2050:
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
26 February 2019

Māori Identity and Wellbeing

- **Direction 1** – ‘Advance Māori wellbeing’
- **Focus area 1** – ‘Meet the needs and support the aspirations of tamariki and their whanau’

35. According to Sport New Zealand data weekly sport participation of Māori in Auckland (76.8 per cent) is similar to European (76.3 per cent), but higher than Asian (70.7 per cent) and Pasifika (69.1 per cent).

36. Research also show pockets of sedentary Māori who do not have adequate opportunities to participate in sport. They will be a target group for investment.

37. Feedback from the Mana Whenua Forum and Aktive Māori Advisory Group during public consultation on the discussion document informed the development of the plan.

38. A key area of focus was the delivery of outcomes through increased Māori participation. Means of achieving this goal include partnerships with iwi and Māori organisations, to manage demand efficiently and to use sports programmes and facilities as a social hub to strengthen cultural and community connections.

39. Partnerships will draw on Māori-centric models and collective models of learning so that key Māori concepts become embedded in sport service design and delivery.

40. Staff will seek further feedback from the Mana Whenua Forum and Aktive Māori Advisory Group as part of the consultation on the draft plan.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

Financial implications

41. Once adopted, the plan will guide all council investment in sport.

42. An immediate focus will be to establish a clear and contestable process for the allocation of the $120 million Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund established in the Long-term Plan 2018–2028.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

Risks and mitigations

43. Staff have identified reputational and operational risks associated with the adoption of the draft plan. These risks will be mitigated through regular communication and engagement with key stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reputational</td>
<td>Some people might worry the plan will change arrangements already in place, or ongoing council investment.</td>
<td>Clear communication with key stakeholders and funding recipients that the plan will guide decisions on future investment only, unless a current project is already scheduled for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>The transition to the new investment 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. Changes will be phased in over the next three to five years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

44. Staff will undertake public consultation from February to March 2019.

45. The consultation will be conducted in various forms:
   - local boards will be asked to formally indicate their support for the draft plan during business meetings and provide any additional feedback
   - the public will be invited to submit their feedback via ShapeAuckland
   - targeted interviews will be conducted with community groups including Māori, Pasific and Asian people
   - the sport sector will be invited to provide their formal views through Aktive.

46. A summary of consultation feedback and a final plan will be prepared for consideration and adoption by the Environment and Community Committee around May 2019.

47. Implementation of the plan will occur in stages over the next three to five years, depending on council budgetary and planning processes. An indicative timeline of the potential changes is presented in section three of the draft plan.

48. Figure 3 below shows the next steps in a flow chart.

**Figure 3: Next steps**

- **Feb-March 2019**
  - Conduct public consultation
  - Seek formal feedback from local boards

- **March - May 2019**
  - Summarise consultation feedback and amend the plan accordingly

- **May 2019**
  - Seek final approval from the Environment and Community Committee for adoption of the plan

- **July 2019 - June 2021**
  - Commence implementation of the plan in stages

This plan will inform the development of other investment plans

49. The draft plan sets out an overarching investment framework to help decision-makers prioritise investment between different sports.

50. Separate, but related plans are being developed to guide council’s investment in golf and play facilities. These plans will be consistent with the overarching framework set out in *Increasing Aucklanders' participation in sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039*. 
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About this document

Rapid growth and social change are changing the face of Auckland.

This creates an opportunity to build a stronger, more diverse and inclusive society where people feel they belong – a vision for Auckland expressed in the Auckland Plan.

Community sport is a key part of this vision. It can bring people together in both organised and casual environments, improving the health, social and cultural outcomes for Aucklanders.

Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Sports Investment Plan 2019-2039 reflects a desire to increase the number of Aucklanders who participate in and benefit from sport.

Australians: more active, more often.

Currently, it’s not easy for everyone to participate in sport and is made harder by a shortage of facilities in the existing network. There are specific groups who are not involved in any kind of sport or have consistently low levels of participation. Our research shows there is a direct link between lack of access to facilities and low participation. This plan aims to remedy this.

The core principle driving the plan is equity-based investment to improve access and outcomes for all. This means different levels of investment will be made to bridge gaps in supply (e.g. facilities) and to increase participation by targeting specific groups. Investment is directed where there is need to achieve good outcomes for all Aucklanders.

The new investment strategy uses a people-centric approach focusing on:

- communities with low sport participation rates
- increasing participation in emerging and ethnically diverse sports
- sustaining popular sports with high participation rates.

Changes to the way people participate and play sport, as well as the sports they play are all factors driving different kinds of demand on a network of aging traditional, code-based sporting facilities.

Our new approach to investing in sport is a shift from bespoke, individualised facilities and programmes to partnership models building an affordable, fit-for-purpose network of sports facilities for all Aucklanders to enjoy.

Policy objectives

Through this document Auckland Council seeks to achieve the following policy objectives:

- ensure that all Aucklanders participate in sport, by targeting communities of greatest need and addressing disparities
- deliver a broader range of programmes, services and facilities that better respond to the diverse needs of Auckland’s communities
- address growth and changing community needs through regular assessments of, and changes to, programmes, services and facilities to maximise participation.
### Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Sports Investment Plan 2019 - 2039

#### Sport is important to Aucklanders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73% of adults participate in sport and recreation regularly. More than 90% of young people participate in sport and recreation regularly. 71% of Aucklanders would like to play more sport.

Auckland Council invests in sport because it delivers a range of health, social and economic benefits (roughly $1.76 billion each year) for our communities and for Aucklanders.

#### Investing in sport has a number of challenges

Auckland's population is rapidly growing and changing, so is the demand for sport. There is evidence showing people are participating in different types of sport and recreation activities, in different formats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young Adults</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Sports or Activities Only</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Competitive Sports or Activities</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participant</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, sport investment is facing growing budgetary and land supply constraints. The existing network of Auckland Council sports facilities is ageing and we have identified supply gaps in some areas of Auckland. (Source: SportNZ)

#### Not all Aucklanders have the same opportunities to access sport

- There is inequity across different gender, age and ethnic groups, and for people living with disabilities.
- Certain demographic groups such as Pacific and Asian residents have lower than average participation rates.

#### The new investment plan for sport

This plan sets out Auckland Council’s new approach to plan for growth and the changing preferences of Auckland’s diverse population.

**We want to increase participation in community sport...**

Our goal is to make Aucklanders “more active, more often.” We will do so by providing fit-for-purpose programmes, services and facilities that cater for the greatest number of people.

We have set aside $120 million in the Long-term Plan to fund regional and sub-regional sports facilities. This is on top of the $1 billion already allocated to sport and recreation.

**With the new plan, there will be a new investment approach...**

#### Key Shifts

We will be making several key shifts to the way we currently invest in sport. Central to these key shifts is a people-centric approach, targeting those who do not have adequate access and opportunities.

#### Investment principles

New investment will be driven by four principles:

- accountability
- equity
- financial sustainability
- outcome-focused.

#### Investment framework

Every new investment will go through a decision-making framework that will deliver value for money, robustness, consistency and transparency.

#### What does it mean for Aucklanders?

**1. “I already play sport.”**

- There will be more fit-for-purpose facilities and programmes to keep me actively involved in sport.

**2. “I play a new sport.” (like futsal)**

- Currently there are limited opportunities to play but in the future there will be more fit-for-purpose facilities and programmes that cater to new and emerging sports like mine.

**3. “I do not currently participate in sport.”**

Auckland Council will create more opportunities and make it easier for me to take up sport.

#### Collaboration and partnerships to deliver the best outcomes for Aucklanders

The scale of investment required means Auckland Council cannot work alone. We have consciously aligned with our sport sector partners: Sport New Zealand and Active. New investment will seek collaboration and partnerships to build on the existing investment by the sport sector, volunteers, local communities and private investors.
The key shifts

**Current challenges**

- **TODAY**
  - Investment decisions seek to achieve multiple objectives.

- **TOMORROW**
  - Focus Auckland Council investment on community sport, where it can add the most value.

**This means...**

- The only objective for our investment is increasing participation in community sport.
- Funding will be split between three key groups:
  - Participants in high-participation sports
  - Participants in emerging sports
  - Those who are currently inactive or have a low participation rates e.g., Pacific and Asian communities.

- Participants in new sports will not compete for funding with traditional sports. New programmes and services will seek to get inactive Aucklanders engaged in sport.
- We will achieve this goal by focusing our investment on fit-for-purpose facilities, programmes and services.
- We will prioritise multi-sports facilities over bespoke facilities to cater for the largest number of people possible.
- We will prioritise facilities that will meet the changing needs of our diverse communities.
- We will use a robust investment decision-making framework driven by four investment principles: accountability, equity, outcome-focused and financial sustainability.
Introduction

Auckland is growing and changing rapidly and so is the demand for sport.

The plan is our response to stakeholders’ requests to take a more structured approach to deliver better outcomes for all Aucklanders through sport.

It reflects our commitment to the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi by providing opportunities through participation in community sports to connect, socialise, learn and celebrate Māori identity and culture.

It is based on a series of Auckland Council decisions, substantial research, evaluations and engagement feedback from 21 local boards, four advisory panels, 40 sports clubs and organisations and 121 public submissions.

Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Sport facility</th>
<th>Community sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A physical activity that is competitive, organised and involves the observation of rules and may involve either team or individual participation.</td>
<td>General or informal physical activity (for example, walking, swimming or kayaking in the sea).</td>
<td>A piece of infrastructure vital to competition and practice of a sport (for example, golf course, hockey turf, outdoor/indoor court, sports field or softball diamond).</td>
<td>Includes play (age and stage appropriate development opportunities for young people), active and outdoor recreation, and competitive sport taking place through clubs and events (including talent development). Community sport does not include passive recreation such as gardening or elite (international) competition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chronological timeline for developing the plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>21 Mar 2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 Jul 2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>14 Mar 2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>Feb-Jun 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mar-May 2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 Jul 2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 Apr 2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>Early 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consultation and stakeholder engagement through the Investors’ Forum, Auckland Council advisory panels, sector advisory groups and sport sector workshops.</td>
<td>Parks, Recreation and Sport Committee approved key components of the plan, modify the primary outcomes, principles, focus and scope of sports facilities investment. [CP2016/12613]</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee agreed to develop an outcome measurement tool for sport investment modelled on the Treasury’s Cost Benefit Analysis Model and to pilot the tool. [CP2017/03041]</td>
<td>Public consultation on the draft plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mar-Apr 2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 Aug 2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dec 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>Early 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops with all 21 local boards.</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee considered the recommendations to expand the current revenue streams to increase funding for sport investment and agree to seek public feedback on the proposal. [CP2017/12378]</td>
<td>Approval of the draft plan by the Environment and Community Committee.</td>
<td>Anticipated final approval from the Environment and Community Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1

Why we invest
1.1 Why do we invest in sport?

Auckland is experiencing rapid population growth and social change. We have a diverse population which brings many differences in values, lifestyles, demands for goods and services, and expectations of civic engagement and democracy.

Auckland Council invests in sport to provide Aucklanders with opportunities to participate in society and develop a sense of belonging in Auckland. We have the largest Pacific and Asian populations in the country. These groups also have the lowest participation rates. For health and social reasons, encouraging participation in sport can have tangible benefits for the whole community.

By removing barriers and creating better access to sport opportunities, Auckland will be one step closer to eliminating disparity and disadvantage as well as fostering healthy lifestyles and wellbeing for all Aucklanders.

It directly contributes to Focus Area 7 of the Auckland Plan 2030’s “Participation and Belonging” outcomes – “Recognise the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life. It is also relevant to achieving:

- **direction 1** – “Foster an inclusive Auckland where everyone belongs”
- **direction 2** – “Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing disparities in opportunities.”

The multiple benefits achieved through increased sport opportunities and participation will contribute to other Auckland Plan outcomes such as:

- “Māori identity and wellbeing” – by helping to advance Māori wellbeing
- “home and places” – by providing public spaces that are inclusive, accessible and contribute to urban living
- “opportunity and prosperity” – by providing employment and business opportunities.

This plan sets out Auckland Council’s investment approach in sport to achieve these goals. It is a direct response to the vision Aucklanders: more active, more often set out in the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan 2014-2024.
Participation in sport has multiple benefits

There is overwhelming evidence showing participation in sport leads to a wide range of benefits for individuals and the community. Our future sport investment will consider the extent of increase in participation and the impact of that increase in terms of health, education, social and economic benefits. We will prioritise projects with the highest aggregate benefits. The table below summarises the benefits in four broad categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical activity, health and wellbeing</th>
<th>Social and community benefits</th>
<th>Education outcomes and skills development</th>
<th>Economic development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The health benefits of sport and recreation activities are clear – they are substantial, population-wide and particularly important to older people. People who regularly participate in physical activity have reduced risks of both mental and physical illness. It’s estimated that inactivity cost Auckland $1.7 billion of health-related expenditure, $213 billion of lost human capital and $10 billion of other costs in 2010.</td>
<td>Most people participate in sport and recreation activities for enjoyment (98%) and social reasons (52%). Organised sport and recreation activities draw individuals and diverse groups of people together, fostering cooperation and strengthening social ties. These connections provide a sense of belonging and create networks that sustain local communities.</td>
<td>Participation in sport or recreation helps improve education outcomes for children and young people. There is evidence of improved cognitive skills (think, read, learn, remember, reason and pay attention) and psychological benefits such as enhanced self-esteem and self-confidence which leads to improved educational behaviour and attainment.</td>
<td>The sport and recreation sector accounts for 2.4% of regional gross domestic product (GDP) – $1.015 billion in 2009. There are approximately 110,443 people working in the industry, 3,555 in related occupations and 212,182 volunteers. International events, such as the World Masters Games 2017, contributed approximately $37 million to Auckland’s GDP. Such events provide an opportunity to reinforce and enhance Auckland’s brand image as an attractive destination to visit and live.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investment in Sport and Te Ao Māori

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.

We acknowledge the special role of Māori 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.
1.2 How does this plan fit within the wider context?

This plan sets out Auckland Council’s approach to regional investment in sport.

It sits within the context of the council’s wider community facilities network and operates in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002 and the Reserves Act 1977.

In the budgetary context, this plan will guide the council’s investment decisions in sport and inform the budgetary processes particularly:

- with decisions on the indicative figures and timing for sports projects during the 10-year budget process (the long-term plan process)
- to assist and prioritise sports projects against other proposals by comparing all possible costs, benefits and trade-offs. Such information will assist the annual budget process in determining the timing, duration and scale of sports projects in local board agreements and in the council’s services and infrastructure plans.

Other complementary processes and documents include:

- Auckland’s Sports Facilities Priorities Plan 2017-2027
  A sector-led plan to clearly communicate their priorities for investment to Auckland Council, investors and potential partners.
  Development of this plan was facilitated by Aktive Sport NZ and Auckland Council with input from over 80 regional and national sport organisations, sports trusts and major facility providers.
  A panel of experienced sector representatives, set up by Aktive, will meet to review and identify high priority projects for future investment using the agreed evaluation and prioritisation criteria in the plan.

- Facilities Partnerships Policy
  The policy guides how Auckland Council will enter into and manage partnerships for sports facilities. The policy sets out the strategic context, principles, the models and investment tools for decision-making, evaluation and monitoring facilities partnerships.

- Auckland Sport and Recreation
  To discuss investment priorities and partnership opportunities.
How does the plan relate to other Auckland Council documents?

Unitary Plan

Auckland Plan

Local Board Plans

Outcomes

Vision:
• what is the vision?
• what outcomes and benefits are we working towards?
• what will success look like?

Outcomes:
• what specific outcomes do we want for different populations, sectors, places, activities?
• what is our role in delivering them?

Priorities

Investment:
• what should Auckland Council invest in, and where, to deliver these outcomes?
• what are the priorities to address needs and gaps?

Delivery

Options:
• will we deliver the outcomes by providing land, facilities or services, or a combination?

Budget

Planning:
• how much will we invest in the outcomes?
• how will we allocate:
  1. capex (for assets)
  2. opex (for everything else)

Mechanism

Enabling:
• how will we enable the community and the market to deliver the outcomes, alongside direct Auckland Council provision?
Collaborating with others to achieve outcomes

Auckland Council

Sports Investment Plan 2019 - 2039
Golf Facilities Investment Plan

Investors

Investors' Forum

Annual Plan

Long-term Plan
- Prioritise sports facilities investment with investment in other areas
- Embed the decision-making framework

Local board plans

Auckland’s Sports Facilities Priorities Plan 2017-2027

Sports sector

Sports codes

Working with the sector

Achieving sporting outcomes requires collaboration from all parties.

We will use this plan to guide our work with others and new investment decisions from the sport sector, private investors and communities.

We have already made considerable efforts to align processes and strategic priorities with our sport sector partners. The focus on community sport and increasing participation aligns with the strategic directions of Sport New Zealand and Active Strategic Plan 2015-2020.
1.2 Why now?

The plan will enable Auckland Council to better respond to the changing population and address current challenges.

**Challenges**

- **Rapid population growth**
  - Auckland's population is growing by 1.5% annually. It is expected to increase by 1 million in the next 30 years.

- **Changing community needs**
  - The makeup of Auckland will be different in the future, including:
    - More older people and more children under 14 years of age.
    - More people of Asian, Pacific and Māori ethnicity.
    - More people born overseas.

- **Disparity of access to sport opportunities**
  - Not all Aucklanders enjoy the same access to sport. There is a direct relationship between access and participation. To achieve our goal of increased participation, we need to target low participation areas or population groups and improve access to sport.

- **Ageing facilities**
  - Auckland Council has a vast network of sports facilities including over 250 sports parks and indoor courts in varying states of ‘fitness’.

- **Unstructured investment**
  - Investment in sports facilities tends to be ad hoc and reactive, based on dispersed or incomplete information.

**Effect on provision**

- **Demand will exceed supply**
  - The growing population places increasing pressure on existing sports facilities.

- **Sports facilities and programmes need to adapt**
  - The changing demographic profile means some existing facilities and programmes may no longer meet the needs of communities.
  - There are new sports, new ways of participating and less club-based activity.

- **There is significant financial pressure to bridge the gap**
  - The financial pressure to meet the supply shortage is substantial due to limited budget and land supply constraints. The costs are likely to grow rapidly over time, meaning a more targeted approach is required.

- **Maintenance costs are increasing**
  - The cost of maintaining and renewing current facilities will increase as they age.

- **Lack of focus on outcomes**
  - Investments aren't targeting the highest need.
How will we invest and how do we know the plan is working?

This page presents the logic for Auckland Council’s sport investment and the key shifts we will make to address the key challenges. Further details of what the key shifts mean in practice are provided in Parts 2 and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Key Shift</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Undertake a people-centric approach with a particular focus on:</td>
<td>70% Increase Aucklanders’ participation in sport by adopting an evidence-based and outcome-focused approach to sports investment.</td>
<td>KPI 1 (participation): Increase the number of adult Aucklanders who are physically active weekly.</td>
<td>This is an outcome indicator that shows how sport participation changes across the Auckland region.</td>
<td>New Zealand Health Survey (Ministry of Health) – repeated annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• supporting communities with low participation rates</td>
<td></td>
<td>KPI 2 (participation): Increase the proportion of children between 5 and 11 years of age who participate in three hours or more of organised sport and recreation each week.</td>
<td>This is an outcome indicator that shows how sport participation of young people changes across the Auckland region.</td>
<td>Active NZ Survey (Sport NZ) – reported annually with data collected continuously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• increasing participation in emerging sports</td>
<td></td>
<td>KPI 3 (participation): Increase participation of community groups with the lowest participation rates:</td>
<td>This is an outcome indicator that shows how sport participation across different demographic groups changes across the Auckland region.</td>
<td>Active NZ Survey (Sport NZ) – reported annually with data collected continuously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sustaining popular sports with high participation rates</td>
<td></td>
<td>• people in high socio-economic deprivation areas, particularly Pacific Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Prioritise investment to focus on increasing participation in community sport and provision of core infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Asian communities particularly young women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• women generally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Invest in a range of assets and services to cater for the needs of communities.</td>
<td>30% Improve value for money and efficiency by adopting an investment framework to guide decision-making.</td>
<td>KPI 5 (delivery): Increase services and the number of sports facilities delivered in geographic areas with an identified supply shortage.</td>
<td>This is an output indicator that shows how quickly Auckland Council could address community needs in areas with the greatest need.</td>
<td>Data from Auckland Council’s operations unit – data collected continuously and subject to periodic audits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KPI 6 (delivery): Increase the pace of renewing and upgrading ageing sports facilities.</td>
<td>This is an output indicator that shows how efficiency improves the quality of ageing facilities.</td>
<td>Data from Auckland Council’s operations unit – data collected continuously and subject to periodic audits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KPI 7 (quality decisions): Improve the number of investment decisions guided by the investment framework.</td>
<td>This is an activity indicator that shows whether investment decisions are evidence-based.</td>
<td>Data from Auckland Council’s operations unit – data collected continuously and subject to periodic audits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KPI 8 (quality decisions): Approve investment projects that adopt the Cost and Benefit Model (CBA) as a framework to track realisation of community benefits over time.</td>
<td>This indicator tracks how successful an investment is in achieving good outcomes.</td>
<td>Data from Auckland Council’s operations unit – data collected continuously and subject to audits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2
What we invest in
We will increase participation in community sport by investing in fit-for-purpose services, programmes and facilities, and focus on core infrastructure.

Our investment decisions will be equitable, outcome-focused, financially sustainable and accountable.

2.1 What are the outcomes we seek from sport investment?

We will invest to increase the level of community sport participation in Auckland.

This requires us to take a people-centric approach to meet the needs of our various communities.

The participation outcome directly aligns with Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan 2014-2024 to enable ‘more Aucklanders living physically active lives through participation in informal physical activity, recreation and sport.’

We will target participation in three areas:

1. **Enabling participation of low-participant communities.**
   - Investment in this area will increase the number of active people by targeting sedentary population groups and communities with low participation rates.
   - These people need more support as they have higher health risks.
   - Improved health and social benefits from increased participation of these community groups is much greater than for people who are already active.

2. **Increasing participation in emerging sports with high growth potential.**
   - Investment in sports that are likely to grow rapidly will help meet the needs of future communities. In particular, it could mean providing support for:
     - traditional Māori sports which have potential to increase participation and wellbeing (for example, Kō Ūrārū)
     - sports played by growing ethnic populations (for example, Kabbadi).

3. **Sustaining or Increasing participation in high-participation sports.**
   - We will continue to support popular sports that appeal to a number of Aucklanders. The focus of the investment will be to build on existing sector capacity.
   - Sports with high participation rates are likely to have small percentage growth but the actual increases in the numbers of participants are large.
What is happening now?

Current investment in sports often aims to achieve a range of health, social and economic goals as well as an increase in participation. It also tends to target spatial- or code-specific needs. Such an approach can spread limited resources too thin. It also runs the risk of not catering to the needs of communities, in particular people who currently do not play sport.

Consultation

Feedback from the local boards, sports sector and public showed strong support for investment to be based on improving outcomes. There is also strong support to target Auckland Council investment in areas where it can add most value.

Such an approach would set a clear direction to other sports partners and help to align investment.

When asked what types of sports facilities the council should focus on, feedback supported emerging sports with high growth potential, popular sports and sports that appeal to particular groups with low participation rates.

Public submissions showed 66% supported prioritisation for emerging sports and 45% supported investment in sports that target certain cohorts.

Feedback also suggested prioritisation based on whether the investment would:
- increase overall sports participation rates
- increase participation of certain age groups
- address the needs of the population
- respond to the level of deprivation and funding gaps.

The change we’re making

Council investment will move away from a geographic or code-specific approach to a single focus on sport participation with three target areas.

TODAY

Limited budget focused on mainly traditional sports and in response to demand rather than need.

TOMORROW

Future investment will take a people-centric approach to increase participation:

- Emerging sports
- High participation sports
- Low participation communities

Key shift 1

Attachment A

Item 18
2.2 What is the scope and focus of our sports investment?

The primary focus is community sport. The intention is to ensure Auckland Council investment provides for the greatest number of people possible and meets the changing needs of the community.

The figure below illustrates where community sport sits in the sport continuum. The size of circles indicates the level of participation at each stage.

Progression of skills

1. **Explore**
   - Babies and toddlers
   - Learn elementary skills such as crawling, standing, and walking

2. **Fundamental**
   - Preschool children
   - Develop basic skills such as running, throwing, and jumping

3. **Learn**
   - School children
   - Develop more refined skills, learn the rules of games and positive attitudes towards sport and recreation

4. **Participate**
   - Young people and adults in clubs and local games
   - Participate in organised sport and training. Players might be motivated by multiple factors such as enjoyment, performance and challenges

5. **Perform**
   - Players in regional and national competitions
   - Identify and develop talent in sports

6. **Excel**
   - Athletes in international competitions
   - Achieve excellence in one sport and compete at a world-class level

We will provide a basic level of provision of fit-for-purpose sports facilities and programmes to support community sport.

We will prioritise investment in core sport infrastructure and ancillary infrastructure required for safe and sanitary public access.

We will not prioritise investment in sports facilities that are already funded or incidental infrastructure that delivers private benefits to small groups of users.

Exceptions will be made if applicants can demonstrate increased sports participation or increased use of a core facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core infrastructure</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure that is central to sport participation.</td>
<td>Courts, fields, playing surfaces and lighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancillary infrastructure</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure that enables safe and sanitary access for participants and spectators.</td>
<td>Toilets, changing rooms, equipment storage and car-parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidental infrastructure</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure that is not required for sports participation but exists for social and management purposes.</td>
<td>Clubrooms and administration facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is happening now?

Auckland Council currently invests in a combination of local, regional and high performance sports facilities, as well as a range of ancillary and incidental infrastructures. This reflects the different priorities of individual legacy councils across Auckland and doesn't have a clear, strategic focus for the region.

This risks diluting the council's efforts and resources, and duplicating investments of other organisations such as Regional Facilities Auckland.

Consultation

Feedback showed strong support from local boards, the public and the sport sector for Auckland Council to target investment where it will increase community participation in sports.

When asked what types of facilities council should invest in, local boards suggested core sports facilities are most important, followed by ancillary and incidental facilities.

In addition, high performance facilities are not a focus but the council should not completely rule them out.

The change we're making

Our future investment in sport will primarily focus on community sport and target core and ancillary infrastructure.

Community sport is considered to be an area where Auckland Council investment is most needed. The focus on community sport will ensure a basic level of access to facilities and a mixture of programmes and services. This will encourage participation and cater for the diverse needs of the Auckland community.

TODAY
Make investment decisions to achieve multiple objectives

TOMORROW
Focus Auckland Council investment on community sport - where it can add the most value

Setting the scope and focus does not mean exclusion of investment in certain types of sports facilities. Rather, it means Auckland Council will prioritise to avoid spreading funding too thin and focus investment in areas where investment can add most value and achieve the best outcomes.

TODAY
Invest mainly in single-purpose facilities without a systematic approach to cater for the different needs of communities

TOMORROW
Invest in a range of facilities, services and programmes to increase participation

Key shift 2

Key shift 3
2.4 What are our investment principles?

Auckland Council’s future investment in sports facilities and programmes will need to meet four investment principles. These principles will be used during the decision-making process to ensure our investments are well-balanced. They are:

1. **Equity**
   (40% of assessment)

   Auckland Council’s investment in sports should ensure equity of outcomes across the population regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status or where people live.

   This is the most important investment principle as it addresses disparities and targets communities of greatest need. Investment in groups with the lowest access to sports opportunities will be prioritised. This may mean allocation or reallocation of funding to overcome inequality.

2. **Outcome-focused**
   (30% of assessment)

   There needs to be a clear line of sight between each investment and the outcomes. This will ensure each investment achieves maximum benefit for the communities it serves. Each investment needs to have:
   - strategic alignment - a clear understanding of how each investment contributes to outcomes set out in this plan, the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan and local board plans
   - robust outcome measurement process - ensuring there is an established monitoring and reporting process in place to demonstrate performance against clearly defined goals.

3. **Financial sustainability**
   (20% of assessment)

   Investment decisions need to be financially sustainable in the long run. This means being:
   - financially viable - ensuring there are means to cover major capital expenses and ongoing operating costs. This also means having clarity about how and who (for example Auckland Council, community, or corporates) is responsible for ensuring the financial viability of sports facilities and programmes and what the expectations are
   - affordable for the public - the investment decisions need to consider public accessibility and long-term affordability.

4. **Accountability**
   (10% of assessment)

   Auckland Council has responsibility to act in the best interest of the Aucklanders. Sport investment should be:
   - efficient and effective - every public dollar invested should represent value for money and deliver the greatest return
   - transparent and consistent - investment decisions should be as transparent and consistent with sufficient information, clear decision-making criteria and outcomes.
What is happening now?

Auckland Council is facing difficult investment choices. We need to balance investment in sport for various target groups and multiple locations with variable effects on sport participants, organisations and local communities. This is the nature of a rapidly growing, dynamic and diverse city.

Consultation

Feedback showed many stakeholders supported the adoption of investment principles to guide future investment decisions.

The ‘outcome-focused’ principle in particular, received the highest support, followed by ‘evidence-based’ and ‘accountability’.

Other principles suggested include:

- affordability
- consistency
- flexibility
- co-investment/partnerships friendly.

The change we’re making

Our future sports investment proposals will align with our four investment principles: accountability, equity, financial sustainability and outcome-focused.

Decision-makers will use the four principles to weigh up and manage multiple investment projects. The investment principles will help ensure future Auckland Council investment decisions are well-balanced and prioritise investment proposals.

Applying the four principles will also be a way of prioritising funding proposals, especially when there are financial constraints:

- Funding only some proposals that are strongly aligned with the four principles
- Funding all proposals that are strongly aligned
- Maybe also funding one or two partially aligned proposals
- Maybe also funding some partially aligned proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of financial pressure</th>
<th>Number of projects funded by Auckland Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH FINANCIAL PRESSURE</td>
<td>Limited budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW FINANCIAL PRESSURE</td>
<td>Expanding budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The equity principle explained

Equity has the highest weighting of all the investment principles. This page provides further information about what equity means in the context of sport investment and how it differs from equality.

Both equity and equality are strategies to ensure fairness. When applied they mean two different investment approaches:

**Equity is: meeting differences to get the same outcome**

*Equity* is ensuring every Aucklander has the same access by targeting sporting opportunities to meet people’s needs. This could mean providing a basic level of provision to most people and additional support for certain groups to encourage greater participation rates.

**For example:**
Person C currently has lower access compared to Person A and Person B. To achieve the same outcome and increased participation, Person C will receive more support from Auckland Council.

**Equality is treating everyone the same**

*Equality* is providing the same level of sporting opportunities to everyone, everywhere. This could mean providing the same sports facilities or programmes to everyone regardless of existing provision of services and facilities.

**For example:**
Persons A, B and C currently have different access to sports facilities and programmes. To achieve equality, they will receive the same support from Auckland Council.
Current inequity and inequality

Currently there are different types of inequity and inequality occurring across the sports facilities network in Auckland Council.

Inequity in people's access to sport

Auckland is home to a diverse range of people. When everyone is different, what fairness and success look like differs too.
Providing the same access equality to everyone regardless of individual needs is likely to lead to inequity of outcomes.

- **EXAMPLES**
  - Different age, gender and ethnic groups are interested in different sports.
  - Children in large families need affordable options to participate in sports.
  - People with disabilities need facilities and programmes that cater to their needs.
  - People in high socioeconomic deprivation groups may need additional support to participate.

Inequality across sports codes

There are differences in the level of support Auckland Council provides to sports codes, partly due to different historical arrangements made by legacy councils.
The types of council support also differ. For example, some sports codes might currently receive direct funding, while others access council land and buildings at a peppercorn rental.

- **EXAMPLES**
  - Fields sports such as rugby and league use Auckland Council sport fields for free.
  - Indoor sports such as gymnastics and basketball pay a hireage fee to use Auckland Council courts.
  - Traditional, high participation sports tend to have good access to Auckland Council facilities, programmes and support.
  - Emerging sports tend to be less organised. Their growth is limited without adequate access to facilities and programmes.

Inequality across geographical areas

Different areas in Auckland have different levels of access to sports facilities and programmes, mainly due to the decisions made by legacy councils.
There are also differences in current funding allocations across Auckland, based on factors such as population, land size and social deprivation.

- **EXAMPLES**
  - Growth areas need additional facilities to cater for growing and changing local demand for sport.
  - There is limited budget for asset renewals and services level increases.
  - Urban areas may have limited access to open space but have better access to built facilities.
  - Rural areas tend to have fewer built facilities but more open space such as estuaries, beaches and regional parks.
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Section 3
How we will work
We will adopt a new investment framework to assist decision-making and ensure delivery of outcomes. The framework provides a rigorous, disciplined approach to answer a set of critical questions before making final investment decisions.

3.1 The investment framework

Section 2 of this plan sets out Auckland Council’s model for sport investment in the future. This section provides the investment framework to ensure future decisions align with that model. The investment framework will ensure structured, evidence-based investment in the future, as set out in Key shift 4.

**TODAY**
Some investment decisions are isolated and reactive with gaps in information such as the costs, benefits and alternatives

**TOMORROW**
Make structured, strategic investments based on evidence to improve efficiency, effectiveness and outcome-delivery

[Diagram]

Key shift 4

Auckland Council will answer a set of critical questions before investing:

- **Whether to invest?**
  1. What are the community needs?
  2. Does it align with Auckland Council’s strategic priorities?
  3. Does it have Better Business Cases?

- **How to invest?**
  4. Is there a partnership opportunity?
  5. What investment mechanisms should be used?
  6. Who makes decisions?
  7. How to report and monitor outcomes?

The next few pages explain, question by question, how the framework will work in practice.
What does it look like in practice?

In this section we use three fictional scenarios to demonstrate how the investment framework could be applied in practice. We put each scenario through the investment framework in the following pages.

**Scenario 1:**
A sub-regional multisport facility

Three indoor sports clubs (gymnastics, badminton and boxing) have outgrown the Auckland Council community hall they currently hire for training. They are in a fast-growing suburb of Auckland with a high proportion of new migrants. Their combined membership has more than doubled in the last five years. The three clubs have jointly approached the council for $10 million to build a multisport facility. The new facility will be a purpose-built indoor facility. It will have a flexible floor layout to be used by different indoor sports. The concept design shows the new facility will be large enough to cater for sub-regional demand for indoor sports and allow for future expansion.

**Scenario 2:**
School netball courts

A high school wants to extend its netball courts from two to six courts to accommodate recent growth in student numbers. The new courts can be used for both training and competition during school hours. The school has approached Auckland Council to co-fund the new courts. It suggested additional lighting would allow the local community to play social games in the evening. Auckland Council has evidence showing increasing community demand for extra court hours in the local area but has been unable to acquire new land to build new courts.

**Scenario 3:**
Activation of a community house

A community group has approached Auckland Council to lease a large room in the local community house owned by the council. The room has been empty for a while because the roof is leaking. The community group proposed fixing the roof and converting the room into a table tennis room. It has raised most of the funding from the local community but may need a small amount of funding from the council.

In real life, assessment of proposals may not necessarily follow a linear process but we will seek to answer every question in the framework before making an investment decision.

The breadth and depth of information analysed will be proportional to the level of investment and how complicated the proposal is. This will be defined by a number of factors such as:

- scope and benefits of the project
- Auckland Council's experience and track record of delivering similar projects
- level of engagement and partnerships with customers / communities required to enable any change
- level of risks and efforts required to manage the risks
- funding sources (whether the majority is provided by multiple external organisations).

For low level, low complexity investments, investors and decision-makers could undertake a scaled down approach. As the value and risk profile increases, investment decisions need to be informed by comprehensive analysis.
Whether to invest?

Quality decision making is based on analysis of all available information and weighing a range of options.

**Question 1:**
What are the community needs?

All sports investment proposals will undergo a needs assessment. It will explore what is happening in a geographic area or community of interest to determine whether any change or intervention is required, either non-facility or facility.

A needs assessment is critical to distinguish ‘wants’ from ‘needs’ ensuring a facility or programme development will be fully utilised. Needs can be quantified through research and evidence and will stand the test of time. Wants are often opinion-based and will change over time.

**Questions to consider:**

- What is the current state of provision – current facility/programme use, catchment, conditions?
- Will the project meet the needs of the local community now and in the future – demographic profile and changes?

**Question 2:**
Strategic alignment

A brief ‘pass/fail’ assessment to ensure the investment proposal aligns with Auckland Council’s strategic priorities and outcomes.

**Questions to consider:**

- Is there strong alignment with:
  - the outcomes, principles and scope in this plan
  - Sports Facilities Priorities Plan
  - Auckland Sports and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
  - Auckland Plan 2060
  - any relevant local plans.

**Question 3:**
Better Business Cases (BBC)

Detailed assessment of the strategic, economic, commercial, financial and management case for the investment proposal.

**Questions to consider:**

- Can the project demonstrate:
  - a strategic case illustrating the need for a change, strategic fit, and business needs
  - an economic case to show value for money
  - a commercial case to show that the investment will be commercially viable
  - a financial case to prove the investment will be affordable within available funding
  - a management case to show the investment will be achievable and can be successfully delivered.

**The change we’re making**

The assessment process will help ensure future investment in sport is evidence-based and focused on outcome delivery and good practice.

We expect to see significant improvements in the quality of Auckland Council’s investment decisions in the future and increased consistency and transparency.

* Working examples and templates for needs assessment, strategic assessment, Better Business Cases and Cost Benefit Analysis are provided on the Auckland Council website.
What does it look like in practice?

Scenario 1: A sub-regional multisport facility

Question 1: What are the community needs?

Questions to consider:

- What is the current state of provision - current facility use, catchment, conditions?
- Will the project meet the needs of the local community now and in the future - demographic profile and changes?

Question 2: Strategic alignment

Alignment with this plan

Investment outcomes

- Will the proposal increase participation?
- Will it increase participation in:
  - community groups of low participation?
  - emerging sports?
  - high participation sports?
- Is the increase in participation likely to bring wider health, social, economic benefits to the local community?

Scope and focus

- Is the facility catering for community sport?
- Is the facility fit-for-purpose and does it provide basic provision?
- What will the facility provide?
  - core infrastructure
  - ancillary infrastructure
  - incidental infrastructure
- Demonstrate project alignment with:
  - the accountability principle (10%)
  - the equity principle (40%)
  - the financial sustainability principle (20%)
  - the outcome-focused principle (30%)

Also consider alignment with:

- Sports Facilities Priorities Plan
- Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
- Auckland Plan 2050.
How to invest?

**Question 4:**
**Is there a partnership opportunity?**

Auckland Council is not always the sole investor in sports. Depending on the nature, type and purpose of investment, we might choose to: a) directly invest; b) partner; or c) invest in others to provide sports facilities.

---

**Auckland Council as the principal investor in sport**

Auckland Council is most likely to be the principal investor when the sport investment is risky or has a significant social element. This type of investment tends to be under-invested by the private sector. Without support from the council or central government agencies, there could be inadequate access and low-quality facilities.

---

**Auckland Council as a partner in sport investment**

Auckland Council is most likely to partner and co-invest in sport to deliver benefits that are shared by multiple organisations. This type of investment tends to be large in scale and is likely to lead to shared agreements to co-own, co-deliver and/or co-manage sports facilities and programmes.

---

**Auckland Council having a supporting role in sport provision**

Auckland Council also invests with others to provide sporting opportunities. This type of investment is likely to happen when the sport sector is already established. In this case, the investment will focus on building existing sector capacity and provide support in areas which the council can add most value.

Details on how to determine the role of Auckland Council in sport investment projects are provided in the Facilities Partnerships Policy.

---

**The change we’re making**

Auckland Council is committed to working collaboratively with the sport sector and the community to provide better access to sports opportunities. To do so, we need to consider our role before investing to ensure efficient use of the budget and council resources in areas where it can make the biggest difference.

**What does it look like in practice?**

- **Auckland Council as the principal investor**
  - Auckland Council is likely to be the principal investor in Scenario 1 as the investment is likely to bring significant social benefits and tend not to attract private investors.
  - We would work with the three indoor sport clubs to explore all possible funding options, either from Auckland Council or from other investors, before making a final decision.

- **Auckland Council as the partner**
  - Auckland Council is likely to form a facility partnership with the school to co-deliver the new courts.
  - Once the courts are built, the council will have a long-term agreement with the school to ensure public access.
  - To enter into a facility partnership, the project will need to go through a separate assessment process set out in the Facilities Partnerships Policy.

- **Auckland Council having a supporting role**
  - Auckland Council is likely to provide a supporting role if significant efforts have been made by the community group.
  - In addition to a lease and a community grant, Auckland Council might also offer capability-building advice to the community group.
How to invest?

Question 5: What investment mechanisms should be used?

Auckland Council uses several mechanisms to invest in sport:

- When Auckland Council is the principal investor
- When Auckland Council supports others
- When Auckland Council partners with others

Different mechanisms create different incentives and support sport participants, community and sport organisations in different ways. Determining the appropriate mechanism should be based on several factors such as:

- the scale and nature of investment
- the needs of the delivery organisations and the roles of other partners
- the needs of the target community group or area
- the expected benefits and alignment with outcomes of this plan
- consistency with the relevant Auckland Council plans (for example, open space network plans, Community Facilities Network Plan)
- consistency with legislation (such as the Local Government Act 2002 and the Reserve Act 1977).

Question 6: Who makes the decisions?

Auckland Council has two complementary but distinct decision-making bodies with responsibilities for sports facilities investment:

The Governing Body

Focuses on region-wide strategic and investment decisions

- Decides where and when the council will invest in the sports facilities and programmes network to address gaps and respond to growth.
- Develops regional policies and strategies.
- Sets budgets for major facility and programme investments or upgrades through the long-term plan process.
- Governs regional facility partnership relationships, funding or lease agreements and performance reporting.

Local boards

Make most decisions on local parks, open spaces, sports facilities and activities

- Set outcomes and priorities for local sport investment through local board plans.
- Identify local sports facility and programmes needs and advocate for investment through the long-term plan process.
- Govern local and sub-regional facility partnership relationships, funding or lease agreements and performance reporting.
- May work together to support facilities that benefit several local board areas.
What does it look like in practice?

### Scenario 1: A sub-regional multisport facility

#### Investment mechanisms

Auckland Council might want to build the proposed facility using the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund. See A1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Applicants will need to show:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a needs assessment that demonstrates the community’s needs for the proposed facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strategic alignment with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the investment outcomes and principles stated in this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the priorities stated in the Sports Facilities Priorities Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>better business cases that demonstrate the economic, financial, strategic, commercial and management cases of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a cost and benefit analysis that demonstrates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the project is value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the input, output, intermediate outcomes of the project, and the links to the strategic outcomes the project aims to achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performance measures to monitor progress over time and methods to collect data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Staff will assess the applications based on the depth, breadth and quality of information provided in the applications.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>The Governing Body will make final decisions based on staff recommendations. Results of various assessments will be presented by staff in a summary table, supplemented by detailed tables of each assessment in the appendices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Once approved by the Governing Body, staff will work with the applicants to form a funding agreement based on the input, output, intermediate outcomes, strategic outcomes and performance measures stated in the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Staff will conduct regular reviews to ensure performance measures are met over time. Information about the input, output, and intermediate outcomes will be collected over time to demonstrate progress towards strategic outcomes. The information will also be used to improve the effectiveness of the investment and help Auckland Council to articulate the benefits of the Sport and Recreation Investment Fund to the public and investors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Scenario 2: School netball courts

#### Investment mechanisms

The school could form a facility partnership with Auckland Council. **See A2**

The partnership might include:
- a regional grant
- an ongoing agreement to ensure public access (for example, Community Access Scheme. **See A3**

#### A2: Facility partnerships

For sport facility partnerships, the applicants will need to show strategic alignment with the investment outcomes and principles stated in this plan.

Applicants will also need to meet requirements stated in Facility Partnership Policy.

#### A3: Community access scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Applicants will need to show:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a needs assessment that demonstrates the scheme will meet a known or identified geographic gap in the provision of the Auckland Council recreation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic alignment with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the investment outcomes and principles stated in this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- other priorities set out in the scheme's guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A cost and benefit analysis that demonstrates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the project is value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- analysis of public/private benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the input, output, intermediate outcomes of the project, and links to the strategic outcomes the project aims to achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- performance measures to show the objectives have been met and methods to collect data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assessment | Staff will assess the application based on the depth, breadth and quality of information provided in the applications. |

| Decision-making | The Governing Body will make the final decision based on staff recommendations. Results of various assessments will be presented in a summary table, supplemented by detailed tables of each assessment in the appendices. |

| Investment | Once approved by the Governing Body, staff will work with the applicants to form a funding agreement, based on the input, output, intermediate outcomes, strategic outcomes and performance measures stated in the application. |

| Monitoring | Staff will conduct regular reviews to ensure performance measures are met over time. Information about the input, output and intermediate outcomes will be collected over time to demonstrate progress towards strategic outcomes. The information will also be used to improve the effectiveness of the investment and help Auckland Council articulate the benefits of the Community Access Scheme to the public. |
What does it look like in practice?

**Scenario 3:**
Activation of a community house

**Investment mechanisms**

The community group could apply for:
- a community grant. See A4
- a community lease. See A5

Alternatively Auckland Council could undertake the renewal work itself. See A6

### A4: Community Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Applicants will need to show:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• strategic alignment with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sport and recreation priorities set out in the local plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the investment outcomes and principles stated in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a cost and benefit analysis that demonstrates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the project is value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the input, output, intermediate outcomes of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- an intervention logic diagram demonstrating the connections with Auckland Council’s strategic priorities and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- performance measures to show the objectives have been met and methods to collect data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assessment | Staff will assess applications based on the quality of information provided in the applications. |

| Decision-making | Local boards will make final decisions based on staff recommendations. Results of various assessments will be presented by staff in a summary table, supplemented by detailed tables of each assessment in the appendices. |

| Investment | Funding will be provided to community groups once their applications are approved by the local board. The applicants will need to fill in an accountability form which will specify the input, output, intermediate outcomes and the strategic outcomes of the project. |

| Monitoring | Staff will conduct regular reviews of the accountability forms to ensure performance measures are met over time. Information about the input, output, and intermediate outcomes will be collected over time to demonstrate progress towards strategic outcomes. The information will also be used to improve the effectiveness of the investment and help Auckland Council to articulate the benefits of community grants. |
## What does it look like in practice?

### Scenario 3: Activation of a community house

### A5: Community leases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Applicants will need to show:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a needs assessment that demonstrates the lease will meet community’s needs now and in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• strategic alignment with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sport and recreation priorities set out in the local plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the investment outcomes and principles stated in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a cost and benefit analysis including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the input, output, intermediate outcomes of the lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- an intervention logic diagram demonstrating the connections with Auckland Council’s strategic priorities and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- analysis of public/private benefits for each lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- analysis of opportunity costs to Auckland Council for each lease (such as the underlying land value, alternative use of the land and building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- assessment of potential service level changes before and after leasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- performance measures to monitor progress over time and methods to collect data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assessment | Staff will assess the application based on the depth, breath and quality of information provided in the applications. Additional assessment will be undertaken by the staff to consider factors such as land status, the open space provision in the local area and impact on current service provision. |

| Decision-making | Local boards will make the final decision based on staff recommendations. Results of various assessments will be presented in a summary table, supplemented by detailed tables of each assessment in the appendices. |

| Investment | Once approved by the local boards, staff will work with the applicants to form a lease agreement, based on performance measures stated in the applications. |

| Monitoring | Staff will conduct compulsory annual reviews to ensure performance measures are met over time. Utilisation data will be collected for both core activities and other uses (shared use, sub-leasing, hireage and commercial activities such as cafés and bars). |
### Scenario 3: Activation of a community house

#### A6: Auckland Council asset renewals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Applicants will need to show:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a needs assessment that demonstrates the facility is still needed to meet local demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- strategic alignment with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the investment outcomes and principles stated in this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sport and recreation priorities set out in the local board plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a cost and benefit analysis that demonstrates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the project is value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- analysis of public/private benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the input, output, intermediate outcomes of the project, and links to the strategic outcomes the project aims to achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- performance measures to show the objectives have been met and the methods used to collect the data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assessment | Staff will assess the proposed renewal project against other renewal projects based on the results of the needs assessment, strategic alignment and CBAX. |

| Decision-making | Local boards will make the final decision based on staff recommendations. Results of various assessments will be presented in a summary table, supplemented by detailed tables of each assessment in the appendices. |

| Investment | Once approved by local boards, staff will commence the renewal work. |

| Monitoring | Performance of the renewed asset will be monitored over time with performance measures. Information about the input, output, and intermediate outcomes will be collected over time to demonstrate progress towards strategic outcomes. The information will also be used to improve effectiveness of the investment and help Auckland Council to articulate the benefits of asset renewals to the public. |
How to invest?

Question 7: How to report and monitor outcomes?

Every sport investment in the future will adopt the **outcome measurement tool** throughout the investment cycle to monitor progress. The outcome measurement tool is based on the cost benefit analysis model used in the previous assessment stage and an intervention logic model to link the specific investment to Auckland Council's strategic outcomes it aims to achieve.

The outcome measurement tool will be used as the basis to set performance measures and reporting requirements for each investment. Over time, robust and consistent measurement of outcomes will allow us to measure and analyse the aggregate benefits of sport investment and its contribution to the Auckland Plan 2050 outcomes. Such information will help us gain a better understanding of what has worked well and not so well to improve effectiveness of future investment. We will also be better at articulating the returns of our investments to our investors and ratepayers.

The change we’re making

The investment framework presented in this plan sets out the process for rigorous decision-making, monitoring and reporting. Over time, we expect to see significant improvement in the quality of evidence and analysis used to inform investment decisions and improve sector and staff capability. This will enable a continuous feedback loop of refinement and improvement in investment to ensure delivery of better outcomes for Aucklanders.

---

**Investing in sport**

- Quality inputs
- Informed decisions
- Investing in sport projects
- Evaluation of KPIs
- Evaluation of outcomes

**Delivering outcomes**

- Achieving outcomes

---

**Continuous refinement and improvement**

Richer data, better analysis, sector and staff capability development.
A new investment approach

Auckland Council is taking a new investment approach to meet the sport needs of Aucklanders

Future Auckland Council investment will be guided by four principles:

1. Accountability
2. Equity
3. Financial sustainability
4. Outcome-focused

We will adopt a new investment framework to:

- Guide decision-making
- Prioritise investment projects
- Measure and monitor outcome delivery
- Refine investment decisions over time

Aucklanders will have:

- Improved access to quality and fit-for-purpose facilities and programmes for community sports
- Increased sport participation of low-participant communities
- Improving participation in emerging sport with high growth potential
- Maintaining levels in high-participation sports
- Increased physical activity, health and wellbeing outcomes

Sport participation levels will increase, with a focus on:

- Increased sport participation will lead to a range of benefits for individuals and community including:
- Belonging and participation
- Māori identity and wellbeing
- Homes and places
- Opportunities and prosperity

The contributions to the Auckland Plan 2050:

KPIs 7 & 8 (quality decisions) → KPIs 5 & 6 (service delivery) → KPIs 1-3 (participation) → Auckland Plan KPIs

Attachment A

Item 18
3.2 Indicative implementation timeline

This plan will be a staged process that will be completed over the next three to five years.

An indicative implementation timeline is provided below.

- **Immediate adoption**
  
  Key parts of the plan will be implemented immediately, particularly:
  - the investment outcomes, investment principles and focus of investment set out in Section 2 will help to set investment priorities to guide every investment decision in sport
  - the investment framework set out in Section 3 will be used to assess every investment proposal, although the scale of the assessment should be adjusted to the scale of the investment and the risk profile.

- **Changes 2019-2021**
  
  The plan will create a number of changes that may affect community organisations, sports organisations and Auckland Council. Further policy work and engagement will be undertaken to understand the full impact of these. These may include:
  - replacing community loans, rates remissions and postponements with grants
  - embedding new outcome measurement tools for different forms of sport investment
  - evaluating and refining processes and practice for loan guarantees, community leases and grants.

- **Plan refresh every three years**
  
  We will refresh the plan in late 2021 to ensure it is fit-for-purpose and assist quality investment decisions. A particular focus of the refresh will be to ensure the plan continues to respond to community needs using new performance data that is collected. The refresh will also determine whether additional revenue streams are necessary to fund future sport investments. After 2021, the plan will be refreshed every three years to coincide with the Long-term Plan processes and ensure alignment with the council’s strategic priorities.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To present the board with the governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is in Attachment A.
3. The calendar aims to support local boards' governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is required and when
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar is updated every month. Each update is reported to business meetings. 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 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
a) note the attached Governance Forward Work Calendar.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Forward work calendar</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports highlighted in blue text reflect a change where a new report is expected or change on the planned date has occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Business meeting report topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>Sports Facility Investment Plan</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Open Space Network Plan</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Homelessness review</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Draft Resilient Recovery Strategy</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>Open Space Management Framework</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>Local board agreement – Advocacy and Finances</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>Draft Golf Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Waters Strategy</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Adopt local board Work Programmes FY20</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Local board agreement - adoption</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Climate Action Plan</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Signage Bylaw 2015 (tbc – or cluster workshops)</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide a summary of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board workshops for 12 and 19 February 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The workshops are held to give an information opportunity for board members and officers to discuss issues and projects, and note that no binding decisions are made or voted on at workshop sessions.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) Note the local board record of workshops held on 12 and 19 February 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Record of Workshops</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workshop record of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board held on 12 February 2019, commencing at 10am.

PRESENT
Members present for all or part of the workshop day:

Debbie Burrows (Deputy Chairperson)  
Don Allan  
Alan Verral  
Maria Meredith  
Nerissa Henry

Apologies:  
Chris Makoare (Chairperson)  
Bernie Diver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLC Connections &amp; Interface around Fergusson Domain, Oranga – Brendon Hosken, Mel Chow</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Obtained the board’s position and feedback on the project and identified the next steps to advance the project further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT Engagement Strategy Plan FY19/20 – Litia Brighouse-Fuavao</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Obtained the board’s feedback on the proposed objectives and principles and obtained direction for next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Open Space Network Plan – Emma Golightly</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The local board provided an indication of what changes they would like to the Open Space Network Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Connections – Tania Pouwhare, Sue Travaglia</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Obtained information from the board to inform a decision at the next available business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taniwha Reserve Consultation &amp; Final Concept Design – Tim Keat</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Obtained the board’s position and feedback to inform a decision at the next available business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&amp;ES Community Riparian Restoration Work Programme – Madison Little</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Obtained the board’s position on the proposed options provided for delivery of the work programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 4.30pm.
Workshop record of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board held on 19 February 2019, commencing at 10am.

**PRESENT**

**Members present for all or part of the workshop day:**

- Chris Makore (Chairperson)
- Debbie Burrows (Deputy Chairperson)
- Don Allan
- Alan Verrall
- Maria Meredith
- Nerissa Henry

**Apologies:** Bernie Diver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities – Rodney Klaassen, Jacqui Fell, Johan Ferreira, Rick Everett, Dominic Stanley, Vincent Perry</td>
<td><strong>Oversight and monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Provided the board with an update on all projects, operations management and maintenance in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Sport and Recreation (Wai-o-taiki path development) – Katharine Black, Vanda Kirmani, Paul Kinac, David Barker</td>
<td><strong>Setting direction / priorities / budget</strong></td>
<td>Obtained the board's feedback on the proposed options provided and obtained direction for the next steps in progressing the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMETI Update – Matt Poland, James Weller, Norman Collier, Bruce Thomas, Melanie Dale</td>
<td><strong>Keeping informed</strong></td>
<td>Provided the board with an update on the progress of the AMETI project and the next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport Te Horeta Extension – Annabel Burgess, Melanie Dale</td>
<td><strong>Keeping informed</strong></td>
<td>Introduced the board to this project taking place in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE – Tin Tacke Reserve Public Art, Events WP, Ready-to-rent – Sarah Edwards, Emily Trent, Nichola Waugh, Victoria Brooke, Lucia Davis, Catalina Vercelli</td>
<td><strong>Oversight and monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Obtained the board’s position and feedback on various projects that are being delivered by the ACE team within the local board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships – Jade Lee Davis, Catalina Vercelli, Natalie Hansby</td>
<td><strong>Oversight and monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Provided the board with an update on the progress of the project so far and obtained feedback on the board’s views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB Annual Update – Kate Anderson, Jude Higginson, Liz Smith, Patsy Sim, Michael Krausse, Christine Caughey</td>
<td><strong>Keeping informed</strong></td>
<td>Provided an annual update to the board on the CAB’s activity in the local board area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5pm.