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Responsibilities
This committee deals with all strategy and policy decision-making that is not the responsibility of another committee or the Governing Body. Key responsibilities include:

- Development and monitoring of strategy, policy and action plans associated with environmental, social, economic and cultural activities
- Natural heritage
- Parks and reserves
- Economic development
- Protection and restoration of Auckland’s ecological health
- Climate change
- The Southern Initiative
- Waste minimisation
- Libraries
- Acquisition of property relating to the committee’s responsibilities and within approved annual budgets
  - Performing the delegations made by the Governing Body to the former Parks, Recreation and Heritage Forum and Regional Development and Operations Committee, under resolution GB/2012/157 in relation to dogs
- Activities of the following CCOs:
  - ATEED
  - RFA

Powers
(i) All powers necessary to perform the committee’s responsibilities, including:
   (a) approval of a submission to an external body
   (b) establishment of working parties or steering groups.
(ii) The committee has the powers to perform the responsibilities of another committee, where it is necessary to make a decision prior to the next meeting of that other committee.
(iii) The committee does not have:
   (a) the power to establish subcommittees
   (b) powers that the Governing Body cannot delegate or has retained to itself (section 2)
Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting

Members of the public
All members of the public must leave the meeting when the public are excluded unless a resolution is passed permitting a person to remain because their knowledge will assist the meeting.

Those who are not members of the public

General principles
- Access to confidential information is managed on a “need to know” basis where access to the information is required in order for a person to perform their role.
- Those who are not members of the meeting (see list below) must leave unless it is necessary for them to remain and hear the debate in order to perform their role.
- Those who need to be present for one confidential item can remain only for that item and must leave the room for any other confidential items.
- In any case of doubt, the ruling of the chairperson is final.

Members of the meeting
- The members of the meeting remain (all Governing Body members if the meeting is a Governing Body meeting; all members of the committee if the meeting is a committee meeting).
- However, standing orders require that a councillor who has a pecuniary conflict of interest leave the room.
- All councillors have the right to attend any meeting of a committee and councillors who are not members of a committee may remain, subject to any limitations in standing orders.

Independent Māori Statutory Board
- Members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board who are appointed members of the committee remain.
- Independent Māori Statutory Board members and staff remain if this is necessary in order for them to perform their role.

Staff
- All staff supporting the meeting (administrative, senior management) remain.
- Other staff who need to because of their role may remain.

Local Board members
- Local Board members who need to hear the matter being discussed in order to perform their role may remain. This will usually be if the matter affects, or is relevant to, a particular Local Board area.

Council Controlled Organisations
- Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation.
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1  **Apologies**

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

2  **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.

3  **Confirmation of Minutes**

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 12 February 2019, as a true and correct record.

4  **Petitions**

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

5  **Public Input**

Standing Order 7.7 provides for Public Input. Applications to speak must be made to the Governance Advisor, in writing, no later than one (1) clear working day prior to the meeting and must include the subject matter. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders. A maximum of thirty (30) minutes is allocated to the period for public input with five (5) minutes speaking time for each speaker.

5.1  **Extinction Rebellion Auckland - effective action against climate change**

**Te take mō te pūrongo**

**Purpose of the report**

1. Rosie Gee, on behalf of Extinction Rebellion Auckland, will be talking about the Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) climate declaration signed by Mayor Phil Goff, and about proposals for Auckland Council taking a lead in Aotearoa, towards effective action against climate change.

**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the presentation from Rosie Gee, Extinction Rebellion Auckland in relation to Auckland Council taking a lead in Aotearoa, towards effective action against climate change and thank her for her attendance.
5.2 Tennis Auckland - the ASB Tennis Arena redevelopment project

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide background to the ASB Tennis Arena redevelopment project including what the project entails and the positive outcomes tennis in Auckland will experience from having an improved facility. It will also cover the wider community and economic benefits that will result from the redevelopment and retention of the ASB Classic tournaments.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the presentation from Marcus Reynolds, Chief Executive Officer, Tennis Auckland, regarding the ASB Tennis Arena redevelopment project and thank him for his attendance.

5.3 Kim Kerrigan - Glenesk Road, Piha - Flooding

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To present on displacement, consultation and their experience with Auckland Council in relation to flooding in the vicinity of Glenesk Road, Piha.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) thank Kim Kerrigan for her presentation in relation to flooding and Glenesk Road, Piha and thank her for her attendance.

6 Local Board Input

Standing Order 6.2 provides for Local Board Input. The Chairperson (or nominee of that Chairperson) is entitled to speak for up to five (5) minutes during this time. The Chairperson of the Local Board (or nominee of that Chairperson) shall wherever practical, give one (1) day’s notice of their wish to speak. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders.

This right is in addition to the right under Standing Order 6.1 to speak to matters on the agenda.
6.1 Waitakere Ranges Local Board - Consultation on options in response to flood safety risk in Piha

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To address the committee regarding the options in response to flood safety risk in Piha.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) thank the Waitakere Ranges Local Board for their presentation and attendance regarding the options in response to flood safety risk in Piha.

7 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.”
Engagement on options in response to flood safety risk in Piha

File No.: CP2019/02333

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval to consult the Waitākere Ranges Local Board, community and iwi on a long-list of options in response to a flood safety risk in Piha.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. To respond to a high flood safety risk in Piha eight options that mitigate flood safety risk collectively to residents, the wider Piha community and visitors have been identified. These options seek to keep people away from floods, enhance readiness and responses to flooding, or keep floods away from people. The scope of the options do not impinge on private property rights or responsibilities.

3. Staff recommend that council consult the Waitākere Ranges Local Board, Piha community and landowners as well as Te Kawerau ā Maki and Ngāti Whātua on these options.

4. Taking this approach will ensure that any future decision-making takes into consideration the views and preferences of all affected or interested parties.

5. There is a low people risk that taking the time to consult could add to the uncertainty and stress experienced by the Piha community following the flooding events. This is mitigated by engaging these people in the decision-making process.

6. Staff will report back to the Environment and Community Committee on 11 June 2019 with a summary of the engagement findings and decision of the next steps for the options.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) agree to engage the Waitākere Ranges Local Board, Piha community and landowners as well as Te Kawerau ā Maki and Ngāti Whātua on a long-list of options in response to a high flood safety risk in Piha.

b) request a report back to the Environment and Community Committee on 11 June 2019 with a summary of the engagement findings and decision of the next steps for the options.

Horopaki

Context

7. Extreme rainfall events on 3 February and 28 April 2018 led to significant flooding at Piha.

8. On both occasions high water depths and velocities resulted in emergency evacuations and flooding at residential properties on Glenesk Road, Piha Campground and Piha Mill Camp. Access along Glenesk Road was also cut-off as water depths and velocities made it unsafe for wading or vehicles.
9. After these events Auckland Council undertook flood modelling and commissioned Tonkin and Taylor to produce an independent assessment. These analyses concluded that the Piha stream is subject to flash flooding, and that unsafe flooding may occur frequently.

10. The analysis also noted that Glenesk Road is likely to flood on an annual basis. Overtopping of some access bridges can be expected every other year. Flooding of approximately 10 buildings is likely in a five-year rainfall event, increasing to approximately 21 buildings in a 100-year event.

11. On 28 February 2019, a joint workshop of the Environment and Community Committee and the Waitākere Ranges Local Board was held to explain Tonkin and Taylor’s findings (publicly available as part of the ‘Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information’ report of this agenda.).

There is a high flood safety risk in Piha for a small number of people

12. There is a high flood safety risk for a small number of people at certain locations during extreme rainfall events in Piha. Attachment A highlights these risk areas.

13. There are four groups of people with a flood safety risk:
   - residents with habitable floors within the floodplain (21 properties)
   - neighbouring residents whose access is restricted by flooding in Glenesk Road
   - members of the wider Piha community
   - visitors to Piha.

14. The risk of drowning or injury is likely to arise when people undertake risky activities. These include driving and wading through floodwaters.

‘Local solutions to local problems’ is the accepted approach to flooding

15. The generally accepted approach to managing natural hazards, including flooding, is ‘local solutions to local problems.’

16. Auckland Council acts in dual capacities as a regional council and territorial authority.

17. The council operates under a legislative framework for flood risk management that enables rather than requires specific levels of flood protection be achieved.

18. In its regional council capacity, Auckland Council maintains records of river flows, rainfall and past floods. We model water flows, warn of future flooding and provide emergency management.

19. As a territorial authority we collect information on flooding and are responsible for controlling buildings and the effects of land use to reduce flood risk. The key tools are set out in the Building Act 2004 and Resource Management Act 1991.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

20. This report primarily focuses on options that mitigate flood safety risk collectively to residents, the wider Piha community and visitors.

21. The scope of the options does not impinge on private property rights or on the private responsibilities and choices of individual property owners. For this reason the purchase of properties, an option raised by parts of the community, is not presented in this report.

22. A long list of possible collection options have been developed in response to the flood safety risk at Piha (see Table 1 below). This will enable engagement with all affected parties.

23. They include existing and new initiatives focussed on collective approaches to:
   - help keep people away from floods
   - enhance our readiness and response to floods
   - physical works to keep floods away from people.
24. A number of the options can and may need to be combined. Implementing most of the options will be difficult. They will come at a cost to either individuals, the community or the region. There are financial, social and environmental trade-offs to consider. These trade-offs are outlined for each option as part of the assessment criteria.

25. Four of the options entail major flood protection and control works in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002.\textsuperscript{1, 2}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Long list of options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current situation to keep people away from flooding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancing readiness and response to flooding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical protection works to help keep flooding away from people</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Detailed descriptions of these options as well as their advantages and disadvantages is presented in Attachment B.

27. Staff developed assessment criteria to enable the comparison of all options. These criteria are unweighted and allow for objective assessment.

**The extent to which each option:**
- provides an effective response to the flood safety risk
- is able to be implemented in the short to medium-term
- helps preserve and protect the natural environment
- supports a resilient Piha community
- is cost effective for council, landowners and the Piha community given their roles and responsibilities in response to flooding.

28. All options are compared against the status quo in order to understand any additional benefits or impacts.

\textsuperscript{1} These are defined as physical structures that are owned by local authorities and are designed to protect urban and rural areas from flooding from rivers and includes ancillary works such as channel realignment or gravel removal.

\textsuperscript{2} There are non-financial performance measures and reporting requirements for major flood protection and control schemes under the Act.
Table 2: Option assessment table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Increase flood warning time</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4: Raise Glenesk Road</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5: Build a dam(s) to contain flood water</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6: Build a tunnel to divert flood water</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 7: Widen the stream to increase water flows</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 8: Clear the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flows</td>
<td>Slight change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Options 1, 2 and 3 score favourably against the assessment criteria. As a suite of options they respond to the flood safety risk, have a positive impact on the community and are cost-effective for all stakeholders.

30. However, engagement with Waitākere Ranges Local Board, Piha community and landowners as well as Te Kawerau ā Maki and Ngāti Whātua will be vital.

31. It is important to ascertain the views and preferences of all persons likely to be affected by, or who have an interest in, these collective responses to the flooding safety risk in Piha.

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

32. There are no council group impacts at this stage of option development.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
33. The 2018 storm events have had a pronounced impact on the Piha community. Some residents were evacuated by emergency services and were displaced from their homes.
34. There have been long-term impacts on the Piha community. People have had to cope with considerable stress and ongoing concerns about the safety of their families and property. Uncertainty and the likelihood of future flooding creates further stress.
35. Council is working to reduce uncertainty, by sharing information about the flooding risk, including the Tonkin and Taylor reports. It is also facilitating resilience planning.

Flooding can have a disproportionate impact on some households
36. Socio-economic factors can influence a community’s capacity to anticipate risk and adapt to increased flood risk. There is also a relationship between socio-economic status and the ability to cope with, and recover from, floods. People with low incomes and those living in rental accommodation are more vulnerable and take longer to recover.

The Waitākere Ranges Local Board are strong advocates for the Piha community
37. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board is working to support Piha residents.
38. The local board will be engaged on the range of options. It has decision-making responsibility for local community and park assets, including leasing and change of use.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
40. The costs of engagement are estimated to be $20,000. These costs can be met within current allocated budgets. No decision on options is being made. Financial implication of any options will be considered as part of future decisions.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
41. People risks are one of the council’s standard risk categories. Specifically, they relate to the health, safety and wellbeing of staff, customers and the community. There is a low people risk that taking the time to consult could add to the uncertainty and stress experienced by the Piha community following the flooding events. This is mitigated by engaging these people in the decision-making process.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
42. Staff will report back to the Environment and Community Committee on 11 June 2019 with a summary of the engagement findings and decision of the next steps for the options.
Ngā tāpirihanga
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Attachment A: Piha flood risk

LEGEND
Event building flooded
- None
- 2 year ARI
- 5 year ARI
- 10 year ARI
- 20 year ARI
- 50 year ARI
- 100 year ARI
- 100 year ARI flood extent
- Main Channel
- Building Extent
- Model Boundary

Environment and Community Committee
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Piha Flooding: Detailed Options Analysis

Background
1. Extreme rainfall events in Piha on 3 February and 28 April 2018 caused significant flooding.
2. On both occasions high water depths and velocities resulted in emergency evacuations and flooding of residential properties on Glenesk, Seaview and Beach Valley Roads. Access along Glenesk Road was also cut-off by flooding.

The flood safety risk in Glenesk Valley is high for a small number of people
3. After these events Auckland Council undertook flood modelling. It also carried out floor level surveys and inspections of affected properties to confirm the level of flood risk.
4. Tonkin and Taylor was commissioned to produce an independent assessment of the Piha area to further understand the flood risk and its causes. They note that the stormwater catchment for Piha is large, covering approximately 1100 hectares, across steep terrain. This catchment generates large flows and high water velocities.
5. The time for the flood waters to peak in Piha is within 40 to 50 minutes of rainstorm events. This constitutes ‘flash flooding.’ The speed by which flooding occurs accentuates the risk to people.
6. Tonkin and Taylor concluded that risk of drowning or injury from these frequent events is likely to arise from people undertaking risky activities. These include driving and wading through floodwaters.
7. Tonkin and Taylor also found that the majority of private bridge structures are not consented. During large flood events they would be unsafe for use and structurally unstable. One bridge was deemed dangerous.
8. These analyses conclude that the flood safety risk is high at some locations during extreme rainfall events.\(^1\)

Flooding is a natural hazard that occurs frequently across Auckland
9. According to current estimates, 10 percent of all buildings in Auckland lie within areas that will flood during a 100-year rainstorm. Approximately 15,000 buildings are predicted to flood such an event.
10. Extreme rainfall is variable across the region. This means that we can expect localised flooding somewhere in Auckland once every three to five years from a 100-year event.
11. Piha differs from other parts of the region in terms of the flood safety risk and the frequency of flooding.

‘Local solutions to local problems’ is the accepted approach to flooding
12. According to the Ministry for the Environment the generally accepted approach to managing natural hazards in New Zealand, including flooding, is ‘local solutions to local problems.’
13. Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined for local and central government as well as individuals and landowners.
15. The council operates under a legislative framework for flood risk management that enables rather than requires specific levels of flood protection be achieved.

\(^1\) For example, rainfall events which occur once every five to 10 years on average.
16. Regional councils maintain records of river flows, lake levels, rainfall and past floods. They model water flows, so they can warn of future flooding. They manage rivers and catchments and control land-use activities through the Resource Management Act 1991. Regional councils issue flood warnings and provide emergency management.

17. Territorial authorities collect information on flooding. They are responsible for controlling buildings and the effects of land use to reduce flood risk. The key tools are set out in the Building Act 2004 and Resource Management Act 1991 (see Appendix 1).

18. For Auckland Council some of the key tools include:
   - rules in the Unitary Plan based on hazard maps that manage where and what activity is allowed
   - minimum floor levels under the Building Act 2004 and Resource Management Act 1991
   - advice to warn people about flood hazards through Land Information and Project Information Memoranda
   - community emergency readiness and response planning and information.

19. The council also has a legislative role under the Building Act 2004 to assess and respond after a flooding event if a property and building is insanitary or dangerous.

20. Central government works through legislation and other policy-settings to enable local government. The police and the fire service help manage local events.

21. Central government also provides assistance following a large flood event to communities and councils to assist recovery. For example, the Earthquake Commission may provide natural disaster insurance to residential property owners in certain situations.

22. Individuals and landowners need to understand their level of flood risk and make decisions about the safety of themselves, their families and their property.

**Council does not provide stormwater infrastructure in rural areas such as Piha**

23. Piha is zoned as Rural – Waitakere Ranges Zone or Residential – Rural and Coastal Settlement Zone under the Unitary Plan.

24. Council provides formal storm water management and systems in urban areas of Auckland. This infrastructure does not extend to rural areas.

**Problem definition**

25. This problem definition set out a simple statement of the current flooding problem and who it affects.

---

**Problem definition**

Piha stream is subject to flash flooding. The high frequency of events, fast catchment response time (40-50 minutes) and locations of buildings, bridges and roads in the floodplain means that there is a high flood safety risk in certain areas.

Glenesk Road is likely to flood on an annual basis. Overtopping of some access bridges can be expected every other year. Flooding of approximately 10 buildings is likely in a five-year event, increasing to approximately 21 buildings in a 100-year event.
There are four groups of people that may have a flood safety risk:

- residents with habitable floors within the floodplain
- residents whose access is restricted by flooding in Glenesk Road
- members of the wider Piha community
- visitors to Piha.

The risk profile of these groups of people varies based on their vulnerability, behaviour during the flood and the physical characteristics of the flood at their location.

The level of risk is likely greater at night when people may be asleep or unprepared to evacuate their homes at short notice. Darkness may make it more difficult for people to safely evacuate.

There are increased risks for children, elderly people and people with disabilities.

26. The problem statement focuses on flood safety risk to people; however, it is important to note that there are other impacts:

- property damage, both structural and to contents
- the cost of evacuation and providing for the welfare needs of those affected by flooding
- disruption to users of roading infrastructure, which further impacts on economic activity.

27. Several options outlined in this document may help minimise these impacts.

**Private property options**

28. This report primarily focuses on options that mitigate flood safety risk collectively to residents, the wider Piha community and visitors.

29. The scope of the options does not impinge on private property rights or on the private responsibilities and choices of individual property owners. For this reason the purchase of properties, an option raised by parts of the community, is not presented in this report.

30. Private property owners may wish to consider options to reduce the impact flooding has on their property.

31. These can include building or property improvements that are not legally required under the Building Act 2004 or the Resource Management Act 1991.

32. Raising the floor level of buildings out of the 100-year floodplains is one example. This was outlined in the Tonkin and Taylor report (see Appendix 2).

33. The only exception is council’s role under the Building Act 2004 relating to insanitary and dangerous buildings as a result of flooding. The Tonkin and Taylor report sets out their assessment of affected properties (see Appendix 3).

34. This information provides the individual property owners and council regulatory staff with information about future decision about whether to issue dangerous or insanitary notices. The notices can require the property owner to undertake building works at their own cost, to that ensure the properties comply with the Building Code.

35. The council will make every effort to balance its statutory responsibilities with the rights of property owners.
A range of collective options

36. A range of options respond to the problem definition and help mitigate flooding risk to the Piha community. They include existing and new initiatives focussed on collective approaches to:
   - help keep people away from floods
   - enhance our readiness and response to floods
   - physical works to keep floods away from people.

37. A long list of possible options has been developed to enable discussion between the council, landowners and the Piha community (see Table 1 below).

38. A number of the options can and may need to be combined. Implementing most of the options will be difficult. They will come at a cost to either individuals, the community or the region. The trade-offs are financial, social and environmental.

39. Four of the options entail major flood protection and control works in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002.\(^2\)\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Long list of options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current situation to keep people away from flooding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancing readiness and response to flooding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Increase flood warning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4: Raise Glenesk Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical protection works to help keep flooding away from people</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5: Build a dam(s) to contain flood water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6: Build a tunnel to divert flood water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 7: Widen the stream to increase water flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 8: Clear/dredge the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Options 5 and 7 have sub-options.

41. Dams could be built to retain floodwaters from either the Glenesk and Piha streams under option 5. A single large dam could cover both tributaries.

42. Stream widening under option 7 has been modelled for a two-year and a 10-year storm event.

43. There is an interdependency between options 7 and 8. The value of clearing the stream depends on widening the stream.

44. Several options could be implemented. Only the large infrastructure projects (options 5, 6 and 7) are considered mutually exclusive.

45. All of these options and their likely impact are discussed in detail below.

---

\(^2\) These are defined as physical structures that are owned by local authorities and are designed to protect urban and rural areas from flooding from rivers and includes ancillary works such as channel realignment or gravel removal.

\(^3\) There are non-financial performance measures and reporting requirements for major flood protection and control schemes under the Act.
46. Staff considered an option to increase the planting of native flora across the catchment to increase its capacity to absorb rainwater. Evidence shows that plants native to Aotearoa New Zealand retain more water than exotics.

47. This option was dismissed because the Waitākere Ranges is the catchment for Glenesk Valley. This area is already heavily planted with native vegetation. Any additional planting would have a minimal impact on flooding in Piha.

**Assessment criteria**

48. Staff developed assessment criteria to enable the comparison of all options. These criteria are unweighted and allow for objective assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent to which each option:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) provides an effective response to the flood safety risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) is able to be implemented in the short to medium-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) helps preserve and protect the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) supports a resilient Piha community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) is cost effective for council, landowners and the Piha community given their roles and responsibilities in response to flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. All options are compared against the status quo in order to understand any additional benefits or impacts.

50. The first criterion focuses on the impact an option will have on reducing the flood safety risk.

51. The second criterion considers the likelihood of successfully implementing the option - *can it be implemented within three years?* The three-year delivery timeframe is proposed because of the frequency of flooding. Implementation in the short-term will reduce the flood safety risk and maximise the impact of the option.

52. The third criterion considers the impact on the natural environment. It recognises the national, regional, and local significance of the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area and legislative framework to promote and protect it.

53. The fourth criterion considers the social consequences of an option – *what will be the lasting impact on social fabric of the Piha community?* Staff consider the likelihood of a positive outcome.

54. The fifth criterion focuses on the cost of the option. This analysis identifies costs and benefits and seeks to ensure that they reflect the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders. Each of these stakeholders will need to make their own assessments as to whether the benefits outweigh the costs and make decisions accordingly.

55. The assessment considers the impact of all the criteria and notes further discussion with all affected parties will be vital.
Keep people away from flooding

Option 1: Local responses to minimise the impact of storm events (status quo)

56. Council has discharged its statutory responsibilities and has implemented a number of discretionary local projects to minimise the impact of flooding in response to the 2018 storm events.

Regulatory

57. Council has included flood notations on Land Information Memoranda for properties in Glenesk Valley since 2000. These memoranda, which provide a summary of the information that council holds on a property, note the potential risk of flooding and in some cases reported instances of flooding.

58. Table 2 below outlines the notations and the timeframes in which they were made.

Table 2: Flood risk notations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood notation</th>
<th>Number of properties</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential risk of flooding / overland flow paths</td>
<td>12 properties in Glenesk Road Piha Mill Camp</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential risk of flooding / overland flow paths</td>
<td>1 property in Beach Valley Road 1 property in Glenesk Road 1 property in Seaview Road Piha Art Gallery, Campground and Fire Station</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported incidence(s) of flooding / stormwater issues</td>
<td>2 properties in Glenesk Road</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential risk of flooding / overland flow paths</td>
<td>6 properties in Glenesk Road 3 properties in Seaview Road</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. This information informs landowners, and prospective landowners, of the level of flooding risk. It allows them to make decisions relating to their property and to have evacuation plans in place.

60. Auckland Council is also considering further regulatory action. It has a non-discretionary role to regulate buildings under the Building Act 2004 to ensure that “people who use a building can do so safely and without endangering their health.”

61. Regulatory responses are delegated to staff who are required to act based on the best available information at their disposal.

62. The Tonkin and Taylor report will inform any regulatory decision-making.

Data collection and modelling water flows

63. In its capacity as a Unitary Authority, council commissioned Tonkin and Taylor to undertake an independent assessment of the Piha area to understand flooding risk and its causes.

64. Since 2018, council has enhanced monitoring systems for rainfall and flood events in Piha:

- a vertical pointing rain radar and tipping bucket rain gauge upstream at the Rangers hut (installed)
- a vertical pointing rain radar downstream (to be installed)
- stream gauges at Seaview Road Bridge and Piha Mill Camp Bridge (installed)
• flow and level gauge in the stream adjacent to Glenesk Road (to be installed, subject to landowner approval).

65. Improved local rainfall records and information can be included in the hazard register and inform Land Information Memoranda.

Emergency management

66. Auckland Transport has installed flood risk and depth signage at Piha. These signs inform residents, the wider community and visitors of the potential for flash flooding.

67. Auckland Emergency Management is facilitating resilience planning for the wider Piha area. This includes evacuation planning and coordination with emergency response agencies.

Stormwater

68. Council has been undertaking regular inspections to manage flood risk. This includes removing debris from Piha Stream prior to storm events.

69. Installation of closed-circuit television cameras is planned to further assist with the identification of debris between inspections as well as to help monitor flood levels.

70. These are discretionary activities, which council would not normally undertake in rural areas.

Asset management

71. Auckland Transport carries out regular, and pre-storm, maintenance of all culverts and post event repairs of roading assets.

Financial implications

72. The total costs of the above local projects is $0.20 million. These costs are being met within baselines.

Risks

73. There are no delivery risks associated with the local projects.

Option assessment: Local projects (status quo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√√√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

74. The suite of current actions decrease the risk to life and injury for all four ‘at risk’ groups.

75. This risk would decrease further if council issues notices under the Building Act 2004. The impact of this action is discussed below.

76. The decrease in flood safety risk is expected to be the result of improved flood profile information, monitoring, warning alerts, maintenance systems, community preparedness and a better understanding of the level of risk.

77. Council provision of information will partially reduce risk by alerting owners and prospective owners to the likelihood of flooding and possible flood levels. People can then plan ahead and make decisions for themselves, their families as well as their property.
78. Improved warning signage and guidance on what to do (and not to do) in a flooding event will partially reduce risk. Educating members of the community and visitors to avoid known dangerous behaviours such as driving or wading in fast flowing waters will help mitigate the risk to life and/or of injury.

79. Stream gauging will only partly mitigate the risk. Short warning times will remain. At least two-hours’ notice of potentially high flood risk is ideal for safe evacuation.

80. Removing debris from waterways when flooding is forecast, if required, will help to reduce the severity and impacts of an event.

81. Emergency warnings will not reach the whole community given that the text message system is voluntary. Children and elderly people may represent a higher percentage of those that do not receive these warnings.

82. Emergency management planning for communities in the wider Piha area will empower residents and businesses to be better prepared and to put appropriate plans in place. These could include specific strategies for children, elderly and people with disabilities.

83. This option will not reduce the volume or velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event.

**Ability to be implemented**

84. All the actions have been or are being implemented.

**Preserves the natural environment**

85. There are no expected additional adverse environmental outcomes under this option. This option may have slight environmental benefits by helping to keep the river free from debris.

**Supports a resilient Piha community**

86. This option supports a resilient Piha community by increasing local knowledge and understanding of flood risk. It empowers the community to develop a collective response.

87. Residents will have a clear understanding of the level of risk that they and the wider community is potentially exposed to. This enables them to make informed decisions.

88. Some community concerns may not be assuaged. The flood safety risk may be too high for some residents. The impact of future flooding may also be unacceptable to residents and their insurers.

**Cost of the option**

89. The costs of the above local projects are being met within existing baselines. They are being implemented in accordance with council’s statutory functions and its flood management responsibilities. Accordingly, they deliver broad public benefits.

90. There are no additional costs to landowners or the Piha community.
Enhancing readiness and response to flooding

Option 2: Increase the flood warning time

91. Council could seek to develop and install an enhanced warning system as part of its emergency management function. This would be a discretionary activity with public benefits.

92. The current warning-time is approximately 50 minutes. The objective would be to increase this to two-hours, if possible. Increasing the reach of any warnings to all four ‘at-risk’ groups would be another objective.

93. The proposed option entails developing a predictive warning system, which draws upon specialist weather forecast modelling and stream monitoring, rather than relying on rainfall alone.

94. This system would depend on technical inputs from the MetService and National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research. Their modelling would be supported by data collected from the vertical pointing radar, rain gauges and water velocity sensors implemented under the status quo.

95. Initial assessments of this option indicate that the proposed system could generate false warnings. These could be up to 50 per cent of all warnings. This could undermine the value of the system. People may decide not to evacuate in an emergency if they have previously responded to prior false warnings. This may make it unsuitable as a public warning system.

96. The proposed system, despite the potential for false warnings, would still assist emergency services. It would increase preparedness and enable them to prioritise high risk properties for evacuation. For this reason it warrants further investigation.

Financial Implications

97. The estimated cost of the predictive warning system is $0.30 million. This includes a capital cost of $0.25 million and annual operational costs $0.05 million.

Risk

98. There is a medium delivery risk associated with the implementation of this option. The predictive warning system may not be effective.

Option assessment: Increased warning time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

99. This option will lead to a slight reduction in the flood safety risk. The decrease is expected to be the result of improved preparedness of emergency services. There would also be an increased likelihood of reaching all affected people, for example, elderly and visitors.

100. To be fully effective the system would need to increase the warning time and the accuracy of the warning. This does not appear feasible.

Ability to be implemented

101. This option could be implemented within the short-term.
102. Trials of the predictive warning system will be required to improve reliability before it could become operational.

**Preserves the natural environment**

103. There are no adverse environmental outcomes under this option.

**Supports a resilient Piha community**

104. This option does little to support a resilient Piha community. The flood safety risk may be too high for some residents, who may choose to leave Piha.

105. The impact of future flooding may also be unacceptable to their insurers.

**Cost of the option**

106. The estimated cost of the predictive warning system is $0.30 million. This includes a capital cost of $0.25 million and annual operational costs $0.050 million.

**Option 3: Enhance ways of warning people**

107. Council could seek to improve communications technology to increase the reach of any warning system. Currently council relies on a text-based service, which people subscribe to at no cost.

108. This would be a discretionary activity as part of council’s emergency management function with a mix of public and private benefits.

109. The proposed option entails expanding the text-based service. This would be in response to limitations with existing landline and cell phone coverage in Piha. This is due to gaps in coverage caused by the Waitākere Ranges and rural service levels.

110. Preliminary assessments have been made of ways to enhance telecommunications in Piha. Implementation could entail using a telecommunications booster to increase signal strength.

111. It may be possible to locate this technology in Piha, for example at the fire station, and to use it to relay signals to the existing cell phone tower.

112. If feasible, this service would provide enhanced reception across Piha. This would increase coverage and provide more reliable options to alert residents of flooding.

113. An additional cell phone tower is another way of increasing coverage.

114. Improved communications would have wider benefits for residents and visitors.

115. The introduction of a recorded voice warning is another feature of this option. This will help visitors and new residents, who may be unaware of the danger, understand the flash flooding risk. It could be much more effective than a siren.

**Financial Implications**

116. The estimated cost of the booster technology is $0.30 million. The cost of a new cell phone tower is $1.50 million.

**Risk**

117. There is a low delivery risk that landowner approval will not be granted for the location of the booster technology at the fire station.

**Option assessment: Enhanced warning system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Effectiveness of the response

118. This option will lead to a small reduction in the flood safety risk. Improved communications may enable people to get to safety earlier. There would also be an increased likelihood of reaching all affected people, for example, elderly and visitors.

119. To be fully effective an increase in warning time is also needed. This does not appear feasible.

120. There would be a significant residual safety risk that people wade through rapid and deep water or seek to evacuate in cars.

Ability to be implemented

121. This option could be implemented within the short-term.

122. Trials of the telecommunications booster will be required to improve reliability before it can become operational.

Preserves the natural environment

123. There are no adverse environmental outcomes under this option.

Supports a resilient Piha community

124. This option supports a resilient Piha community by improving communications with local residents. It would enhance current community resilience and emergency plans.

125. The flood safety risk may be too high for some residents, who may choose to leave Piha.

126. The impact of future flooding may also be unacceptable to their insurers.

Cost of the option

127. There are costs associated with the enhancement to telecommunications. The public benefits of this investment would be limited to storm events. This should be reflected in where costs lie.

128. Improved communications would have wider benefits for the fire service as well as private benefits for residents and visitors. These stakeholders would be able to use the improved cell phone coverage and increased reliability in their day-to-day activities.

129. Trialling of the booster should allow telecommunications companies to identify the properties and areas that will benefit from any service improvement.

Option 4: Raise Glenesk Road

130. Auckland Transport could undertake transport engineering works to raise the height of Glenesk Road.

131. This would be a discretionary activity with primarily public benefits. It would allow the road to be used by emergency services and by Piha residents to evacuate during an extreme rainfall event.

132. The proposed option is to raise approximately 560 meters of Glenesk Road by approximately one metre. This would make the road usable up to a 10-year storm event.

133. Replacement of 20 metres of culverts and an existing bridge would be required.

134. This option would require the upgrade of approximately 30 driveways.

135. It is also proposed that new vehicle bays are built to prevent vehicles floating away in a flood event.
Financial implications
136. The estimated capital costs to raise Glenesk road is $1.2 million. This expenditure is unbudgeted.

Risks
137. This option would create a low financial risk to Auckland Transport. It may put other planned capital expenditure at risk.
138. There are high delivery risks associated with the implementation of this option. It relies on landowners investing in new accessways and vehicle bays.

Option assessment: Raising Glenesk Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response
139. This option would lead to a small decrease to the risk to life to three ‘at risk’ groups. This option may marginally increase the flooding risk.
140. Raising the road will reduce the risk of flooding preventing emergency services access.
141. Those who have restricted access in a flood event will see the most benefits. It will provide for safer evacuation for houses on the uphill side of the road.
142. Raising the road along with the construction of new bridges and safe vehicle bays may assist with the evacuation of houses within the floodplain. It may also accentuate flooding.
143. Reinforcing bridge structures reduces the risk of bridge damage or collapse.
144. Building safe vehicle bays reduces the risk that vehicles could float away in a flood event.

Ability to be implemented
145. Implementation of this option is dependent on landowners undertaking private works.

Preserves the natural environment
146. This option will have a low environment impact. It entails the replacement, and raising, of existing structures.

Supports a resilient Piha community
147. This option is expected to have a moderate positive impact on the Piha community.
148. Private works to improve accessways and parking bays are likely to viewed as unnecessary and costly. Landowners may not have the financial resources to undertake these works. This would add to existing stress levels.
149. This option would minimise disruption to users of roading infrastructure.

Costs of this option
150. Raising the road would provide public benefits. It would improve access for emergency services. It would also facilitate the evacuation of Piha residents.
Physical protection works to help keep flooding away from people

Option 5: Build a dam(s) to contain flood water

151. Council could consider major engineering works to construct a storage dam or dams to retain floodwaters and reduce peak flows during extreme rainfall events.

152. This would be a discretionary activity with primarily private benefits.

153. Council does not currently have any flood protection and control works of comparable size and scale. If approved, this option would represent a significant policy shift.

154. Tonkin and Taylor set out four main dam sub-options. The key aspects of each proposal is outlined in Table 4 below.

155. Dams could be built to retain floodwaters from either the Glenesk and Piha streams. Both dams could be constructed. A single large dam could also cover both tributaries.

Table 4: Dam options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Dam Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single dam - Piha tributary</td>
<td>Stores water from a 100-year storm event from Piha Stream. The resulting flow from Glenesk Stream would be 54m³/s.</td>
<td>27 metres high 147 metres long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single dam - Glenesk tributary</td>
<td>Stores water from a 100-year storm event from Glenesk Stream. The resulting flow from Piha Stream would be 54m³/s.</td>
<td>30 metres high 205 metres long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two dams - Piha and Glenesk tributaries</td>
<td>Each dam stores water from a 100-year storm event. Any compensatory release would be 20 m³/s.</td>
<td>Refer above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single dam - tributary confluence (Piha Mill Camp)</td>
<td>Stores water from a 100-year storm event. Any compensatory release would be 20 m³/s.</td>
<td>21 metres high 190 metres long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

156. This information is indicative only. The size, scope, location and functionality of any proposed dam would require detailed investigation if this option was considered feasible.

157. Any of these sub-options would be considered ‘large dams’ under the Building Act 2004. They would require building and resource consents under the Resource Management Act 1991.

158. Each sub-option would likely be classified as ‘high potential impact’ category dams under the Building Act 2004. This means that they would need to meet the highest design and construction specifications. For example, the dam or dams would have to be able to withstand any seismic or volcanic event. They would also have to pass the probable maximum flood.

Financial Implications

159. The estimated capital costs for this option are:

- Single dam at Piha tributary: $17-22 million
- Single dam at Glenesk tributary: $22-28 million
- Two dams at Piha and Glenesk tributaries: $49 million

---

* A large dam means a dam that retains three or more metres depth and holds 20,000 or more cubic metres volume of water.
• Single dam at tributary confluence: $12-18 million.

160. There would also be significant annual operational expenditure required. High potential impact category dams require considerable operational support, maintenance and rigorous dam safety management.

161. Both the capital and operational expenditure is unbudgeted.

162. Development of infrastructure of this scale would typically be debt-funded by council and the costs recovered by way of a targeted rate payable by the Piha community.

163. The council’s debt ceiling may mean that there is insufficient funding available to deliver this infrastructure in the long-term. This is due to existing commitments to growth-related projects.

**Risks**

164. This option would create a high financial risk to council. It would put other capital expenditure at risk.

165. There are high delivery risks associated with this implementation of this option. It is dependent on the willingness of the Piha community for a targeted rate.

**Option assessment: Build a dam(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness of the response**

166. A well-located and constructed dam or dams to retain floodwaters could effectively eliminate the flood safety risk as well as other impacts from flooding.

167. All Piha residents and visitors would be safe under this option.

**Ability to be implemented**

168. The engineering feasibility of large dams is highly dependent on geology. The volcanic origins of the Waitākere Ranges may make it unsuitable for construction. Material availability might be another problem.

169. There is a high delivery risk in that the proposed construction plans may not gain consent under the Resource Management Act 1991.

170. Piha is also covered by the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008, which sets out additional environmental protections.

171. The combination of these factors will likely result in a lengthy timeframe for completion.

**Preserves the natural environment**

172. All of the dam sub-options would have a significant environmental impact.

173. Extensive clearance of native bush would be required for both the construction area and for access ways.

174. The dam or dams would have a significant negative visual amenity impact.

**Supports a resilient Piha community**

175. This option is likely to increase the confidence of residents during an extreme rainfall event. Residents could stay in their properties and would not need to worry about flood safety risks.
176. The community will be more confident in making informed decisions on future developments in the area.
177. Construction of a dam and its environmental impacts could be viewed negatively by some members of the community.
178. Rain water retained by the dam would need to be kept low in preparation for any storm event. There would not be any benefit to the community from increased drinking water supply. The ability to generate hydroelectricity would also be limited.

Cost of this option
179. The costs of this option are high and likely to outweigh the benefits of flood risk mitigation.
180. These costs would largely be borne by landowners in Piha. This is because flood protection and control schemes deliver private benefits to the properties they protect.
181. Council is a landowner in the area. It could derive some benefit from a flood protection and control scheme. However, council would need to weigh the costs versus benefits and may conclude that the removal of assets is more cost effective.
182. There would be some public benefits from reducing the flood safety risk. The costs of this option would need to be weighed against other options.

Option 6: Build a tunnel to divert flood water
183. Council could consider major engineering works to construct a flood flow diversion tunnel for Piha stream.
184. This option would be a discretionary activity with primarily private benefits.
185. If approved, the construction of a major flood protection and control scheme would represent a significant policy shift.
186. Tonkin and Taylor considered a flood flow diversion tunnel from Piha stream to Whakatahi Creek. It would entail boring a 1.4-kilometre long tunnel with a diameter of four to five meters.
187. This tunnel would divert floodwaters from Piha Stream in a 10-year storm event and above. However, it would increase flows and likely flood risk in areas around Whakatahi Creek.

Financial Implications
188. The estimated minimum capital cost is $45 million. The actual cost would be dependent on geology.
189. Annual operational expenditure would also be required.
190. Both the capital and operational expenditure is unbudgeted.
191. Council may not have the capacity to debt-fund construction even if there is support from the Piha community for a targeted rate to meet all capital and operational costs.

Risks
192. This option would create a high financial risk to council. It would put other capital expenditure at risk.
193. There are high delivery risks associated with the implementation of this option. It is also dependent on the willingness of the Piha community for a targeted rate.
Option assessment: Build a tunnel to divert flood water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

194. This option would divert flood waters in an extreme rainfall event. It would significantly decrease the flood safety risk to all Piha residents and visitors.

195. There would be an increased risk to people living near, or visiting, Whakatahi Creek.

Ability to be implemented

196. This option may be impractical to implement. Consenting will be extremely difficult. The physical works may be impossible due to volcanic rock.

Preserves the natural environment

197. This option would have a significant environmental impact. It would entail boring through the Waitākere Ranges. Clearance of native bush would be also required.

Supports a resilient Piha community

198. Piha residents could stay in their properties and concerns about flood safety risks would be reduced.

199. The environmental impacts could be viewed negatively by the community.

Cost of this option

200. The costs of this option are high and likely to outweigh the benefits of flood risk mitigation.

201. These costs would largely be borne by landowners.

202. While there would be some public benefits from reducing the flood safety risk, the costs of this option may be preclusive.

Option 7: Widen the stream to increase water flows

203. Council could consider engineering works to widen and lower Piha Stream. This would allow floodwaters to quickly drain into the Tasman Sea.

204. This would be a discretionary activity with primarily public benefits.

205. Tonkin and Taylor considered two design models. They cover two and 10-year storm events.

206. Implementation requires the relocation and replacement of a number of built structures, including all public and private bridges, as outlined in Table 5 below.

207. Construction within the streambed and floodplain as well as sensitive receiving environments is complex. There is a risk that this option may not be effective.
Table 5: Stream widening options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm event</th>
<th>Implementation requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Two-year storm event | - Widen the top width of the channel from 18 to 21 metres upstream of Seaview Road bridge and downstream to 26 metres  
|                   | - Replacement of three vehicles bridges and nine pedestrian bridges                         
|                   | - Relocation/replacement of two sheds (18 and 30-32 Glenesk Road)                          
|                   | - Relocation/replacement of one tree house and one water tank (50 Glenesk Road)           |
| 10-year storm event  | - Widen the top width of the channel from 24 to 36 metres upstream of Seaview Road bridge and downstream to 50 metres  
|                | - Replacement of three vehicles bridges and nine pedestrian bridges                         
|                | - Reconstruction of the Piha Mill Camp driveway                                             
|                | - Construction of 600 metres of retaining wall                                              
|                | - Relocation/replacement of five sheds (18, 30-32 and 50 Glenesk Road)                     
|                | - Relocation/replacement of one tree house and one water tank (Glenesk Road)               
|                | - Relocation/replacement of nine cabins, one tennis court, one building and one water tank at the camp ground |

Financial implications

208. The estimated capital cost to widen the stream to cope with a two-year storm event is between $22 and 25 million. The cost range increases to $31-36 million for a 10-year storm event. Some annual operational expenditure may be required.

209. Both the capital and operational expenditure is unbudgeted.

210. Council may not have the capacity to debt-fund construction even if there is support from the Piha community for a targeted rate to meet all capital and operational costs.

Risks

211. This option would create a high financial risk to council. It would put other capital expenditure at risk.

212. There are high delivery risks associated with this implementation of this option. It is also dependent on the willingness of the Piha community for a targeted rate.

Option assessment: Widen the stream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of the response

213. Stream widening and lowering the channel would provide a moderate decrease to the flood safety risk for all four ‘at risk’ groups.

214. This option would result in floodwaters being discharged more effectively and lower stream levels in an extreme rainfall event.

215. Increasing stream depth will alter water flows and increase water velocities in an extreme rainfall event. This increases the risk if someone, most likely a child, was to fall into the stream.
216. This option does not eliminate the risk for extreme rainfall events. There is a residual risk of extreme rainfall events that could exceed the capacity of the stream.

   Ability to be implemented

217. Construction within the streambed and floodplain and sensitive receiving environments is complex. There is a risk that the desired outcome will not be achieved.

218. Implementation of this option requires removal of some existing structures. Landowners would need to agree to these works.

219. Consenting the works is likely to present some challenges, but these could be overcome if there is support from the community.

   Preserves the natural environment

220. Both options would have a moderate environmental impact. This could be mitigated by planting.

221. Increasing water velocities could increase erosion downstream.

   Supports a resilient Piha community

222. Residents could stay in their properties and concerns about flood safety risks would be reduced.

223. The environmental impacts could be viewed negatively by the community.

   Cost of this option

224. The costs of this option are high. There would be public benefits from reducing the flood safety risk.

Option 8: Clear/dredge the stream from Seaview Road Bridge to the sea to increase water flows

225. Council could consider engineering works to increase the stream velocities of Piha Stream from Seaview Road Bridge through the lagoon area to the Tasman Sea.

226. This would be a discretionary activity with primarily public benefits.

227. This option would entail forming a larger and deeper stream channel through a combination of excavation and dredging. It would also involve removal of the sandbar and sediment build-up in the lagoon.

228. The works would cover approximately 800 metres. Tonkin and Taylor estimate that 12,000 metres³ of soil, sediment and sand would need to be removed.

229. This option would require ongoing excavation and dredging to be effective. This could be required on an annual or more frequent basis.

230. Further modelling and study of sediment levels over time will be required if this option is supported.

   Financial implications

231. The estimated initial costs of this option are $3.5-4.5 million. There would also be annual costs from ongoing excavation and dredging. These costs are unbudgeted.

   Risks

232. There are low delivery risks associated with obtaining consents for the works. This could be overcome if there is support from the community.
### Option assessment: Clear/dredge the stream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slight change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Effectiveness of the response

233. This option would lead to a small change in the flood safety risk, primarily for visitors to Piha.

234. Modelling by Tonkin and Taylor indicates that this option would help reduce stream flood levels between Seaview Bridge and the coastal marine area by 0.5 to 0.85 metres in a 10-year rainfall event.

235. It would have no discernible impact on flooding at the Piha Domain Campgrounds.

236. Tonkin and Taylor also notes that sandbar clearance would have a negligible effect to water levels upstream of Seaview Bridge.

237. This option will not reduce the volume and velocity of flood waters in an extreme rainfall event.

#### Ability to be implemented

238. Dredging has been previously undertaken in the Piha area.

239. This option would require ongoing maintenance. There is a risk that the desired outcome will not be achieved or maintained due to tidal, wave, wind and fluvial processes.

#### Preserves the natural environment

240. This option will have a low long-term impact on the environment.

241. Increasing water velocities could increase erosion in the coastal marine area.

#### Supports a resilient Piha community

242. If implemented in conjunction with option 7, Piha residents could stay in their properties and concerns about flood safety risks would be reduced.

243. This option would also help to flush contaminated water from the lagoon. Poor water quality from run-off and septic tanks is a long-standing community concern.

#### Costs of this option

244. The main public benefits would be from improvements in water quality. This is not the primary objective.
## Appendix 1: Legislative framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Power to require residents to leave their home temporarily during a flood?</th>
<th>Power to require residents to leave their homes permanently due to the risk of a flood event?</th>
<th>Can the Council compulsorily acquire the land due to the significant flood risk?</th>
<th>Compensation required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Act 2004</strong></td>
<td>Yes, if Council is satisfied that the building is an insanitary building in accordance with section 122(1)(a)(i) and section 124(2)(d) of the BA</td>
<td>Yes, if Council is satisfied that the building is an insanitary building; section 122(1)(a)(i) and section 124(2)(a) and (b) allow the Council to put up a hoarding and attach a notice to warn people not to approach the building.</td>
<td>No, Council cannot compulsorily acquire land or buildings. The Council can force buildings which are ‘insanitary buildings’ to be made sanitary, which can include being partly or completely demolished or moved under sections 124(2)(c) and (d). The Council could also take action to fix insanitary conditions if ‘immediately’ required under section 129 of the BA.</td>
<td>No, unless the Council is sued in tort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Management Act 1991</strong></td>
<td>Yes, under section 330(2) of the RMA the Council can enter onto any place (without prior notice) and can take action, or direct the occupier to take the action immediately necessary to mitigate any actual or likely adverse effect of an emergency, if the Council forms the reasonable opinion that an adverse effect on the environment requires immediate preventative or remedial measures or any sudden event causing or likely to cause loss of life, injury or serious damage to property will occur to a natural or physical resource within its jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Potentially, by issuing an abatement notice or seeking an enforcement order from the Environment Court under sections 17(3), 322(1)(a)(i), 314(1)(a)(ii) or 314(1)(d)(a) of the RMA. The most useful power is likely to be section 314(1)(d)(a). In our view the use of these powers are not likely to be appropriate to require the permanent removal of residents due to the risk of flooding.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes, if the Council takes emergency action under section 330(2) of the RMA it will be liable to compensate any people harmed by the actions or the occupants of the land injuriously affected under section 331 of the RMA. Otherwise no, unless the Council is sued in tort.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Public Works Act 1981

| Public Works Act 1981 | No. | No. | Yes, although the Council would not be requiring the land due to the significant flood risk, but rather on the basis that it is required for a local work. In order to use the land acquisition process in the PWA, the Council would need to positively use the land for the purpose of a local work (directly or indirectly). |

### Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002

| Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 | Yes, under section 86, while a state of emergency is in force, a constable or Group Controller may direct the evacuation of any premises or place if, in their opinion, it is necessary for the preservation of human life. Section 90 also allows a constable or Group Controller to requisition land while a state of emergency is in force if it is necessary for the preservation of human life. Once that person was in control of the land, they could require any residents to leave the property. | No. These e | No, the land can only be requisitioned if it is necessary for the preservation of human life, and will only remain under the control of a constable or Group Controller while a state of emergency is in force. | Yes, if land is requisitioned under section 90, the Council will be liable to pay compensation to any person having an interest in that property in accordance with section 107. |


| Local Government Acts 1974, 2002 and Auckland Council 2009 | No. | No. | Yes, in accordance with the PWA process. Note that the Council does have functions in relation to land drainage and storm water. | Yes, as per the PWA. |
## Appendix 2: Private property options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Flood Refuge within property (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</th>
<th>Surveyed Floor Level (m) (From survey results provided by Auckland Council)</th>
<th>TT Hydrology Flood Risk (From T+T flood risk assessment)</th>
<th>Required floor level</th>
<th>Subfloor Space (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</th>
<th>Structural Integrity note (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>Not habitable</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>10 year flood level trigger Required Floor Level: 6.18mRL</td>
<td>None. Slab on grade foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Seaview Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gallery building positively connected to concrete slab. Sheds are marginal for fynny in ground. Some damage may occur in flood.</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8 Glenesk Rd</td>
<td>Habitability</td>
<td>Yes – upstairs on second level</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>10 year flood level trigger Required Floor Level: 8.63mRL</td>
<td>Driven piles embedded supposedly 1.2m into natural ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robust cantilevered piles embedded at reasonable depth. May incur some damage to structure in flood event.</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 Glenesk Rd</td>
<td>Habitability</td>
<td>Yes – refuge in the attic space within upper level</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>10 year flood level trigger Required Floor Level: 8.39RL</td>
<td>Low subfloor space (&lt;300mm).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower house (north side of stream) – unknown address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well braced piles with minimum pile embedment of 450mm. Central area supported by masonry block foundation wall.</td>
<td>Good – likely to withstand flood event pressures, well braced foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Glenesk Rd</td>
<td>Habitability</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>10 year flood level trigger Required Floor Level: 8.76mRL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Flood Refuge within property (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Surveyed Floor Level (m) (From survey results provided by Auckland Council)</td>
<td>TT Hydrology Flood Risk (From T+T flood risk assessment)</td>
<td>Required floor level</td>
<td>Subfloor Space (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Structural Integrity note (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Glenesk Rd</td>
<td>Habitable</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Floor level above 100 year ARI from site inspection</td>
<td>7.07  7.80  8.56</td>
<td>No trigger</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Bank alongside stream, supporting dwelling and deck above, has eroded and poses a potential ground slip hazard and risk of undermining structure.</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Glenesk Rd</td>
<td>Habitable</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.21  6.97  7.77  8.48</td>
<td>10 yr trigger Required FFL – 6.96</td>
<td>Braced piles.</td>
<td>House uninhabited. Water damage was visible to bottom of internal linings of dwelling.</td>
<td>Raise – 1.77m and upgrade or replace pedestrian bridge.</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Glenesk Rd Garage</td>
<td>Not habitable</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.97  7.00  7.64  8.35</td>
<td>10 yr trigger Required FFL – 6.85</td>
<td>Braced timber piles – reported embedment of 450mm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Glenesk Rd House</td>
<td>Habitable</td>
<td>Yes – on second level.</td>
<td>7.14  7.03  7.78  8.47</td>
<td>10 yr trigger Required FFL – 6.97</td>
<td>Low subfloor space – 300mm.</td>
<td>Some concern regarding stability of original foundations and potential undermining of the house piles from river scours. Deck and unconsented bridge were connected behind property. Flood damage to bridge may</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Flood Refuge within property (From survey results provided by Auckland Council)</td>
<td>Surveyed Floor Level (m)</td>
<td>TT Hydrology Flood Risk (From T+T flood risk assessment)</td>
<td>Subfloor Space (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Structural Integrity note (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Glensk Rd House</td>
<td>Habitabile</td>
<td>Yes – on second level</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>7.18 7.92 8.57</td>
<td>10 yr trigger Required FFL – 9.07</td>
<td>Original – N.A.</td>
<td>Destabilise dock which is attached to house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Glensk Rd Sleep-out</td>
<td>Habitabile</td>
<td>Yes on upper floor/attic</td>
<td>Not available – assumed level of 7.4</td>
<td>7.22 7.89 8.54</td>
<td>10 yr trigger Required FFL – 9.04</td>
<td>Low subfloor space.</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-47 Glensk Rd</td>
<td>Habitabile</td>
<td>Yes – on second and third levels.</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>6.91 7.71 8.39</td>
<td>10 yr trigger Required FFL – 9.89</td>
<td>Low subfloor space below dwelling.</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Glensk Rd House 1</td>
<td>Habitabile</td>
<td>Yes – on upper level.</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>8.87 9.01 9.38</td>
<td>No trigger</td>
<td>Building appears well founded on piles and slab at grade and unlikely to be destabilised</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Glensk Rd House 2</td>
<td>Habitabile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>8.49 8.80 9.23</td>
<td>No trigger</td>
<td>Low subfloor space. Piles on perimeter are embedded, internal piles rest on concrete blocks.</td>
<td>May incur some scour damage to piles. No action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Flood Refuge within property (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Surveyed Floor Level (m) (From survey results provided by Auckland Council)</td>
<td>TT Hydrology Flood Risk (From T+T flood risk assessment)</td>
<td>Required floor level</td>
<td>Subfloor Space (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Structural Integrity note (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Glenesk Rd House 3 (Storage)</td>
<td>Habitable</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>8.46 8.77 9.19</td>
<td>No trigger</td>
<td>Piles are embedded.</td>
<td>Some structural damage likely to occur from caravan movement in flood event.</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Glenesk Rd House 4</td>
<td>Habitable</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.7 (No survey – assumed FL)</td>
<td>8.53 9.89 9.23</td>
<td>10 yr trigger Required FFL – 9.73</td>
<td>Piles are embedded into ground.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raise by 0.63m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Glenesk Rd Several Caravans</td>
<td>Habitable – not a permanent structure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A. N.A. N.A.</td>
<td>No trigger</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Several caravans noted onsite – all are at risk of being destabilised in a flood event.</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Glenesk Rd</td>
<td>Habitable</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.8 (No survey – assumed FL)</td>
<td>8.93 9.10 9.39</td>
<td>2 yr trigger Required FFL – 9.89</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Structure vulnerable to flood/wash out. Poor construction.</td>
<td>Raise by 1.09m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Glenesk Rd</td>
<td>Habitable</td>
<td>No – for unit at rear Yes – upper storey for addition at front of dwelling</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>8.54 8.92 9.32</td>
<td>No trigger</td>
<td>Low subfloor space below dwelling (max height – 600mm).</td>
<td>Good. Dwelling appears rigid.</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Glenesk Rd</td>
<td>Habitable</td>
<td>Yes – upper storey</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>- 7.62 8.24</td>
<td>10 yr trigger Required FFL – 8.74</td>
<td>Building was outside of structural assessment scope</td>
<td>Building was outside of structural assessment scope, structural integrity of upper storey should be assessed to confirm safe refuge.</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Flood Refuge within property (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Surveyed Floor Level (m) (From survey results provided by Auckland Council)</td>
<td>TT Hydrology Flood Risk (From T+T flood risk assessment)</td>
<td>Required floor level</td>
<td>Subfloor Space (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Structural Integrity note (From 31/01/2019 T+T structural assessment report)</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Glenesk Rd</td>
<td>Habitable</td>
<td>Yes – upper storey</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>10 yr trigger Required FFL – 11.99</td>
<td>Building was outside of structural assessment scope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3: Insanitary and dangerous buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Dangerous buildings criteria</th>
<th>Insanitary buildings criteria</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building is dangerous already</td>
<td>Building is likely to be dangerous in a 2 year ARI flood event</td>
<td>People are likely to be injured or killed during evacuation in a 2 year ARI flood event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Glenesk Road dwelling</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Glenesk Road dwelling</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>T+T structural assessment has identified that the stream bank has eroded and subject to ground slip and is potentially undermining the deck and dwelling. Therefore the deck and house are likely to dangerous in flood events. Refer appendix D.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Glenesk Road bridge</td>
<td>T+T structural assessment has identified that the timber footbridge with concrete piers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Dangerous buildings criteria</td>
<td>Insanitary buildings criteria</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building is dangerous already</td>
<td>Building is likely to be dangerous in a 2 year ARI flood event</td>
<td>People are likely to be injured or killed during evacuation in a 2 year ARI flood event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Glenesk Road dwelling</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>An internal inspection of the dwelling is necessary to assess the insanitary condition. If found insanitary, then an insanitary building notice may be used to require repair to the buildings. However, this may not be necessary, as the building is not in use due to the flood risk uncertainty and current consideration of flood management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Glenesk Road dwelling</td>
<td>T+T structural assessment has identified concerns regarding the stability of the foundations and potential undermining of the house piles from river scour. Also flood damage to bridge may destabilise deck which is attached to the house. Therefore the deck and house are likely to be dangerous in</td>
<td>Water through house during 3 February flood.</td>
<td>We consider the subject bridge is likely to be dangerous in the event of a flood. We recommend an engineering assessment of the foundations and that these are to be made secure as identified by that assessment. An internal inspection of the dwelling is necessary to assess the insanitary condition. If found insanitary, then an insanitary building notice may be used to require repair to the buildings. However, this may not be necessary, as the building is not in use due to the flood risk uncertainty and current consideration of flood management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Dangerous buildings criteria</td>
<td>Insanitary buildings criteria</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building is dangerous already</td>
<td>Building is likely to be dangerous in a 2 year ARI flood event</td>
<td>People are likely to be injured or killed during evacuation in a 2 year ARI flood event</td>
<td>Building is likely to be flooded above floor level in a 2 year ARI flood event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flood events. Refer appendix D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Glenesk Road dwelling</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA, DV=0.5m²/s</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safe Communities Accreditation for Auckland: Approval of Application

File No.: CP2019/01168

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To approve the Auckland Safe Communities accreditation application (Attachment A).

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. In June 2016, the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee resolved for Auckland to become an accredited Safe Community and write to the Safe Communities Foundation of New Zealand (SCFNZ) to initiate the accreditation process (REG/2016/33).
3. The SCFNZ defines a Safe Community as “a place that is attractive to live, work and visit…It increases community well-being by creating an infrastructure in local communities to increase action by building local partnerships and collaborative relationships”.
4. The application has been prepared by 12 organisations with a community safety and injury prevention focus who, coordinated by council, have come together as the Safety Collective, Tāmaki Makaurau, Auckland (Safety Collective).
5. A governance group led by Councillor Collins, has signed off the application and is providing strategic direction for the accompanying operational and implementation work, which is underway.
6. The SCFNZ has conducted a preliminary assessment of the application and indicated that it is sufficiently developed to move to the next stage of sign-off by council and partners, and for formal review by the SCFNZ assessment team. Additions and alterations through the review process may be integrated into the final document.
7. On 21 February 2019, the Community Development and Safety Committee endorsed the draft application (COM/2019/1).
8. Following approval, the application will be submitted to SCFNZ for assessment and accreditation.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the Auckland Safe Communities accreditation application (Attachment A to the agenda report).
Horopaki

Context

9. In June 2016, the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee resolved for Auckland to become an accredited Safe Community and write to the SCFNZ to initiate the accreditation process (REG/2016/33).

10. In January 2017, the Safety Collective was established to develop the application. Coordinated by Auckland Council, it includes the following organisations with a community safety and injury prevention focus:

- Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC)
- Auckland Emergency Management (AEM)
- Auckland Transport (AT)
- Department of Internal Affairs (Office of Ethnic Communities)
- Drowning Prevention Auckland
- Health Promotion Agency
- Ministry of Health (MoH)
- New Zealand Police
- Safekids Aotearoa
- Safer North Community Trust
- Safer West Community Trust.

11. In April 2018, staff updated the Community Development and Safety Committee on the progress of Auckland’s application to become an accredited Safe Community. A project manager commenced in October 2018 to advance the accreditation process, including the development and implementation of the operational model.

12. In 2018, a governance group was formed as the decision-making body for the collective. Its membership is drawn from Accident Compensation Corporation, Ministry of Health, New Zealand Police, and Auckland Council. Led by Councillor Collins, the governance group has signed off the application and is providing strategic direction for the accompanying operational and implementation work, which is underway.

13. The SCFNZ has conducted a preliminary assessment of the application and indicated that it is ready for sign-off by council and partners, and for formal review by the SCFNZ assessment team.

14. On 21 February 2019, the Community Development and Safety Committee endorsed the draft application (COM/2019/2).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

15. The SCFNZ defines a safe community as a place that is attractive to live, work and visit. A safe community is a liveable community, where people can go about their daily activities in an environment that without fear, risk of harm or injury. It increases community well-being by creating an infrastructure in local communities to increase action by building local partnerships and collaborative relationships. A safe community is about wellbeing, building strong, cohesive, vibrant, participatory communities.

16. The Safe Community model is internationally recognised as an effective intervention that provides a consistent platform for collaboration on projects that deliver evidence-based safety and injury prevention strategies at a local and regional level. It is recommended as an effective approach by the World Health Organisation.

17. Auckland is the largest local government authority in Australasia to seek Safe Communities accreditation. It will join more than 20 other local authorities across New Zealand who have this status, representing more than 50 per cent of New Zealanders, including Wellington and Christchurch. International cities such as Melbourne also have this status.
18. Auckland Council has a lead role as the host agency and for coordination of the accreditation and its implementation, however the initiative belongs to the Safety Collective.

19. The range of community safety and injury prevention programmes currently carried out across Tāmaki Makaurau by the Safety Collective members can be themed as follows:
   - reducing alcohol related harm
   - child injury prevention
   - community connectedness/resilience
   - road safety/policing
   - violence/crime prevention
   - water safety.

20. There is considerable scope for the further development and integration of programmes and initiatives that address Auckland’s needs for improved community safety and injury prevention. For example, addressing the five-year trend for road deaths and serious injuries in Auckland, which has increased by 67 per cent from 486 in 2013 to 813 in 2017. This growth in road trauma exceeds the growth in the Auckland population and vehicle kilometres travelled over the same time period and is three times higher than the national road trauma growth.

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

21. AEM and AT are represented on the Safety Collective. Synergies include AEM’s building of resilience for Auckland to ensure that communities are prepared for any risks and hazards that could impact them, and AT’s co-leadership of RoadSafe Auckland, the Road Safety Strategy and locally co-ordinated Road Safety Action Plans.

22. Staff from council’s Research Investigation and Monitoring Unit (RIMU) are assisting with the development of a monitoring and evaluation framework that the Safety Collective can use to determine its own effectiveness and that of interventions intended to improve community safety and reduce preventable injury and death.

23. Safe Communities accreditation could provide a framework for local responses to anti-social behaviour and safety issues across the Auckland region.

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

24. Staff presented to the Local Board Chairs Forum on 11 February 2019 about the Safe Communities accreditation application and the opportunities it presents for community safety and injury prevention work programmes across local boards. Feedback was sought on whether the range of community safety and injury prevention programmes currently carried out across Tāmaki Makaurau adequately address the needs of local boards and their communities.

25. The Safe Communities accreditation aligns with local boards’ priorities on community safety and injury prevention as per their 2017 Local Board Plans and 2018/2019 work programmes.

26. Work will shortly commence on a proposed implementation plan to follow on from accreditation, addressing the methods of local engagement, and priority setting. Local boards will be engaged on this as details are developed, and before the operational model is put in place.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

27. Case studies included in the Safe Communities accreditation application demonstrate how Māori are disproportionately reflected in many community safety and injury statistics. For example, Safekids Aotearoa in research for its “Check for me before you turn the key” programme found that it is predominantly Māori and Pasifika children who are killed in driveway incidents.

28. The Terms of Reference for the Safety Collective require the collective to recognise and advocate for Te Tiriti o Waitangi by enabling Māori to contribute to decision-making to address the inequities between Māori and non-Māori community safety and injury prevention outcomes across Auckland.

29. The Safety Collective will support and recognise the value of Māori mātauranga, tikanga and approaches in case studies and effective strategies. Together, these are expected to make a meaningful impact over time on community safety and injury prevention outcomes as they relate to Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

30. The MoH has provided funding to council for project management and staffing costs associated with obtaining the Safe Communities accreditation. Discussions are underway with ACC, who have indicated an interest in exploring funding options for the implementation of the post-accreditation work. Further funding implications will be explored during the implementation planning phase once accreditation has been obtained.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

31. The timeframe for submitting the application to the SCFNZ is March 2019 and a decision on obtaining accreditation is May 2019. There are the following reputational and financial risks for council, if the indicated timeframes are not met:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reputation with stakeholders (agencies and community groups who form the Safety Collective, including the MoH who have funded the work), and the SCFNZ could be negatively affected, as they have invested considerable time and effort to progress the application.</td>
<td>• Close working relationships with stakeholders, and the agreement of Councillor Collins to chair the group as a demonstration of Council’s commitment to the process. • Close collaboration with the SCFNZ, to ensure the application is well prepared and regularly reviewed throughout the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding to support implementation may not be secured, at all or in time for the 2019/2020 financial year.</td>
<td>• Working closely with ACC, as a Safety Collective member and likely funder of the bulk of implementation costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

32. Following approval by the committee, the Safe Communities accreditation application will be submitted to the SCFNZ in late March 2019.
33. Assessment and approval from the SCFNZ is expected by May 2019. In the interim, the Safety Collective will develop an operational model for implementation following accreditation.

34. Following accreditation, staff will report to the committee on the accompanying operational and implementation work.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**
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INTRODUCTION

Auckland's Safe Communities accreditation explained

Auckland is the largest local government authority in Australasia to seek Safe Communities accreditation. It will join more than 20 other accredited local authorities across New Zealand, representing more than 50 per cent of the population.

Auckland is a distinct, unique and challenging region with over 1.6 million urban and rural residents from many diverse backgrounds, and our approach to Safe Communities accreditation has had to recognise and work through this reality.

A safe community is a place that is attractive to live, work and visit. A safe community is a liveable community, where people can go about their daily activities in an environment without fear, risk of harm or injury. It increases community well-being by creating an infrastructure across the region through partnership building and collaborative relationships.

The majority of community-based injuries and accidents are preventable and predictable – it is this premise that forms the basis for everyone’s safety. The Safe Communities accreditation approach, supported by the Safe Communities Foundation New Zealand (SCF-NZ), specifically supports communities to adopt the Safe Community model to increase well-being and become effective advocates and enablers of injury and violence prevention.
The range of community safety and injury prevention programmes currently carried out across Auckland is diverse and includes themes such as reducing alcohol-related harm, child injury prevention, community connectedness/resilience, road safety/policing, violence/crime prevention, and water safety. There is considerable scope for the further development and integration of these programmes and initiatives.

Within Auckland each community and local board area is unique, so our approach must recognise the diverse needs of the people, their goals and community values. From a local perspective Safe Communities accreditation provides a framework for local responses to anti-social behaviour and safety issues across the Auckland region, and is well aligned with local boards’ priorities as set out in their plans and work programmes.

Community safety is not only about reducing and preventing injury and violence. It is about wellbeing, and building strong, cohesive, vibrant, participatory communities. It is about creating homes, roads, public spaces and workplaces that are safe for everyone to enjoy. The approach aligns closely to key outcomes in the Auckland Plan 2050, including Belonging and Participation, Transport and Access, and Maori Identity and Wellbeing.

Background to the Auckland accreditation application

Interest in the concept and practice of safe communities has long been held in Auckland. In 1999, Auckland West became the first designated Safe Community in New Zealand. It was joined in 2007 by Auckland North. Both were reaccredited with the status in 2013.

In May 2015, Auckland Council’s Community Safety and Development Committee heard public representations on the Auckland region becoming an accredited Safe Community.

Council resolved in June of the following year to initiate the region-wide accreditation process. Funding for the process was provided jointly by the Ministry of Health and Auckland Council.

In January 2017, Council brought together several governmental and non-governmental agencies with a focus on community safety and injury prevention, with the intent of obtaining accreditation.
The Safety Collective, Tāmaki Makaurau | Auckland, was established with representation drawn from Accident Compensation Corporation, Auckland Council Auckland Emergency Management, Auckland Transport, Drowning Prevention Auckland, Health Promotion Agency, Ministry of Health, New Zealand Police, Office of Ethnic Communities, and Safekids Aotearoa. In addition, the Safer North and Safer West Community Trusts brought their expertise and community-led perspectives.

Together the Safety Collective has developed the accreditation application for Auckland, while also looking to the future and the creation of an operational model that will enable effective change across the region. It is critical to all partners that beyond the acknowledgment that accreditation provides, impact is evident.

Our benefit to Auckland

The Safety Collective has the vision of keeping Auckland safe and thriving. This means prioritisation on areas where our collective approach can have a real impact on reducing preventable injury and death.

Through this regional and collective approach we intend to remain responsive to issues which communities tell us are important to them, including addressing the impact of socio-economic and demographic inequity, and the priorities of our local boards and partner organisations.

Māori are disproportionately reflected in many community safety and injury statistics. The Terms of Reference for the Safety Collective require the Safety Collective to recognise and advocate for Te Tiriti o Waitangi by enabling Māori to contribute to decision-making to address the inequities between Māori and non-Māori community safety and injury prevention outcomes across Auckland. The Safety Collective will support and recognise the value of Māori mātauranga, tikanga and approaches in case studies and effective strategies. Together, these are expected to make a meaningful impact over time on community safety and injury prevention outcomes as they relate to Māori.

The challenge for the Safety Collective is to address inequities which lead to preventable injury by adopting innovative and transformational approaches, in a truly collaborative way. We are committed to developing a monitoring and evaluation framework to demonstrate effectiveness, and ensure that information is transparent and accessible. It’s our desire that all Aucklanders can support us to create effective interventions that enable a world class, safe and prosperous region.

*Tāmaki Makaurau, the Māori name for Auckland, means Tāmaki desired by many. From here on, simply refer to “Auckland” and “Safety Collective”
Outline of application

The application is in four parts:

1. **Leadership and collaboration**
   - An introduction to the Safety Collective - who we are, how we are organised, and the challenges we have set for ourselves

2. **Priority setting**
   - An introduction to our region and our people, followed by a “Safety Profile” for Aucklanders, and the thinking the Safety Collective will need to apply as it addresses the issues raised by this profile

3. **Effective strategies**
   - A set of six case studies presenting a range of collaborations between agencies and communities, aligned to the themes the Safety Collective has identified for the region and showing how they have impacted positively on community safety and injury prevention outcomes for Aucklanders. A fuller stocktake of programmes and activities is attached as an appendix

4. **Shared learning**
   - A description of how the Safety Collective can engage with our communities, and use evaluation to inform its strategy and planning
**Leadership and Collaboration**

Introducing the Safety Collective, Tāmaki Makaurau | Auckland

The Safety Collective, Tāmaki Makaurau | Auckland (Safety Collective) brings together agencies and organisations with a focus on community safety and injury prevention.

- It comprises a Governance group and a Steering group. Auckland Council plays a lead role as the host agency although the initiative belongs to the Safety Collective as a whole, on behalf of Aucklanders.
- The Steering Group was established in early 2017 to progress the accreditation process. Specifically it is to:
  - Maintain and sustain the Safe Communities model, to be determined by a strategic and operational plan as agreed by the Safety Collective
  - Recognise and advocate for Te Tiriti o Waitangi by enabling Māori to contribute to decision-making to address the inequities between Māori and non-Māori community safety and injury prevention outcomes
  - Address inequities in community safety and injury prevention outcomes across key demographics including Māori, Pasifika, gender, age and income
  - Support collaborative partnerships to implement best practice
  - Influence and advise communities on Safe Communities policies and practices
  - Collect and collate data, provide advice, monitor and evaluate the implementation of relevant programmes, policies and projects
  - Design and develop guiding documentation
  - Report to and/or advise the Safety Collective, communities and stakeholders as required

The Governance Group was established in late 2018 to provide strategic direction for the work of the Safety Collective, and to be its decision-making body. Specifically it is to:

- Advocate for and allocate funding and other resources to achieve the Safe Communities vision and strategy
- Recognise and advocate for Te Tiriti o Waitangi by enabling Māori to contribute to decision-making to address the inequities between Māori and non-Māori community safety and injury prevention outcomes
- Support and recognise the value of Māori mātauranga, tikanga and approaches in case studies and effective strategies
- Address inequities in community safety and injury prevention outcomes across key demographics including Māori, Pasifika, gender, age and income
- Mandate the strategic direction for implementation, ensuring alignment with other key national and regional community safety and injury prevention priorities, encouraging and where possible adopting innovative and transformational approaches
- Utilise strategic relationships to advance the Safe Communities vision and implementation for Auckland.
- Communicate and advise on matters relating to the Safe Communities vision, and provide updates on activity to Safe Communities Foundation New Zealand, Auckland Council committee(s), and others.
- Approve the submission of the completed application for Auckland Safe Communities accreditation, to the relevant Auckland Council committee(s) and in turn to the SCFNZ.

Membership of the Safety Collective is drawn from agencies with a safety and/or injury prevention priority, operating at a regional level (or sub-regional, as agreed by the relevant body). Others may be co-opted as deemed necessary. It is intended that membership of the governance group will include senior representatives from the respective agencies.

Meetings occur as required, but the expectation is:
- Steering Group - bimonthly
- Governance Group - quarterly

The Chairs will attempt to schedule at least biannual joint meetings, as part of the above meeting schedule, to ensure effective communication/alignment of purpose and activity.

More details of the joint Terms of Reference for the Safety Collective can be found in appendix one.
Safety Collective, Tāmaki Makaurau | Auckland: structure

**Governance Group**
- Accident Compensation Corporation
- Auckland Council
- Ministry of Health
- New Zealand Police

**Steering Group**
- Accident Compensation Corporation
- Auckland Council
- Auckland Emergency Management
- Auckland Transport
- Drowning Prevention Auckland
- Health Promotion Agency
- Ministry of Health
- New Zealand Police
- Office of Ethnic Communities
- Safekids Aotearoa
- Safer North Community Trust
- Safer West Community Trust
The framework above is intended to describe the interrelationship between governance and priority setting, underpinned by a strong evaluation component.

An effective governance model, able to prioritise interventions and be responsive to local/community input, is critical to the framework.

The Safety Collective needs to address community safety and injury prevention priorities facing the Auckland region, and its sub-regions, recognising the current inequities across key demographics including Māori, Pasifika, gender, age and income.

Evaluation underpins the framework. It will be evidence-based and will inform both business/operational planning and highlight the efficacy of actions undertaken to improve community safety and injury prevention initiatives. Further detail on the proposed evaluation approach can be found in the Shared Learnings chapter.
Our safe community partners

The strength and sustainability of Auckland’s Safe Communities accreditation rely on our commitment to partnership. This section identifies the key partners, the role they play in safety and injury prevention, and the strengths they bring to Auckland’s accreditation.

Accident Compensation Corporation

Everyone in New Zealand is covered by Accident Compensation Corporation’s (ACC) no-fault scheme if they’ve been injured in an accident. The cover they provide helps pay for the costs of recovery. This includes payment towards treatment, help at home and work, and help with income.

ACC wants to create strong partnerships to improve New Zealanders’ quality of life by preventing injuries from happening.

They work across government and with partners and communities, including the delivery of injury prevention programmes across councils, community organisations and other agencies. ACC has access to unique data and resources which support agencies and organisations, such as the Safety Collective, to focus their efforts in the right areas and on the most effective programmes.
Auckland Council

The Auckland Council model of local government helps meet both regional and local needs and gives Auckland the resources required to meet population growth and related development.

The governing body and the local boards are autonomous and make decisions as Auckland Council within their respective areas of responsibility. Although they make different types of decisions, it is critical that there is an effective working relationship between the governing body and the local boards.

**Governing body**

The governing body consists of the mayor, elected by all Auckland voters, and 20 governing body members elected by voters from the ward they represent.

The governing body focuses on the big picture and on region-wide strategic decisions.
Local boards

Local boards represent the communities in their area and make decisions on local issues, activities and facilities.

Local boards are a key part of the governance of Auckland Council. Local boards have a wide-ranging role that spans most council services and activities. Local boards make decisions on local matters, provide local leadership and support strong local communities. Local boards provide important input into region-wide strategies and plans including those of the council-controlled organisations (CCOs).

Local boards are responsible for:

- Making decisions about non-regulatory local matters, including negotiating the standards of services delivered locally
- Identifying and communicating the views of local people on regional strategies, policies, plans and bylaws to the governing body
- Developing local board plans every three years and negotiating local board agreements with the governing body
- Providing local leadership and developing relationships with the governing body, the community, community organisations and special interest groups in the local area
- Providing input to CCO plans and initiatives
- Identifying and developing bylaws for the local board area and proposing them to the governing body
- Monitoring and reporting on the implementation of local board agreements
- Any additional responsibilities delegated by the governing body, such as decisions within regional bylaws.

Council-controlled organisations

Auckland Council also has Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs), which look after specific council assets, services or infrastructure. The CCOs operate separately but are accountable to the governing body, which sets their direction and monitors their performance.

Independent Māori Statutory Board

The role of the Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB) is to ensure there is a voice for Māori in the governance of Auckland, and to assist the council with making informed decisions and meeting its statutory obligations in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi.

While the council has existing obligations to engage with Māori and to enable Māori participation in council decision-making, it has additional duties to work with the IMSB.

The IMSB is completely independent of Auckland Council.

Advisory panels

Auckland Council is also advised by a range of advisory panels, which identify and communicate the interests and preferences of specific groups of Aucklanders to the council.
Auckland Emergency Management

Auckland Emergency Management (AEM) is a specialist department within the Operations Division of Auckland Council.

They are tasked with coordinating the response and recovery from emergency situations across Auckland and the 4Rs – Reduction, Readiness, Response and Recovery with the overarching theme of Resilience. They hold the role of creating resilience for Auckland to ensure that communities are prepared for any risks and hazards that could impact them. AEM work with communities and stakeholders to ensure that all are able to respond and recover effectively following a disaster.

Auckland Transport

Auckland Transport is a council-controlled organisation tasked with improving the functioning of our roads and streets.

It is part-funded by the Auckland Council and NZTA. Improving road safety is a key component of their work, including:

- Retrofitting safety features onto existing roads and intersections with a high crash risk
- Developing guidelines for new roads that enhance their safety
- Constructing pedestrian crossings and facilities that make it easier for people to cross the road safely
- Engaging with schools and communities on road safety education and promotion
- Speed management through reducing limits and retrofitting roads with traffic calming measures such as speed bumps

Providing a leadership role along with NZTA and NZ Police and other stakeholders in the form of the Tamaki Makaurau Road Safety Governance Group, the Road Safety Strategy and locally co-ordinated Road Safety Action Plans.
Department of Internal Affairs - 
Office of Ethnic Communities

The Office of Ethnic Communities is the government’s principle advisor on ethnic diversity in New Zealand.

It provides information, advice and services to, and for, ethnic communities.

In May 2018, the Minister for Ethnic Communities hosted a Safer Ethnic Communities Ministerial Forum in partnership with the Ministry of Justice and New Zealand Police to ensure safety and security for all communities in Auckland.

A further forum on safer ethnic communities is under consideration for 2019.

Drowning Prevention Auckland

Previously known as WaterSafe Auckland, Drowning Prevention Auckland (DPA) is the acknowledged lead agency for regional water safety coordination and education in the Auckland region.

Drowning Prevention Auckland's vision is a water safe Auckland free from drowning.

Their mission is to prevent drowning through education.

As one of the service delivery amenities under the Auckland Regional Amenities Funding Act 2008, DPA is mandated by the ratepayers of Auckland to deliver the best possible water safety education to meet the water safety needs of those living in and visiting the region, needs that are unique – geographically, demographically and statistically.

DPA's approach is to focus on three channels of engagement across community, education and workplaces to help reduce drowning and develop water competence.

This is achieved through professional development for educators, programme delivery with community groups and in the workplace, and awareness-raising at events – all underpinned by research and evaluation.
Health Promotion Agency

Health Promotion Agency (HPA) is a Crown entity established on 1 July 2012 under legislation to lead and support national health promotion initiatives.

It has a board appointed by the Minister of Health, and has staff in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch.

In addition to national health promotion initiatives, HPA performs all functions previously undertaken by the Alcohol Advisory Council (ALAC) and the Health Sponsorship Council (HSC).

HPA is an evidence-based health promotion organisation, influencing all sectors that contribute to good health and wellbeing.

Their work is divided into three main areas:

- Promoting health and wellbeing
- Enabling health promoting initiatives and environments
- Informing health promoting policy and practice

Ministry of Health

The Ministry of Health leads New Zealand’s health and disability system, and has overall responsibility for the management and development of that system.

The Ministry of Health seeks to improve, promote and protect the health and wellbeing of New Zealanders through:

- Its leadership of New Zealand’s health and disability system
- Advising the Minister of Health, and government, on health and disability issues
- Directly purchasing a range of national health and disability support services
- Providing health sector information and payment services for the benefit of all New Zealanders.

The Ministry works in partnership with other public service agencies and by engaging with people and their communities in carrying out these roles.
New Zealand Police

The New Zealand Police have a mission for our country to be the safest in the world.

Their role in engaging with communities and organisations such as the Safety Collective is demonstrated in their motto of “Safer Communities Together”.

In Auckland / Tāmaki Makaurau the organisation is structured into three administrative districts: Watemata, Auckland City, and Counties Manukau, each overseen by a district commander. To ensure a collaborative approach to policing across the region, Police work to a joint District Commanders Work Plan.

The key strategies of the New Zealand Police are strongly aligned with the vision of the Safety Collective for a safer Auckland, they include:

**Prevention First**
- Taking every opportunity to prevent harm

**Turning of the Tide**
- Better outcomes by working in partnership with community

---

**Safer Journeys**
- Reducing and preventing road trauma

The aim is to achieve these strategies and the mission by having a focus on victims, and working in partnership with key groups including:
- Iwi
- Communities
- Social, Justice, Transport and Security sectors

---

**Starship Child Health**

Starship Child Health provides dedicated paediatric healthcare and training within the Auckland region and delivers family centred care to children and young people throughout New Zealand and the South Pacific.

Starship is committed to working in partnership with Auckland Council, the Ministry of Health, ACC, the Northern Regional Alliance and others to improve trauma care and promote the prevention of injury of children and young people. The Auckland District Health Board hosts SafeKids Aotearoa, a national child injury prevention service and the Starship Trauma Service is part of the National Trauma Network.
Safer North Community Trust

Safer North Community Trust is North Shore's Community Injury Prevention Coalition. This group has been in operation on the North Shore for 13 years and is made up of key stakeholders from organisations involved in health, safety, crime prevention and injury prevention.

Safer West Community Trust

Safer West Community Trust holds and facilitates the accreditation process on behalf of the community of West Auckland. The trust reflects the diversity and inclusiveness of the wider community and strives to serve by working in partnership with all. Their commitment to the Te Tiriti o Waitangi brings a quality of process that strives to honour the first peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand.
### Safety Collective membership

**Governance Group:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma Powell</td>
<td>Accident Compensation Corporation</td>
<td>Chief Customer Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eftsso Collins</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Councillor and Chairperson of the governance group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Redican</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Manager Communicable Diseases &amp; Healthy Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karyn Mathias</td>
<td>New Zealand Police</td>
<td>District Commander, Auckland City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Steering Group:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judd Baker</td>
<td>Accident Compensation Corporation</td>
<td>Senior Injury Prevention Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan McLaggen</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Service and Integration Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Cooper</td>
<td>Auckland Emergency Management</td>
<td>Head of Emergency Management Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Bell</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; Performance Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernad Gomes</td>
<td>Department of Internal Affairs</td>
<td>Acting Manager Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Langworthy</td>
<td>Health Promotion Agency</td>
<td>Manager Alcohol Harm Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Burton</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Portfolio Manager Communicable Diseases &amp; Healthy Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Stanley</td>
<td>Safer North Community Trust / Drowning Prevention Auckland</td>
<td>Safer North Chairperson/Research and Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Alatini</td>
<td>SafeKids Aotearoa</td>
<td>Injury Prevention Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mareta Hunt</td>
<td>SafeKids Aotearoa</td>
<td>Strategic Advisor Equity &amp; Injury Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Timmins</td>
<td>Safer West</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Whittaker</td>
<td>New Zealand Police</td>
<td>District Prevention Manager, Auckland City District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Safety Collective also acknowledges the contribution and support from previous steering group members during the accreditation application process.
Letters of support from key agencies

Auckland’s Safe Communities accreditation has received letters of support from the following key agencies (refer to appendix two):

- Accident Compensation Corporation
- Auckland Emergency Management
- Department of Internal Affairs - Office of Ethnic Communities
- Drowning Prevention Auckland (previously WaterSafe Auckland Incorporated)
- Northern Regional Alliance
- Health Promotion Agency
- New Zealand Police
- Safer North Community Trust
- Safer West Community Trust
- Starship Child Health (SafeKids Aotearoa)
- Pasifika Injury Prevention Auckland

Strategic plan

The Safety Collective strategic plan will guide the operational approach and will be confirmed by the Safety Collective following accreditation.

Safe Communities staff will work with the Safety Collective to develop the strategic plan, and a strategic planning session is scheduled for the Safety Collective in March 2019.

Key aspects of the strategic plan will include:

- Affirming the purpose, vision and values of the Safety Collective
- Defining core priorities against clear outcomes, and the benefits these are intended to bring to Aucklanders
- Confirming the approach to decision-making and accountability
- Outlining the approach to monitoring, evaluation and reporting

Together, these will set out the statements enabling the Safety Collective, and Aucklanders, to hold it to account.
Sustainability and coordination

Sustainability is critical to the success of the Safety Collective beyond accreditation.

Auckland's context, with a large population and geographic size, and the amount of coordination to bring people and organisations together, requires an adequate level of funding and people.

This is required to undertake key roles including:

- Relationship building and communications
- Networking and supporting the administration of the Safety Collective
- Strong priority setting through the collation and analysis of high-quality data

There are strengths in continuing to host the operation of the Safety Collective within Auckland Council. Key benefits include:

- In-kind organisational, administration and managerial support
- Access to council resources
- Responsiveness and governance responsibility across the region
- Direct connection to key decision makers within council and council-controlled organisations

Several actions are being undertaken to address the issue of sustainability post-accreditation. These include:

- Identifying resources and funds with Auckland Council from both regional and local sources
- Ongoing discussions and planning with ACC to build a case for support post-accreditation
- Working with the Safety Collective to identify a suitable operational model and how this might be supported financially or in-kind.
PRIORITY SETTING

Auckland’s region

The Auckland region is to the north of the North Island. It extends from the mouth of the Kaipara Harbour to within a few kilometres of the mouth of the Waikato River.

It encompasses a range of natural environments and features, including three major harbours – the Kaipara, Manukau and Waiheke – as well as lakes, islands, estuaries, and bays, the bush-clad Hunua and Waitakere ranges, volcanic fields and a centrally located isthmus which is one kilometre wide at its shortest length.

Auckland has a total land area of 4,894km$^2$ which is comprised of approximately 70 per cent rural land and 30 per cent urban area. Approximately 90 per cent of Auckland’s population lives in the urban area.

Following local government amalgamation in 2010, Auckland is governed by one unitary authority and 21 local boards [refer to figure 1]. These local board areas vary with regard to their geographic and population size.

Figure 1: Local Boards [Source: Auckland Council website]
Auckland’s people

Auckland is New Zealand’s most populous city, with a third of the country’s residents. Auckland is home to over half of New Zealand’s overseas-born population and its ethnic diversity is reflective of a global city.

QUICK FACTS
- Estimated population of 1,657,200 (2017)
- 34.6 per cent of New Zealand’s population (2017)
- 35.1 years median age (2013) 854,413 employees (2017)
- 59 per cent European ethnicity, 23 per cent Asian ethnicity, 15 per cent Pacific ethnicity, 11 per cent Māori ethnicity (2013)
- 39 per cent born overseas (2013)
- $63,955 median household incomes (2017)
- 51.6 per cent of residents employed (2017)
- 545 schools (2016)
- 192,378 businesses (2017)

Auckland’s Māori

New Zealand’s Māori culture and heritage is unique, and Auckland is home to the country’s largest Māori population. Māori living in Auckland, Tāmaki Makaurau, are mana whenua or mataawaka. Mana whenua are represented by the 19 iwi (tribes) or hapū (sub-tribes) with territorial affiliations to the Tāmaki Makaurau area that are recognised by Auckland Council. In addition, there are Māori from other tribes and their descendants who migrated to Tāmaki Makaurau from other parts of the country, and Māori who have no connection to their hapū and iwi referred to as mataawaka.

Stats NZ counts both Māori descent (ancestry) and Māori ethnic identity (cultural affiliation) in the census. At the 2013 census:
- 163,920 or 11.6 per cent of people in Tāmaki Makaurau identified as being of Māori descent. This is almost a quarter (24.5 per cent) of all those of Māori descent in Aotearoa
- The largest proportion of those of Māori descent lived in the Manurewa Local Board (12 per cent), followed by the Henderson-Massey Local Board area (11 per cent)
- 142,775 or 11 per cent identified as being of Māori ethnicity. This is 24 per cent of all Māori in Aotearoa, or 11 per cent of the population of Tāmaki Makaurau

The Māori population in Tāmaki Makaurau is relatively youthful. The median age increased from 23.3 years in 2001 to 23.5 years in 2013. This compares to the Tāmaki Makaurau population overall which increased from 33.3 years to 35.1 years respectively.
Population Growth

As at 30 June 2017, the estimated population for the Auckland region was 1,657,200. The Auckland region grew by 2.6 per cent or 42,700 people from 2016 to 2017. New Zealand’s total population grew by 2.1 per cent over the same period.

The population increased in all 21 local board areas within Auckland, with 14 local board areas growing faster than the New Zealand average of 2.1 per cent. Waitakere was the fastest-growing local board area, increasing 6.7 per cent (6,800).^1

![Population Growth](image)

Figure 2: Population growth ([Source: Infometrics: Auckland economic profile]^1)

Looking ahead, Auckland’s population is anticipated to continue to increase. Its share of the national population is also anticipated to increase, driving much of the national population growth.^[3]

Age Structure

Auckland’s age structure is markedly different than the rest of New Zealand, and reflects its role as a large centre of employment and education. In 2013, Auckland had larger proportions of people in every age group under 50 years than did the rest of New Zealand, and smaller proportions in every age group over 50 years. There were particularly large proportions of residents aged between 20 and 44 years in Auckland, compared to the rest of New Zealand. This is an overall picture though, and age structures differ markedly within the region, by local board area and across different ethnic groups.^[1]

Stats NZ population projections [medium series] suggest that the number of people aged 65 and over will more than double in the decades between 2013 and 2043, reaching a total of 432,770. By 2043, people aged 65 and over could account for 18.4 per cent of the population, compared to 11.4 per cent in 2013. Those aged 0 to 24 could account for 28.1 per cent of the population by 2043, compared to 36 per cent in 2013.^[4]
The Economy

In the year ended March 2017, Auckland had 854,413 filled jobs, which was 35.5 per cent of the national total. The proportion has risen since 2000 when it was 32.4 per cent. Auckland’s real GDP for the year ending March 2017 was $90 billion (in 2010 dollars). This accounts for 38.2 per cent of total New Zealand real GDP. Auckland’s real GDP growth rate over the 12-month period was 5.2 per cent, compared with 3.6 per cent growth for New Zealand.

Productivity in terms of GDP per employed person for the year ending March 2017 was $105,337 for Auckland, which was 7.8 per cent higher than for New Zealand as a whole ($97,707).

Auckland has a higher proportion of its employment in knowledge-intensive industries (36 per cent or 303,662 in 2017) than New Zealand as a whole (32 per cent).

International tourists spent $4.04 billion in Auckland in the year ending December 2017, which was 31.3 per cent of total international tourism spend in New Zealand.

Migration

Thirty-nine per cent of residents were born overseas, and of this group, 43 per cent had been in New Zealand for less than ten years. The largest overseas born group was born in England (14 per cent of those born overseas), followed by the People’s Republic of China (13 per cent), India (8 per cent) and Fiji (8 per cent).

There was a net gain of 33,169 permanent and long term (PLT) migrants in Auckland in the 12-month period ending June 2018, a 9 per cent decrease from the previous 12-month figure of 36,650. Auckland currently receives just over half (55 per cent for the 12-month period ending June) of New Zealand’s permanent and long-term arrivals that specified a New Zealand destination region.

For the 12-month period ending March 2016, the source countries contributing the highest number of net permanent and long-term migrants to Auckland were India (5,674 net migrants), China (5,339), Philippines (1,916), United Kingdom (1,829) and France (1,685). Ten years earlier, the top five source countries were the United Kingdom, Fiji, India, Japan and Samoa.

Of those permanent and long-term migrants arriving in Auckland in the 12-month period to June 2018, 63 per cent were aged less than 30 years. This is a significantly younger demographic than Auckland as a whole (44 per cent of the Auckland population was aged less than 30 in June 2017). This reflects the considerable number of migrants arriving on student visas — for New Zealand as a whole, those on student visas made up 44 per cent of Chinese citizen arrivals and 63 per cent of Indian citizen arrivals in the 12-month period to June 2018. After a period of high immigration, there was a net gain of 28,900 permanent and long term (PLT) migrants in Auckland in the year to June 2017, a 14.8 per cent decrease over the 2016 figures.
Priority setting process

As the Safety Collective determines its strategy and work programme going forward, it is critical that these address the community safety and injury prevention priorities facing Auckland.

A process for formulating priorities and strategies will be finalised once accreditation has been obtained. This will be informed by discussion within the Safety Collective and data gathered and analysed during the accreditation process.

At the outset, it would appear that priorities need to be considered in a framework that addresses at least three differing, though related and overlapping, perspectives or approaches:

- Thematic – the range of interventions in place, or needed, that address themes outlined in the “Effective Strategies” part of this application
- Community priorities – the range of interventions in place, or needed at a local board level, that address issues which communities (potentially via local boards) tell us are important to them
- Target audience – the range of interventions in place (or needed) that address issues facing particular sub-groups, or demographics, of the population, e.g. by age, gender, ethnicity and income

Approaches and perspectives

Potentially, priorities will become clearer the more they intersect between these perspectives or approaches, as the following diagram illustrates:
It is equally important that in all cases, prioritisation and effective strategies are evidence-based in terms of the issues being addressed and interventions proposed. A possible operational model to help integrate these perspectives, prioritise interventions, and determine effective strategies for their implementation could incorporate the following elements:

Decision-making and delivery for Safe Community

- Governance Group
- Steering Group
- Safe Communities Coordinating Staff
- Local/cluster working groups or workstreams
- Local/community input

This recognises the need for governance at a regional level supported by a steering group, and potentially local working groups or workstreams at a sub-regional level ensuring effective understanding and roll-out of targeted interventions that address local issues.
Data analysis to inform future decisions

The data presented in the following section points to a number of possible areas for further analysis and/or intervention. Further work is required following accreditation in order to make informed decisions taking into account an agreed priority setting process as part of the Safety Collective strategic plan.

Several constraints were identified when analysing data to inform future decisions:

- The timeliness of data presents challenges to address the current community environment
- Not all data sources use the same geographic boundaries. Some data sets are broken down to local board level, others into the three districts: Waitemata, Auckland City and Counties Manukau
- Many cases of injury and crime are also under reported

The Safety Collective therefore utilises a range of data sources and other influences to inform decisions:

- New Zealand Police, police.data.nz interactive reporting tool
- Otago University, Injury Prevention Research Unit National Injury Queries System
- Safe Communities Foundation of New Zealand factsheets
- Accident Compensation Corporation annual injury statistics
- NZ Transport Agency, Crash Analysis System, road deaths and serious injuries
- Water Safety New Zealand, DrownBase™
- Auckland Council, Research, Investigations and Monitoring Unit, State of Auckland Demographic report cards

- Quality of Life Survey 2018 Auckland Report
- Auckland Plan 2050 – monitoring framework, in particular the outcomes:
  - Participation and Belonging:
    - Measure 1: Aucklanders’ sense of community in their neighbourhood
    - Measure 2: Aucklanders’ sense of safety in their homes and neighbourhood
    - Measure 3: Aucklanders’ quality of life
    - Measure 4: Relative deprivation across Auckland
    - Measure 5: Aucklanders’ health
  - Transport and access:
    - Measure 5: Deaths and injuries from transport network
  - Political direction
  - Local surveys

Injury profile data can be analysed to highlight outcomes for a range of demographics such as age, gender, and ethnicity. This section highlights some examples showing considerable disparities, but others will be highlighted when the data is further analysed.
Safety profiles for Auckland

Crime Profile

Perceptions of safety

As part of the Auckland Quality of Life Survey 2018, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which various social issues have been a problem in their local area in the previous 12 months. The most commonly perceived problem is dangerous driving (62 per cent); rate this as a big problem or a bit of a problem), followed by car theft or damage to cars (51 per cent), the presence of unsafe people (42 per cent), alcohol or drugs (42 per cent), people begging (47 per cent), vandalism (35 per cent), and people sleeping rough (35 per cent).

While the majority of Aucklanders feel safe in their home after dark (91 per cent) and in their city centre during the day (80 per cent), less than half of respondents (46 per cent) felt safe walking in the city centre alone after dark. The infographics below show the overall crime and safety results for Auckland.

Source: Quality of Life Survey 2018 Auckland Report
Victimisations for assault by family member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUCKLAND</th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate/10,000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,928</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Victimisations for assault in community locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUCKLAND</th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate/10,000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,988</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the period 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018, there were 76,326 crimes reported in Auckland, compared to 219,363 for New Zealand. All crimes went down by -5,664 compared to the previous period [-5,777] for New Zealand.11

The most common type of crime reported was theft (61.6 per cent), followed by burglary (27.2 per cent) and assault (8.3 per cent). This is shown in Figure 3.14

Figure 3: Reported crimes in Auckland by type of crime FY17-18 (Source: New Zealand Police Crime-snapshot)
Injury profile

QUICK FACTS
- 2,212 injury deaths from 2011-2015
- 80,875 hospital discharges from 2013-2017
  Males are over-represented
- Falls are the leading external cause
- Adults 85+ years over-represented for number and rate of injury deaths and hospital discharges

Injury deaths (2011-2015)\textsuperscript{15}
Over the five year period from 2011-2015, there was a total of 2,212 injury deaths in the Auckland region, 24 per cent of the national total. 63 per cent of these were unintentional.

![Injury Deaths Pie Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Death</th>
<th>Number of Deaths</th>
<th>Rate/100,000 People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More males (n=1,397, 63 per cent) were fatally injured than females (n=815, 37 per cent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of Deaths</th>
<th>Rate/100,000 People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three leading external causes of injury deaths in the Auckland region were falls (29.4 per cent), suffocation (23.9 per cent), and poisoning (13.4 per cent). Motor vehicle traffic as an external cause came in fourth (13.1 per cent), as shown in the table.

During this period, adults 85+ years had the highest rate and frequency of fatal injuries. Children aged 5-14 years had the lowest rate and frequency of fatal injuries. This is shown in figure 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>11. Unspecified</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffocation</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>12. Fire/Flame</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisoning</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>13. Natural/Environmental</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Traffic</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>14. Pedestrian, Other</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15. Other Land Transport</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specified</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16. Machinery</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut/Pierce</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17. Pedal Cyclist, Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18. Hot Object/Substance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Transport</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19. Fire/Hot Object or Substance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck by or Against</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20. Overexertion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![External causes of injury deaths from 2011-2015](image)

Figure 5: Auckland injury deaths by age group (Source: IPRU)
Injury data is available to local board level, and shows considerable variation. For example, the rate of injury deaths/100,000 people was 23.3 for the Howick local board area from 2011-2015, and 34.5 for the Mangere-Otahuhu local board area.

Over the same period, the rate/100,000 people for the Auckland region was 29.4. For the New Zealand population as a whole for the same period, the rate was 42.4.

![Graph showing Auckland injury deaths by local board](image)

**Figure 6:** Auckland injury deaths by local board (Source: IPRU)

Over the five year period from 2013–2017, there was a total of 80,875 hospitalisations due to injury in the Auckland region, 31 per cent of the national total. 87 per cent of these were unintentional injuries.

The three leading external causes of injury discharges in the Auckland region were falls (46.3 per cent), poisoning (9.2 per cent), and struck by or against (8.7 per cent). Motor vehicle traffic as an external cause came in fourth (7.7 per cent), as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of Discharges</th>
<th>Rate/100,000 People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>36,565</td>
<td>963.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>42,310</td>
<td>1,096.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80,875</td>
<td>1,028.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Auckland public hospital injury discharges by intent [Source: IPRU]

More males (n=42,310; 52.3 per cent) were discharged from hospital due to injury than females (n=38,565; 47.7 per cent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Discharge</th>
<th>Number of Discharges</th>
<th>Rate/100,000 People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15,841</td>
<td>1,060.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16,239</td>
<td>1,063.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>16,495</td>
<td>1,050.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15,876</td>
<td>983.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>16,424</td>
<td>991.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80,875</td>
<td>1,028.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External causes of hospital injury discharges from 2013-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fall</td>
<td>37,462</td>
<td>11. Other Land Transport</td>
<td>1,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Poisoning</td>
<td>7,458</td>
<td>12. Hot Object/Substance</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Struck by or Against</td>
<td>7,039</td>
<td>13. Machinery</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cut/Pierce</td>
<td>5,666</td>
<td>15. Other Transport</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Overexertion</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>16. Pedestrian, Other</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other Specified</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>17. Fire/Flame</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nature/Environmental</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>18. Drowning</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unspecified</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>19. Firearm</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pedal Cyclist, Other</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>20. Fire/Hot Object or Substance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During this period, adults 85+ years had the highest rate and frequency of injury discharges. This is shown in figure 8.

2013 to 2017 New Zealand Public Hospital Injury Discharges, all injury, all intents, both genders, all age groups, all Auckland Local Boards

Figure 8: Auckland public hospital injury discharges by age (Source: IPPU)
Injury data is available at the local board level, and shows considerable variation. For example, the rate of injury discharges /100,000 people was 728 for the Howick local board area from 2013-2017, and 1,180.2 for the Mangere-Ohauhu local board area. Over the same period, the rate /100,000 people for the Auckland region was 1,028.7. For the New Zealand population as a whole for the same period, the rate was 1,142.2.13

![Graph showing injury discharges by local board](image)

**Figure 9:** Auckland public hospital injury discharges by local board (Source: [IPRU])
ACC Claims

The overall number of ACC claims in the Auckland region (number of new and accepted claims) has increased over the past five years, from approximately 632,990 in 2013/2014 to 698,542 in 2017/2018 in line with population growth. This includes claims for fatal and serious injury. Total ACC claims costs for Auckland between 2013/2014 and 2017/2018 (financial years) rose by $300m, to approximately $950m.

Injuries in the home account for $116m (39 per cent) of this increase. Road crash costs increased by $42m (14 per cent) and sports-related injuries rose by $416m (14 per cent).
Most accidents in Auckland happen at home (49 per cent), with places of recreation and sports (22 per cent) the second most common location.

In 2017/2018, 7 per cent of ACC claims happened on the roads but were 15 per cent of ACC claim costs. Road accidents result in more severe injuries than other accidents.
Injuries in the home

The most common cause of accidental death is from falls in the home. Those over the age of 85 are at most risk of serious injury or death and have high incidence and cost per claim.

Lifting injuries (back strains and sprains) are the second most common injury type in the home.
In the past five years, there have been 1,275 new and accepted fatal claims\textsuperscript{2} peaking at 283 in 2013/2014. In 2017/2018, this number was 249. Of the 1,275 new and accepted fatal claims from 2013/2014 to 2017/2018, 507 occurred at home and 324 on a road or street.

The highest number of serious new and accepted ACC injury claims for the Auckland region occur as the result of events which happened on a road or on a street – except in 2014/2015 when more of these claims were about events which occurred in the home.

Events (accidents) which result in claims that require services and funding beyond immediate medical treatment, (e.g. compensation for loss of earning, attendant care, equipment, and modifications), occur most frequently in Aucklanders’ homes. Over the past five years these accidents in the home have resulted in more than 66,000 claims.

After home, place of recreation or sports is the most common location, followed by commercial/service locations, then road or street, “other”, and then industrial locations.

Auckland’s new and accepted ACC claim rates are approximately 5,700/100,000 higher compared to Wellington\textsuperscript{2}, but approximately 1,700/100,000 lower than Christchurch City. In comparison to Wellington, Auckland’s claims occur more frequently due to events which happen within homes, and less in places of recreation or sports.

Auckland fatal and serious injury claim rates (per 100k population) are lower in comparison to both Wellington and Christchurch.

Auckland sits between Wellington and Auckland for ACC claim cost/100,000, at $41,000 - $42,500/100,000 population.
Road safety

Auckland’s streets have become increasingly dangerous with 64 people killed and another 749 people seriously injured in crashes in 2017, a level of road trauma that was last seen over twenty years ago in 1996.

The social cost for 2017 road deaths and injuries in Auckland is estimated at $1.13 billion and does not include the considerable congestion-related costs from growing peak-hour crash delays.

The majority of this road trauma occurs on local urban streets with a speed limit of 50kph, including an increasing number of vulnerable road users (people walking, cycling and motorcycling).

The five-year trend for road deaths and serious injuries (DSI) has increased by 67 percent from 486 in 2013 to 813 in 2017. This growth in road trauma exceeds the growth in Auckland population and vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) over the same time period and is three times higher than the national road trauma growth. It has been described as a road safety ‘crisis’.

Crash-risk is analysed across a number of themes including locations (road, intersections, and communities), transport modes (vehicle, motorcyclist/moped, cyclist, and pedestrian), crash factors (speed, alcohol, distraction, restraints, fatigue) and age-groups (young drivers, older road users). A number of these themes overlap with each other.

A third of the 2017 deaths and seriously injured (DSI) (32 per cent) occurred at intersections. Speed and alcohol are each factors in about 26 per cent of crashes.

Crashes involving pedestrians, motorcyclists and mopeds have become more common. In 2017, 131 people died or were seriously injured whilst walking on Auckland’s roads, and a further 167 were killed or seriously injured while riding motorcycles or mopeds.

Road trauma related to older road users, distraction, young drivers and non-use of safety belts have also increased in recent years.

These trends differ slightly across Auckland, with certain themes being more common in some parts of Auckland than others. For example, road deaths and serious injuries occur at three times the rate for people living in the poorest areas.

Pākehā/European and Asian people have a transport system that keeps them significantly safer than Māori and Pacific people in Auckland.

The response to this Auckland road safety crisis includes the recent adoption of a Vision Zero approach where no loss of life on our streets is acceptable. This approach is being led by
Auckland Transport with partners NZ Police, NZTA, Auckland Council, ACC and Health agencies. It includes a number of speed management, safety engineering, vehicle safety, enforcement, education and regulation programmes.

Auckland is also a member of the OECD Safer City Streets network and is learning from the best-performing cities.

Improving road safety is also one of the key strategies for ensuring increased public and active transport in urban areas, as well as supporting significant health, access and environmental benefits. It is more than the absence of road trauma; it is also about creating healthy lives and places.

Auckland Transport has committed to investing $700 million of capital expenditure over the next ten years on our streets, using proven designs to build a protective road network that prevents death and serious injury when inevitable human error occurs. This has been made possible by the newly introduced Regional Fuel Tax and along with partner investments, is estimated to reduce DSIs by 60 per cent from the 2017 baseline, as well as contribute towards additional congestion reduction benefits and increased health and environment benefits.

The 2018/19 Safe Speeds Programme is the first of these coordinated Road Safety Programmes to be delivered in 2018/19 and will create safe walking facilities in town centres, public transport facilities, neighbourhoods and schools, as well as improvements to high-speed, high risk rural roads.

Speed management is one of the most effective low-cost scalable interventions for addressing road trauma as it reduces the likelihood of a crash occurring as well as improving the survivability when a crash occurs. The chart below illustrates the percentage of survivability for a person walking when hit by a car at different impact speeds.

**Survivable Speeds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed (km/h)</th>
<th>10% Risk of Death</th>
<th>80% Risk of Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Pedestrian survivability varies significantly with age, frailty, vehicle type & size. The above graph represents a conservative approach to survivability for our most vulnerable pedestrians, based on Research Report AP-R560-18 Towards Safe System Infrastructure, Austroads, 2018.*

Other Road Safety Programmes will deliver safe intersections and corridors through roundabout construction, red light camera enforcement, pedestrian crossings, separated cycle-ways, signage and lane marking improvements, skid resistance road surface upgrades, roadside and median barriers.

An Auckland Road Safety Strategy is being developed among partners and stakeholders to help coordinate, monitor and evaluate the impact of these road safety programmes, as well as a Road Safety Action Plan to help coordinate annual delivery.
Drowning

Water Safety New Zealand reports 88 preventable drowning deaths in New Zealand (WSNZ 2017 Drowning Report).

Preventable drownings include recreational and non-recreational deaths, considered applicable to the prevention and rescue effort of the water safety sector.

The Auckland region experienced 22 preventable drownings in 2017, twice that of the previous years and one-quarter of the national drowning toll.

Most drownings are male. In the past five years (2013 - 2017) males accounted for 81 per cent of both New Zealand and Auckland fatal drowning.
Of note is that although Auckland experienced twice as many preventable drownings in 2017 as the year before, the rate of drowning in the Auckland region (1.3 per 100,000) remains one of the lowest in the country. The dramatic increase in the ages of under five years and over 65 years is concerning and will need to be monitored for any future trends.
Alcohol

Drinking alcohol increases the risk of injury which has devastating effects on the lives of individuals and their families. Alcohol is a frequent contributor to preventable injury, hospitalisation, and deaths. It often intersects with other safety and injury prevention themes. As the Health Promotion Agency makes clear, related harm includes injuries, alcohol poisoning, and other health conditions, road trauma, offending and assaults, and impacts on children and families. Fifty-eight per cent of those living in Auckland reported consuming alcohol in the last four weeks. One-quarter of these reported risky drinking behaviour. Risky behaviour is defined as seven or more drinks on any one occasion for those aged 18 years and over, and five or more drinks on any one occasion for those aged 15 to 17 years.

A lower percentage of people living in south east Auckland reported drinking alcohol in the last four weeks compared to the rest of Auckland. Of those who did drink in the last four weeks, a greater percentage of people who live in south east Auckland (34 per cent) reported risky drinking behaviour compared to the rest of Auckland (22 per cent).

Drinkers experienced a range of outcomes as a consequence of drinking. 20 per cent of people living in Auckland who had consumed alcohol in the last four weeks reported at least one experience that may be considered harmful as a consequence of drinking alcohol.

These harmful experiences included “spent too much money on alcohol” (10 per cent), “did something embarrassing that you later regretted” (4.8 per cent), and “drove a vehicle while being unsure of how much you were under the influence of alcohol” (4.5 per cent).

Forty-eight per cent of people living in Auckland agreed or strongly agreed that “The bars/pubs in my community have a good reputation” and 63 per cent agreed or strongly agreed that “It is easy to get to licensed premises from where I live”. Smaller percentages of people living in south/south east Auckland and west Auckland agreed or strongly agreed with both statements, compared to the rest of Auckland.
Thirty-six per cent of people living in Auckland agreed or strongly agreed that “Some licensed premises are too close to public facilities like schools”. This is greater than the rest of New Zealand (31 per cent).

About one in 10 people living in Auckland reported knowing about local council planning processes for the sale and supply of alcohol - significantly lower than the rest of New Zealand. Supermarkets (69 per cent), bottle or liquor stores (50 per cent) and restaurants/cafes (33 per cent) were the most frequently reported places for Aucklanders to purchase alcohol in the last four weeks.

Figure 7: Percentage of people who reported consuming alcohol in the last four weeks, comparison by Auckland area and with the rest of New Zealand, 2013/14 to 2015/16
Linkages to programmes and activities

Auckland has an extensive range of community safety and injury prevention programmes and activities undertaken by government and non-government agencies across the region.

These programmes and activities have been designed over time to address elements of the safety profile described above. They have been themed in this application as follows:
- Reducing alcohol and drug related harm
- Child injury prevention
- Community connectedness/resilience
- Road safety/policing
- Violence/crime prevention
- Water safety

The breadth and extensive reach of these programmes and activities highlight the role the Safety Collective can play in leadership and collaboration on community safety and injury prevention responses. They also identify a starting point for priority setting.

National, regional and local alignment

Auckland’s injury prevention and community safety programmes and activities align with a number of national, regional and local priorities. Examples include:

National:

**Accident Compensation Corporation Statement of Intent 2018-2022**, sets out the strategic intentions for the next four years. These intentions are best expressed as a commitment to:
- Increase the success of ACC’s injury prevention activities
- Improve ACC’s customers' outcomes and experiences
- Improve the financial sustainability of the Scheme

ACC’s success in injury prevention goes a very long way towards improving the quality of life in New Zealand while ensuring the long-term sustainability of the Scheme.

ACC will deliver their injury prevention intention by focusing on five priorities:
- Use analytics to increase impact
- Embed client-centred design to change behaviours
- Partner outside ACC for greater effect
- Work with communities to extend our reach
- Ensure that injury prevention efforts reduce the outstanding claims liability
New Zealand Police Four Year Plan 2017-2021 outlines Police’s strategic intentions for the years 2017-2021. The Safest Country: Policing 2021 is the next phase of their transformation programme. It will support the organisation to deliver on key outcomes and to build a sustainable policing model. It is an ambitious programme and it will provide better outcomes to New Zealanders and improve policing services delivered to the public.

NZ Transport Agency Safer Journeys 2010-2020 is a strategy designed to guide New Zealand’s efforts to improve road safety from 2010-2020. Its vision is for:

“A safe road system increasingly free of death and serious injury”.

To achieve this it takes a Safe System approach, looking across the entire road system to improve safety by creating safer roads and roadsides, safer speeds, safer vehicles and safer road use. Within these categories, it sets a number of areas of concern where action is needed.

New Zealand Water Safety Sector Strategy 2020 sets out the water safety sector’s plan to work collectively over the next five years to achieve greater impact – working towards its vision of no one drowning.

The strategy is a joint effort, a partnership by water safety organisations including Accident Compensation Corporation, Coastguard New Zealand, Coastguard Boating Education, Maritime New Zealand, New Zealand Recreational Association, Surf Life Saving New Zealand, Swimming New Zealand, Water Safe Auckland and Water Safety New Zealand.

Input from other sector members – both large and small – has also contributed significantly to this new approach.

The joint goals the sector has agreed on are ambitious - seeking to halve the male drowning toll and bring the pre-school drowning toll down to zero by 2020.

To achieve these goals, and to create a culture where all New Zealanders will enjoy the water safely, the sector will work together to deliver new and innovative programmes and drive attitudinal and behavioural change through communications and other campaigning. It will engage in research, set a policy agenda and resource drowning prevention initiatives according to what will have the greatest impact.
New Zealand Health Strategy 2016 outlines the high-level direction for New Zealand’s health system over the next 10 years, with an aim to improve health outcomes, with particular attention to groups such as Māori, Pacific peoples, older people and children.

The Strategy has two parts.

- New Zealand Health Strategy: Future direction
- New Zealand Health Strategy: Roadmap of actions 2016

The New Zealand Health Strategy: Future direction outlines the high-level direction for New Zealand’s health system over the 10 years from 2016 to 2026. It lays out some of the challenges and opportunities the system faces; describes the future we want, including the culture and values that will underpin this future; and identifies five strategic themes for the changes that will take us toward this future.

The New Zealand Health Strategy: Roadmap of actions 2016 identifies 27 areas for action over five years to make the Strategy happen. The actions are organised under the five themes of the Strategy. This roadmap will be updated over the 10-year lifetime of the Strategy.

Regional:

The Auckland Plan 2050 is Auckland Council’s long-term spatial plan to ensure Auckland grows in a way that will meet the opportunities and challenges of the future.

Auckland Council has developed the Auckland Plan 2050 with, and on behalf of, all Aucklanders.

The plan outlines the big issues facing Auckland and recommends the way in which Aucklanders and others involved in the future of Auckland can best respond to them.

The Development Strategy and six outcomes set Auckland’s strategy to 2050. They consider how we will address the key challenges of high population growth and environmental degradation, and how we can ensure shared prosperity for all Aucklanders.

Auckland Council’s research and engagement has identified six important areas in which Auckland Council must make significant progress, so that Auckland can continue to be a place where people want to live, work and visit.

The six outcomes are:

- Belonging and Participation
- Māori Identity and Wellbeing
- Homes and Places
- Transport and Access
- Environment and Cultural Heritage
- Opportunity and Prosperity

Of the six outcomes in the plan, two provide a strong focus on community safety:

Belonging and participation:

Focus area 1: Create safe opportunities for people to meet, connect, participate in and enjoy community and civic life.

Focus Area 6: Focus investment to address disparities and serve communities of greatest need.
Transport and access:

Focus area 6: Move to a safe transport network, free from death and serious injury.

New Zealand Police, Ngā Pirihimana o Tāmaki Makaurau, District Commander’s Work Plan, Phase One 2017-2018, sets out the aspirations for how they will police across the three Auckland districts.

The work programme will be led by the three Tāmaki Makaurau District Commanders with support from Police National Headquarters. It will focus on ensuring they achieve their organisational outcomes amidst the challenges arising from significant social, economic and demographic changes.

The work programme will consist of four key projects:

1. Governance: a new governance model will be developed to provide strategic and operational decisions to be made for the benefit of Tāmaki Makaurau.

2. Deployment: police in Auckland have been focused on the community they serve within artificial borders. These borders hinder their ability to deploy in an integrated and effective manner, therefore they will explore opportunities to improve deployment and operate without traditional police borders.

3. Administration: the administrative functions that support new governance and deployment arrangements will need some reshaping.

4. Mind-set: the new way of operating will require Police to think differently. Open and honest communication will ensure their staff are kept informed and changing the way they deliver policing to meet the expectations of the Tāmaki Makaurau District Commanders.

This plan supports the Police High Performance Framework (PHPF) and is about lifting performance across Tāmaki Makaurau by using their collective resources more effectively. Police staff will no longer be constrained by invisible borders at area and district level and will be able to make good deployment decisions to provide the best outcomes for victims.

It is not expected to have a significant impact on how front line officers conduct their day to day business, however, where officers deliver services may be different depending on where demand and risk are.

It will also increase the consistency of some services delivered to diverse communities across Tāmaki Makaurau.
Local:

Local board plans are strategic documents that are developed every three years to set a direction for local boards. Reflecting community priorities and preferences, the plans guide local board activity, funding and investment decisions.

A number of local boards identified safety as a key outcome that they want to achieve, and have a variety of safety activities in their annual work programme.

For example, an initiative in the Papakura Local Board Plan 2017 is to implement strategies to continue improving safety and security in the Papakura town centre.

Figure 8 provides an overview of Auckland Council’s planning system and where the Auckland Plan and local board plans fit.
EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES

The development of new interventions requires as much an eye on the past as on the future. Reviewing what programmes and projects have been effective provides an understanding of elements of success that can shape the future of our collective work.

This chapter takes a snapshot of activities and interventions undertaken by key organisations across Auckland over approximately two years. It is not exhaustive, and nor is it meant to be. Rather it demonstrates the range and reach of community safety programmes that reflect the level of resourcing across the region, while giving a flavour of the different intervention modes and models.

The stocktake (presented in appendix three) and the case studies which form this chapter focus primarily on the priority areas identified in this application:

- Reducing alcohol and drug related harm
- Child injury prevention
- Community connectedness/resilience
- Road safety/policing
- Violence/crime prevention
- Water safety

Case studies addressing needs for high risk groups and environments

The following six case studies demonstrate how agencies and people in our community have worked collaboratively to develop programmes and activities that will have a positive impact on children, young people, elderly, visitors and residents of Auckland. Between them, they align with the key safety and injury prevention themes highlighted in this application.

In some cases, programmes are community-driven such as the New Lynn – Briar Lane case study.
Case Study 1

SAFEKIDS AOTEAROA CHILD DRIVEWAY SAFETY

Initiative/Programme Name: Check for me before you turn the key

Issue/Population Group Addressed: Māori, Pacific peoples and at-risk families

Objectives:
Safekids’ organisational objective: Reduce the incidence and severity of preventable deaths and hospital admissions to children in New Zealand so that they can live to their full potential.
Campaign communications objectives:
- Raise awareness about New Zealand’s high child driveway run over rates
- Change the public’s perception of driveway run overs, and to convince audiences that driveway run overs are preventable
- Gain strong community support to reach Māori, Pacific, low-income and at-risk families, taking the ‘Check for me’ message to parents where traditional advertising could not reach

Partners:
- Ministry of Health
- Starship Foundation
- Auckland Council
- Impact PR
- NZ Post
- BCG2 and MediaCom
- Accident Compensation Corporation
- Wilshire Investments
- Housing New Zealand
- Brand Developers
- The Early Childhood Council

Evidence reviewed before implementing programme: (i.e. Link to peer reviewed journal article, national strategy, guidelines on best practice etc.) Story behind data.
To understand the injury issue and identify injury trends, SafeKids Aotearoa (SafeKids) studied New Zealand and international literature on driveway run overs and reviewed specialist injury databases (for example from primary care, Accident and Emergency’s, hospitals, Coroners, Accident Compensation Corporation and Police).

These include external resources:
- Driveway runover, the influence of the built environment: A case control study (Starship Child Health)
- Paediatric driveway run over injuries: time to redesign? (Starship Child Health; Starship’s Trauma Service; University of Auckland)
- Driveway-related motor vehicle injuries in the paediatric population: a preventable tragedy (The New Zealand Medical Journal).
- Housing New Zealand’s Driveway Safety Programme (includes “A guide to driveway safety for property owners”)
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And Safekids resources:
- Position Paper: Child Driveway Run Over Injuries.
- Working with local government to prevent Driveway Run Over Injuries.
- Infographic: PREVENTING DRIVEWAY RUNOVERS. Ten things to think about.
- Factsheet: Child Driveway Run Over Injuries.
- Lesson Plan: Driveway Safety Lesson: CHECK FOR ME BEFORE YOU TURN THE KEY.

Safekids also collated all driveway incidents reported by the media in the last 20 years.

With this information Safekids:
- Identified the age and ethnicity of the children killed (under-5 years and predominantly Māori and Pacific). Most belonged to low-income families, living in social housing or with extended family.
- Knew when it happened (summer, peaking in December, 10am-12pm and 5-6pm).
- Knew who was driving (49 per cent parents, 51 per cent neighbours and relatives) and how it happened.
- Knew 30 per cent of cars involved were moving forward. This information eliminated wrong safety messages (i.e., reversing in driveways, relying on cameras).
- Identified three factors that could reduce the risk (human factor, vehicle visibility and house design).
- Consulted with parents affected by driveway run overs and pre-tested the campaign with community action groups that worked with Māori, Pacific and low-income families.

Using this solid base of information, Safekids developed the following strategies:
- Use research as a tool to identify audiences and develop messages, timings and tactics.
- Tell a compelling and emotional story about the human cost of driveway run overs.
- Use communications tactics to connect with audiences, create awareness, traction and momentum for the campaign.
- Use kanohi ki te kanohi (face-to-face communication) tactics to reach Māori, Pacific and low-income families.
- Use the key ring as an emotional trigger during the moment of influence (when drivers pick up the keys), and to empower their audiences to take ownership of children’s safety.
- Ensure tactics were measurable - if it couldn’t be measured, don’t do it.
What did they do?

Media tactic
- Pitched interviews with leading news agencies featuring the story of two brave mums whose children were killed in driveways, and why they were supporting this campaign.
- Announced the call to action (order a free key ring) at an event and in a press release

Social tactic
- Ran a Facebook campaign centred on an emotive video and an infographic on driveway injury facts, figures, and safety tips. They asked audiences to visit www.safekids.nz to order a free key ring.
- Ran a www.neighbourly.co.nz campaign that asked neighbourhood support groups to promote Check for Me during Neighbour's Day 2016.
- Partnered with Māori, Pacific, and community stakeholders who had Facebook pages (e.g. Vaka Tautua, Plunket and Māori Wardens).
- Scheduled social media posts during driveway danger hours (6AM-12PM and 5-6PM) using targeted keywords (e.g. Māori, Pasifika, Matariki, Waitangi) and interests (e.g. parenting, baby, motherhood and fatherhood).

How well did they do?

Objective: Raise awareness about New Zealand’s high driveway runover rates.
- Positive news covered about the launch (Radio 1, Newspaper 23, TV 6, exceeding our target by 60 per cent).
- Launch day news features appeared in Seven Sharp, NZ Herald and Stuff.
- 559 positive Safekids news coverage between July 2015 and June 2016. This included two front-page headlines in the NZ Herald in the same week.

Objective: Change the public perception about driveway runovers.
- The top Facebook post received 1,724 likes and 625 shares. The video was watched 160,000 times. The Facebook posts were seen by 724,710 users, had 4,268 likes and 1,372 shares. Facebook followers increased by 44 per cent during the campaign.
- www.safekids.nz visits increased 144.82 per cent from the previous year.

Is anyone better off?

(e.g. Changes in knowledge/attitude, increase of skills, Safer Behaviour, Safer Environments, Policy change)
- The www.neighbourly.co.nz campaign attracted 769 likes, 101 thanks and 1,909 responses to a safety quiz. 85 per cent said they would walk around the car to check to keep children safe.
- 9,443 parents and drivers ordered a key ring from the website. In a survey 93 per cent said they were more aware of the risks, and 85 per cent said they were making changes to keep children safe. 67 per cent of survey participants said they belong to the young parent group (21-40 years old).
- A survey of 100 parents indicated 87 per cent were Māori or Pacific and 96 per cent said they were made more aware of how to keep their children safe.
- Their biggest success in 2015-2016 driveway hospital injury admissions at Starship were halved, driveway deaths were the lowest in a decade - zero deaths in 2015 and one in scope in 2016.
### What did they do?

**"Kanohi ki te kanohi" (Face to face) tactic**

- Activated community partners by announcing the campaign in the SafeKids News magazine.
- Invited community stakeholders to become key ring distribution hubs and organise Check for Me events.
- Asked community stakeholders to help at Check For Me photo booths located in areas that were predominantly Māori and Pacific in ethnicity. Parents could take a picture of their child and place this on their key ring.
- Sent a letter to 2,760 kohanga reo, pacific language nests and other early childhood services. They invited them to promote messages and give key rings to parents when dropping off and picking up children.
- Partnered with national and regional agencies, particularly those that have large numbers of Māori and Pacific staff, customers or audiences. They included Housing New Zealand, Auckland Council, Early Childhood Council, Kohanga Reo Trust and ACC.

### How well did they do?

**Objective:** Gain strong community support and reach Māori, Pacific and at-risk families.

- A week after the October media launch, 50,000 key rings were sent to parents and communities.
- By June 2016, 350,000 key rings were distributed, exceeding the target by 75 per cent.
- 1,150 community stakeholders participated, exceeding the goal by 130 per cent. Participants included early childhood services and kohanga reo (44 per cent), Māori and Pacific providers, Pacific Island Churches, marae, schools, social services and community groups.
- 3,220 families visited their photo booths, and 10,088 pictures of children were placed inside key rings.
- Housing NZ ran a complimentary campaign targeting 14,000 rental properties with children under five years old. ACC, Plunket, and Auckland Council promoted the campaigns to staff and clients.
- Paid media channels came on board, giving $2 million worth of free advertising spots (600 per cent added value).

### Is anyone better off?

(Changes in knowledge/attitude, increase of skills, Safer Behaviours, Safer Environments, Policy Change)
Case Study 2

ROAD SAFETY PROMOTIONS – DRINK DRIVE FREE PROGRAMME

Initiative/Programme Name: Road Safety Promotions – Drink Drive Free programme

Issue/Population Group Addressed: Alcohol consumption and driving

Goals:
To reduce the number of people killed or fatally injured due to alcohol-impaired driving by improving attitudes and awareness of the risks associated with alcohol and driving.

Partners:
- NZ Transport Agency (funder), Auckland Council (funder) and the New Zealand Police (delivery partner on some engagements, including checkpoints)

Evidence reviewed before implementing programme: (i.e. Link to peer reviewed journal article, national strategy, guidelines on best practice etc.) Story behind data.

A range of programmes have contributed to improvements in the rates of drinking and driving in New Zealand, including national advertising campaigns and reductions in the legal blood alcohol limit. Yet, alcohol is still a substantial road safety issue.

In Auckland in 2016, 54 people died or were seriously injured in crashes where people were at or above the legal drinking limit. Alcohol will be a factor in many more crashes because reaction times and judgement are impaired at blood alcohol levels lower than the legal limit. The high incidence period of alcohol/drug crashes is from Friday to Sunday with crash numbers increasing from 6pm each day towards midnight on the weekdays. Peak hours on weekends are from midnight to 4:00AM.

When Road Policing is well targeted and combined with Road Safety Promotion it can have a Benefit: Cost Ratio of 81 (Taylor, Dugan, Barry, 2007).

Auckland Transport (funded by NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) and Auckland Council) works alongside the New Zealand Police to deliver a range of activities and interventions promoting a “zero drinks” when driving message and reminders to make safe passenger choices by avoiding traveling in a car when the driver has been drinking. The exact mix of activities differs from year to year but the key activities in the 2016/17 programme were:

- Social marketing campaigns
- Host responsibility events
  - Four Licence Controller Qualification Courses
  - Talks and information packs for parents on hosting social engagements involving teenagers
- Local event promotions and engagements
- Engaging with the public at Police compulsory breath stations
- Fund recidivist drink driver education programmes
- Road safety expos with 15-18 year old high school students
What did they do?

The key activities for this programme are:

1. A drink drive free social marketing campaign targeted males aged between 25-35 years with a specific focus on the urban central and urban south areas. The campaign involved an online video, outdoor media, digital media (Facebook/Instagram), cinema advertising, TVNZ OnDemand, Auckland Transport webpage and on the ground promotion at key events. The online video received over 59,000 views, 285 comments and 523 shares.

2. Host responsibility events
   a. Four License Controller Qualification Courses (46 participants)
   b. Talks and information packs for students and parents about how to responsibly host social engagements for teenagers

3. Event promotions and engagements (5266 interactions)

4. Sober driver promotions to workplaces (193 participants)

5. Engaging with the public (11700 in 2016/17) at police compulsory breath stations

6. Funding recidivist drink driver education programmes (26 attendees in 2016/17)

7. Road safety expos delivered to 3,200 high school students in 2016/17.

How well did they do?

- 49 per cent prompted awareness of the drink drive free campaign among the target audience
- At least 70 per cent agreement in post-campaign testing that these are relevant and/or memorable
- Recidivist driving programmes had high satisfaction ratings from participants.

Is anyone better off?

( i.e. Changes in knowledge/attitude, increase of skills, Safer Behaviour, Safer Environments, Policy Change)

- In post-testing of the 2016 drink drive free campaign, over half reported that the campaign made them feel more positive about not drinking any alcohol when driving. Over 60 per cent reported that the campaign encouraged them to avoid any alcohol if driving.
- An average of 70 per cent of people engaged with at events reported that their interaction would decrease their chances of getting into a car with a driver who had been drinking. Some people who said interaction did not affect their choices said they already do not drink and drive, or get into vehicles with people that have been drinking.
- 100 per cent of parents surveyed at the host responsibility events said they would think more about their responsibility as a host of school-aged students and that they would use the tips that we discussed with them at the event.
- One of the recidivist driver rehabilitation programmes has been evaluated as having a post-completion drink drive re-offending rate of 35 per cent (1 in 28 people) and a benefit-to-cost ratio of 201.
What did they do? | How well did they do? | Is anyone better off?
---|---|---
| | | (e.g. Changes in knowledge/attitude, increase of skills, Safer Behaviour, Safer Environments, Policy Change)
- After completing or watching someone complete the fatal vision or 'beer goggles' activity at a road safety expo, over 88 per cent of students agreed it is not safe to get into a car with a driver who had been drinking. 94 per cent of students reported that they had an increased awareness of alcohol on their ability to drive.

These evaluation activities focus on people's self-reporting of their attitudes or intentions. Over time, shifts in attitudes and awareness should contribute to shifts in behaviour and what society collectively considers socially acceptable behaviour.
Case Study 3

AVONDALE COMMUNITY ACTION ON HUFFING

Initiative/Programme Name: Avondale Community Action on Huffing

Issue/Population Group Addressed: Population targeted: Children 10-13 and Youth 14-24 huffing glue, and community members - increased awareness of the seriousness of huffing and increased collaboration to address issues:

- Young people huffing glue in public, mainly in groups, and disruptive and ‘drunken-like’ behaviour escalating
- Local shops selling glue to young people, or adults who are supplying young people
- Low awareness and understanding of the serious harm associated with huffing
- Need for activation of spaces for young people to use and engage in community activities

As a result of a local youth network conversation and concerns around increased huffing, CAYAD (Community Action Youth and Drugs) supported this group to develop a Community Action Plan on Huffing. CAYAD facilitated a series of meetings with local schools, youth organisations, agencies, sports organisations, Police and Auckland Council staff, which helped the group to clarify the issues, set goals and determine interventions to address each issue. Multiple issues and outcomes were discussed and actions created.

Goals:

- Reducing access to glue from local shops and upskilling local shop owners on the harms of huffing, what to look for and how to respond
- Increased reporting/intelligence gathering of suspicious purchases of glue and of young people on the streets in Avondale
- Awareness raising with local community about the harms of huffing and how to respond to incidents
- Enhancing working relationships between Police and local Youth organisations to respond to the issues and engage with young people huffing
- Activation of spaces where young people are huffing in public

Partners:

- Generation Ignite
- Police
- Turn Your Life Around (TYLA)
- Avondale Business Association
- Auckland Council Community Empowerment Unit

- Avondale Community Centre/Auckland Council Facilities
- Avondale Library
- Avondale College
- Avondale Intermediate
Evidence reviewed before implementing programme: (i.e. Link to peer reviewed journal article, national strategy, guidelines on best practice etc.) Story behind data.


A key focus under this policy is delaying the use of substances by young people for as long as possible.

- CAVAD works from a best practice community action approach, which is evidenced to effectively bring about community-led change to specific social and health issues: [https://academic.cup.com/cdj/article-abstract/41/2/143/403685](https://academic.cup.com/cdj/article-abstract/41/2/143/403685).

- CAVAD draws on tested resources from The New Zealand Drug Foundation. For this project, a resource on volatile substance was used as the basis for messaging around huffing which provided tested public health messaging that was appropriate to young people [https://www.drugfoundation.org.nz/info/did-you-know/volatile-substances/](https://www.drugfoundation.org.nz/info/did-you-know/volatile-substances/).
Safe Communities Accreditation for Auckland: Approval of Application
What did they do? | How well did they do? | Is anyone better off?
---|---|---
**Youth Hub at Avondale Community Centre**
One of the issues identified was young people huffing in un-used spaces including the Community Centre, therefore Avondale Community Centre worked with local groups including Generation Ignite and Sport Waitakere to create a daily afternoon 'youth hub' at the Centre.

The hub is free and engages young people in sports and pro-social activities, keeping them off the streets.

Youth hub has a core of 15 young people, five of whom were some of those initially identified as at risk of harm from alcohol and other drugs.

Youth hub made permanent in 2017.

The success of the youth hub trial at the end of 2016 enabled it to become permanent in 2017 and the Community Centre continues to engage more organisations and support services for young people.
Case Study 4

WATERSAFE AUCKLAND - WAWISE AND WAI TURAMA

Initiative/Programme Name: WaWise / Wa Turama

Issue/Population Group Addressed: Māori, Pasifika and Asian Youth at risk

Goal:
To develop increased participation and safer attitudes and behaviours when in, on and around the water

Partners:
- Watersafe Auckland – As a funder, facilitation and administration, deliverer and original partner
- New Zealand Police – Provided support and youth-at-risk identification
- Surf Life Saving Northern Region and Bethells Beach SLSC – As a provider for the Beach Education component for each group
- Auckland Council Pools (WestWave, Glenfield Pool and Leisure, Mangere) – Provided pool space
- Greymans Solutions – Provider for Boot camp lessons
- ABACUS counselling, training and supervision – Provided alcohol and drugs workshops
- Mission Bay Water Sports – Provided paddle boarding and kayaking lessons

Evidence reviewed before implementing programme: (i.e. Link to peer reviewed journal article, national strategy, guidelines on best practice etc.) Story behind data.

In New Zealand, Māori, Pasifika and Asian populations, young people and males are overrepresented in the drowning statistics. 575 people drowned in New Zealand between 2008 and 2012, of which 16 per cent were aged 15-24 years. In the same period, 122 people drowned in Auckland, of which 24 per cent were Pacific Island people. Māori comprise 15 per cent of New Zealand population, but from 2008 to 2012 Māori made up one-fifth of the total drowning toll (average 22/109, WSNZ DrownBase). Asian peoples represent 8 per cent of the annual drowning toll yet comprise only 6 per cent of the national population. From 2005 to 2009, 25 Asian New Zealanders died from drowning, 14 (56 per cent) of those in the Auckland region and 72 per cent of these drowning fatalities were associated with recreational activity [Water Safety New Zealand (WSNZ), 2010]. In addition, males comprise 49 per cent of the New Zealand population (Statistics NZ, 2016), but account for 80 per cent of the drowning fatalities (WSNZ, 2016).

Pacific Island, Māori and Asian populations have traditionally been involved in water activities, however new environments and lack of traditional safety measures has led to them not being able to participate safely in many aquatic activities. It is essential to equip youth with these skills, as they will act as role models to their communities to develop a culture of safety when participating in future aquatic sport and recreation activities.
WeWiSafe and Wai Turama water competence programmes were developed specifically for youth in these ethnicities, with the aim to increase safe participation in aquatic environments. The two programmes focus on water competencies, water safety attitudes, behaviour and knowledge for open water environments.

The Wai Wise programme is an innovative programme which aims to give youth of Māori, Pacific and Asian background practical knowledge and skills to keep them, their whānau and communities safer when in, on and around the aquatic environment. Wai Wise offers organisations/groups the opportunity to engage with the water in a practical but safe environment, and learn personal skills such as critical thinking and decision-making, that will assist them in the future when pursuing aquatic activity.

The programme covers swimming lessons, practical water safety sessions in the pool and classroom, and then a day at a local surf club to introduce them to surf lifesaving and allows transfer of skills learnt over the programme into the beach environment. Also included is a session to introduce them to a new water-based activity, something that the youth may not have had the opportunity to do before. Groups are matched with an activity or sport that they may be interested in pursuing after the programme.

There is a leadership component to the programme, with a leadership course being delivered each year for youth that have shown potential leadership skills during their programme. At least two youth from each group are chosen to do the leadership course, with the aim to deliver, promote and encourage the water safety messages within their wider community.

The sixth year of the Wai Wise programme has now been completed, with 171 youth having gone through the programme regionally, more than twice that of the previous year.

**WeWiSafe** - WeWiSafe is a programme that is targeted for Māori and Pacific Island youth and is designed to develop safer attitudes and behaviours when in, on and around the water. The programme does this by developing water competency skills, water safety knowledge and critical thinking around decision-making when in the aquatic environment. Embedded within the programme are also opportunities for participants to emerge as leaders and be considered for leadership opportunities in facilitating Wai Wise for other groups in the future. The WeWiSafe programme consists of 6-10 sessions, developed to meet the needs of each individual group. One or two classroom sessions are followed by up to four pool sessions, an aquatic recreational activity then a beach session. Risk management, first aid or drug and alcohol sessions can also be included.

**Wai Turama** - Wai Turama has similar goals to WeWiSafe, but it is a shorter programme. Wai Turama consists of four sessions: one classroom, two pool sessions followed by a beach session.
What did they do?

Thirteen community groups with a total of 171 individuals completed one of two water competence programmes, Waikato (N=111) or Wai-Turama (N=63).

A written questionnaire was completed prior to the programme that sought information on their current level of aquatic recreation, perceived water and rescue competency, water safety knowledge, and attitudes and behaviours around water. Participants were also asked to complete a written questionnaire at the completion of the programme for comparative purposes.

Responses were analysed. Chi-square tests were used to determine the association between dependent variables (such as perceived swimming competency) and independent variables (such as gender, programme, and ethnicity).

How well did they do?

- 100 per cent of students said they were “very satisfied” with the way the Waikato programme was delivered.
- 77 per cent of participants achieved the goals they set at the beginning of the programme.

Is anyone better off?

(i.e. Changes in knowledge, attitude, increase of skills, Safer Behaviours, Safer Environments, Policy Change)

Following the intervention, more participants thought they were “good or very good” swimmers (64 per cent pre vs. 65 per cent post). Significantly more participants thought they could rescue others safely (49 per cent pre vs. 82 per cent post) and significantly more had swum their estimated swimming distances in open water (53 per cent pre vs. 77 per cent post). An important component of Waikato is teaching participants how to become better decision-makers in, on and around water. Improved opinions toward water safety were evident with participants showing significantly more positive attitudes toward not swimming outside the patrolled flags at a surf beach (59 per cent pre, 80 per cent post) and not drinking beer while fishing (63 per cent pre vs. 80 per cent post).

Perceived swimming distances improved significantly more in Waikato (35 per cent pre vs. 47 per cent post), while remaining unchanged for Wai-Turama (15 per cent pre vs. 15 per cent post), for participants who estimated they could swim more than 25m. While significant differences were shown pre and post intervention for rescue competence, rescue knowledge and survival knowledge, surprisingly greater competence was evident in the shorter Wai-Turama programme.
What did they do?  |  How well did they do?  |  Is anyone better off?
--- | --- | ---
Participants self-reported increased confidence in and around water (94 per cent), improved swimming ability (88 per cent), increased practical water safety skills (93 per cent), improved knowledge of water safety (93 per cent), improved beach safety knowledge (89 per cent), and improved boat safety knowledge (94 per cent) after participation in the programme.

One limitation of the study was that there was no practical testing; this has been implemented for further interventions.
Case Study 5

NEW LYNN – SAFETY THROUGH EMPOWERMENT

Initiative/Programme Name: New Lynn: Briar Lane
See the video case study here: New Lynn - safety through empowerment

Issue/Population Group Addressed: Community safety concerns

- Addressing rough sleeping issues
- Low perceptions of safety
- Antisocial behaviour

Goal:
To respond to community concerns around safety because of drug use and other anti-social behaviour under a local bridge.

Partners:
- Local residents
- Auckland Council – Community Empowerment Unit and Maintenance team
- Auckland Transport
- New Zealand Police
- Salvation Army
- Generation Ignite
- Kāhui Tu Kaha

Evidence reviewed before implementing programme; (i.e. Link to peer reviewed journal article, national strategy, guidelines on best practice etc.) Story behind data.

- Auckland Council’s Community Empowerment Unit works from an Empowered Communities Approach where individuals, whanau, and communities have the power and ability to influence decisions, take action and make change happen in their lives and communities.
- Using Placemaking as a method to bring communities together to shape the places they live, work and play, with the outcome of reducing crime and increasing perceptions of safety. Safety is also enhanced when people feel proud of their community and have a strong sense of belonging.
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles to discourage crime.
What did they do?

The Community Empowerment Unit engaged with residents, many of whom are migrants, to understand what their concerns/issues were, in response to an initial complaint by a community member.

The Community Empowerment Unit talked to Auckland Council maintenance and Auckland Transport to raise the issue with them and see what could be done.

They engaged others in the area that had knowledge and expertise in this area, such as Police and Salvation Army.

Community Empowerment Unit staff facilitated a community meeting to hear from residents and representatives about their concerns and suggestions for improving safety in the area.

As a result, a gate was put up at the entrance to the underpass by Auckland Transport, and the grounds around the pathway near the bridge were trimmed back significantly to make the area lighter and more open to increase visibility.

Rubbish was cleared from under the bridge.

The Community Empowerment Unit is in discussions with New Zealand Police, Neighbourhood Support and Neighbourhood Patrols to increase patrols and visibility.

How well did they do?

- Really well as far as addressing the concerns of residents and helping them to feel both safer and actively engaged in achieving this result.
- Four rough sleepers that had previously been using the under bridge area were housed as a result of the project.
- Commitment from the locals involved to stay in touch and continue to work together.
- A community meeting was held on the 13th July at Te Toi Uku, where up to 25 people attended.

Another community meeting was held in August where two people attended. There will be another meeting called in September by the community.

Is anyone better off?

- The residents have said they feel safer and more connected thanks to involvement with this work.
- Residents feel a sense of belonging – know their neighbours.
- Rough sleepers were housed.
- Greater collaboration between agencies, and community working in partnership with council.
- Now looking into community-led initiatives.
Case Study 6

LIVE STRONGER FOR LONGER

Initiative/Programme Name: Live stronger for longer

Issue/Population Group Addressed: Falls in people aged 65 years and over (a reduction)

Objectives:
- Keeping older people independent and well, living the life they want to live – a shared objective for ACC, partners, communities, and individuals
- Independent and well at home
- Fewer fall injuries
- Fewer serious harm falls and fractures
- Improved recovery
- Integrated falls and fracture care across the system

Partners:
- Accident Compensation Corporation
- Health Quality & Safety Commission New Zealand
- Ministry of Health
- District Health Boards

Evidence reviewed before implementing programme: (i.e. Link to peer reviewed journal article, national strategy, guidelines on best practice etc.) Story behind data.

The New Zealand health system is facing increasing demand for services as a result of the ageing population. Falls are the most common and costly cause of injury in people 65 years and over. There is compelling evidence of effective interventions to reduce falls and recent fractures in this population group.

For ACC, a fall is an injury; for the health system, a fall is often a marker of frailty and an indicator of a number of health care issues, for the older person, a fall often means a loss of independence.

Around 30 to 60 per cent of people aged 65 years and over fall each year and 10 to 20 per cent of these events result in injuries such as hip fractures, hospitalisation or death.

ACC data shows people, those who have an ACC claim resulting from a fall, are 21 per cent more likely to sustain a hip fracture in the future. This increases to 24 per cent for people who have had three or more fall-related claims in the previous year when compared with others of the same age group.

The number of people in New Zealand aged 65 years and over is expected to double to around 12 million by 2035, which will equate to almost a quarter of the population.

Sources:
- Robertson and Campbell (2012). Falling costs: the case for investment. Department of Medicine, Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago.
What did they do?

- Ongoing development of effective falls and fracture system, including
  - In-home strength and balance programmes
  - Group based community strength and balance programmes
  - Fracture Liaison Services (FLS) to identify and treat those at risk of osteoporosis
  - Assessment and management of visual activity
  - Assessment and management of environmental hazards in the home
  - Medication review for people taking multiple medicines
  - Vitamin D prescribing in Aged Residential Care
  - Service integration across primary and secondary care
  - Online platform and resources for over 65s, their families, and health professionals
  - Home safety checklist
  - Providing safety advice

How well did they do?

- Measures relating to:
  - Independence and Wellness at home
  - Fewer Fall Injuries
  - Fewer Serious Harm Falls and Fractures
  - Improved Recovery
  - Integrated Falls and Fracture Care Across the System
- Fails and fractures outcomes dashboard

Is anyone better off?

- Changes in knowledge/attitude, increase of skills, Safer Behaviours, Safer Environments, Policy Change
- It helps health sector partners to evaluate the benefits of services they provide to older people and drive innovation and development
Community engagement

Within Auckland Council, Safe Communities accreditation is supported by the Community Empowerment Unit (CEU).

The CEU has a unique role within the council. Staff work within communities, alongside the 21 local boards, to support community groups to realise the goals and aspirations they have for their areas. This integration strongly supports the community engagement activity of the Safety Collective, leveraging the strength and breadth of community organisations across Auckland.

Strategic brokers within the unit connect with all 21 local boards and hundreds of community organisations and partners. Through being hosted within the council, the Safety Collective is able to use that structure to engage directly with community organisations and local boards identifying key injury prevention and community safety priorities.

Responding to Māori aspirations is a key responsibility of the work of the Safety Collective and engagement with mana whenua and mātauranga must reflect that. The Safety Collective can access the resources of Auckland Council in this engagement utilising the following:

- Māori responsiveness staff and resources within the CEU
- Māori responsiveness staff and resources within the wider Arts, Community and Events department
- Te Waka Angamua, the central unit of Māori expertise within Auckland Council

Auckland Council invests significant resources into supporting successful community engagement. The Safety Collective can draw on the council’s resources including the Engagement Hub, allowing us to use the framework developed with community partners. We also have access to professional expertise within the Citizen Engagement and Insights team.

Above: Engagement performance Framework – Auckland Council
Safety Collective members will also have access to their wider community networks which extends the reach of engagement, and staff are building additional links to key regional networks such as the Auckland Social Sector Leadership Group.

Communication modes

Auckland is a large and diverse city, both demographically and geographically. Therefore, the communications approach of the Safety Collective needs to communicate directly with key audiences through the most relevant and accessible channels.

The Safety Collective has engaged in the development of a communications strategy, undertaking a co-design approach with social change creative agency Curative. The strategy details the objectives, audience/s, values, content, channels, and reasons for engagement of the Safety Collective, which will be attuned to the priorities set in the relevant year.

Detailed in the strategy are the key channels of communication, along with the frequency, aim of this channel and the responsible partner or partners to lead on this.

Examples of these channels include:

- Direct marketing
- Events – internal and external
- Twitter
- LinkedIn
- Web / internet

Measures of success have been drafted and these will need to be confirmed by the Safety Collective once the operational plan and key priorities have been established post-accreditation.

Branding and brand guidelines have been developed and agreed to. These provide a clear point of differentiation from any individual partner agency or networks, reflecting the unique character of Auckland, especially Māori and Pasifika influence, and provide a bold and recognisable visual statement.

The Safety Collective can utilise the communications resources of Auckland Council to promote its work and raise the profile of injury prevention and community safety issues across the council’s departments and Council-Controlled Organisations.
Shared experiences

While developing the Auckland accreditation, members of the Safety Collective have been represented at conferences and forums related to community safety and injury prevention, such as those hosted by the Safe Communities Foundation of New Zealand.

Led by Safe Communities staff, engagement activity has been undertaken within Auckland Council and associated council-controlled organisations, local boards, and key partners and networks to raise the profile of the accreditation, the Safety Collective and key safety and injury prevention themes.

Aligned with the development of the accreditation, Safe Communities staff have been working closely with Safer North, to align its future with the regional accreditation for Auckland. This includes the provision of funding to research and provide options on the future of the network and its relationship with the wider-Auckland accreditation.

A calendar of community safety and injury prevention events attended and/or organised by Safety Collective members will be developed as Safe Communities accreditation is gained.

Evaluation to inform strategy and business planning

Monitoring, evaluating and reporting back on outcomes enables the Safety Collective, our partners, and Aucklanders to understand the efficacy of activity undertaken to improve community safety and injury prevention interventions across the region.

A key element of the operational model of the Safety Collective is a commitment to the collation, analysis and use of evidence-based data to support strategic and business/operational planning.

This can be undertaken by looking at both data and evidence from existing sources and partners, and developing approaches to evaluation specific to the work of the Safety Collective.

The Safety Collective views evaluation as a message to all Aucklanders about the effectiveness of interventions to improve community safety and reduce preventable injury and death. Evaluation results will be openly communicated so that the work of the Safety Collective and our partners is accountable to Aucklanders. Open and transparent data on effectiveness can then enable Aucklanders and our partners to play their part in co-designing innovative and transformational interventions.
Examples of effective evaluation strategies that the Safety Collective can draw on include:

- Collective impact approaches use indicators to measure reactions to initiatives and impacts on people, programmes and policy – rather than measure the initiative itself. This is a useful tool when looking at the effectiveness of a network or campaign. For the Safety Collective this enables us to review our impact in the following areas:
  - Guide Vision and Strategy
  - Support Aligned Activities
  - Establish shared measurement practices
  - Build Public Will
  - Advance Policy
  - Mobilise Funding

- A life course approach, which suggests interventions at earlier points in a person’s life, to prevent issues that arise that increase risk or prevalence of injury later in life. Research conducted by ACC found that the approach considers the persons’ life events prior to their injury, and the impacts these events have on that persons’ choices. Using this approach, the greatest impact can be had by identifying key transition points and influencers in a persons’ life. This provides an opportunity to enhance existing, and influence the design of future, interventions. The evaluation of a life course approach requires understanding the events that lead to increased risk or prevalence of injury, and measuring the reduction of these events and the impacts of these interventions. An example is seen in the effort to strongly encourage sports warm up and recovery in intermediate aged children, not so much to prevent injuries in the now – but to change knowledge, attitudes, and behaviour towards sport preparation to prevent injuries in later life.

In terms of existing evaluation resources, the Safety Collective can access comprehensive injury prevention related data from ACC, New Zealand Police, Ministry of Health and other key partners.

By being hosted within Auckland Council, the Safety Collective has the advantage of support from the Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU) of Council. A key piece of research they undertake is the biennial Quality of Life survey which focuses on a range of wellbeing measures including perceptions of safety, drug and alcohol problems and road safety.

A core function of the staff support for the Safety Collective is the role of project analyst. This role is responsible for the collation, analysis and evaluation of data that supports the strategy of the Safety Collective and our community partners. We envisage this role continuing post-accreditation to lead on the evaluation of the accreditation and the outcomes of the Safety Collective.
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Safety Collective,
Tāmaki Makaurau | Auckland

GOVERNANCE AND STEERING GROUPS: JOINT TERMS OF REFERENCE

December 2018

Background

The Safe Communities model is a “process that creates a local infrastructure to enable community members, community organisations, businesses, local government, government agencies and others with an interest and concern about community safety issues to work together in a coordinated and collaborative way. This process then helps communities to put in place joint activities and projects to address local concerns” (Peters and Mills, 2018).

In June 2016, Auckland Council’s Regional Strategy and Policy Committee resolved for “Auckland to become an accredited Safe Community, and write to the Safe Communities Foundation New Zealand (SCFNZ) to initiate the accreditation process” (REC/2016/33).

Representatives from a number of organisations together form the “Safety Collective, Tāmaki Makaurau | Auckland” (the Safety Collective).

This document establishes the joint terms of reference for the two bodies that make up the Safety Collective: the Governance Group, and the Steering Group, highlighting the essential difference(s) between the two.

Role of the Governance Group

The Governance Group was established in late 2018 to provide strategic direction for the work of the Safety Collective, and to be its decision-making body. Specifically it is to:

- Advocate for and allocate funding and other resources to achieve the Safe Communities vision
- Recognise and advocate for Te Tiriti o Waitangi by enabling Māori to contribute to decision-making to address the inequities between Māori and non-Māori community safety and injury prevention outcomes
- Support and recognise the value of Māori mātauranga, tikanga and approaches in case studies and effective strategies
- Address inequities in community safety and injury prevention outcomes across key demographics (including Māori, Pasifika, gender, age)
- Mandate the strategic direction for implementation, ensuring alignment with other key national and regional community safety and injury prevention priorities, encouraging and where possible adopting innovative and transformational approaches
- Utilise strategic relationships to advance the Safe Communities vision and implementation for Auckland


- Communicate and advise on matters relating to the Safe Communities vision, and provide updates on activity to SCFZN, Auckland Council committee(s), and others.
- Approve the submission of the completed application for Auckland Safe Communities accreditation, to the relevant Auckland Council committee(s) and in turn to the SCFZN.

Role of the Steering Group

The Steering Group was established in early 2017 to progress the accreditation process. Specifically, it is to:

- Maintain and sustain the Safe Communities model (in time, to be determined by a strategic/operational plan as agreed by the Safety Collective).
- Recognise and advocate for Te Tiriti o Waitangi by enabling Māori to contribute to decision-making to address the inequities between Māori and non-Māori community safety and injury prevention outcomes.
- Address inequities in community safety and injury prevention outcomes across key demographics (including Māori, Pasifika, gender, age).
- Support collaborative partnerships to implement best practice.
- Influence and advise communities on Safe Communities policies/practices.
- Collect and collate data, provide advice and monitor and evaluate the implementation of relevant programmes, policies and projects.
- Design and develop guiding documentation.
- Report to and/or advise the governance group, and communities and stakeholders as required.

Responsibilities of the Chairs

Chairs are elected by the Governance and Steering Groups.

- Overseeing the membership of the group.
- Maintains and respects Te Tiriti o Waitangi principles.
- Ensures that a Terms of Reference is in place and that this is reviewed at least annually.
- Follows up with agencies/representatives concerning attendance and participation.
- Ensures that replacement members are identified and appointed promptly.
- Working with the group to identify potential, and appoint, new members.
- Chairing of meetings.
- Sets the agenda for each meeting.
- Ensures that agendas and supporting materials are delivered to members in advance of meetings.
- Ends each meeting with a summary of decisions and assignments.
- Managing the functions of the group.
- Delegating roles and areas of responsibility to members.
- Ensuring that activity reports and accounts are received and monitored.
- Liaison with SCFZN on local, regional and national matters.

Specific to Steering Group Chair

- Reports back to the Governance Group through attending Governance Group meetings and/or providing a written report to be disseminated to Governance Group members.
Membership

Membership is drawn from agencies with a safety and/or injury prevention priority, operating at a regional level (or sub-regional, as agreed by the relevant body), and is assessed on a regular basis.

The Governance Group includes but is not limited to representatives from Accident Compensation Corporation, Auckland Council, Ministry of Health, and New Zealand Police.

The Steering Group includes but is not limited to representatives from Accident Compensation Corporation, Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, Department of Internal Affairs, Drowning Prevention Auckland, Health Promotion Agency, Ministry of Health, New Zealand Police, Safer West Community Trust, Safer North Community Trust, and SafeKids Aotearoa.

Others may be co-opted into the Groups as deemed necessary by the Groups.

Quorum

One half plus one of the current members of the group.

Decision-making process

By consensus, and in the event that this cannot be achieved a 2/3 majority vote will be applied.

Frequency of meetings

Meetings will occur as required, but the expectation is:
- Steering Group - bimonthly
- Governance Group - quarterly

The Chairs will attempt to schedule at least biannual joint meetings, as part of the above meeting schedule, to ensure effective communication/alignment of purpose and activity.

Should a delegate be sent in place of a group member, they will be appropriately briefed and able to speak for the member they represent.

Agenda and minutes

The agenda and meeting papers shall be circulated to members one week prior to the meeting. Minutes are taken and distributed to all members within two weeks of each meeting.

Confidentiality

No party will, without the consent of every other party at any time disclose to a third party information concerning the affairs of any other party, or that is otherwise deemed to be confidential by any other party or where such disclosure of information may be subject to the provisions of the Official Information Act 1982.

Conflict of interest

All members agree to state any conflict of interest as matters arise. In general, leave will be given to any member identifying a conflict of interest from participating in discussion and decision-making on any matters associated with that conflict.

Conflicts are to be managed between the member and the chair.

No member will use membership in a way that could reasonably give rise to the expectation of financial gain by the member or bring the group into disrepute.

Review

This Terms of Reference will be reviewed on an annual basis following agreement. It can be amended by agreement of the group at any time.
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Letters of support from key agencies

---

16 February 2017

Kathryn Martin
Auckland Council
Injury Prevention Advisor
Arts, Community and Events
Private Bag 92300
Victoria Street West
Auckland 1142

Re – ISC Safe Communities Accreditation – Auckland

ACC is one of a number of key stakeholders supporting the Auckland Council’s application for International Safe Communities accreditation. This is because ACC recognises the value of communities working together to create safe communities that are free from harm. Coalitions, local leadership, needs analysis and enabling communities to be more informed about injury prevention are important to ACC.

Consequently, ACC has recognised the benefits that ISC accreditation will bring to the community – collaboration and a coordinated framework for safety initiatives. Opportunities for collaboration will be with existing partner organisations as well as new community organisations who are working in the areas of injury prevention and crime prevention in the home, on the road in public spaces, at work and at play.

We look forward to playing our part in achieving this designation.

Yours faithfully

Adie Blackwood
Injury Prevention Portfolio Manager – Community
ACC
13 March 2017

Kathryn Martin
Injury Prevention Adviser
Arts, Community and Events
Auckland Council
Private Bag 92300
Victoria Street West
Auckland 1142

Dear Kathryn,

Letter of support

I am pleased to provide this letter of support for the Auckland Council in its efforts to be accredited as a safe community. HPA are a supporter of the Safe Communities network and as such will offer what support we can to assist Auckland Council to achieve this status.

I will be the contact for you in the first instance.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Galloway
Northern Regional Manager
31 January, 2017

Kathryn Maple
Injury Prevention Advisor
Arts Community and Events
Auckland Council
Medway House
24 Wellesley Street
AUCKLAND

Dear Kathryn,

This letter is to confirm the support of Safer North for application for an Auckland wide Safe Community accreditation.

Safer North already has a Safe Community designation, and is supportive of the model and developing the model across the region. We look forward to developing a region-wide Safe Community designation that includes and acknowledges Auckland North and the Safer North designation.

Safer North is already committed to the continuance of the Safe Community once designation has been achieved. Areas of support are likely to be, but not limited to, providing statistical evidence of injury and safety data where required, information on evidence-based community safety and injury prevention programmes undertaken in Auckland North, collaboration with other organizations working together with other safe community or injury prevention organisations where appropriate, and support for Safer North Chair (Dennis Stanley) on the accreditation steering group. We see the Safe Community designation as a vehicle to improve collaboration with other safe community or injury prevention organisations across our region.

We look forward to working with you to achieve a safer Auckland.

Kind regards

[Signature]

Terrena Stanley
Chair
Safer North Community Trust

Safer North: www.safernorth.nz
Safe West Community Trust
98 Parker Rd
Ootara

22 June 2017

Attention: Kathryn Martin
Auckland Council Safe Communities Lead
Auckland Council Community Empowerment Unit
Auckland

Dear Kathryn,

This letter is in support of the Auckland Council application as a Safe Community under the WHO Safe Communities framework.

Safe West Community Trust currently holds the WHO Safe Communities Accreditation on behalf of the communities of the Henderson-Maungatapu, Whau and Waitakere Ranges local board areas.

The trust supports the development of the Auckland Council application and are prepared to work alongside the council as it develops the structure required to implement the Safe Communities model.

Yours sincerely,

Name: Carolynne Stone, Chair, Safer West Community Trust
Date: 22 June 2017
17 March 2017

To whom it may concern,

Dear Sir/Madam,

This letter confirms Starship Child Health’s support for Auckland Council’s application for Safe Community Accreditation.

Starship Child Health provides dedicated pediatric healthcare and training within the Auckland Region and delivers family-centred care to children and young people throughout New Zealand and the South Pacific.

Starship is committed to working in partnership with Auckland Council, the Ministry of Health, ACC, the Northern Regional Alliance and others to improve trauma care and promote the prevention of injury in children and young people. The Auckland District Health Board hosts Sathelos Aitana, a national child injury prevention service and the Starship Trauma Service is part of the National Trauma Network.

Our participation in Auckland Council’s application for Safe Community Accreditation will assist Starship to achieve better interagency communication, more efficient and effective prevention activities and assist our service delivery.

We look forward to working with Auckland Council and the success of this application.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Mike Shepherd
Director – Medical and Community
Starship Child Health
16 January 2019

Kathryn Pond, Project Analyst
Arts Community and Events
Auckland Council
Bedebloe House
34 Wellesley Street
AUCKLAND

Dear Kathryn

This letter is to confirm the support of Drowning Prevention Auckland (formerly known as WaterSafe Auckland) for application for an Auckland regional Safe Community Accreditation through the Safety Collective, Tāmaki Mākaurau | Auckland.

Drowning Prevention Auckland has a history of supporting Safe Communities. The organisation supports and is closely involved with both Safer West and Safer North, and an employee is currently chair of Safer North.

WaterSafe Auckland is committed to supporting the application for accreditation, and the continuance of the Safe Community once designation has been achieved. Areas of support are likely to be, but not limited to, providing statistical evidence of drowning data, information on evidence-based water safety programmes undertaken, collaboration with other aquatic organisations, working together with other safe community or injury prevention organisations where appropriate, and support for a staff member (Teresa Stanley) on the accreditation steering group. We see the Safe Community designation as a vehicle to improve collaboration with other safe community or injury prevention organisations.

In addition, I am happy to be part of any higher level governance group that may be formed. We look forward to working with you to achieve a safer Auckland.

Kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Davin Bray | Chief Executive DROWNING PREVENTION AUCKLAND
davin.bray@dpac.org.nz

Drowning Prevention Auckland
85 Victoria Drive, Auckland 0610
Tel: 09 376 8722 | Fax: 09 376 8744
www.dpac.org.nz
18 July 2017,

Kathryn Martin,
Auckland Council

Dear Kathryn,

Julia Chambers has notified the Northern Region Child Health Network about the Auckland Council application to become a “Safe Community”. We understand there is a stakeholder document being prepared to showcase collaborative injury prevention projects.

The Northern Region (Region) Child Health Network includes the four DHBs from the northern region. Projects include a range of primary secondary and tertiary settings providers. Relevant projects include child health services in primary care e.g. decision Child Care centres such as Plunket. There is a regional plan developed to promote projects that are best achieved by working together. The region has a role to endorses projects that are being developed within districts that will benefit children and young people across the region.

We focus on the following child health themes:

- Knowledge every child enhancing systems of vigilance for effective engagement with universal healthcare.
- Informing families; using consistent health promoting messages regionally.
- Enabling clinical teams; to deliver health care to those with highest need through supporting models of care and evidence based approaches.
- Advocating for the child through coordinated regional approach and active intersectoral relationships.
- Two projects that may be of interest to the Auckland Council relate to injury prevention. They are:
  - Home injury prevention: The deliverables included:
    - Description of a regionally consistent home visiting program that will be effective to reduce unintentional injury in and around the home, particularly in high risk populations.
    - Delivery of an Implementation Plan for communicating the regional key messages for strengthening home visiting programmes by April 2016.

This project was delivered to ACC and Plunket senior managers. Our Northern Regional Child Health Network continues to advocate for Accident Compensation Commission (ACC) to implement the model.

- Primary care pathway for the identification and management of children following a head injury (not requiring hospital admission). This has been piloted with ACC funding attached to the primary care Spine Core Assessment Tool 3 (SCAT3) assessment. ACC is determining whether it will provide funding for the SCAT3 assessment to be implemented nationally, alongside the pathway.

We are keen to increase awareness of regional activity in child health and support Auckland Council to demonstrate collaborative relationships with groups and organisations across the Auckland Region that will assist the prevention of injuries.

Yours sincerely,

[Signatures]

Dr. Tim Jelleyman
Chair, Northern Region Child Health Network

Dr. Minna Shepherd
Chair, Northern Region Child Health Injury Project

cc:
Julia Chambers
Dr. Rebecca Hayman
Christina Howard-Blenkin (ACC)
Dr. Christine Mainusch
4 February 2019

Wayne Lencink
Auckland Council
Arts, Community and Events
Private Bag 93200
Victoria Street West
Auckland 1142

Re: ISC Safe Communities Accreditation – Auckland

Auckland Emergency Management is pleased to provide a letter of support to Auckland Council, Arts Community and Events in its efforts to gain accreditation as a safe community.

We support the application being made by Auckland Council and we are committed to working in partnership with all the agencies and organisations who are supporting this application. Auckland Emergency Management believes that Safer Communities Accreditation will better assist with interagency coordination and communication that will support the creation of safer and more resilient communities.

Your sincerely,

[Signature]

Sarah Sinclair
Director (Acting)
Auckland Emergency Management

Private Bag 93200, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142
(09) 301 0101
www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
11 February 2019

To whom it may concern

Dear Sir/Madam

This letter confirms the Office of Ethnic Communities’ (the Office) support for Auckland Council’s application for the International Safe Communities accreditation. The Office of Ethnic Communities is a member of the Safety Collective’s steering group and provides input and advice on community safety to reflect the views and concerns of New Zealand’s ethnic communities.

The initiative by Auckland Council aligns with the work of the Office to support safer ethnic communities. In May 2018, we hosted a Safer Ethnic Communities Ministerial Forum, to establish an environment where ethnic communities and government work in partnership to create sustainable solutions for ethnic communities. A further forum on safer ethnic communities is likely to be held in 2019.

As the government’s principle advisor on ethnic diversity in New Zealand, we welcome the opportunity to be involved in Auckland Council’s Safety Collective, and its application for Safe Communities accreditation for Auckland.

Yours Sincerely,

Anita Balakrishnan
Director Tumoko
Office of Ethnic Communities Te Tari Matawaka
8th February 2019

Safety Collective
Tamaki Makaurau

To whom it may concern,

The Safety Collective

This letter confirms Tamaki Makaurau Police are in support of the Tamaki Makaurau Auckland Safety Collective.

New Zealand Police are committed to ensuring Safer Communities Together and will assist in what support is required in achieving this.

We look forward to working in partnership for the greater outcome of our communities.

Yours sincerely

Keryn Mathins
District Commander
Auckland City District
18th July, 2017

Kathryn Martin
Injury Prevention Advisor
Arts Community and Events
Auckland Council
Private Bag 92300
Victoria Street West
AUCKLAND 1142

Dear Kathryn,

This letter serves to confirm the support of Pasifika Injury Prevention Aukilana Inc (PIPA), for the Auckland Council’s application for Safe Community accreditation.

PIPA has been involved as a stakeholder, partner or support to a number of community based injury prevention interventions looking to address the over-representation of Pacific people across the injury and death statistics in Auckland and at times nationally.

PIPA has also worked in partnership with Council and some specific local board areas across the injury prevention, health, safety and wellness spectrum. Our organisation views the Safe Community designation as a way of furthering collaboration with others working in the safety and injury prevention areas across the region to achieve a safer Auckland for all.

We look forward to working with Council and others to achieve safer outcomes for all across Auckland.

Lau manava,

Sandy Harrop
Chairperson
PASIFIKI INJURY PREVENTION INC (PIPA)
027 271 5791
Appendix: Three

Stocktake of community safety and injury prevention programmes and activities

Within Auckland Council, Safe Communities accreditation is supported by the Community Empowerment Unit (CEU).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE CODING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention Mode</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Raising Awareness Changing Attitude/Opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE CODING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency Duration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE CODING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUZZED – watch our stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REDUCING ALCOHOL AND DRUG RELATED HARM - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Action on Youth And Drugs (CAYAD) Community Action Plans – engaging communities to help them identify and respond to alcohol and other drugs (AoD) issues</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, IC, EC, PC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population i.e. Youth</td>
<td><a href="https://cayad.org.nz">https://cayad.org.nz</a>; <a href="https://www.facebook.com/cayadauckland/">https://www.facebook.com/cayadauckland/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole School Approach – working with secondary schools on wellbeing and exclusion policies and practices</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, EC, PC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Groups of sub-population i.e. youth at particular high schools</td>
<td><a href="https://www.wellbeingatschool.org.nz/sites/default/files/W@S-A-whole-school-approach-research-brief">https://www.wellbeingatschool.org.nz/sites/default/files/W@S-A-whole-school-approach-research-brief</a>. pdf; <a href="https://www.drugfoundation.org.nz/drug-info-and-support/schools/a-whole-school-approach/">https://www.drugfoundation.org.nz/drug-info-and-support/schools/a-whole-school-approach/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Regional Methamphetamine Working Group (ARMWG)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Community-Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ancad.org.nz/armwg">http://www.ancad.org.nz/armwg</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip Hop and Partier Peer Crowd Interventions for alcohol use – through a co-design process as a recommendation from NZ Peer Crowd Research</td>
<td>AO, SC, BC, EC, IC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Individual identified people i.e. at risk youth</td>
<td><a href="https://youtu.be/w9kcUbj0fIs">https://youtu.be/w9kcUbj0fIs</a>; A collaborative project supported by CAYAD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build capacity: sale of alcohol harm reduction forum</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Individual identified people i.e. at risk youth</td>
<td>Auckland Council is supporting a community organisation to facilitate a forum to build community capacity to understand issues relating to the establishment of outlets selling alcohol. The forum will seek to empower the community to input into the decision-making processes around alcohol licensing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaskForce on Alcohol and Community Safety in the Central City</td>
<td>SK, IC</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Central city</td>
<td>To address alcohol and safety issues within Auckland's central city, it was set up in response to New Zealand Police and public concern about the levels of alcohol issues and violence in the central city at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Purpose of the group:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To connect key stakeholders in the central city safety space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To bring up issues that need to be addressed and look for shared solutions and increased knowledge around these issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REDUCING ALCOHOL AND DRUG RELATED HARM - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation Summer</td>
<td>BC, IC</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Whole Population</td>
<td>To address the increases in violence and disorder caused by alcohol consumption, Tamaki Makaurau Police run an annual operation over the summer holiday period. 2019/20 will be the second annual operation with combined resources from across Tamaki Makaurau working with wardens with a key outcome to prevent violence and disorder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Action Plan</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Whole Population</td>
<td>New Zealand Police Alcohol Action Plan 2018. This plan sets out clear expectations of Police staff. It supports them to meet these expectations by setting out appropriate training and identifying required resources to allow them to perform their role more effectively. The five 'Activity Areas' that capture these expectations are: 1. Using meaningful data 2. Understanding and implementing what works 3. Enhancing New Zealand Police capability 4. Engaging with partners 5. Consistent understanding &amp; communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHILD INJURY PREVENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Child Poisoning: Position Paper and Infographic | AO, SK, EC, PC   | One-off            | Community Wide or Whole Population | Poisoning is one of the major causes of childhood injury in New Zealand. In the period 2004-2011, a total of 13 children aged 0-14 years died as a result of unintentional poisoning. This Safe Kids Aotearoa position paper 'Child Poisoning Prevention' aims to advocate and  
  - Describe the epidemiology of unintentional poisoning among children in New Zealand.  
  - Identify the policy and legislative context surrounding poisoning prevention.  
  - Summarise key strategies to reduce unintentional child poisoning.  
  - An infographic (Mistaken Identity) was created to shows how easy it is for children to confuse medicines with foods and chemicals. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Child Unintentional Injury [Factsheet, 2016]</td>
<td>AO, SK, EC, PC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population; Asian communities, Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>This factsheet gives New Zealand unintentional injury death and hospitalisation figures for Asian children between 0 and 14 years old. It shows leading causes and provides suggestions for interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Farm Injuries [Factsheet, 2016]</td>
<td>AO, SK, EC, PC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population; Rural communities, Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>This four-page factsheet gives New Zealand farm injury death and hospitalisation figures for children between 0 and 14 years old. It shows leading causes and provides suggestions for interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>AO, SK, EC, PC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub-population, Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the last 12 months, SafeKids Aotearoa has made submissions on a number of topics to ensure children's voices are heard and their safety considered:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SafeKids Aotearoa submission on the Building (Pools) Amendment Bill, 3 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Recommendations on Playground Equipment and Surfacing Standard, 6 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Infant Sleep Environment regulation, 20 August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maternal and Child Health Promotion Service Review, 22 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Update of the New Zealand Health Strategy, 20 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>AO, SK, EC, PC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population, Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>We also sent submissions on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Vulnerable Children's Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- National Cycling Advisory Panel Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Auckland Council 10 Year Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Wellington City Council 10 Year Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Invercargill City Council 10 Year Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Auckland Council Unitary Plan Planning Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reform of Hazardous Substances Management Under the HSNO Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NZ$ 5th Periodic Report under UNCEDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Product Safety Standards- Children's Nightwear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CHILD INJURY PREVENTION - CONTINUED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Safekids Child Injury Prevention Workshops | AO, SK, BC, EC, PC, IC | Annual | Neighbourhood or Sub population | This is New Zealand’s only dedicated workshop series for unintentional child injury prevention. **The workshops agenda includes:**  
  - National and regional data on child home injuries.  
  - Māori and Pacific child injuries  
  - Latest campaigns  
  - Emerging injury issues.  
  Each workshop is a networking opportunity that discusses local child injury topics relevant to the community or region. The workshops are particularly beneficial to community leaders, policy makers, health professionals, teachers, home visitors, injury prevention practitioners, Tamariki Ora providers, DHBs, councils, refugee and migrant and social support services. |
### Child Injury Prevention - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Māori and Pacific Peoples Factsheet</td>
<td>AO, SK, EC, PC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population, Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>The Māori and Pacific child injury is taken from hospital admissions and deaths data between 2010 and 2014. It shows trends and leading causes of injuries and deaths, and gives possible preventative interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Ruin the Fun (Fall campaign)</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, EC, PC, IC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population, Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>While childhood fall related injuries are often viewed as “part” of growing up, some falls can cause serious injury with great social and financial costs to children, their families and the government. In some cases falls are fatal. Safekids ran a national campaign to raise awareness on how to prevent serious falls injuries in the home and at play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHB and Auckland Region Child Injury Infographics</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, EC, PC, IC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population, Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>These infographics includes statistics on unintentional child injury in the Auckland region’s local board areas and DHB areas, with information on hospital admissions by ethnic group, unintentional injury by leading cause, and most common places children are injured. It also includes four actions readers can do to prevent child injuries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHILD INJURY PREVENTION - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World TV Day/ TV safety</td>
<td>AD, SK.</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>In November, World TV Day, and are reminding parents to secure TVs to the wall to prevent them from falling onto and crushing children. “A TV falling a metre high has enough force to seriously injure or kill a child on impact,” said Safekids Auckland Director Ann Weaver. Safekids Auckland’s message is simple—Mount TVs to the wall with a TV bracket or secure it with a low and stable piece of furniture with a TV strap.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Attachment A**

**Item 9**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infographic: child dog bite hospitalisations in NZ</td>
<td>AO, SK.</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>This SafeKids infographic contains child dog injury data (0-14 years old) sourced from the Injury Prevention Research Unit - University of Otago. It contains injury statistics, including information on demographics, location and ethnicity. It also contains useful links on responsibilities, understanding dog behaviour and supervision of children around dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe as houses: recommendations for child safe rental properties in New Zealand</td>
<td>AO, PC, EC, IG.</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>This publication is targeted primarily at landlords and home owners and is intended as a reference guide for a library or collection. Hazards around the home contribute to children experiencing injuries. This guidebook outlines ways that the risk of home injury to children can be reduced, for example through good planning and design of new homes, and maintenance programmes for existing ones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CHILD INJURY PREVENTION - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy: Report: 'Child Unintentional Deaths and Injuries in New Zealand, and Prevention Strategies'</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, EC, PC, IC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>To give policymakers a clear view of child injury and death rates and their causes, including child drowning, SafeKids compiled an extensive report that shows unintentional injury death and hospitalisation rates between 2006 and 2012. The report also references proven prevention strategies for each cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Safekids Aotearoa - Home Safety Campaign | AO, SK, BC, EC, IC | 2017-2019 | Street or Groups of sub-population i.e. youth at particular high schools | Make Your Home a Safety Zone is a partnership programme between Safekids and New Zealand’s no-fault accident compensation authority – ACC.
The three-year programme aims to reduce the number of home injuries for children under 10 years old in New Zealand.
The programme reflects best practice evidence which shows that parenting education provided during home visits, coupled with the provision and installation of safety devices can reduce the number of home injuries. It includes train the trainer workshops and community events as well as the provision of financial support to community providers to enable them to deliver in-home training, undertake home safety checks and provide and install appropriate child safety devices.
Programme goals include increasing the child home safety knowledge of 60 per cent of families and changing the home safety behaviour of 70 per cent. |
### CHILD INJURY PREVENTION - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Johns in Schools</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population, School children</td>
<td>The St John's in schools programme teaches children responding to an emergency, first aid and injury prevention. This programme is for primary and intermediate age children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iMoko</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population, School children</td>
<td>iMoko is a digital healthcare programme, which increases access to health services for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunket</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population, School children</td>
<td>Plunket leads the way in preventing injuries to children under five years old. We're supporting Plunket to develop injury prevention capabilities within their staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Connectedness/Resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-led place making activities</td>
<td>SK, BC, EC, IC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population i.e. Youth</td>
<td>Activities facilitated by Auckland Council's Community Empowerment Unit working with specific communities where safety is identified as an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building capacity of Business Improvement Districts (BIDS) to improve safety for their town centres</td>
<td>EC, BC, PC, IC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population</td>
<td>Enhancing the capacities of business associations to achieve wider economic and safety outcomes, as outlined in their strategic plans. Management and oversight by business associations of council's safety camera systems (CCTV maintenance budget).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie Tamaki Safety and Alcohol Harm Reduction Plan</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population i.e. Youth</td>
<td>Auckland Council is supporting local community organisations to deliver initiatives outlined in the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Safety and Alcohol Harm Reduction Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience and welfare</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Community wide or whole population</td>
<td>Activities facilitated by Auckland Council's Auckland Emergency Management department (AEM), in collaboration with strategic partners and the community, to build a resilient Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The steps that AEM are undertaking can reduce exposure to an emergency and create a safer and more prosperous region that understands its hazards and has resilient communities working together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Virtual Resilience Team (across whole of council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Auckland University Resilient Cities Work - National Science Challenge. Working alongside AEM for resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Business Continuity Plans across council and ensuring those plans are accurate and up-to-date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Resilient Communities and Community Resilience Plans - Plha flood project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ethnic and Faith based community work - diverse communities and communication with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Hazard and Risk Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS/RESILIENCE - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Splice</td>
<td>Community connectedness</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Splice is based and operates in Auckland's CBD. Isolation has been identified as an issue in Auckland's city centre with senior Chinese, stay-at-home-parents of under 5's, and students being particularly affected. Splice addresses isolation in the Auckland city centre by connecting isolated residents. The purpose of this project is to build social cohesion between ethnic and host communities, so everyone has a sense of belonging and can participate in building a neighbourhood that is inclusive and values diversity. <a href="http://www.splice.org.nz/">http://www.splice.org.nz/</a> Email: <a href="mailto:info@splice.org.nz">info@splice.org.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Welfare Trust</td>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Auckland wide</td>
<td>The African Welfare Trust has a team of social workers that provide intensive social advocacy and support. The Social workers provide advice, support, empowerment and advocacy for people facing difficulties, personal issues, family issues, and community circumstances, including emotional and mental health concerns. The African Welfare Trust promotes awareness of child abuse, family violence, neglect, abuse of young people, effects of family violence and better understanding of community and social issues. <a href="http://www.africanwelfare.org.nz">www.africanwelfare.org.nz</a> Email <a href="mailto:info@africanwelfare.org.nz">info@africanwelfare.org.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS/RESILIENCE - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shanti Nivas</td>
<td>Elder abuse and neglect prevention</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Auckland wide</td>
<td>Shanti Nivas runs a service called Kruzni - Elder Abuse and Neglect Prevention. The goal of the service is to recognize, prevent and respond to abuse and neglect of older people of South Asian Communities and ensure their wellbeing. This service aims to increase the awareness of growing incidence of abuse &amp; neglect amongst older people by people in a relationship of trust with them such as family, friends or other on whom they depend. <a href="http://shanti.nivas.org.nz/">http://shanti.nivas.org.nz/</a> Email <a href="mailto:shantinivas@xtra.co.nz">shantinivas@xtra.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Attachment A**

Item 9
### COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS/RESILIENCE - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Asian Network Incorporated (TANI)</td>
<td>Health and well-being of Asian families</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or sub population of Asian communities New Zealand wide</td>
<td>Ensures that Asian New Zealanders enjoy optimal quality of life and well-being. TANI is committed to developing strong and healthy Asian communities through advocating and promoting their welfare; and their active participation in policy-making. TANI provides a health literacy programme to the wider Asian Community. Organises an annual Asian Forum to raise awareness about issues faced by Asian people in Auckland. <a href="http://www.asiannetwork.org.nz">www.asiannetwork.org.nz</a> Email <a href="mailto:info@asiannetwork.org.nz">info@asiannetwork.org.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese New Settlers Services Trust (CNSST)</td>
<td>Settlement support to migrant communities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>New Zealand community and Asian new settlers</td>
<td>Chinese New Settlers Services Trust (CNSST) provides community based social services for the Chinese and Korean communities. Services are provided in Mandarin, Cantonese, Korean, and English. The community support services provided by CNSST include and range from social work support, counselling services, community education, employment services, settlement services, free Chinese and Korean legal clinics, holiday youth programme, parenting support groups, senior mutual support network. <a href="http://www.cnst.org.nz/">http://www.cnst.org.nz/</a> Email: <a href="mailto:info@cnst.org.nz">info@cnst.org.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhartiya Samaj Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Social services and old age care</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood and Sub Population: Asians and Auckland wide</td>
<td>They offer a wide range of services through their Senior Citizens Wing, Children and Youth Wing, New Migrants Support Wing and Social Services Wing. They also work in co-operation with other Community Welfare organisations which are operating primarily in the Auckland region. BSCT and their founders are Mr. Jeet Suchdev QSM JP and Ms. Roopali Suchdev QSM who remain important stakeholders of our office. <a href="https://bsct.org.nz/">https://bsct.org.nz/</a> Email: <a href="mailto:bscnt1995@gmail.com">bscnt1995@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The UMMA Trust   | Social services for Muslim families | Ongoing            | Neighbourhood or Sub population i.e., Muslim families | The UMMA Trust seeks to provide support for Muslim families who are in the process of resettlement in New Zealand, as either migrants or refugees, with a specific focus on women. The UMMA Trust Women’s Empowerment Project seeks to aid refugee women who are or have suffered domestic violence by providing the means of building education and employment training. Outreach workers employed by the Trust, previous sufferers of domestic violence themselves, lead targeted individual interventions for women dealing with domestic violence.

http://www.ummatrust.co.nz/contact-us/ Email
Contact: manager@ummatrust.co.nz |
### COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS/RESILIENCE - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Family Services</td>
<td>Provides culturally specific services to people suffering gambling addiction and mental health issues.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Subpopulation, I.E. Youth (Men, women and families of Asian origins including Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, Japanese, Thai and Hindi)</td>
<td>Asian Family Services (AFS) provide free, professional, confidential, nationwide face-to-face or telephone support to Asians living in New Zealand. These services are offered in English, Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, Vietnamese, Japanese, Thai and Hindi. An interpreter can be arranged for other languages. Based in Auckland, AFS has 15 staff, including Chinese, Korean, Indian, Vietnamese and Thai. Based in Wellington, AFS has 2 staff, including one counsellor who can speak English, Japanese and Chinese and one public health promoter. <a href="https://www.asianfamilyservices.nz/">https://www.asianfamilyservices.nz/</a> Email: <a href="mailto:asian.admin@pgfnz.org.nz">asian.admin@pgfnz.org.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahaayta</td>
<td>Provides counselling and social support to family violence victims</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or sub population</td>
<td>Sahaayta is the delivery arm of South Asian Trust Incorporated. The primary focus of the Trust is to support the South Asian community in accessing client-centred, culturally appropriate professional services. Sahaayta provides holistic, confidential, culturally appropriate counselling and support services for individuals, couples, families, youth, children and seniors. Sahaayta's primary focus remains the safety well-being of South Asian migrant and refugee families. <a href="https://healthpages.cs.ni%E4%B8%81directory/listing/et-hnic-support-sahaayta-south-asian-support">https://healthpages.cs.ni丁directory/listing/et-hnic-support-sahaayta-south-asian-support</a> Email: <a href="mailto:info@sahaayta.org.nz">info@sahaayta.org.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ROAD SAFETY/POLICING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Travelwise Schools programme</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Over 300 schools are actively involved in the programme each year</td>
<td>Travelwise schools are supported to develop Safe School Travel Plans and relevant road safety, walking and cycling initiatives for each school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Rural schools Travelwise programme</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Around 30 engaged rural schools</td>
<td>Delivers rural-focused road safety events and education to schools and surrounding communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - &quot;Safer Communities&quot; programme</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, EC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Targeted to a small number of communities</td>
<td>The safer communities' process takes three years during which engineers work through a process of investigation, design and construction of road safety treatments while education and community engagement occurs alongside this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Walking School Bus programme</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>4,000 children and 1,500</td>
<td>The programme provides safe accompanied travel to primary school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Young Driver learner licence training</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Other – approximately 40 per year</td>
<td>Approximately 500 young people attending courses</td>
<td>Learner licence courses delivered in high risk communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Love your local safe speed programme</td>
<td>AO, BC, IC</td>
<td>One-off (in each community)</td>
<td>Approximately 3-5 communities per year</td>
<td>A community/speed awareness campaign, working with local residents to influence driver behaviour on local roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ROAD SAFETY/POLICING - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Back to school campaign</td>
<td>AO, BC</td>
<td>Other – first two weeks of each school term</td>
<td>In 2015, worked with 176 schools and engaged with 11,000 road users</td>
<td>The Back to School campaign seeks to remind drivers to be aware of children through media campaigns, bus back and roadside messaging by students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Holiday weekend stops</td>
<td>AO, BC, IC</td>
<td>Other – on key long weekends</td>
<td>In 2015, 10 stops engaging with 1,800 people</td>
<td>Safe Travel Stops on key routes out of Auckland delivered in conjunction with the NZ Police. These provide reminders and messaging about safe speeds and the dangers of driver fatigue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Slow down around schools</td>
<td>AO, BC</td>
<td>Ongoing – other (timings negotiated with schools)</td>
<td>Approximately 600 students participate a year appreciate</td>
<td>Curriculum-based Slow Down Around Schools activities typically involve students in collecting speed data outside schools, analysing the information and using it to develop messages to share with parents and their local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Drink Drive Free messaging</td>
<td>AO, BC, IC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Regional, approximately 15,000 engagements</td>
<td>Drive drink free messages are promoted through campaigns, staff at community events, sober driver promotions, school road safety reps and supporting Police at Controlled Breath Testing operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ROAD SAFETY/POLICING - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Host responsibility education</td>
<td>SK, BC</td>
<td>One off</td>
<td>Bar staff, parents and young people</td>
<td>Licence Controller Qualification Courses and host responsibility training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Restraint checkpoints and child restraint clinics</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, IC</td>
<td>Other - e.g. 9 checking clinics, 20 checkpoints</td>
<td>Whole population, child restraint information targeted to parents</td>
<td>Child Restraint checking clinics; restraint checkpoints; safety messaging and technician training are delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Motorcycles and mopeds engagement</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, IC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Moped and motorcycle riders</td>
<td>Promote motorcycle safety training and deliver key safety messaging and high visibility gear to motorcycle and mopeds riders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Non-signalised intersection campaigns</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Billboards, videos and engagements communicating importance of stopping and looking both ways at intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Walking and cycling behaviour change programme</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Safety messaging, advertising campaigns, events and safety gear provided to people who walk and/or cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - High risk urban roads and intersection programme</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Larger infrastructure treatments to address the safety of intersections and other urban sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Minor safety improvement programme</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Small scale infrastructure treatments to address locations with a high crash risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Road Safety/Policing - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Speed management programme</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Speed reductions targeted to safety risk and high benefit areas, includes active warning signs and school speed zones. New approach to identifying (non-school) priority areas is being developed in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - High risk rural roads programme</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Regional, rural roads</td>
<td>Engineering treatments to deliver safety issues on rural roads using the Safe System approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Walking infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Delivery of new footpaths and shared paths to areas of highest need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Cycling infrastructure programme</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Regional, with a focus on connections to key trip trip generators (e.g. a 7km radius around CBD)</td>
<td>Delivery of new cycle ways based on a strategic programme of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Maintenance programme</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Annual, ongoing</td>
<td>Locations across Auckland</td>
<td>Maintenance of existing footpaths, crossings and road infrastructure which is which is important for maintaining the viability and safety of this infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Safe Communities Accreditation for Auckland: Approval of Application

### Attachment A

#### Item 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safekids Aotearoa - It's Safer To Wait Till You're Wider</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, EC, PC, IC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>For children 0-14 years, one of the leading causes of injury involves children as passengers in motor vehicles, with about 18 deaths a year and the equivalent of one dayroom full (1%) of children admitted to hospital every month. This national campaign advocates for the correct use of child restraints. Studies show that child restraints can significantly reduce the risk of hospitalisation and death when used correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Global Road Safety Week</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, EC, PC, IC</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>Every year Safekids and its partners celebrate the UN Global Road Safety Week (May). In 2017 they called for a pledge to #SlowDown. Over 700 schools, kindergartens, companies and communities across New Zealand got involved in the Week by holding #SlowDown events – the theme for Road Safety Week 2017. According to the NZ Transport Agency, the single biggest road safety issue in New Zealand is speed, or drivers travelling too fast for the conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ROAD SAFETY/POLICING - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driveway safety &quot;Check for me before you turn the key&quot; campaign</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, IC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>Check for me before you turn the key. Turn the key in 2015-2016 has connected with New Zealanders, particularly with Māori, Pacific and low-income families, to reduce driveway run over deaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scooter &amp; Skateboard &quot;Safe2Scoot&quot; campaign</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC, IC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>Kick scooters and skateboards provide children with a valuable form of exercise and transport. Learning to ride a skateboard or scooter can be an important part of play, risk-taking, and development. The rise in popularity of, and subsequent exposure to, skateboarding and scooter has been coupled with a marked increase in skateboard and scooter related injuries. This campaign advocates for the correct use of helmets and safety gear when scooter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Quest</td>
<td>AO, SK, BC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>Cycling is an important form of exercise, transportation and recreation for children in New Zealand, and for many children, learning to ride a bicycle is an important part of their play and development. However, cycling related injuries are one of the top ten causes of unintentional injury related deaths for children in New Zealand. Creative Quest is a school-based competition that invites students to get really creative with a great safety message – and be in to win some awesome prizes for the school or themselves. The theme is 'No Helmet. No Brain! so kids need to show us why they should wear a helmet when they’re riding a bike, a scooter, skateboarding or rollerblading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cycling safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ROAD SAFETY/POLICING - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operation Five is based on this action plan and runs until June 2019 with a strong likelihood of continuing further. Aim is to achieve 5 per cent reduction in road deaths each and every year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Makaurau Road Safety Partnerships</td>
<td>PC, IC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Whole Population</td>
<td>Combined Road Safety partnership between Auckland Transport, NZ Police, NZTA, Auckland Regional Health, Auckland Council and ACC. Three levels of the Partnership including Governance, Leadership and Working Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Partner Tasking and Coordination</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Annual, Quarterly and Strategic</td>
<td>Whole Population</td>
<td>Under Development is the establishment of a Strategic and Tactical level tasking and coordination process for Tamaki Makaurau Road Safety Partners. Its aim is to set road policing priorities and ensure an integrated, efficient and effective approach to road safety across Tamaki Makaurau.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ROAD SAFETY/POLICING - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huarahi Whakamua</td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Sub Population – Graduated Driver License Holders</td>
<td>Huarahi Whakamua (the road forward) aims to provide opportunities to assist all drivers overcome obstacles prevention them from obtaining a full driver’s License. The outcomes for the program is to ensure drivers are fully licensed/qualified and reduce the instances of graduated drivers entering the criminal justice system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorway Liaison Meeting</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Whole Population</td>
<td>Monthly coordination meeting involving NZTA, Auckland Motorway Alliance, and Police to ensure the effective and efficient operation of the Auckland Motorway Network. Liaison includes lessons learnt and development of best practice from critical incident that occur on the network. They stage regular critical incident exercises (Johnsens Tunnel &amp; Waterview) to ensure emergency services and road safety partners are familiar with roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Track</td>
<td>AO, IC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Sub Population – High Risk Drivers</td>
<td>A program designed to change driver behaviour aligned with high risk drivers. Police assist by giving lectures and providing expertise for mock serious crash exercises. <a href="http://therighttrack.org.nz">http://therighttrack.org.nz</a>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ROAD SAFETY/POLICING - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATOC Liaison</td>
<td>IC,</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Whole population</td>
<td>Police have committed resource to a liaison role with Auckland Transport Operations Centre to identify and develop a response to safety risks that occur across the 220 km’s of Auckland roads, train, ferry, and bus stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC’s Ride Forever programme</td>
<td>SK Change in Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population – Motorcycle and scooter riders</td>
<td>To reduce road injuries ACC has programmes to teach new drivers, motorcyclists and people on scooters how to be safe on the road. ACC’s Ride Forever programme has everything you need to know about staying safe on a motorcycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivewith NZTA</td>
<td>SK Change in Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub Population Young drivers without driver licences</td>
<td>Drivewith NZTA helps young drivers build up their skills and confidence. It aims to give young drivers the knowledge to stay safe on the road and has tips for getting your learner’s, restricted and full licenses, as well as information if you’re teaching someone else to drive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VIOLENCE/CRIME PREVENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### VIOLENCE/CRIME PREVENTION - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YCAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whole population</td>
<td></td>
<td>YCAP is a multi-agency plan designed to reduce crime by preventing young people entering the criminal justice system. The opportunity is to engage with young people and their families at the earliest opportunity and coordinate interventions aimed at preventing further offending. To support this initiative 37 Youth Engagement Officers (34 Police officers and three employees) have been appointed across Tamaki Makaurau and operate alongside Education, Health and Oranga Tamariki.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassurance Policing Operations</td>
<td>Other - when required</td>
<td>Other - Specific group identified</td>
<td>Tamaki Makaurau employ reassurance policing tactics to specific communities who are vulnerable to crime increases. One such example was in response to an increase in robberies targeting Dairy and convenience store owners. Ongoing police visits to the proprietors were implemented with targeted crime prevention information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandhi Nivas</td>
<td>SK Change in Knowledge/Skills BC Behaviour Change</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Other – Specific offending group</td>
<td>Gandhi Nivas is an early intervention model/facility/service for male perpetrators of family violence. Initiated by the Counties Manukau District South Asian Advisory Board in conjunction with Police and a service provider, it is a multi-agency community approach to help men identify and address the root causes of their problems, reducing the likelihood of further family harm and increasing safety for families. There are now three facilities across Auckland providing this service. More than 1000 families from 19 different ethnicities have been helped. <a href="https://gandhinivas.nz/">https://gandhinivas.nz/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Policing Teams</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or sub population</td>
<td>There are 15 Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) in Tamaki Makaurau. They are small teams of police officers that work with communities in Neighbourhoods where people are particularly likely to be victims of crimes and crimes. <a href="http://www.police.govt.nz/about-us/programmes-initiatives/neighbourhood-policing-teams">http://www.police.govt.nz/about-us/programmes-initiatives/neighbourhood-policing-teams</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VIOLENCE/Crime Prevention - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Education, community engagement, advice, networking, Police liaison and victim support</td>
<td>Weekly coordination role</td>
<td>Individual, whānau and community level – street coordination</td>
<td>Police coordinated to support Neighbourhood policing teams. Activity directed at hotspots and older networks maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardens and community patrols</td>
<td>Community patrols – cultural knowledge and practices</td>
<td>3 – 4 days per week and evenings – as needed</td>
<td>Individual, community level</td>
<td>Māori Wardens are warranted officers regarding liquor offences. Community patrols are usually Police connected and in some cases police directed to areas of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pae Oranga: Iwi Community Panels</td>
<td>PC, IC, AO, BC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Te Pae Oranga (IwiCommunity Panels) is a Māori-led approach that provides an alternative justice outcome for people who commit low-level offences where it is not in the public interest to prosecute. The Iwi Community Panel concept emerged from local practice, blending restorative justice principles and practices with increasing elements of tikanga. It is a partnership between Iwi, community organisations and the justice sector. While the Panels follow Māori cultural practice and protocol they are available to participants of any ethnicity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Violence Policy development for council staff</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Working with Senior Solicitor Employment Relations, People &amp; Performance, to update policy to take account of the new legislation that is coming into force next year - giving staff impacted by domestic violence 10 days paid leave per year, and to redraft the policy into &quot;Our Voice&quot; format.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Shakti | Family Violence | Ongoing | Women, children, young people and families from Asian, Middle Eastern and African communities. | Shakti provides intervention and prevention around family violence. Services that are provided include 24/7 multi-lingual national crisis line, outreach social work, crisis response, specialist advocacy (WINZ, HNZ, immigration and legal representation), refuge accommodation, counselling and life skills and other safety programmes. Shakti also provides family conferencing, couple counselling, youth-specific social support in Auckland. Other Shakti social services include:  
  - Women's Centre  
  - Safehouses  
  - Shakti Education, Training and Advisory Company (SETAC)  
  - Women's Support Groups Website: https://shakti-international.org/ Email: scc@shakti.org.nz |
### VIOLENCE/Crime Prevention - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Patrol Group</td>
<td>Community safety</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Auckland wide</td>
<td>Founded by Rana Judge, manager of Otara Business Association. This group consists of patrolling wardens working in the community, assisting business owners and shoppers in the area as well as reporting suspicious behaviour to police. The group works closely with the Otara Papatoetoe Local Boards and Auckland Council. Contact: manageroba.org.nz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Ethnic Social Services Trust (NZESS)</td>
<td>Social services including family violence</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides a broad range of information and assistance for all migrants, refugees, and the general public. Services are culturally appropriate and often language appropriate, including: Family Violence Crisis Line 028 888 493 (24 hr) Family Violence Issues for Ethnic Men, Women and Children Information and Advocacy Services Family Services Team Parenting and Relationship Services and Programmes Website: <a href="https://www.nzess.co.nz/">https://www.nzess.co.nz/</a> Contact: <a href="mailto:info@nzess.co.nz">info@nzess.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VIOLENCE/CrIME PREVENTION - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Sikh Women Association</td>
<td>including support to family violence to South Asian migrant women and their families, particularly Punjabi community specific.</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Indian community in general but Punjabi/Sikh communities in particular are the main beneficiaries. Provides services only to South Auckland residents particularly in Manukau</td>
<td>NZSWA has a philosophy of accepting diversity while promoting a violence free community around South Auckland and is guided in its service delivery by the following objectives: Raising awareness of domestic violence to South East migrant families within South Auckland and Counties Manukau. Providing appropriate social services support, rendering quality service to victims of domestic violence. Providing valued and competent response service to crisis from victims of domestic violence. <a href="http://nzswea.com/">http://nzswea.com/</a> Email <a href="mailto:office@nzswea.org">office@nzswea.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce training for council staff</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Rape Prevention Education provided training to frontline Auckland Council staff on Dealing with Disclosures of Sexual Violence. There were seven sessions provided region wide and the sessions covered child protection policies, documentation processes, safety for young people whilst in Auckland Council premises and New Zealand laws on sexual violence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Programme List

- **Tulai Pasifika Youth Leadership Programme - Healthy Relationships Module**
  - AO, SK, BC
  - Education: increased knowledge by young people about protective factors and how they can be enabled.
  - Training by community development worker of young people about how to enact protective factors locally.
  - Modelling by young people as community mobilisers of protective factors in their behaviour.
  - Part of an 8 week leadership development programme.
  - Individual, whānau and community level.
  - The Tulai Pasifika Youth Leadership Programme is for Year 12 and 13 Pasifika students from across the three West Auckland local boards. A co-design approach with students to adapt the eight protective factor cards and inform the development of a new healthy relationships module. Students identify the protective and risk factors within their community that affect healthy relationships.
  - Supported by West Auckland Pasifika Forum, Community Empowerment Unit and Rape Prevention Education.

- **Ambassadors programme [south] boards**
  - Work and Income New Zealand employment project, host activity, information, security observation role,
  - 30 hours per ambassador per week
  - Individual community level – town centres
  - Work and Income employment programme for the long term unemployed / often older workers.

- **Power to Protect**
  - SK
  - Change in knowledge/Skills
  - Weekly
  - Neighbourhood or Sub population
  - Power to Protect aims to prevent the incidence of shaken baby syndrome (SBS) in New Zealand.
  - Education for parents and caregivers begins in birthing units, as well as in antenatal and post-natal care.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mates &amp; Dates</td>
<td>BC, SK</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population i.e. Youth</td>
<td>ACC leads and support violence prevention programmes to make sure young people and the people around them experience safe, healthy and respectful relationships. Mates &amp; Dates is a programme for secondary school students. It teaches young people healthy relationship skills and behaviours to help prevent sexual and dating violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atu Mai</td>
<td>SK, Change in Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Neighbourhood or Sub population - Pasifika youth</td>
<td>Le Va supports Pasifika families and communities to realise their full potential. It focuses on mental health, addiction, public health, suicide prevention and general wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Break-Away</td>
<td>Direct delivery by staff at approximately 6 locations. Teacher packs and uniforms, practical gear (lifejackets, goggles, boat, underwater gear, improvised flotation and rescue equipment).</td>
<td>2 holidays x 3-6 venues x 4-5 days</td>
<td>623 11-17 year olds</td>
<td>Holiday programme developing practical water competence for 11-17 year olds targeting Māori and Pacific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Communications</td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>100 plus social media</td>
<td>Water safety awareness and advocacy as per communications plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Early Childhood</td>
<td>AO, SK, EDC, Professional Learning and Development (PLD) with Early Childhood centre staff.</td>
<td>1-2 PLD sessions</td>
<td>92 sessions to 3500 children. Eight PLD sessions for teachers and parents.</td>
<td>PLD and resources for early childhood, parents and educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Gateway - Schools Year 11-13</td>
<td>Promotion and coordination of Gateway programme, Communication with School Gateway Coordinators. Delivery of water competence included as part of WAI Gateway programme: SNZ Swim Teacher Award, PLDC, Day Skipper Experience delivered by SNZ, CLM and CBE.</td>
<td>3-4 courses of one school term each</td>
<td>14 students from 10 secondary schools</td>
<td>Aquatic employment qualifications and water competence for secondary students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WATER SAFETY - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Land Based Fishing</strong></td>
<td>Workshops delivered by staff. Rock Fishing Safety brochures and Crab Fishing Safety brochures (multilingual). On site education by rock fishing advisors; fishing equipment.</td>
<td>2-3 practical and/or classroom workshops</td>
<td>250 individuals</td>
<td>Safer net fishing and rock fishing targeting Māori, Pasifika and Asian fishers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Lifejacket Hubs</strong></td>
<td>Staff linking with Pacific, Māori and New Settler communities to develop lifejacket hubs and run water safety workshops. Lifejackets and other resources.</td>
<td>One off education plus ongoing support</td>
<td>19 lifejacket hubs</td>
<td>Establish and maintain lifejacket hubs for Pacific, Māori and Asian communities through Pacific or Asian churches, Marae and community groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Lifejacket Loan Scheme</strong></td>
<td>Lifejackets - coordination of loan scheme.</td>
<td>Schools book lifejackets for 1-2 weeks at a time</td>
<td>44,854 lifejacket experiences via 40 educational institutions</td>
<td>Free lifejacket use for schools and community groups. Coordination and liaison with school age lifejacket loan hubs to collate use of the lifejackets in the hubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Māori Water Safety – Kai Gathering</strong></td>
<td>Water safety education in Māori settings delivered by Māori Aquatic educator - especially focused on waka ama and under water.</td>
<td>One off practical or classroom workshops</td>
<td>268 adults via nine presentations, 14 pool sessions, and four open water dives.</td>
<td>Development of water competence for Māori delivered through Marae or Māori stakeholder groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drowning Prevention Auckland - New Settler - International Students</strong></td>
<td>Workshops (classroom and on-site) delivered by staff in secondary and international schools.</td>
<td>One off practical or classroom workshops</td>
<td>20+ presentations to 665 students</td>
<td>Water safety for international students through secondary schools, ESOL departments, tertiary and English language schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - New Settler Refugees</td>
<td>Workshops delivered in conjunction with Red Cross as part of refugee settlement.</td>
<td>One off practical or classroom workshops</td>
<td>6 presentations to 120 refugees</td>
<td>Developing water competence for refugees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - New Settler Communities</td>
<td>Water safety education in targeting Asian and new settlers delivered by Asian Aquatic educator - especially focused on beach safety and crab / rock fishing.</td>
<td>One off practical or classroom workshops, or set of nine Women Only water competence lessons</td>
<td>506 individuals</td>
<td>Developing water competence for new settler groups and other targeted ethnic groups. Includes Women's Only Swimming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Promotions - Events</td>
<td>Team of Ambassadors deliver messages and resources through key regional events. Printed resources and giveaways.</td>
<td>One off direct engagement via 30 events</td>
<td>4756 direct contacts</td>
<td>Water safety promotion through key regional and local events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Patauanofo</td>
<td>Pacific Aquatic Educator delivers workshops in the workforce in conjunction with MEB.</td>
<td>One off workshop</td>
<td>209 employees</td>
<td>Water safety targeting Pacific employees through Health and Safety workforce development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WATER SAFETY - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Research</td>
<td>Research and Development Manager delivers research publications and outputs, supports evaluation of WAI programmes.</td>
<td>Eight peer reviewed publications,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of knowledge and expertise through research and evaluation to provide evidence and educational direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Schools Y 0-8 – Primary, Y 7-13 – Secondary, Tertiary</td>
<td>Registered teacher delivers PLD for staff. Water Sense Teacher resource (primary), in at Deep End. Teacher resource (intermediate), Wai Survival Teacher resource (secondary), and other resources.</td>
<td>1-5 PLD sessions. One/two practical and classroom PLD workshops for teacher trainees at UoA, AUT, MIT. 25,912 direct points of contact</td>
<td>Professional Learning and Development and resources for Primary School student and teachers to support the delivery of holistic aquatic education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Swim School Water Safety</td>
<td>Resources to support inclusion of water safety in 'swim' lessons. PLD for swim teacher staff delivered by WAI staff.</td>
<td>PLD for swim teachers</td>
<td>30 teachers</td>
<td>Swim school relationships, messaging, resources and PLD for swim school staff. Development of WaterSafe Swim Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - WaiWise and Wai Turewa</td>
<td>Aquatic educators deliver programme within community groups.</td>
<td>8-15 courses; 8-10 sessions per course</td>
<td>127 youth</td>
<td>Development of safer aquatic practices for at-risk Māori, Pacific, and Pacific youth. WaterWise 6-10 sessions (6-4x classrooms 4 x pools, 2.3 beaches/open water). Wai Turewa (1x classroom, 2x pools, and 1x beach).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Whānau Nui</td>
<td>Aquatic educator coordinates programme. Delivery by approximately 10 swim schools at 18 locations.</td>
<td>Five lessons each</td>
<td>1,220 parents and children</td>
<td>In-water competence programme of five lessons for caregiver and their child.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WATER SAFETY - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme List</th>
<th>Intervention Mode</th>
<th>Frequency/Duration</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Workplace</td>
<td>Courses from 2-3 hours to 2-3 days delivered by staff, developed specifically for the workplace requirements e.g. WaterCare, DOC etc.</td>
<td>Half, full day or two day courses.</td>
<td>543 employees via 39 presentations, four PPLC courses and six two-day Coastal Awareness courses.</td>
<td>Water competence development for employees specific to their work environment, or through team building development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning Prevention Auckland - Youth - General</td>
<td>Other water competence programme for youth developed and delivered as required by staff.</td>
<td>One off practical or classroom workshops</td>
<td>259 youth</td>
<td>Water competence development for youth through community groups and organisations (not included in other programmes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aktiv Auckland GAAAP</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>10 lessons</td>
<td>19,757 children 7-10 years</td>
<td>Delivery of swimming and water safety to school children by swim teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYF0O - Community Swim</td>
<td>Providing 7 free swim lessons plus pool entry, transportation and instructors, at no charge to Year 3 - 6 students from 79 primary schools in Auckland south each year. Children have 28 lessons over 4 years.</td>
<td>Seven lessons</td>
<td>20,000 + children 7-10 years</td>
<td>Delivery of swimming and water safety to school children by swim teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming New Zealand - Schools 0-8</td>
<td>Classroom workshops and poolside support.</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>600 teachers and 18,000 children</td>
<td>Professional development for teachers delivering Water Skills for Life to school children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming New Zealand - secondary</td>
<td>Classroom workshops and poolside support.</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>50 teachers and 1500 students</td>
<td>Professional development for teachers delivering Water Skills for Life to school children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming New Zealand - secondary</td>
<td>Course and assessment</td>
<td>One day course once a month</td>
<td>100 students</td>
<td>Training and qualifications for swim teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming New Zealand - Youth</td>
<td>Course and assessment</td>
<td>One day course once a month</td>
<td>100 swim teachers</td>
<td>Training and qualifications for swim teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming New Zealand - Under 5’s active movement in water</td>
<td>Classroom workshops and poolsde sessions</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>100 parents and 200 under five years</td>
<td>Education for parents of under five years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming New Zealand - Quality Swim Schools</td>
<td>Annual audit, staff training workshops, management support</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>20 swim schools</td>
<td>Swim school accreditation programme requiring water safety education in all lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming New Zealand - Royal Life Saving programmes</td>
<td>Training and assessment</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Approximately 100 trainees</td>
<td>Education for 14+ with 266SNZ awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastguard Boating Education - Safer Boating</td>
<td>Delivered by facilities and organisations who have undergone training and have an MoU with Coastguard Boating Education</td>
<td>One, one-hour session</td>
<td>36,000 children annually</td>
<td>National programme aimed at teaching primary and intermediate aged children how to be safer around boats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastguard Boating Education - Day Skipper</td>
<td>Delivered by any accredited Coastguard Boating Education Tutor or training centre, or the Online Day Skipper.</td>
<td>15 hours</td>
<td>2500+ annually</td>
<td>An entry level course designed to enable a person to safely operate a small recreational craft in familiar waters by day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Life Saving Northern - Beach Education</td>
<td>Full day programme targeted at school age children, taught by qualified surf lifeguards at the beach.</td>
<td>One full day (five hours)</td>
<td>17,000 primary and intermediate age children</td>
<td>Theory and practical surf safety education taking place at the Northern Surfclubs, developing skills and knowledge about the surf environment. Children experience the environment first hand and learn how to keep themselves safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Life Saving Northern - City Nippers</td>
<td>Introduces city based children to the beach environment and allows easy access to this education. Taught by qualified lifeguards.</td>
<td>5 x 2 hour sessions</td>
<td>600 5-11 year olds</td>
<td>Theory and practical surf safety sessions taking place at the Auckland inner city beaches, incorporates beach and water safety skills as well as surf sports and beach games in a safe environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make your home a safety zone programme</td>
<td>AQ, SK, BC, EC, IC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>Our focus is on creating child injury prevention awareness in the home. For water safety our focus is on home drowning injuries i.e drowning in and around the home (baths, buckets) and pools. Delivered via existing home visit programmes that deal with young children i.e. Plunket, Tamaki Ora, HIPPY, PAFT etc. The programme aims to promote home injury prevention related to children under ten years old with the focus on under five years old (in collaboration with ACC). Our target audience are Māori, Pacific and at risk families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme List</td>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Frequency/Duration</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy: Challenging changes to The Fencing of Swimming Pools Act (1987)</td>
<td>AO, EC, PC, IC</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Community Wide or Whole Population</td>
<td>The Act has proven to be a cost-effective legislation—drowning of children in home pools and spa pools has reduced from 10 to two per year. Safekids has challenged changes to the Act by making a submission, presented to the select committee hearing and making itself heard in the media to ensure changes will strengthen, and not threaten, the lives of children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
End notes:

1 Census 2013
2 Auckland Council Website
3 Demographics evidence report June 2018
4 Statistics New Zealand: Population Estimates
5 Informetrics: Auckland economic profile
6 Statistics New Zealand: international travel and migration data
7 Permanent and long-term migrants are people arriving or departing for 12 months or more. This data includes New Zealand citizens
8 There is a relatively large ‘NZ region not specified’ component in the migration data which is excluded from this calculation
9 Refer to page one of the Effective Strategies section
10 Quality of Life Survey 2018 Auckland Report
11 Compiled by NZ Police and Safe Communities Foundation New Zealand. Data current to 16 March 2017. Includes data for assault by ex-partner/boyfriend/girlfriend (these data not included in ‘victimisations for assault by family member’ data in previous years). Instances are excluded where, at 30 days after coming to Police attention, Police determine no crime actually occurred.
12 Compiled by NZ Police and Safe Communities Foundation New Zealand. Data current to 16 March 2017. Community locations include educational, health, religious, transport, justice, open space and public place locations and community locations not defined.
13 http://www.police.govt.nz/crime-snapshot
14 New Zealand Police: Crime-snapshot. Data as at 26 October 2018
15 Otago University: Injury Prevention Research Unit. IPRU data as at October 2018. 2011 to 2015 New Zealand Injury Fatalities, all injury, all intents, both genders, all age groups, all Auckland local boards
16 Otago University: Injury Prevention Research Unit. IPRU data as at November 23, 2018. New Zealand Injury Fatalities
17 Otago University: Injury Prevention Research Unit. IPRU data as at October 2018. 2013 to 2017 New Zealand Public Hospital Injury Discharges, all injury, all intents, both genders, all age groups, all Auckland local boards
18 Otago University: Injury Prevention Research Unit. IPRU data as at November 23, 2018. New Zealand Public Hospital Injury Discharges
19 ACC New Claims Data
20 Otago University: Injury Prevention Research Unit. IPRU data as at October 2018
21 ‘New and accepted’ fatal claims include new claims and claims which have ongoing support and/or services provided after the initial event.
22 Age-standardisation has not been applied to these rate comparisons
23 NZTA Crash Analysis System (CAS)
24 Water Safety New Zealand’s DrownBase™
Adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029

File No.: CP2019/01422

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To adopt the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council is reviewing its Regional Pest Management Strategy 2007-2012 to update the council’s approach to pest management in the region. The review has taken into account requirements of the Biosecurity Act reform in 2012, changes in pest species in the region, political feedback, community expectations, and the available implementation budget.

3. The proposed Regional Pest Management Plan (“the proposed plan”) was publicly notified for submissions in February-March 2018, alongside the Long-Term Plan 2018-2028.

4. The proposed plan sets objectives and rules to manage pests in the region, primarily to protect Auckland’s priority ecosystems and threatened species and primary production. The proposed plan relies on a variety of statutory and non-statutory actions to do this. These include enforcement, delivery of pest control by council, education and behaviour change programmes.

5. A total of 1,324 submissions were received during the consultation period. In accordance with section 75(2) of the Biosecurity Act 1993, Attachment B to this report sets out the staff advice for accepting or rejecting submissions on the proposed plan, grouped by submission theme. Overall, submissions contained a strong level of support for the proposed plan, except for cat management, where approximately 75 per cent of submitters were opposed.

6. Staff consider that most changes needed are minor and often technical in nature. These do not materially affect the overall nature of the proposed approach. Programmes where staff have made more substantive changes in response to the feedback received include parks, Hauraki Gulf Islands, possums and cats.

7. Existing council budgets and the natural environment targeted rate approved by the Governing Body in May 2018 (resolution GB/2018/91) provide for the implementation of a Regional Pest Management Plan similar in scope and scale to the proposed plan. However, the final approved total funding envelope (general rates plus targeted rate) is approximately 80 per cent of the estimated cost to implement the full proposed plan. To ensure the plan can be delivered within existing budgets it has been scaled back by:
   - reducing the original extent of parkland included in the Significant Ecological Area parks programme, to include 94 per cent of original on-park land and 36 per cent of original buffer land (see maps in Attachment D)
   - reducing the original extent of proposed rural possum control from all rural land to 50 per cent
   - reducing the original extent of proposed pest plant management in the Hauraki Gulf, while maintaining controls for moth plant on Waiheke, Rakino and Aotea Great Barrier.

8. Despite the above amendments, the final plan will still be a substantial increase on what was being delivered under the legacy Regional Pest Management Strategy.
9. Staff have made several changes to the proposed approach to cat management, to mitigate submitters’ concerns while still achieving adequate protection for threatened species. The main changes recommended are to:
   - change the term ‘pest cat’ to ‘unowned cat’
   - provide more certainty on cat control areas by clarifying that unowned cat control will only be carried out in rural areas with threatened species present
   - amend the ban on feeding unowned cats on parks to apply only to parks with threatened species present.

10. All changes by staff have been incorporated in the amended plan in Attachment A and are covered by recommendation (e) to adopt the operative plan.

11. Auckland Council is required to make several sequential resolutions to comply with the Biosecurity Act 1993 for the adoption of a Regional Pest Management Plan. A schedule of assessments against key provisions of the Biosecurity Act is contained within Attachment C.

12. In summary, the assessments demonstrate compliance with sections 72, 73, 100 (2), 74, 75 and 100T of the Act. Sections 72 to 75 relate to satisfaction with the consultation process, preparation, requirements and decision-making on the plan. Sections 100(2) and 100T require councils to determine the funding mechanisms for implementation and council’s capacity to be the management agency.

13. The Biosecurity Act requires the Council to make decisions on these requirements sequentially, which is reflected in the recommendations in this report.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendations

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) determine that it is satisfied that the consultation that has taken place in relation to the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 complies with section 72(1) of the Biosecurity Act 1993

b) approve the preparation of a final plan in accordance with section 73(1) of the Biosecurity Act 1993;

c) determine under section 100(1) of the Biosecurity Act 1993 that Auckland Council is the management agency for the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029;

d) determine that it is satisfied that the contents of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 meet the requirements of section 74 of the Biosecurity Act 1993;

e) adopt the final Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 (Attachment A to the agenda report)

f) incorporate by reference the Pest Free Warrant conditions for commercial transport operators moving people or goods within the Hauraki Gulf Controlled Area as part of the final Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 under part 6 of the Biosecurity Act.

g) adopt the agenda report and attachments as Auckland Council’s report under section 75 of Biosecurity Act.

h) determine under section 100T of the Biosecurity Act 1993 that the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 will be funded by a combination of general rates (approximately $85m over 10 years) and targeted rates (approximately $161m over 10 years);
i) delegate to the Chair of the Environment and Community Committee the power to edit the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 to correct any identified errors or typographical edits, and to give effect to changes to the final plan requested by the Committee at this meeting.

Horopaki Context
14. The Regional Pest Management Strategy 2007-2012 (still operative) was prepared by the former Auckland Regional Council and is the main statutory document implementing the Biosecurity Act in the region. It provides a statutory framework for the management of pests in Auckland.

15. Auckland Council is reviewing the Regional Pest Management Strategy 2007-2012 to update the council’s approach to pest management across the whole region. This review has taken into account requirements of the Biosecurity Act reform in 2012, changes in pest species in the region, costs and benefits of pest control options, political feedback, community expectations and available implementation budget.

16. The review process has involved iterative engagement and consultation with elected members, mana whenua, stakeholders and the public, including on a 2015 public discussion document. This early consultation informed the drafting of a proposed Regional Pest Management Plan.

17. At its meeting on 14 November 2017, the Environment and Community Committee approved the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan (“the proposed plan”) for public consultation alongside the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 during February – March 2018 (Resolution ENV/2017/162).

18. During this consultation period 1,324 submissions were received on the proposed plan. A summary of submissions is included as Attachment B. This includes feedback themes, proposed staff responses and recommended amendments to the proposed plan.

19. The next step is to adopt an operative Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 (“the operative plan”), taking into account issues raised through the submissions process.

Statutory process considerations
20. Auckland Council is required to make several sequential resolutions in order to comply with the Biosecurity Act 1993. At the 14 November 2017 meeting of the Environment and Community Committee, the council determined that it was satisfied that the proposed plan complied with the following sections of the Biosecurity Act:
   - section 100D(5) (defining the scope of review)
   - section 70 (requirements on structure and content of the plan)
   - section 71 (various requirements that collectively ensure the plan will effectively and fairly achieve the outcomes sought).

21. Following these determinations, the council is now required to make several sequential resolutions on the operative plan under this Act. These determinations which must be made to adopt the operative plan are reflected in the recommendations in this report. Staff advice on compliance with these statutory requirements is contained in Attachment C of this report.
22. The proposed plan contains over 400 pest species for control. Much of the proposed plan is structured around defendable geography and high ecological value sites, such as offshore islands, Hunua and Waitākere Ranges and other high value parkland. Other components of the plan apply regionally, but with delivery often prioritised to support high value sites.

23. During the consultation period a total of 1,324 submissions were received. This represents a significant increase on the approximately 400 submissions that were received on the 2015 discussion document.

24. The consultation feedback form included eight questions regarding the key structural elements of the proposed plan. As shown in Table 1 below, submissions contained a strong level of support in relation to these topics. A range of other topics were raised in response to a final open-ended question. Key themes included cat management and new bans of species which are addressed later in this report.

| Table 1: Submission statistics – Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan Questions 1-8 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Approach in proposed plan | Response to question regarding view of proposed approach | Approx count | Approx per cent |
| Q1 - Parks | Control and monitoring of pest plants and animals on council parkland with Significant Ecological Areas. Coordination of pest plant management by council, transport corridor agencies and private land occupiers through enforcement in buffers around parks. | Full or partial support | 582 | 58 |
| | | Full or partial do not support | 58 | 6 |
| | | Other/neutral comment | 366 | 36 |
| Q2 - Kauri dieback | Regulatory and increased hygiene measures to slow spread, particularly keeping kauri dieback out of currently non-symptomatic areas (prioritising Hunua and Hauraki Gulf islands). | Full or partial support | 587 | 64 |
| | | Full or partial do not support | 73 | 7 |
| | | Other/neutral comment | 264 | 29 |
| Q3 - Hauraki-Gulf Islands | Human-assisted spread of pests to Hauraki Gulf Islands reduced by a range of rules including mandatory pest free warrant programme for transport operators. | Full or partial support | 689 | 70 |
| | | Full or partial do not support | 137 | 14 |
| | | Other/neutral comment | 161 | 16 |
| Q4 - Great Barrier Island | Outstanding natural values protected by managing existing pests at high value sites and preventing new pests from establishing on the island. | Full or partial support | 560 | 66 |
| | | Full or partial do not support | 58 | 6 |
| | | Other/neutral comment | 236 | 28 |
Q5 - Kawau Island
Multispecies eradication of wallabies, possums, rats and stoats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full or partial support</th>
<th>586</th>
<th>64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full or partial do not support</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/neutral comment</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6 - Waiheke Island
Multispecies eradication of rats, stoats and feral pigs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full or partial support</th>
<th>545</th>
<th>65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full or partial do not support</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/neutral comment</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7 - Possums
Expansion of existing possum control efforts to entire rural mainland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full or partial support</th>
<th>592</th>
<th>67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full or partial do not support</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/neutral comment</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8 - Freshwater pests
Reduction of human-assisted spread across region.
Protection of two highest priority lakes (Tomarata and Rototoa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full or partial support</th>
<th>503</th>
<th>69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full or partial do not support</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/neutral comment</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. As Table 1 shows, for some elements of the plan (e.g. parks) a high proportion of submissions provided ‘other’ feedback or neutral comments. This is because the feedback form for the proposed plan did not specifically ask submitters if they supported or opposed the plan’s direction for each element. Instead it asked for open-ended public feedback. Because of this, many submissions did not specifically express support or opposition to each element.

26. Most ‘other’ comments were operational in nature and consistent with the approach taken in the proposed plan (e.g. emphasising the importance of supporting community groups when implementing the plan). Minor amendments have been made in response in some places.

27. In accordance with section 75(2) of the Biosecurity Act 1993, Attachment B sets out the staff advice for accepting or rejecting submissions on the plan, grouped by submission theme. The proposed changes staff have made for kauri dieback, Aotea/Great Barrier Island, Kawau Island, Waiheke Island and freshwater pest management are minor and do not materially affect the overall nature of the proposed plan. More substantive proposed changes made in other sections (parks, Hauraki Gulf Islands, possums, cats and new species) are described below.

28. All amendments to the plan described in staff advice below and in Attachment B are covered by the formal recommendation (e), to adopt the operative plan.

Feedback on parks and resulting amendments to plan

29. Expanding scope of approach: Many submissions requested that the proposed approach be expanded in some way. Common requests for expansion included expanding to all council parkland, Department of Conservation land, covenanted private land, or the addition of more pest plant species.

30. The sites included in the proposed plan exceed those for which such a programme can be implemented within the natural environment targeted rate. As such there is insufficient funding available to further expand council’s pest management programme.
31. To address this fiscal constraint, staff have amended the plan by prioritising sites for protection based on biodiversity value, current pest plant burden (i.e. cost to control) and social equity of access to well-maintained parkland across the region. The retained programme represents 94 per cent of the original on-park area and 36 per cent of the original buffer area. This is because selection criteria preferred larger parks with less edge relative to core area.

32. Maps in Attachment D show the comparison between the extent of parkland included in the proposed plan relative to the amended plan. Staff note that the available funding will provide for implementation of protection over the retained area gradually over the 10-year lifetime of the plan.

33. Despite the above amendments, the final plan will still be a substantial increase on what was being delivered in parks under the legacy Regional Pest Management Strategy.

34. *Legacy rules for pest plants on property boundaries*: The proposed pest plant rules around parks represent a change in approach from those contained within the legacy Regional Pest Management Strategy. Some submitters, including Federated Farmers, requested the retention of legacy rules requiring land occupiers to control gorse, woolly nightshade or ragwort along their property boundaries.

35. In respect to woolly nightshade and ragwort, staff have not changed the plan as such rules are neither technically effective nor affordable. However, in respect to gorse, staff have included re-instatement of a gorse boundary rule to apply only when the affected land is being used for commercial primary production.

36. Staff consider this is appropriate and affordable because gorse has a different dispersal biology to the other species considered. The amended approach will have relatively low cost to serve because it is limited to commercial primary production land (see Attachment B for further discussion).

**Hauraki Gulf Islands**

37. Staff have made changes to the pest plant programmes set out for the Hauraki Gulf Islands in the draft plan. These changes will ensure the operative plan is affordable within the natural environment targeted rate and address species-specific technical issues raised in submissions. Specifically, recommended changes are:

- Amend the moth plant land occupier rule to apply only to Waiheke and Rakino, instead of throughout the inner Hauraki Gulf as originally proposed.
- Remove Madeira vine and mile-a-minute from inner Hauraki Gulf site-led programmes.

38. These changes do not affect the management of these species on Aotea/Great Barrier, which retains its own separate programmes for each of these species.

**Possums**

39. The most common changes requested by submitters in relation to the proposed rural mainland possum control programme were for the programme to be increased beyond that proposed - either by inclusion of urban areas as well, or by extending the objective to eradication rather than suppression to low levels.

40. The proposed plan already contained a separate programme for urban possum control. As the two programmes are fundamentally compatible, staff have amended the plan to include a single mainland-wide progressive containment programme for possums, instead of the two separate programmes.

41. The extent of rural possum control has been reduced from all rural Auckland to approximately 50 per cent of rural Auckland. Because this reduced control is still consistent with the programme type in the proposed plan, no changes have been made to the plan to accommodate this budget reduction. The approach is also still consistent with council’s longer-term aspirations towards possum eradication.
42. Staff consider that an eradication goal is not affordable within the available budget. Therefore, the plan has not been amended in this way.

43. Staff will incorporate advances in control methods over the 10 years of the plan, to ensure the region is best placed to pursue eradication into the future. Collaboration with neighbouring regions will also be important.

Other issues – Cat management and new pest species
44. A final open-ended question provided an opportunity for submitters to comment on any of the other aspects of the proposed plan (such as the strategic section of the document or region-wide programmes). Comments were received on a diverse range of issues and these are summarised, along with staff responses in Attachment B.

45. Of the changes suggested, most are relatively minor in nature. However, the following paragraphs address two submission topics in more detail;
   • cat management (due to the number of non-supportive submissions received)
   • the inclusion of new pest species in the plan (due to its potential for creating a risk of a legal challenge from the nursery industry).

Cat management for biodiversity protection
46. Approximately half of all submitters (around 600) mentioned cats. Of these, approximately one quarter were in support of the proposed approach and three quarters were opposed. Because the consultation form did not ask a specific question about cats, the views of the other half of submitters who did not mention cats are unknown.

47. Key feedback themes among un-supportive submitters are outlined below, along with a description of how these concerns have been addressed by staff recommendations in the final plan (Attachment A). An options analysis for cat management changes is also set out in Attachment E to this report.

Feedback theme one: The term and definition of pest cat
48. Describing cats: Submitters expressed concern that the term ‘pest cat’ is offensive, inappropriate and may enable animal welfare abuse. Staff have changed the plan, so that the term 'pest cat' is replaced with 'unowned cat'. Staff consider 'unowned cat' provides the most clarity in terms of the person responsible for the cat, and is likely to be more publicly acceptable than some alternatives considered in Attachment E.

49. Defining unowned cats: The underlying definition in the plan remains tied to the absence of a microchip and accompanying registration on the Companion Animal Register. Alternative options for defining the cats to which the plan applies were considered by staff, including the legacy approach of ‘feral’ cats. Options analysis is set out in Attachment E.

50. Submitters were concerned that microchips may fail, endangering responsibly owned cats. The risk of microchip failure can be managed operationally (e.g. by advising cat owners to consult vets regarding reliable brands). The plan has also been amended to give cat owners the alternative option of identifying their cat with a collar showing the owner’s name and address. Owners also have the option of keeping their cats indoors during unowned cat control.

Feedback theme two: Spatial extent of proposed cat management
51. The proposed operational approach was to manage unowned cats at high biodiversity value sites, not region-wide.

52. Submitters were concerned that the proposal provided powers which would enable much more cat control than the stated approach of a small number of sites targeted to high biodiversity value. Submitters felt that new sites might be created at any time and they sought assurance that control sites would not be created unannounced near communities with pet cats.
53. Staff have amended the plan to provide more certainty on where cat management might take place. Areas for live-capture unowned cat trapping would be linked to the presence of threatened native animals (birds, reptiles or amphibians). Four options were considered as shown in Attachment E.

54. Staff have amended the plan to include option 2 (map 2), to strike a balance between protecting threatened species and mitigating public concern. This option would provide for unowned cat control to be undertaken only in rural areas, to protect any 'Threatened' bird, reptile or amphibian species.

55. The plan retains a small number of sites with a zero tolerance for cats. These are mainly pest-free offshore islands, and fenced or intensively managed sanctuaries for reintroduced species (e.g. Tawharanui). In most instances this is a continuation of current practice.

56. Prior to the start of any cat control communities will be extensively notified to ensure that cat owners have the opportunity to micro-chip or otherwise identify or contain their cats.

Feedback theme 3. Ban on feeding cats on council parkland

57. The proposal included a ban on feeding cats on council parkland containing Significant Ecological Areas.

58. Submitters were concerned that the ban on feeding cats on Significant Ecological Areas of parkland would result in adverse welfare outcomes for those cats. The ban was also seen as not being justified on ecological grounds, as submitters felt Significant Ecological Areas primarily reflect vegetation habitat value rather than presence of native animal populations.

59. Staff have amended the plan so that the ban on feeding cats on parkland is aligned with parkland containing threatened animal species instead of Significant Ecological Areas. Alternative options considered are set out in Attachment E.

60. This is consistent with the proposed approach to cat control outlined above and should mitigate submitters’ concerns about cat welfare. However, it will still provide an additional tool to assist in managing unowned cats where threatened species are present. This will protect council’s investment in threatened species management.

61. Further details in relation to these and other more minor proposed amendments to the cat management programme are addressed in Attachment B of this report.

Inclusion of new pest species in the proposed plan

62. The proposed plan included 55 plants and 11 animals that had not previously been classified as statutory pests in the Auckland region. This was because preventing the sale of potential pest species is an effective early intervention that can avoid future environmental impacts and management costs.

63. Submissions were received both in support and opposition of new species additions, with overall more submissions in favour than against. The total number of submissions (approximately 50) on this theme was relatively small, and the opinions of other submitters on this topic are unknown. However, People’s Panel research suggests that if people understand that a species could be invasive there is strong support for sales to be banned.

64. Submissions opposing new pest additions commonly cited the following reasons:
   • commercial value to industry (which for some species exceeds $500,000 per annum in the Auckland region)
   • value to gardeners, landscapers or pet owners (note that the proposal does not require removal of existing specimens, only banning sale of new individuals)
   • dispute relevance or quality of evidence for that species being a problem.
65. In most instances, staff have retained the approach from the proposed plan. However, staff have included a phase-in period for new pests to allow time for industry to adjust. The phase-in period has been set at one year for plants to which there were no objecting submissions, three years for short-form agapanthus, and two years for all other commercial species (plants and animals) (see Attachment B for further detail).

66. Staff will work with nursery and pet industries to assist with a smooth transition to the new framework. This support can include ‘plant me instead’ identification and promotion of non-invasive alternatives.

67. For a small number of species, staff have made the following changes based on issues raised in submissions (refer Attachment B for justification):
   - Remove dragon tree from plan in recognition of its value to industry, along with its endangered status in native range, and biological characteristics.
   - Amend regulation of *Furcraea* to allow for some species in this genus to still be sold. This will regulate the most invasive species but allow the main commercial species to still be sold.
   - Provide an exemption for two sterile cultivars of Taiwan cherry to be sold. These are not an invasion threat because they don’t set viable seed.

68. Submissions were also received requesting addition of further new species as pests in the plan including:
   - myrtle rust (approximately 30 submissions)
   - marine pests (approximately 40 submissions)
   - over 30 additional plants currently available for sale (approximately 30 submissions)
   - a further six animal species (including dogs, bird species and insect species) (approximately 10 submissions).

69. Staff do not recommend adding any of these new species to the plan at this stage. This is due to Biosecurity Act process requirements as well as general principles of consultation. Specifically, it would not be fair to introduce new pest plants at this stage which were not included in the draft plan, as other submitters have not had a chance to comment on their inclusion.

70. However, staff do acknowledge that some suggested new species are worthy of further consideration for management under the Biosecurity Act. Over the lifetime of the operative plan it is open to council to add new species through a partial plan review under s100D of the Biosecurity Act. Staff may schedule a partial plan review to address these and other issues within the next two years.

71. Further details on submissions and staff advice relating to new pests are addressed in Attachment B to this report.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

**Council group impacts and views**

72. Submissions on the proposed plan were received from Auckland Transport and Auckland Botanic Gardens. Staff also discussed the proposed plan with staff from Watercare. Implications of the plan for each of these entities and Auckland Zoo are outlined below.

**Auckland Transport**

73. Auckland Transport must comply with rules requiring land occupiers to remove pest plants. The proposed buffer areas around high value parkland are the most notable of these rules, although the proposed plan also contains a small number of other such requirements in rural areas. These rules will replace existing land occupier obligations under the legacy Regional Pest Management Strategy 2007-2012 (still operative).
74. Auckland Transport submitted in support of the plan overall and the Significant Ecological Area parks programme specifically. However, Auckland Transport noted implementation issues that were both financial and operational (e.g. where plant removal may adversely affect bank stability).

75. From April 2019, Community Facilities will take over responsibility for maintaining green spaces in the road corridor on behalf of Auckland Transport. The accompanying budget transferred from Auckland Transport is insufficient to meet all land occupier obligations under either the legacy Regional Pest Management Strategy or the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029.

76. Enforcement of the proposed parks buffer programme is intended to be phased in across the park network gradually over the lifetime of the plan. Staff from Biosecurity are assisting Community Facilities to refine estimates of the budget required to comply with the forthcoming plan. These will be available to inform annual plan decisions for 2020/2021.

**Watercare**

77. Watercare land in the Hunua Ranges and Waitākere Ranges falls within the Regional Pest Management Plan Significant Ecological Areas parks programme. At these and other smaller Watercare sites, Watercare must comply with land occupier requirements to manage pest plants. However, Watercare will also need to address actual and perceived risks relating to herbicide use within the catchments supplying drinking water to the region.

78. Rayonier New Zealand Ltd Matariki Forests (hereafter “Matariki Forests”) own a cutting right in Hunua, purchased from Watercare. Matariki Forests submitted to request kauri dieback hygiene requirements in Hunua be amended to ‘all practicable steps’ in recognition of operational realities which may make the required standard difficult for forestry operations to attain. Staff have retained the proposed rule as it stands, to be supplemented by discussions with Matariki Forests to agree conditions for an exemption.

**Auckland Botanic Gardens and Auckland Zoo**

79. Both Auckland Botanic Gardens and Auckland Zoo hold current or new pests within their collections. Both facilities offer excellent opportunities to educate the public about biosecurity issues. As is the existing case, exemptions can be granted to ensure that pest risks are robustly managed while also enabling these facilities to continue to offer quality education and recreational experiences.

80. Both Auckland Botanic Gardens and Auckland Zoo fall within the sites or buffers proposed for retention within the Regional Pest Management Plan Significant Ecological Areas parks programme. Staff consider that operational implications of this can be managed adequately through cross-council collaboration and phasing in of the Significant Ecological Areas parks programme.

81. Auckland Botanic Gardens submitted on some additional pest issues, such as inclusion of new pests, based on their technical expertise in plants. These submission points have been considered in the overall analysis presented in Attachment B to this report.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

82. Many of the programmes in the Regional Pest Management Plan are regional in nature and impacts will be similar throughout the region. However, some programmes focus on protecting high value ecosystems which are clustered particularly in Waitākere, Hunua and Hauraki Gulf islands. Therefore, these parts of the region will especially benefit from the investment (in terms of environmental and associated socio-cultural outcomes) but will also bear more of the costs (i.e. needing to comply with rules).

83. In October 2018 staff attended workshops with all local boards to present an overview of submissions on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan. Staff’s proposed approach for responding to this public feedback was also presented.
84. Local boards then provided formal feedback in November and December 2018 through resolutions at business meetings. The full resolutions from each local board are shown in Attachment F. Local board feedback was largely supportive of approaches recommended by staff, with the exception of the Waitākere Ranges local board which requested substantive changes to increase recognition of the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area.

85. Staff acknowledge both the national significance of the area and the particular biosecurity challenges it faces. However, staff also consider that the mechanism by which these challenges should be addressed is essentially the same as that for other mainland park areas (i.e. the parks site-led programme and region-wide progressive containment programmes focusing on high value areas). For brevity, staff have not repeated this approach in two separate sections, one for Waitākere and another for all other parkland. Staff have included additional text in the plan to more explicitly highlight the importance of the Waitākere Ranges and how it will be protected by the plan.

86. Local board feedback is set out in full along with corresponding staff advice in Attachment B to this report. Key themes include:
   - suggestion of additional sites for prioritisation of pest plant management on parkland
   - suggestion of additional sites for kauri dieback management
   - acknowledgement of the importance of high values sites on private land
   - requests for council to work with large organisations such as Housing New Zealand Corporation and Kiwirail to enforce land occupier obligations
   - requests for retention of the legacy boundary rules for pest plants
   - requests for herbicide or toxin use to be minimised.

87. 13 local boards provided feedback on topics related to cat management. All 13 local boards noted the need for more effective communications and engagement on this topic to address public concerns.

88. Five boards noted support for staff proposals for changing the plan to mitigate submitters’ concerns in relation to cat management as described earlier in this report. Six local boards proposed an alternative approach to cat management including using the term ‘wild’ rather than ‘pest’ cat, suggesting the programme only applies to feral cats and suggesting the programme only includes live trapping and/or non-lethal methods.

89. Two local boards requested further controls on cats including phasing out ownership of Bengal cats and mandatory de-sexing, microchipping and reflective collars on Great Barrier Island.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

90. Under the Biosecurity Act a specific purpose of a regional pest management plan is to provide for the ‘protection of the relationship between Māori and their ancestral lands, waters, sites, wāhi tapu, and taonga, and to protect those aspects from the adverse effects of pests’.

91. Kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) engagement has been undertaken with interested mana whenua in the Auckland region throughout the development of the plan, at multi-iwi hui and individually. Themes arising from earlier mana whenua engagement informed development of the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan including (but not limited to), the importance of building the capacity of mana whenua to directly undertake pest management in each rohe, the importance of education and community pest control and the need for the plan to be visionary and bicultural, reflecting Te Ao Māori and Te Reo.
92. Aligned with consultation on the proposed plan, staff attended the Infrastructure and Environmental Services Hui in March 2018 and the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum in April 2018. Staff also had one-on-one meetings (either in person or by teleconference), by request, with representatives from Te Uri o Hau, Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara (Ngā Maunga Whakahī), Te Kawerau ā Maki and Ngāti Maru.

93. Written submissions on the proposed plan were received from the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum, three individual iwi organisations (Te Kawerau ā Maki, Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua, and Te Uri o Hau), and Te Tira Whakamātaki (the Māori Biosecurity Network). Some common themes raised in these submissions and discussions included:

- requests for further expansion of pest management throughout the landscape in addition to the high value sites protected in the proposed plan
- requests for increased acknowledgement in the plan of the value of rāhui and other ecological customs and mātauranga (knowledge)
- comments on operational methods (e.g. toxins)
- requests for meaningful involvement of mana whenua in operational implementation of the plan, including opportunities for capacity building and economic development.

94. All written submissions from mana whenua, and corresponding staff advice, are addressed in Attachment B to this report.

95. As was the case for the 2015 discussion document, all headings in the proposed plan were translated into te reo Māori, as were all names of native species, and some key sections of text. A mana whenua representative has since reviewed all translations and provided additional translations where necessitated by new headings being inserted in the document in response to submissions. The operative plan will be updated with these translations accordingly.

96. Staff will continue to grow engagement with mana whenua as partners throughout the implementation of the plan and wider natural environment targeted rate projects. Opportunities to achieve Māori outcomes include:

- kaitiaki participation in advisory and governance discussions
- Māori leading the scoping and delivery of some projects
- a structured programme to build capacity and capability across iwi to work alongside council in their capacity as kaitiaki for the natural environment, potentially starting with rangatahi
- developing key performance indicators for targeted rate funded programmes that reflect mātauranga Māori perspectives
- iwi involvement in local environmental projects delivered in their rohe.

97. A strategic assessment is currently being completed to identify and further scope opportunities to integrate Māori outcomes into work programmes. The strategic assessment will enable council staff to work with mana whenua and mataawaka to develop a mutually agreed implementation plan for the targeted rate.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

98. Section 100T of the Biosecurity Act 1993 requires the council to decide to what extent it should fund the implementation of the plan from a general rate, a targeted rate, or a combination of both. In doing so, the council must have regard to the factors set out in section 100T(2). These address the extent to which it is fair to fund the plan from specific types of properties and rates (general or targeted) (refer Attachment C for detailed analysis).
99. Consultation on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan and the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 were aligned. This ensured that submitters could consider the programmes in the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan alongside wider council spending decisions, such as how much money should be allocated to hard infrastructure, libraries, and other public amenities.

100. Overall, public feedback supported Auckland Council making a higher investment in environmental outcomes. Accordingly, in May 2018 the Governing Body approved an additional investment of $311 million through the natural environment targeted rate (resolution GB/2018/91).

101. Based on the council’s decision to introduce the natural environment targeted rate, staff have developed a plan which can be funded by a combination of general rates ($85 million over 10 years) and targeted rates ($161 million over 10 years). Staff advice on the factors specified in section 100T is set out in Attachment C of this report.

Scaling back of elements of the plan
102. The funding provided by this targeted rate and other existing council budgets provides for the implementation of a Regional Pest Management Plan similar in scope and scale to the proposed plan. Some elements of the proposed plan do need to be scaled back to fit within the available funding. The council cannot adopt an aspirational plan that cannot be fully implemented, as s74(d) of the Biosecurity Act requires council to be satisfied that adequate funding is likely to be available.

103. As described above, staff have made some changes to the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan to enable the plan to be implemented within the available funding. These include reducing the number of parks included, reducing the extent of rural possum control and reducing the extent of pest plant management within the Hauraki Gulf.

104. Despite the above amendments, the final plan will still be a substantial increase on what was being delivered under the legacy Regional Pest Management Strategy.

Positive outcomes of investment in pest control
105. The proposed pest control actions described in the plan are supported by extensive cost-benefit analysis (Attachment D to CP217/23161). This analysis considered monetary and non-monetary costs and benefits of each pest species and scenarios for managing those pests.

106. Implementation of the Regional Pest Management Plan also has financial implications for green assets managed by council or other parties. In the absence of adequate pest control, the state of these assets will continue to decline, with potential for significant losses in the medium to long term. Such assets are of considerable value to Auckland.

107. The annual net flow of ecosystem services from assets protected by the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan is substantial (e.g. staff estimate $274 million - $424 million over the lifetime of the plan for Significant Ecological Area parkland and $390 million - $508 million for Hauraki Gulf islands).

108. Total economic valuation of the natural environment targeted rate overall (which includes but is not limited to implementation of the Regional Pest Management Plan) is estimated to have a net benefit of $734.2 million, with a corresponding benefit cost ratio of 2.8.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
109. There are environmental, legal and political risks associated with the review of the Regional Pest Management Plan.

110. Environmental: Continued investment at historic levels risks loss of species and ecosystems in the mid- to long-term. The Regional Pest Management Plan seeks to address this risk through programmes targeting protection of sites of high ecological value.
111. Legal: Section 76 of the Biosecurity Act permits those who submitted on the proposed plan to apply to the Environment Court within 15 working days of public notice of the council’s decision on the plan under section 75(3). The following matters can be the subject of an appeal:
- any aspect of the plan:
- whether the plan is inconsistent with the national policy direction:
- whether the process requirements for a plan in the national policy direction, if there were any, were complied with.

112. As set out in Attachment C, staff are satisfied that the requirements of the Biosecurity Act have been met.

113. Political: Pest management often involves conflicting value positions. Many pests, regardless of the magnitude of their ecological or economic impacts, may be prized by sections of society (e.g. as a garden plant, pet, recreational hunting or fishing resource, or for commercial gain). Public views may be polarised in relation to the acceptability of control methods, such as toxins or lethal control of animals.

114. In particular, the management of cats has drawn a range of strong responses both in support of and opposition to the proposals. A proactive communications and engagement plan aimed at locally affected communities will mitigate this risk. The amendments described in this report may also go some way to mitigating concerns. Regardless, a solution that is acceptable to all submitters is not possible to achieve. Staff consider that the recommended amendments to cat management in the final plan will provide a reasonable balance between ecological protection and animal welfare concerns.

115. Statutory: A National Pest Management Plan for kauri dieback is being developed. There is a risk of inconsistencies between this plan and the Regional Pest Management Plan. This situation can be addressed, if needed, through a partial plan review under section 100D of the Biosecurity Act.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

116. Once approved, section 75 of the Biosecurity Act requires a copy of the analysis report to be provided to every submitter, and that public notice of Council’s decision on the plan is made, including where the plan can be read.

117. Operational implementation will then commence. Staff will work with affected parties to enable a smooth and reasonable transition from the legacy provisions.
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## Attachment C - Biosecurity Act Assessments

### Section 72

(1) If the council is satisfied of the matters in section 71, the council may take the third step in the making of a plan, which is for the council to consider whether the council is satisfied—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment on compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) that, if Ministers’ responsibilities may be affected by the plan, the Ministers have been consulted; and (b) that, if local authorities’ responsibilities may be affected by the plan, the authorities have been consulted; and (c) that the tangata whenua of the area who may be affected by the plan were consulted through iwi authorities and tribal runanga; and (d) that, if consultation with other persons is appropriate, sufficient consultation has occurred.</td>
<td>(a) The Minister’s responsibilities are not affected by the proposed plan because no rules in the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan set out in Appendix A either add or remove any responsibilities affecting the Minister. (b) As Auckland Council is a Unitary Authority, no other Auckland territorial authorities have been consulted. Consultation has been undertaken with Waikato Regional Council with respect to the Hunua Ranges. (c) The tangata whenua of the area who may be affected by the plan were consulted through iwi authorities, as outlined in the analysis report contained within Attachment B to this report. (d) The proposed plan was publicly notified in early 2018 and feedback from that consultation is described in detail in Attachment B to this report. This is in addition to earlier consultation that was described in the Consultation Summary document (Attachment C to committee report CP217/23161) and was required by Council resolution ENV/2017/165. Staff consider that sufficient consultation has now been undertaken, as set out below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) In considering whether the council is satisfied as required by subsection (1)(d), the council must have regard to the following: (a) the scale of the impacts on persons who are likely to be affected by the plan; and (b) whether the persons likely to be affected by the plan or their representatives have already been consulted and, if so, the nature of the consultation; and

In November 2017, the Committee agreed that consultation undertaken to date was not sufficient as the general public had not had an opportunity to be consulted on the full plan. As such, Auckland Council agreed to publicly notify the proposed plan, so that there would be a significant opportunity for the public to provide feedback. Consultation was undertaken concurrently with the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 consultation, which was extensive and
(c) the level of support for, or opposition to, the proposal from persons who are likely to be affected by it.

resulted in a significant amount of feedback being received from interested parties. Staff consider that the positions of affected parties have been clearly elucidated through this process. As described in the analysis report contained within Attachment C to this report, feedback on the proposed plan was largely supportive, with the notable exception of the approach to cat management. Staff recommendations have been made to mitigate these concerns.

(3) If the council is satisfied as required by subsection (1), the council must apply section 73.

Please refer to the analysis on s 73 for staff advice on compliance with this provision.

(4) If the council is not satisfied as required by subsection (1), the council may require consultation to be undertaken on the proposal.

Not applicable – staff are satisfied as required by subsection (1).

(5) If the council requires consultation to be undertaken, the council must determine the way or ways in which the consultation must be undertaken, including, but not limited to, ways such as—
(a) consultation with persons likely to be affected by the plan or with their representatives;
(b) the appointment by the council of 1 or more persons to carry out an independent inquiry into the proposal on terms of reference set by the council;
(c) public notification of the proposal and the receipt of submissions.

Not applicable – staff are satisfied as required by subsection (4).

(6) After the consultation required by the council has been undertaken, the council must apply subsection (1) again.

This assessment has been undertaken above.

**Section 73**

If the council is satisfied as required by section 72(1) and is satisfied that the issues raised in all the consultation undertaken on the proposal have been considered, the council may take the fourth step in the making of a plan, which is to approve the preparation of a plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment on compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) If the council approves the preparation of a plan, the council must apply section 100 to decide which body is to be the management agency.</td>
<td>The council has applied s 100 to decide which body is to be the management agency. Please refer to the analysis of s 100 for staff advice on compliance with this provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Matters to be specified

(3) A plan must specify the following matters:

(a) the pests to be eradicated or managed:
(b) the plan’s objectives:
(c) the principal measures to be taken to achieve the objectives:
(d) the means by which the achievement of the plan’s objectives will be monitored or measured:
(e) the sources of funding for the implementation of the plan:
(f) the limitations, if any, on how the funds collected from those sources may be used to implement the plan:
(g) the powers in Part 6 to be used to implement the plan:
(h) the rules, if any:
(i) the rules, if any, that are good neighbour rules:
(j) the management agency:
(k) the actions that local authorities, local authorities of a specified class or description, or specified local authorities may take to implement the plan, including contributing towards the costs of implementation:
(l) the portions of road, if any, adjoining land covered by the plan and, as authorised by section 6, also covered by the plan:
(m) the plan’s commencement date and termination date:
(n) any matters required by the national policy direction.

### (a) the pests to be eradicated or managed are those assigned to one or more programmes in section 7 of the plan.
(b) the plan’s objectives are those of the pest programmes contained within the plan. Objective(s) for each pest in the plan are included in the corresponding programme(s) in section 7 of the plan.
(c) the principal measures of achievement for each objective in the plan are included in the corresponding pest programme(s) in section 7 of the plan.
(d) the means by which the achievement of the plan’s objectives will be monitored or measured are set out in the corresponding principal measures of achievement in section 7 of the plan and in section 8 of the plan.
(e) the sources of funding for the implementation of the plan are set out in section 10 of the plan.
(f) there are no limitations on how the funds collected from those sources may be used to implement the plan. These are available to implement all aspects of the plan.
(g) the council may use any of the powers provided in Part 6 as the management agency for the plan to implement the plan, as set out in section 2.1.1 of the plan.
(h) the rules are set out in the corresponding pest programme(s) in section 7 of the plan.
(i) the rules that are good neighbour rules are identified as such in the plan.
(j) Section 3.1 of the plan proposes that Auckland Council is the management agency. Please refer to the following analysis of compliance with s 100 in this regard.
(k) As Auckland Council is a unitary authority under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, no other local authorities are involved in the implementation of the plan. Auckland Council, as the relevant local authority, may take any of the actions specified in sections 6 and 7 of the plan.
### Item 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) A plan—</td>
<td>(5) A plan may include rules for all or any of the following purposes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) may provide for the payment of compensation for losses incurred as a direct result of the implementation of the plan:</td>
<td>(a) requiring a person to take specified actions to enable the management agency to determine or monitor the presence or distribution of the pest or a pest agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) must not provide for the payment of compensation for the following losses:</td>
<td>(b) requiring a person to keep records of actions taken under the rules and to send to the management agency specified information based on the records:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) loss suffered because a person’s income derived from feral or wild organisms is adversely affected by the implementation of the plan:</td>
<td>(c) requiring the identification of specified goods:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) loss suffered before an inspector or authorised person establishes the presence of the pest on the place of the person suffering the loss:</td>
<td>(d) prohibiting or regulating specified methods that may be used in managing the pest:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) loss suffered by a person who fails to comply with the plan.</td>
<td>(e) prohibiting or regulating activities that may affect measures taken to implement the plan:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attachment C

The plan contains the following types of rules:

- specifying, for the purposes of section 52(a), the circumstances in which the pest may be communicated, released, or otherwise spread
- prohibiting or regulating the movement of goods that may contain or harbour the pest or otherwise pose a risk of spreading the pest.
- requiring the occupier of a place to carry out specified treatments or procedures to assist in preventing the spread of the pest.
- regulating activities that may affect measures taken to implement the plan
- requiring the destruction of goods if the goods may contain or harbour the pest or otherwise pose a risk of spreading the pest.
(g) specifying, for the purposes of section 52(a),
the circumstances in which the pest may be
communicated, released, or otherwise spread;
(h) requiring the occupier of a place to take
specified actions to eradicate or manage the
pest or a specified pest agent on the place;
(i) requiring the occupier of a place to take
specified actions to eradicate or manage the
habitat of the pest or the habitat of a specified
pest agent on the place;
(j) prohibiting or regulating specified activities
by the occupier of a place if the activities are of
the kind that would promote the habitat of the
pest on the place:
(k) requiring the occupier of a place to carry out
specified activities to promote the presence of
organisms that assist in the control of the pest
on the place;
(l) prohibiting or regulating specified activities
by the occupier of a place, which deter the
presence on that place of organisms that assist
in the control of the pest:
(m) requiring the occupier of a place to carry out
specified treatments or procedures to assist in
preventing the spread of the pest:
(n) requiring the owner or person in charge of
goods to carry out specified treatments or
procedures to assist in preventing the spread of
the pest:
(o) requiring the destruction of goods if the
goods may contain or harbour the pest or
otherwise pose a risk of spreading the pest:
(p) prohibiting or regulating specified uses of
goods that may promote the spread or survival
of the pest:
(q) prohibiting or regulating the use or disposal
of organic material:
(r) prohibiting or regulating the use of specified
practices in the management of organisms that
may promote the spread or survival of the pest:
s) prohibiting or regulating the movement of
goods that may contain or harbour the pest or
otherwise pose a risk of spreading the pest.

| **(a)** Each rule in section 7 of the plan sets
out whether that rule applies generally
or to different classes of people, places,
goods or other things. |
| **(a)** A rule may—
(a) apply generally or to different classes or
descriptions of persons, places, goods, or other
things: |
(b) apply all the time or at 1 or more specified times of the year;
(c) apply throughout the region or in a specified part or parts of the region with, if necessary, another rule on the same subject matter applying to another specified part of the region;
(d) specify that a contravention of the rule creates an offence under section 154N(19).

(b) All rules in the plan apply all the time.
(c) Each rule in section 7 of the plan sets out whether that rule applies throughout the region or in a specified part or parts of the region.
(d) All rules in the plan specify that a contravention of the rule creates an offence under section 154N(19) of the Biosecurity Act 1993.

Section 100(2)

The management agency specified in a plan must be 1 of the following bodies; a department; a council; a territorial authority; a body corporate. In deciding which body is to be the management agency, the Minister or council must take the following into consideration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment on compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) the need for accountability to those providing the funds to implement</td>
<td>(a) As set out in section 10 of the plan, it is proposed that the funds to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the plan; and</td>
<td>the plan be sourced from rates paid by liable Auckland ratepayers. Therefore, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>council is the most appropriate body to be held accountable for the use of these funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) the acceptability of the body to-</td>
<td>(b) i. Funds to implement the plan are provided by Auckland ratepayers. Consultation on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. those providing funds to implement the plan; and</td>
<td>both the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan and natural environment targeted rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. those subject to the management provisions under the plan; and</td>
<td>indicates that there is strong support from Auckland ratepayers for the council to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsible for implementing the plan as the management agency; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Consultation on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan and natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>targeted rate indicates that there is strong support from parties affected by the plan,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the council to be responsible for implementing the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) the capacity of the body to manage the plan, including the competence</td>
<td>(c) Council has both the capacity and capability to manage the plan. Council employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and expertise of the body's employees and contractors.</td>
<td>and contracts have demonstrated this competence and expertise through the successful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 74

If the council is satisfied that section 73 has been complied with, the council may take the fifth step in the making of a plan, which is for the council to consider whether the council is satisfied, in relation to the plan prepared under section 73,—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment on compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) that the plan is not inconsistent with—</td>
<td>(a) The Regional Pest Management Plan contained within Attachment A is not inconsistent with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) the national policy direction; or</td>
<td>(i) the national policy direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) any other pest management plan on the same organism; or</td>
<td>The Regional Pest Management Plan is consistent with all clauses of the National Policy Direction, including in setting of objectives and programme descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) any pathway management plan; or</td>
<td>(ii) any other pest management plan on the same organism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) a regional policy statement or regional plan prepared under the</td>
<td>Council is not aware of any other operative management plans with which proposed RPMP provisions are inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management Act 1991; or</td>
<td>(iii) any pathway management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) any regulations; and</td>
<td>As there is no operative pathway management plan within the Auckland region, this provision is not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) a regional policy statement or regional plan prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991

The Auckland Unitary Plan Regional Policy Statement section B7 identifies that animal and plant pests threaten the viability of indigenous ecosystems and species. Regional Plan provisions further detail this threat, and identify that indigenous biodiversity should be enhanced, including through encouraging and enabling the control and eradication (where possible) of plant and animal pests. Rules generally permit without resource consent the removal of pest plants, and promote the inclusion of pest control measures as a condition of resource consent in appropriate circumstances. Provisions are also included to address marine biosecurity issues, in relation to...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (b) that, for each subject of the plan, the benefits of the plan outweigh the costs, after taking account of the likely consequences of inaction or other courses of action; and |
| For each subject contained within the plan, the benefits of the plan would outweigh the costs after taking account of the likely consequences of inaction or other courses of action. These findings are set out in the Cost Benefit Analysis accompanying the proposed plan, and that analysis remains up to date and relevant. |

| (c) that, for each subject of the plan, persons who are required, as a group, to meet directly any or all of the costs of implementing the plan— |
| As set out in the Cost Allocation Analysis accompanying the proposed plan (analysis remains up to date and relevant), staff are satisfied that for each subject, the persons who are required, as a group, to meet directly any or all of the costs of implementing the plan— |

| (d) that, for each subject of the plan, there is likely to be adequate funding for the implementation of the plan for the shorter of its proposed duration and 5 years; and |
| Staff are satisfied that for each subject, there is likely to be adequate funding for the implementation of the plan for the shorter of its proposed duration and 5 years. The council has implemented a Natural Environment Targeted Rate, which will provide $161 for implementation of the plan, in addition to $85m from general rates over 10 years. |

| (e) that each rule— |
| Each proposed rule— |

| (i) will assist in achieving the plan’s objectives; and |
| (i) would assist in achieving the plan’s objectives, because all rules have been drafted to align with the objectives and outcomes sought be the corresponding programme; and |

| (ii) will not trespass unduly on the rights of individuals. |
| (ii) would not trespass unduly on the rights of individuals. The council has undertaken the Cost Benefit and Cost Allocation analyses accompanying the proposed plan. This identified both qualitative and quantitative costs that may arise from the proposed programmes. Through these analyses, the council concluded that those costs are |

| boat hulls and structures in the Coastal marine Area. The specific threat of kauri dieback disease is identified, with policy and rules directing that works in the vicinity of kauri are managed to prevent the spread of soil and kauri plant material. Staff are satisfied that all of these provisions are consistent with, and complement, those in the RPMP. |

| (v) any regulations |
| Council is not aware of any regulations with which proposed RPMP provisions are inconsistent |
Section 75

(1) When the council is satisfied of the matters in section 74, the council must prepare a written report on the plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment on compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) If the council has received submissions on the proposal, the council must—</td>
<td>(a) Officer recommendations of reasons for accepting or rejecting submissions are set out in Attachment A to this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) set out in the report the council’s reasons for accepting or rejecting the submissions; and</td>
<td>(b) Following adoption of the operative plan, a copy of the final decision report will be given to every person who made a submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) give a copy of the report to every person who made a submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The report must give the council’s decision on the plan.</td>
<td>(3) The report will set out the council’s final decision on the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The council must give public notice—</td>
<td>(a) Following adoption of the operative plan, council will give public notice stating the council’s decision on the plan; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) stating the council’s decision on the plan; and</td>
<td>(b) Following adoption of the operative plan, council will give public notice of where the plan resulting from the council’s decision can be read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) stating where the plan resulting from the council’s decision can be read.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 100T

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment on compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) A regional council must decide the extent to which it should fund the implementation of its regional pest management plan or its regional pathway management plan from a general rate, a targeted rate, or a combination of both, set and assessed under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.</td>
<td>(1) In 2018 council set a natural environment targeted rate for environmental initiatives including those contained within the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan. The targeted rate applies to all ratepayers in Auckland. Staff recommend that implementation of the plan be from a combination of general rate ($85m over 10 years) and targeted rate ($161m over 10 years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) In making the decision, the council must have regard to—</td>
<td>In deciding to fund the implementation of the plan through a combination of general and targeted rates, both applied to properties throughout the region, council has had regard to the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) the extent to which the plan relates to the interests of the occupiers of the properties on which the rate would be levied:</td>
<td>(a) The plan relates extensively to the interests of occupiers of properties across the region, as the plan will prevent pest impacts across most, if</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) the extent to which the occupiers of the properties on which the rate would be levied will obtain direct or indirect benefits from the implementation of the plan:

(c) the collective benefits of the implementation of the plan to the occupiers of the properties on which the rate would be levied compared with the collective costs to them of the rate:

(d) for the regional pest management plan, the extent to which the characteristics of the properties on which the rate would be levied and the uses to which they are put contribute to the presence or prevalence of the pest or pests covered by it:

(e) for the regional pathway management plan, the extent to which the characteristics of the properties on which the rate would be levied and the uses to which they are put contribute to the actual or potential risks associated with the pathway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not all, properties. Therefore it is appropriate that the plan is funded from both the targeted rate and general rates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) As set out in the Cost: Benefit and Cost Allocation analyses accompanying the proposed plan, most, if not all, occupiers throughout the region on whose properties the rates will be levied, will obtain both direct and indirect benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) As set out in the Cost: Benefit and Cost Allocation analyses accompanying the proposed plan, the collective benefits of the implementation of the plan to the occupiers of the properties on which the rate would be levied outweigh the collective costs to those occupiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) As set out in the Cost: Benefit and Cost Allocation analyses accompanying the proposed plan, the characteristics of properties throughout the region on which the rate would be levied and the uses to which they are put contribute substantively to the presence or prevalence of the pest or pests covered by it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) As this is a regional pest management plan, this provision is not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment D: Maps of Significant Ecological Area Parkland

Proposed plan: All parkland containing Significant Ecological Areas (green), and surrounding buffer enforcement areas (blue).
Amended plan: Parkland retained in amended parkland programme (green), and surrounding buffer enforcement areas (yellow).
Attachment E: Options analysis for cat management changes in response to submissions

Feedback theme one: The term and definition of pest cat

1. Describing cats: Staff have changed the plan, so that the term ‘pest cat’ is replaced with ‘unowned cat’ to address concerns about the term ‘pest’ in relation to cats. Other options suggested include ‘uncared for cat’, ‘wild cat’, ‘target cat’, and the legacy approach of ‘feral cat’. Staff consider ‘unowned cat’ provides the most clarity in terms of the person responsible for the cat, and is likely to be more publicly acceptable than terms such as ‘target’.

2. Defining unowned cats: The underlying definition in the plan remains tied to the absence of a microchip and accompanying registration on the Companion Animal Register (or named and addressed collar, see below). This approach provides a clear black and white distinction which would enable management to more effectively protect native species as well as protecting the value of companion cats.

3. Staff consider the risk of microchip failure can be managed operationally by working with vets to provide cat owners with sound advice on reliable micro-chip brands and checking procedures.

4. Staff have also amended the plan to allow for other forms of identification, if owner’s name and address can be identified (e.g. named, addressed collar). Alternatively, owners can choose to contain their cats indoors during control periods, rather than identify them, if they prefer this method of keeping their pets safe.

5. An alternative to microchips is to revert to the legacy approach of applying the plan only to feral cats. This approach is inadequate in a highly populated region such as Auckland because:
   - it is challenging to identify a truly feral cat based on behavioural characteristics in a trap
   - many of the unowned cats that need to be managed to protect threatened species are stray rather than feral.

6. Another alternative is to apply the plan to all stray as well as feral cats. However staff consider that this may not be any more acceptable to submitters, as objection to the plan including stray cats was a strong theme in submissions. Again, it can be difficult to distinguish between a stray cat and an unowned cat in the absence of clear identification.

Feedback theme two: Spatial extent of proposed cat management

7. Staff have amended the plan to provide more certainty on where cat management might take place. Areas for live-capture cat trapping would be linked to the presence of threatened native animals (birds, reptiles or amphibians). Four options were considered as set out below and in corresponding maps:
   - Option 1 (Map 1): Unowned cats managed in rural areas only where ‘Endangered’ or ‘Critically Endangered’ birds are present, or any ‘Threatened’ reptile or amphibian species. No unowned cat control in urban areas.
   - Option 2 (Map 2): Unowned cats managed in rural areas where any ‘Threatened’ bird, reptile or amphibian species is present. No unowned cat control in urban areas.
   - Option 3 (Map 3): Unowned cat management in rural areas where any ‘Threatened’ bird, reptile or amphibian species is present (same as rural cat control in Map 2). Unowned cats managed in urban areas only if ‘Critically Endangered’ bird, reptile or amphibian species are present.
   - Option 4: (Map 4): Unowned cat management in rural areas where any ‘Threatened’ bird, reptile or amphibian species is present, and at sites containing five or more ‘At Risk’ reptile or amphibian species. Unowned cats managed in urban areas only if ‘Critically Endangered’ bird, reptile or amphibian species are present (same as urban cat control in Option 3).

8. In each option the criteria for urban areas are much more restrictive than those in rural areas. This is in part to provide more assurance to pet owners, and in part reflects that control of
unowned cats in urban areas may offer less protection to native species when there are still numerous owned cats in the area.

9. The maps which include a greater extent of live-capture cat trapping would protect a larger number of threatened native species. Option 4 also provides for more sites to be protected for any given species, thereby making them more secure.

10. Staff have amended the plan to include option 2. This provides protection of any 'Threatened' bird, reptile and amphibian species in rural areas, and does not include any unowned cat control in urban areas. Staff consider it strikes a balance between protecting threatened species and mitigating public concern.

11. Staff note that Shakespear Open Sanctuary is within the urban: rural boundary. However, this site is protected by a predator-proof fence and has an existing policy of zero-tolerance for all cats. Staff have retained this approach in the plan, as one of a number of mapped sites of outstanding conservation value with a zero-tolerance approach in the plan. This approach is supported by extensive engagement with neighbouring communities to ensure the protection of owned cats.

12. Staff note that there are some other sites of significant conservation importance within the urban: rural boundary, which will not be eligible to receive unowned cat control under the amended plan. Particularly, map 3 shows that there are four urban sites that are known to be home to Critically Endangered native species that are vulnerable to cat predation. Staff consider that council can still assist the protection of these Critically Endangered species by facilitating responsible pet ownership behaviours in nearby communities.

13. The level of cat control in option 2 may also be insufficient to protect iconic species such as Hochstetter’s frog, which is classified as ‘At Risk’ rather than ‘Threatened’. However, options three and four may be beyond the level of cat control that would be likely to be implemented in practice, and therefore risk unnecessarily raising public concerns in relation to more extensive cat control without gaining anything in biodiversity protection.

Feedback theme 3. Ban on feeding cats on council parkland

14. Staff have amended the plan so that the ban on feeding cats on Significant Ecological Area parkland is aligned with parkland containing threatened animal species.

15. This is consistent with the proposed approach to cat control outlined above and should mitigate submitters’ concerns about cat welfare. However, it will still provide an additional tool to assist in managing unowned cats where threatened species are present and protect council’s investment in threatened species management.

16. It would be open to council to extend this in the future to other areas via a partial plan review under section 100D of the Biosecurity Act if this approach proves inadequate to protect investment in ecological restoration at other sites. Further details in relation to these and other more minor proposed amendments to the cat management programme are addressed in Attachment B of this report.

17. Alternative considered include:
   a. Retain the ban on feeding any cats on Significant Ecological Area parkland, as in the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan. The advantage of this option is that it sends a clear message to the community that cat colonies in native habitats are not consistent with efforts to restore such areas. The disadvantage of this option is that it does not address submitters’ concerns regarding cat welfare.
   b. Remove the rule entirely, thus allowing cat feeding on any parkland. The advantage of this option is that it addresses submitters’ concerns regarding cat welfare. A disadvantage is that it reduces council’s ability to manage situations in which colony cats are maintained at sites that are being managed to protect threatened species. This would undermine council investment in species protection. Another disadvantage is that it conflicts with views expressed by other sections of the community (e.g. conservation community groups) who see cat colonies as undermining conservation activity.
Map 1. Unowned cats managed in rural areas only where ‘Endangered’ or ‘Critically Endangered’ birds are present, or any ‘Threatened’ reptile or amphibian species. No unowned cat control in urban areas.
Map 2: Unowned cats managed in rural areas where any ‘Threatened’ bird, reptile or amphibian species is present. No unowned cat control in urban areas. This is the option included in the amended plan.
Map 3: Unowned cat management in rural areas where any 'Threatened' bird, reptile or amphibian species is present (same as rural cat control in Map 2). Unowned cats managed in urban areas only if 'Critically Endangered' bird, reptile or amphibian species are present.
Map 4: Unowned cat management in rural areas where any ‘ Threatened’ bird, reptile or amphibian species is present, and at sites containing five or more ‘ At Risk’ reptile or amphibian species. Unowned cats managed in urban areas only if ‘ Critically Endangered’ bird, reptile or amphibian species are present (same as urban cat control in Option 3).
Local board resolutions in response to public feedback on the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029
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Albert-Eden Local Board

Resolution number AE/2018/335

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Albert-Eden residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) provide the following feedback on the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan:

i) request that Auckland Council should aim for Auckland to be a pest and weed-free city;

ii) support the approach that Auckland Council lead by example by managing plant and animal pests on council-owned land;

iii) support the identified priority parks and buffer zones mapped in the draft Regional Pest Management Plan;

iv) request the following additions to priority parks and buffer zones:
A) Significant Ecological Areas on private land as well as public land;
B) extension of the currently mapped buffer zone of Te Auaunga/Oakley Creek to cover Eric Armishaw Reserve and Selwyn Retirement Village in Pt Chevalier;
C) Waititiko/Meda Creek as a mapped priority park;
D) Significant Ecological Area in Gribblehurst Park, Sandringham as a mapped priority park.

v) request that Auckland Council work collaboratively with large landowners to control, contain and/or eradicate pests on their land, thereby minimising the impact of pest species across the region.
vi) support additional funding being used to work with community groups, and increase public communications and engagement;

vii) anticipate that Auckland Council will include community volunteer groups in decision-making about pest management in ecological areas within which the groups work;

viii) support, in principle, phasing out of sale of further plant and animal pests.

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Resolution number DT/2018/199

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Devonport-Takapuna residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) provide feedback on the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan based on consultation feedback as follows:

i. request that carp and eel grass be considered fresh water pests in the Regional Pest Management Plan.

ii. does not support the proposed plan to eradicate wallabies from Kawau Island.

Franklin Local Board

Resolution number FR/2018/175

That the Franklin Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Franklin residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) supports the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan.

c) recommends that the cost benefit of enforcing good pest management practices on private land should factor in the community good of the compliance role, not just the financial considerations, as there will be occasions where private landowners do not voluntarily control pest plants on their land.

Great Barrier Local Board

Resolution number GBI/2018/67
That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) receive the summary of consultation feedback from the residents of Aotea Great Barrier Island on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) delegate Member S Daly in discussion with other board members to provide its formal written feedback on the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan based on consultation feedback.

**Great Barrier Regional Pest Management Plan feedback**

Aotea Great Barrier Local Board provides the following feedback to the Regional Pest Management Plan:

Thank you for the acknowledgement of Aotea Great Barrier Island and initiatives in the plan designed to protect and enhance our special ecology.

We note the recommended changes to the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan based on the consultation feedback and would like to highlight the following:

- Pest Management cannot be successful without collaboration with mana whenua, community members, Department of Conservation and Auckland Council as it requires a unified approach. We need quality engagement and buy in at all levels.

- Feral cats are a problem for our island and need to be managed by best practice. We suggest that all domestic cats on and visiting Aotea be desexed, have a reflective collar and be microchipped for clear identification.

- Protection of the Hauraki Gulf vector pathway management is vitally important to our island and we are supportive of any initiatives such as the Treasure Island Ambassador’s education of visitors, and wharf and airport freight inspections. We request greater monitoring and enforcement options.

- We support community feedback that further research is an important component of kauri dieback management and are open to participating in any research programmes.

- We will support the inclusion of new pests such as myrtle rust, marine and freshwater pests through a partial plan review under section 100D of the Biosecurity Act.

- We support the retention of the Moth Plant eradication programme for Aotea Great Barrier Island.

**Henderson-Massey**

**Resolution number HM/2018/181**

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Henderson-Massey residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) support the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan based on consultation feedback.

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board**

**Resolution number HB/2018/202**
That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Hibiscus and Bays residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan

b) provide the following feedback on the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan (the Plan) based on consultation feedback:

i) note that most respondents from Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area supported the Plan

ii) support the increased control of pest plants and animals in parks and the intention to provide community groups with funding and other assistance to implement the Plan in our parks

iii) support the community feedback suggesting the need for substantial public communications and engagement to encourage landowners to recognize and voluntarily remove pest plants, supported by enforcement when required

iv) agree with the Plan’s focus on addressing Kauri Dieback, and further requests that more attention is given to Hibiscus and Bays Local Board areas that don’t currently exhibit symptoms of this disease in order to avoid the disease spreading in the future

v) support urban management of possum control in high ecological value parks, and strategically important urban areas

iv) request that cats should only be live-trapped, in clearly defined areas that have been widely publicised, and that any cats caught are checked for microchips and returned to their owners

v) request council work on a communications plan to address the need for micro-chipping cats and controlling their access to predator free locations.

Howick Local Board

Resolution number HW/2018/193

That the Howick Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Howick residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) note the boards feedback on the regional pest management strategy in Attachment A.

[Note – Attachment C has been included, as Attachment A to the report included the staff’s proposed changes to the plan, rather than local board feedback].

Attachment C: Howick Local Board feedback on the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan – August 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Proposed Approach</th>
<th>Supports Y/N</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>To continue management of cats in areas of high biodiversity value as part of integrated pest control but potentially for an increased number of sites. To provide greater certainty cats will be defined as pests in these circumstances if they are not able to be identified by microchip or other means as being owned. Cats will continue to be controlled on areas of public land where threatened species are being protected (regardless of whether they are owned or unowned). Example sites: the open sanctuaries and kōkako/kiwi management area in the Hunua Ranges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possums</td>
<td>Landscape scale progressive containment programme to manage possums. Rural management would be integrated with management in high value biodiversity areas. This could be achieved using a targeted rate across rural Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widespread pest plants</td>
<td>Site-led programme for parks with significant ecological areas (including coastal parks in the Howick local board area such as Mangemangeroa Reserve) to manage a suite of up to 30 pest plants per site to an extent that protects the values of the parkland. Includes use of rules in buffer areas around parkland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ban of sale</td>
<td>Phasing out the sale of approximately 50 new plant pests and 13 new animal pests in addition to those currently identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodents and Mustelids</td>
<td>Site-led programmes for parks with significant ecological areas (including coastal parks in the Howick local board area such as Mangemangeroa Reserve) and the Hauraki Gulf Controlled Area, to manage rodents and mustelids to an extent that protects the values of these places. Enhanced pathway management to protect islands. Sustained control programme for the remainder of the region focusing on support for community pest control initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More education around pests</td>
<td>Provision of information and advice on pest identification, impacts and control, and increased communications around pathway management for a suite of species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of community pest control</td>
<td>Provision of advice and support to community groups undertaking pest control, with priority given to activity in or around biodiversity focus areas and taking advantage of defendable landscape features such as islands and peninsulas. The plan will support the Pest Free Auckland initiative, which focuses on community empowerment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kaipātiki Local Board

Resolution number KT/2018/233

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Kaipātiki residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) provide feedback on the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan based on consultation feedback as tabled.

KAIPĀTIKI LOCAL BOARD FEEDBACK ON THE REGIONAL PEST MANAGEMENT PLAN

Pest management is an important issue for the Kaipātiki Local Board, with the community-led Pest Free Kaipātiki strategy being one of the key objectives its Local Board Plan 2017, specifically Outcome 2: Our natural environment is protected for future generations to enjoy.

The Kaipātiki Local Board:

• Supports the proposed approach in the Regional Pest Management Plan to pest plant management in parks (full support – 20%; partial support – 27%; partial non-support – 2%; neutral – 51%)  
• Supports the proposed approach in the Regional Pest Management Plan to managing kauri dieback (full support – 31%; partial support – 24%; partial non-support – 6%; neutral – 38%), noting that kauri dieback has been confirmed in some local reserves in Kaipātiki, compounding the urgency for efforts to contain the disease and prevent its spread to unaffected parks and reserves in the rest of the local board area
• Supports the proposed approach in the Regional Pest Management Plan to prevent the spread of pests to the Hauraki Gulf Islands in line with the views expressed in submissions from the local board area (full support – 51%; partial support – 17%; partial non-support – 13%; neutral – 19%)  
• Supports the proposed approach in the Regional Pest Management Plan to managing pests on Aotea/Great Barrier (full support – 33%; partial support – 25%; neutral – 42%)  
• Supports the proposed approach in the Regional Pest Management Plan to managing pests on Kawau Island (full support – 49%; partial support – 24%; partial non-support – 1%; neutral – 26%)  
• Supports the proposed approach in the Regional Pest Management Plan to managing pests on Waiheke Island (full support – 52%; partial support – 22%; partial non-support – 2%; neutral – 25%)  
• Supports the proposed approach in the Regional Pest Management Plan to the management of rural possums (full support – 43%; partial support – 31%; partial non-support – 1%; full non-support – 3%; neutral – 22%)  
• Supports the proposed approach in the Regional Pest Management Plan to the management of freshwater pests (full support – 53%; partial support – 25%; neutral – 22%)

Noting that local feedback has been largely supportive and in line with the regional response to the draft plan, categorised according to the following broad themes:

Pest plant management in parks
• The importance of working with communities/community groups. The Kaipātiki local board area contains one of the largest areas of continuous urban native vegetation remaining in Auckland and our community volunteers form a vital component of all environmental and conservation efforts through active and established volunteer groups such as Pest Free Kaipātiki and Kaipātiki Project. With 30% tree cover spread between public and private landowners in the Kaipātiki Local Board area, the importance of pest management to protect our green spaces is recognised by our community. During public consultation for the Long Term Plan 2018-2028, one of the local priorities we had suggested was greater investment into environmental projects such as the community-led Pest Free Kaipātiki initiative. This received the most support among our local priorities with 74% in favour, and just 9% against.

• The importance of protecting Significant Ecological Areas on private land – the Kaipātiki local board area enjoys approximately 540ha of local parks and reserves. Some of these are high in ecological value and have been diligently conserved and cared for by community volunteers. However, some areas of ecological significance fall on private land and require working with landowners to protect and prevent the loss of important species within them.

• The need for the ability to enforce weed removal on Crown land and land controlled by council controlled organisations. Officers will need the right tools for effective enforcement, and best practice examples of behaviour change programmes will need to be researched.

• Request that Wilding Pines be added to the list of widespread pest plants, noting that as a large percentage of our forest coverage is wilding pine, a gradual and careful strategy is required in order to prevent “gaps” in our bush, mitigate ground damage, prevent weeds from taking the place of the pines, and ensure adequate replacement planting.

• The importance of public comms and engagement to support the effort around the removal of pest plants in parks, particularly in encouraging landowners to recognise and voluntarily remove identified infestations on their property.

Kauri dieback

• Note that substantial pockets of kauri exist in our local board area, and kauri dieback has been confirmed in some areas

• Priority is to mitigate and, if possible, prevent the further spread of kauri dieback in our local parks and reserves

• Support for the regional process to mitigate and prevent the spread of kauri dieback through track upgrades and public restrictions, as reported at the 17 Oct business meeting of the Kaipātiki Local Board.

• Recognise existing knowledge gaps about kauri dieback management, and support further research alongside partner agencies.

Rural possums

• Support working with landowners and community groups for possum-control activity where practicable, noting that the Natural Environment Targeted Rate can be used to provide enhanced facilitation of community conservation groups

• Support the urban management of possums, particularly in high ecological value parks such as Eskdale Reserve and Kauri Park

Other

• Acknowledge that cats, specifically strays or unowned, are an issue in the local board area, and request that the ownership and sale of the Bengal breed of cats be restricted and eventually phased out due to their particular predatory threat to native
wildlife. The board is therefore supportive of non-lethal measures to manage strays or unowned cats in important biodiversity areas in the proposed plan. However, education alongside such efforts is needed to ensure community support, along with collaboration with organisations such as the SPCA. A gradualist approach should be adopted here, allowing reasonable lead in time for the public to adjust to any new measures will also be needed.

- Support for a multi-species eradication programme of wallabies, rats and possums on Kawau island, and a region-wide incursion response programme for the remainder of the region to protect the current wallaby-free status

Kaipātiki specific issues

Additionally, as per its 21 May 2014 and 26 July 2017 workshops, the Kaipātiki Local Board reiterates:

- Support the urban management of mice, possums, rats and stoats
- The addition of pigeons as a pest bird
- The need for an enhanced biological control programme focused on controlling an increased number of priority pest plants through the release, in greater numbers, of identified pre-existing and new biological control agents
- The ban of sale of approximately 50 new plant pests and 13 new animal pests in addition to those identified in the plan, given the ease of transporting prohibited plants into the Kaipātiki local board area, being situated in the heart of the Auckland region
- The need for the inclusion of Significant Ecological Areas partially or fully on private land in any site-led programme to manage rats
- The importance of community pest control to maximise the return on investment of council’s pest management efforts, given the established and well organised environmental groups present in the Kaipātiki local board area
- The importance of public education around pests to support pest management efforts
- As a general approach, the Regional Pest Management Plan should be flexible enough to allow for innovation informed by regular monitoring and evaluation. Evaluations should also assess the replicability and scalability of new innovative approaches, to allow the successful roll out of such measures in other areas. These will ensure available resources can be better targeted over time to maximise the efficiency, effectiveness and economy of regional pest control efforts.

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

Resolution number MO/2018/200

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) gives the following points as feedback on the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan based on consultation feedback:

i) the board supports the proposed changes.

ii) requests that use of the regional targeted rate for pest management in local areas is applied in consultation with local boards
iii) the board asks that three locations – Ambury Regional Park, Pūkaki Crater and Īōtuatua Stonefields be given priority in the plan implementation. The areas are of importance to the wider Auckland community and of significance to mana whenua.

iv) notes a further comment that only feral cats are to be considered as pests – those that have not interacted with human habitation. The general concern otherwise raised is to do with issue of stray cats.

Manurewa Local Board

Resolution number MR/2018/206

That the Manurewa Local Board:

a) receive the summary of consultation feedback from Manurewa residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) note the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan based on consultation feedback with the following feedback:

i) recommend that the pest species suggested by the board to be added to the plan be looked at again for addition to the plan once it is operative either through a partial plan review under section 100D of the Biosecurity Act, or as additions to site-led programmes.

ii) endorse the concerns expressed by the community about the inclusion of cats as a pest under the plan and the need for changes to how cat controls are described in the plan to address those concerns.

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Resolution number MT/2018/188

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan;

b) provide the following feedback on the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan based on consultation feedback:

i) endorse the approach that Auckland Council lead by example by managing plant and animal pests on council-owned land;

ii) endorse the identified priority parks and buffer zones mapped in the draft Regional Pest Management Plan;

iii) recommend that the Regional Pest Management Plan includes working collaboratively with or assisting large landowners such as the Ministry for the Environment, Ministry of Education, Housing New Zealand, Housing Land Community and Tāmaki Regeneration Company to control and contain pests on their land, thereby minimising the impact of pest species across the region;

iv) recommend working with mana whenua, mataawaka and community groups, and increase public communications and engagement;

v) advocate for pest and weed control undertaken by Auckland Council in compliance with the RPMP use sustainable and eco-friendly methods, for example minimizing the use of agrichemicals;
vi) recommend changing the term ‘pest cat’ to ‘wild cat’ and endorse the control of wild cats alongside community education and communication to ensure the protection of companion cats.

Örākei Local Board

Resolution number OR/2018/234

That the Örākei Local Board:

a) support the approach that Auckland Council lead by example by managing plant and animal pests on all council-owned land.

b) support the identified priority parks and buffer zones mapped in the draft Regional Pest Management Plan.

c) request the following additions to priority parks and buffer zones in the draft Regional Pest Management Plan:

i) Te Tauoma/Purchas Hill and Tauere/Mt Taylor as mapped priority parks.

d) request that Auckland Council work with large landowners such as the Ministry for the Environment, New Zealand Transport Agency, Kiwirail, Housing New Zealand and Ministry of Education to control and contain pests on their land, thereby minimising the impact of pest species across the region.

e) support Auckland Council in taking a proactive approach to enforcing the Regional Pest Management Plan as part of the Council’s statutory responsibility under the Biosecurity Act 1993.

f) support additional regional funding being used to work with community groups, and increase public knowledge through engaging communications and education.

g) support the addition of Myrtle Rust as a pest to the Regional Pest Management Plan.

Ötara-Papatoetoe

Resolution number OP/2018/220

That the Ötara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Ötara-Papatoetoe residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) endorse the proposed amendments to the plan (outlined in Attachment B of the report) in response to public consultation feedback.

c) request pest eradication along rail corridors to be prioritised in the implementation of this plan.

d) request Council to look at the use of herbicides and in particular glyphosate and how we can minimise potential health risks for our community

[Note – Attachment B has not been included in this summary because it consists of changes suggested by staff, rather than local board feedback]

Papakura

Resolution number PPK/2018/203

That the Papakura Local Board:
a) receive the summary of consultation feedback from Papakura residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) note the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan based on consultation feedback with the following feedback:
   i) recommend that the pest species suggested by the board to be added to the plan be looked at again for addition to the plan once it is operative either through a partial plan review under section 100D of the Biosecurity Act, or as additions to site-led programmes.
   ii) endorse the concerns expressed by the community about the inclusion of unchipped cats as a pest under the plan and the need for changes to how cat controls are described in the plan to address those concerns.
   iii) recommend easy to access advice, and if necessary, equipment be made available to make it easy for people to eradicate pests whether plant or animal based.
   iv) recommend Privet on berms and carriageways should be included in the plan.

Puketāpapa

Resolution number PKTPP/2018/236

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) note the deferral of the Puketāpapa Local Board feedback from the 15 November 2018 Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting was to enable members to consider the detail of local submissions.

b) provide the following feedback on the Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan to the Environment and Community Committee.
   i) support staff recommendations in response to some feedback from constituents disagreeing with the inclusion of cats as a pest.
   ii) note the increased importance of the Waikowhai Coast as a recreational area due to the large reduction of access into the Waitakere Ranges.
   iii) request that the Waikowhai Coast (and neighbouring bush reserves) be considered as a priority for regional pest management.
   iv) support the closure of the Waitakere Ranges due to kauri dieback.
   v) support retaining the proposed approach to the use of toxins in relation to rural possums and officer’s acceptance in part of urban management in high ecological value urban areas - especially in relation to the Waikowhai Coast.
   vi) support the management of rabbits through available bio control agents and advice provision.
   vii) advocate for strong collaboration with community stakeholders to target weeds and pests along the coast, waterways and maunga.
   viii) support community initiative pest management programmes to help eliminate pests.

Rodney

Resolution number RD/2018/146
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Rodney residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) provide the following feedback on the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan (the Plan) based on consultation feedback:

i) note that most respondents in Rodney to the consultation supported the Plan

ii) support the increased control of pests in parks and the intention to provide community groups with funding and other assistance to implement the Plan in our parks

iii) support the community feedback and request that the number of parks’ sites and community groups in Rodney receiving support be expanded to have the most impact on reducing pests

iv) request that the Plan retain the 20 metre buffer zone in rural areas on private land for the control of pest plants

v) agree with the Plan’s focus on addressing Kauri Dieback, and further requests that more attention is given to Rodney areas that don’t currently exhibit symptoms of this disease in order to avoid the disease spreading in the future.

vi) request that cats should only be live-trapped, in clearly defined areas that have been widely publicised, and that any cats caught are checked for microchips and returned to their owners

vii) request council work on a communications plan to address the need for micro-chipping cats and controlling their access to predator-free locations.

Upper Harbour

Resolution number UH/2018/145

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Upper Harbour residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) provide feedback on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan as outlined in Attachment C to the agenda report.

Attachment C: Upper Harbour Local Board feedback on the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan – August 2017 (UH/2017/119)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Proposed Approach</th>
<th>Supports Y/N</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>To continue management of cats in areas of high biodiversity value as part of integrated pest control but potentially for an increased number of sites. To provide greater certainty cats will be</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The board accepts that cats (feral, unowned and domestic cats allowed to wander overnight) are predators and cause harm to native wildlife. There are also a large number of SEAs of high ecological value scattered across the board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possums</td>
<td>Landscape scale progressive containment programme to manage possums. Rural management would be integrated with management in high value biodiversity areas. This could be achieved using a targeted rate across rural Auckland.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The board is supportive of a landscape scale approach being taken to possums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widespread pest plants</td>
<td>Site-led programme for parks with significant ecological areas to manage a suite of up to 30 pest plants per site to an extent that protects the values of the parkland. Includes use of rules in buffer areas around parkland.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Any site-led programme also needs to cover surrounding area partially or fully on private land if it is to be effective. Further detail is needed around what the approach would be in ‘buffer areas’. The board expects that our community volunteers will be included in any planned action to address pest plants on council land. The contribution of volunteers (both directly on parks and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

defined as pests in these circumstances if they are not able to be identified by microchip or other means as being owned. Cats will continue to be controlled on areas of public land where threatened species are being protected (regardless of whether they are owned or unowned). Example sites: the open sanctuaries and Kokako/kiwi management area in the Hunua Ranges.

The board is supportive of controlling feral and unowned cats in areas where threatened species are being actively protected. The board is unaware of any areas which would qualify as needing this level of protection in Upper Harbour. If this situation was to change the board would seek to engage with the community before any lethal cat control was employed.

The board suggests that a gradualist approach be taken so that controls are brought in overtime and gradually extended to all areas as community understanding of the ‘cat’ issue grows.
reserves, and indirectly through their ability to motivate and inspire others in the community) will help council maximise the rate of return on its pest management investments.

The issue of widespread pest plants on private land also needs attention. Pest plants on nearby private land increase the risk of pests spreading to parkland. This can be by creeping growth through boundaries, the production of seed in mature plants, or the unlawful dumping of garden waste on council property. While individual private gardens are small, collectively they form the majority of the board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New ban of sale</th>
<th>Phasing out the sale of approximately 50 new plant pests and 13 new animal pests in addition to those currently identified.</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>The board supports this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pest birds (pigeons)</td>
<td>Education and advice.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The board supports this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallabies (Kawau Island)</td>
<td>Region-wide eradication programme, comprised of two components: i. multi-species eradication of wallabies, rats and possums on Kawau. ii. incursion response programme for the remainder of the region to protect current wallaby-free status.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029
<p>| Rodents | Site-led programmes for parks with significant ecological areas and the Hauraki Gulf Controlled Area, to manage rodents to an extent that protects the values of these places. Enhanced pathway management to protect islands. Sustained control programme for the remainder of the region focusing on support for community pest control initiatives. | Y | In order to achieve a landscape approach to rodent pest work should be coordinated with pest control on private land. As such the identification of high value sites should consider proximity to volunteer projects on private land. |
| Kauri dieback | Exclusion programme with pathway management rules to prevent the establishment of kauri dieback in high priority kauri dieback-free zones, comprised of the Hunua Ranges and Hauraki Gulf Controlled Area. Sustained control programme for the remainder of the region with pathway management rules to prevent the spread of kauri dieback to healthy kauri throughout the region. | Y | The board supports further measures to prevent kauri dieback. Albany is considered a Kauri dieback red zone due to significant infection in Albany Scenic Reserve. However, there are stands of Kauri where it is not known if the infection has reached. Attention should be given to contain Kauri dieback where it is present in Albany to prevent it spreading to neighbouring forests in Okura and Kaipatiki. |
| Biocontrol | Enhanced biological control programme focused on identifying and releasing in greater numbers pre-existing and new biological control agents for an increased number of priority pest plants. | Y | The board would support the continued controlled release of biological control agents. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10</th>
<th><strong>More education around pests</strong></th>
<th>Provision of information and advice on pest identification, impacts and control, and increased communications around pathway management for a suite of species.</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>The board supports this. In developing strategies to undertake this work the council should consider the work being undertaken by volunteer groups in the Upper Harbour Ecology Network, and support it where appropriate. Specific note should be taken of the work of the Chinese Conservation Trust who is providing education to their ethnic community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The importance of community pest control</strong></td>
<td>Provision of advice and support to community groups undertaking pest control, with priority given to activity in or around biodiversity focus areas and taking advantage of defendable landscape features such as islands and peninsulas. The plan will support the Pest Free Auckland initiative, which focuses on community empowerment.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The board would not wish to see a priority being given to biodiversity focus areas and defendable landscape features to the exclusion of the wider urban area. The board expects continued regional support for this initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rabbits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The RPMP should consider the impact of urbanisation on rabbit populations. This has been seen at Hobsonville Point where large numbers of rabbits have been pushed onto Te Onekiriitea by advancing urbanisation. This is having a significant impact on understory of existing forests and efforts to reforest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Myna</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Myna are a significant concern within suburbs where native birds may forage. They are not as much of a concern within forests. High Value public reserves are declared pest free communities should be encouraged to engage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Myna control to support migration of wildlife between reserves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment F**
Waiheke

Resolution number WHK/2018/226

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Waiheke residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) provide feedback on the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan after further deliberation.

Resolution number WHK/2019/12

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) approve the feedback on the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan.

Feedback on Staff Responses to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Programmes</th>
<th>Submitter Suggestion</th>
<th>Proposed staff response</th>
<th>Staff recommendation</th>
<th>Recommend amendments to proposed plan</th>
<th>Board feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pests on parks</td>
<td>Suggest working with communities/communtity groups</td>
<td>The operational implementation of buffer rules around parks will involve a proactive communications and engagement component to encourage landowners to recognise and voluntarily remove pest plants, supported by rule enforcement when required. The natural environment targeted rate will also provide for enhanced facilitation of community conservation groups through Pest Free Auckland.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Retain approach from proposed plan</td>
<td>The board supports the staff recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest expansion of sites included in parks programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>The budget determined through the natural environment targeted rate does not provide for control and enforcement at all sites identified in the proposed plan. The spatial extent of the parks programme has been reduced to fit the targeted rate budget, with the highest ecological value sites retained. Enforcement is less cost-effective than on-park control. Therefore, the recommended approach is to prioritise on-park control, and extend enforcement only to highest priority sites.</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Reduce spatial extent of site- based programme to fit within the budget provided through the Natural Environment Targeted Rate</td>
<td>The board supports the staff recommendation to target the sites of highest ecological value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Item 10

<p>| Suggest public communications and engagement | The operational implementation of buffer rules around parks will involve a substantial communications and engagement component to encourage landowners to recognise and voluntarily remove pest plants, supported by rule enforcement when required | Accept | Retain approach from proposed plan | The board supports the staff recommendation |
| Kauri dieback | Support the closure of Waitakere Ranges | The proposed plan was drafted prior to the announcement of the rāhui and subsequent closure of the ranges. The operative plan will be updated to reflect these events. | Accept | Update operative plan to reflect the council’s support of the rāhui and park closures. | The board supports the staff recommendation |
| Suggest additional park or track closures. | High risk tracks have been closed within the Hunua Ranges, to protect Hunua kauri. At time of writing a small number of further closures have been made on the North Shore. The council may choose to close or re-open tracks over the next 10 years outside of the Regional Pest Management Plan framework. The operative plan will be updated to reflect park closures, but not all sites suggested by submitters may be included. | Accept in part | Update operative plan to reflect the council’s support of the rāhui and park closures. | The board supports the staff recommendation and supports track closures to protect kauri subject to all relevant formal approvals |
| Suggest further research, sometimes in conjunction with concern over lack of scientific certainty | The proposed approach recognises that kauri dieback management is challenging due to knowledge gaps, and that further research is an important component of kauri dieback management. The council contributes to research alongside other partner agencies including the Ministry for Primary Industries and the Department of Conservation. | Accept | Retain approach from proposed plan | The board encourages council to urge central government to lead on KDD research and divert council resources to managing KDD in the Auckland region and on preventing its further spread. |
| Pest spread to Hauraki Gulf Islands | Disagree with inclusion of cats as a pest (variety of reasons) | The Hauraki Gulf Islands are a globally significant sea bird hotspot. Over half the islands in the gulf are free of mammalian pests and are important sites for species.| Accept | Accept in part | The board supports the best practice control of cats |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment F</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggest public communications and engagement</strong></td>
<td>The operational implementation of the plan will involve a substantial communications and engagement component to encourage voluntary behaviour change to reduce pest spread to islands. Rule enforcement would be used as a last resort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accept</strong></td>
<td><strong>Retain approach from proposed plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not support use of toxins</strong></td>
<td>The Regional Pest Management Plan sets outcomes for pest management in the region but does not specify methods, therefore this submission theme is not applicable to the statutory plan. The council always seeks to use best practice methods which comply with all relevant legislation and minimise the use of toxins where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accept</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reject (not applicable)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotearoa Great Barrier</td>
<td>Suggest working with Aotearoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accept</strong></td>
<td><strong>Retain approach from proposed plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>Attachment F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greet Barrier community</strong></td>
<td>pivotal to this programme's success. Operational delivery of the programme will therefore include in-depth community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not support use of toxins</strong></td>
<td>The Regional Pest Management Plan sets outcomes for pest management in the region but does not specify methods, therefore this submission theme is not applicable to the statutory plan. The council always seeks to use best practice methods which comply with all relevant legislation and minimise the use of toxins where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggest Auckland Council collaboration with the Department of Conservation</strong></td>
<td>The council and the Department of Conservation have existing collaborative relationships at all levels from operational field staff to senior managers, and will look to strengthen and extend these relationships over the lifetime of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kawau Island Suggest working with Kawau community</strong></td>
<td>Staff acknowledge that working with the Kawau community will be pivotal to this programme's success. Operational delivery of the programme will therefore include in-depth community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not support inclusion of wallabies (variety of reasons such as animal welfare, heritage value on Kawau)</strong> Note that more than twice the number of submitters supported wallaby control.</td>
<td>Staff acknowledge that some people value wallabies on Kawau for their historic and cultural significance. The cost benefit analyses accompanying the proposed plan concluded that the benefits that can be expected from the proposed approach outweigh the loss of these values. The council always seeks to use best practice methods which comply with all relevant legislation and are as humane as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not support use of toxins</strong></td>
<td>The Regional Pest Management Plan sets outcomes for pest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waiteke Island</strong></td>
<td>Suggest working with Waiteke community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff acknowledge that working with the Waiteke community will be pivotal to the success of this programme. The proposed plan seeks to support the community-led initiative Te Korowai o Waiteke.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not support the use of toxins</strong></td>
<td>The Regional Pest Management Plan sets outcomes for pest management in the region but does not specify methods, therefore this submission theme is not applicable to the statutory plan. The council always seeks to use best practice methods which comply with all relevant legislation and minimise the use of toxins where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns that mammal eradication may not be feasible on this inhabited island. Note that over four times as many submitters supported the multi-species eradication approach.</strong></td>
<td>Staff acknowledge there will be substantial challenges associated with achieving rat and stoat eradications from Waiteke. However, Aotearoa New Zealand is a world leader in eradications. Many of our past eradications were thought unachievable at the time. Reinvasion can also be successfully managed, as demonstrated by Rangitoto and Motutapu islands which receive over 100,000 visitors per year yet remain mammal-free.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshwater pests</th>
<th>Suggest freshwater management should focus on management of sediment and other pollutants</th>
<th>Management of freshwater pollutants falls outside the scope of the Regional Pest Management Plan.</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Retain approach from proposed plan</th>
<th>The board supports the staff recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggest additional sites for management</td>
<td>The budget determined through the natural environment targeted rate does not provide for an increase in control beyond that provided for in the proposed plan. Community activity at other freshwater sites will instead be supported primarily through the Pest Free Auckland initiative. Site selection was based on a combination of ecological priority, existing community activity and ability to manage other pressures at the site, such as nutrient enrichment.</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Retain approach from proposed plan</td>
<td>The board supports the staff recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest new species</td>
<td>For species that were not included in the proposed plan, it is not possible for the council to include new pests in the final plan at this stage (see below in ‘other’ section for further explanation). Some species were included in the proposed plan at a regional level but not in the site-led programme due to their current absence from those sites. In some cases it may be useful to add species to the site-led programme, even if they are not currently at those sites, to support potential future management in case of incursions.</td>
<td>Accept in part</td>
<td>Consider additional species for inclusion in site-led programme</td>
<td>The board supports the staff recommendation and wants expansion around high value sites to include invasive species such as moth-plant, rhannus, climbing asparagus, tradescantia and Japanese honeysuckle. There must be recognition of prior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Disagree with inclusion of cats as a pest (variety of reasons including animal welfare, concern over implications for companion animals).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | Many submitters expressed concerns regarding risks to pet cats. In many instances these are perceived rather than actual risks, with submitters assuming much more extensive cat control than is likely in practice. In addition, the council always seeks to use best practice methods which comply with all relevant legislation and guidance provided by the SPCA, Ministry of Primary Industries and the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee. While staff consider the approach set out in the proposed plan remains sound, staff are exploring options for mitigating these concerns in the wording of the final plan. | Accept in part | Staff are not recommending any changes to the current proposed methods. Staff are considering changes to how these controls are described, in particular:  
• the possibility to refer to unowned cats rather than pest cats;  
• ways in which the spatial extent of the proposed approach can be clarified. | The board will give final feedback when final wording is confirmed. The board supports the best practice control of cats whether owned or unowned. In areas of high biodiversity value, the board recommends continuous improvement of trapping procedures. |

| Suggest add new pest (included myrtle rust, marine pests, additional pest plants and animals) | It is not open to the council to insert a new pest in the final plan now. This is due to Biosecurity Act process requirements as well as general principles of consultation. Following adoption of the operative plan, it is open to the council to add new species during the lifetime of the plan through a partial plan review under section 100D of the Biosecurity Act. | Reject | Retain approach from proposed plan | The board supports the staff recommendation and further recommends that council add new pest species as they arise. |

**Additional substantive changes to plan**

Table 2 below highlights other substantive changes that may be required to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan to fit within the available budget provided by the Natural Environment Targeted Rate, or in response to submissions (these points are not covered above as they did not receive a large amount of public feedback). Less significant changes may be required as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff work through submissions.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pests on parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Some of the suggested parks may have merit for inclusion in the plan to ensure parks are comprehensively protected from pest plant impacts. Further work is required to review suggestions and to recommend possible additions. It is not open to the council to add new species which were not included in the proposed plan, but in some instances it may be possible to add species to the site-led programme.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amend buffer boundaries to incorporate small pockets of land that are encircled by buffers but do not fall within 500m of any surrounding park</strong></td>
<td><strong>Staff acknowledge, for simplicity of understanding by affected communities as well as operational completeness, that it is preferable to avoid situations where small areas of land are excluded from encircling buffers, such as Huia and Piha.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pest spread to Hauraki Gulf Islands</strong></td>
<td><strong>Suggest moth plant be eradicated from the Hauraki Gulf</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The budget determined through the natural environment targeted rate does not provide sufficient funding for enforcement of the proposed Hauraki Gulf landowner rule for moth plant. This species will therefore be managed through a non-regulatory approach on islands. Exceptions to this are the retention of eradication programme on Aotea Great Barrier, and sites which fall within buffer areas around priority parkland.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Waitākere Ranges

**Resolution number WTK/2018/159**

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Waitākere Ranges residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) delegate authority to provide feedback on the draft Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan to Deputy Chair S Toms and Member S Coney.

**Feedback on Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan from Waitākere Ranges Local Board**

1. **Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008**

   The Waitakere Ranges Local Board area covers almost all of the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area which was established by statute in 2008. The Act puts particular responsibility on to Auckland Council to implement the Act and make decisions consistently with it. Consequently the Board has a particular responsibility to ensure that the needs of the area are met in any Auckland Council plan or policy.

   The Act recognises that the Waitakere Ranges are unique in New Zealand. The Local Board area is over 80% native vegetation cover, and contains 40% of the native vegetation in the region. It is close to a rapidly growing urban area, has a temperate climate and a rainfall that
is 40% higher than the rest of Auckland. The damage caused by kauri die-back should serve as an alert to the harm that can be caused by biosecurity risks, and the challenges of managing these in close proximity to a large centre of population.

The Local Board was expecting that the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan would recognise this context and provide a fit-for-purpose framework for managing biosecurity risks in the Ranges. This submission restates that we do not believe that the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan will “protect, restore and enhance” the eco-systems, landscapes and other heritage features of the Heritage Area as required by Section 8a of the Act. Neither do we think the site-led approach – with whole are considered when decisions are made...”

Section 22 of the Act states that “particular regard” needs to be given to the Act when making decisions under the Biosecurity Act, but we cannot see that this has been done.

**Waitakere Ranges Local Board is seeking that the Plan contains a special Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area “programme” or “zone” with stronger rules that recognise the national significance of the area and the biosecurity challenges it faces.**

The previous Regional Pest Management Strategy 2007-2012 contained a Waitakere Ranges Weed Control Zone with specific rules to strengthen pest plant control in the area. This was adopted prior to the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 which requires an even more stringent approach from Council.

The Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act is a stronger piece of legislation than the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act; yet the Hauraki Gulf is provided with greater protection in the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan than the Waitakere Ranges. While the Hauraki Gulf has particular programmes in the Plan, the only rule for the Waitakere Ranges is for feral goats. Feral pigs, mustelids and rats are to be eradicated by Auckland Council on Waiheke Island and Kawau Island – which is DOC estate – but only controlled in the Waitakere Ranges which are principally owned by Auckland Council.

We are disappointed that the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area is essentially treated the same as any other area of Auckland (see Table 2, 3 and 4)

In particular, the Board is concerned that the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan is softer than the existing Regional Pest Management Strategy as regards roading authorities and management of road corridors. The previous strategy had specific rules for roading authorities (and rail corridor manager and quarry operators) which recognised their roles as pest plant vectors (Section 18 Vector Control Programmes). This approach is absent from the proposed Plan. Control of pest plants in the road corridors is already a huge problem in our area where lack of pest plant control and over-use of the flail mower has resulted in weeds (in particular climbing asparagus, agapanthus and Japanese Honeysuckle) spreading along the road corridors.

**The Waitakere Ranges Local Board asks that the Regional Pest Management Plan recognises the roles of vectors of pest plants such as roading authorities and sets and enforces rules that prevent this.**

The Waitakere Ranges Local Board has a Waitakere Ranges Strategic Weed Management Plan but this is not mentioned. This Plan has been adopted by the Board and this Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan should have said how it would implement that plan.

Overall, the Board’s concerns would be met by the inclusion of a specific Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area programme or Zone with stronger rules for pest animals and plants as discussed below.
2. Site-led approach

3.1 This Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan has adopted a site-led approach “aligned to the region’s areas of highest biodiversity and defendable geography”.

However, the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act gives value and status to the whole Heritage Area, not just parts of it. In this respect the site-led approach is at odds with the requirements of the Heritage Area Act. The Act requires Council to “restore and enhance” and to “provide opportunities for ecological restoration”, and to treat the Ranges as a “continuous area” so that selecting sites that are at present of the “highest biodiversity value” only, is not consistent with the Act.

The proposed plan does not contain any discussion of weaknesses of the site-led approach, experience with site-led approaches in other places, or the implications for the long term of abandoning pest control in areas not deemed of highest biodiversity. What do eco-systems look like in the future if this approach is adopted? The case for adopting this approach is not strongly put.

One obvious weakness is for pest animals and we note that in 3.2.9 it is decided to adopt a Landscape-wide approach for possums to reduce reinvasion from surrounding uncontrolled areas.

The same argument might be applied to other animals pests and plant pests that are spread through distribution of seed by birds or wind, or a disease such as kauri dieback.

The Board also contests the 500 metre rule applied through the Plan. There does not seem to be a strong evidence basis for this as it is well known many birds fly greater distances than 500 metres.

This Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan does not take into account that roads play important roles in taking people through scenic areas, thus providing tourism benefits. It is important that roading authorities control pest plants in road corridors to preserve these aspects as well as to prevent spread into adjoining parkland. As well, controlling pest plants aids stormwater management and helps prevent flooding.

The site-led approach of requiring pest control by only where pest control is occurring on adjacent parkland, consigns large amounts of roadway bordering parkland to future week infestation. This would be a great backward step given the effort that has already gone in.

If the Regional Pest Management Plan continues with a site-led approach, the Local Board requests that the whole of the Heritage Area is deemed to be a “site” with a strong set of rules attached to it. This would avoid the fragmentation inherent when a site is a small unit.

3. Stronger rules in Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area

The Waitakere Ranges Local Board believes that the following pest plants and animal pests should be given stronger rules within the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan to control and if possible eradicate them within the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area.

The Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan should outline steps that need to be taken to prevent the spread of these particular weeds within the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area. We also believe that some pest animals need stronger rules – in part, because of their possible role as vectors for kauri die-back.

Please note that this list is not exclusive.
7.5.2.1 – Agapanthus
The Board dislikes the general approach of requiring owners of transport corridors (OTCs) to only manage ecological weeds near parks being managed for agapanthus. An owner of a transport corridor should control agapanthus everywhere. Otherwise this rule is very limited and OTCs do not have to control where a park is not currently being controlled for agapanthus or where control is taking place on adjoining private property.

Control by cutting off seed heads is also not satisfactory as agapanthus spreads by multiplication and spread, as well as seed, and flail mowing does not set a good community example. The same comment applies to Formosa lily.

The approach also allows agapanthus to remain in public parks when it should be controlled.

7.5.2.3 Climbing asparagus
The phrase “and where Auckland Council has undertaken initial control on that land” should be deleted. That is a disincentive to land owners agreeing to take part in the Waitakere Ranges Local Board climbing asparagus programme: the responsibility should be absolute.

7.5.2.8 Moth Plant
Local Board believes that owners should have a duty to remove anywhere in the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area.

7.5.2.11 Wild Ginger
Local Board does not believe this rule is sufficient within the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area.

7.5.2.12 Woolly nightshade
Local Board believes this should be anywhere in Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area.
4. Site-led pest plants managed on park only 7.5.3

The Waitakere Ranges Local Board believes this approach is insufficient for the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area and would lead to widespread spread of pest plants within private property and road corridors and consequently the potential to reinvade parks.

In the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area the privately owned land is contiguous with parks over many kilometres and in effect the forest in indistinguishable. It is not possible to protect parkland without setting rules for the buffering private property or roads.

Many of the weeds listed here are highly ecologically damaging and there should be every encouragement to control them on private property. As examples: alligator weed, boneseed, blue morning glory, boxthorn, Arundo grass, pampas, Japanese honeysuckle.

It is particularly foolhardy to include pampas in this category. Pampas seeds can fly many kilometres and the ARC put huge effort into a south-west to north-east sweep which was not completed at amalgamation. Pampas seed gets into rocky gullies and cliffs and is then very difficult to control without the expense of using helicopters. The Board believes pampas should be listed in 7.5.2.

5. Gorse

The rules for gorse have been substantially weakened from the Regional Pest Management Strategy. Gorse in roadsides in the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area has been well controlled for that last 15 years, and this was continued by Auckland Transport since amalgamation. It would be a tragedy for that good work to be abandoned when keeping it up at present is not a big job.

There also need to be rules for control of gorse in parks. There are large tracts of gorse in regional parkland sometimes near tracks, that pose a particular fire risk in our area, and there should be requirements for Council to remove these and revegetate, which would improve habitat for native fauna as well.

A reinstatement of the “boundary control” rule for gorse in the Heritage Area (page 60 of the current Regional Pest Management Strategy) would meet this concern.

7.7.9 We are mystified as to why there would be a rule that allows a person to transfer a Sustained Control Pest Plant within their property. This rule should be deleted.

The Plan is very hard to follow and would benefit from a fuller contents page and an index.

Waitematā Local Board

Resolution number WTM/2018/183

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Waitematā Local Board residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) provide the following high-level feedback:

i) note that the residents in Waitematā Local Board area submitted the highest positive response to Auckland Council’s Long-term Plan introducing a targeted rate for managing pests
ii) support the key focus areas across the region to improve environmental outcomes to protect and enhance New Zealand’s unique native environment

iii) support the proposed regional focus and funding to improvements to Western Springs & Auckland Domain in alignment with each Park Management Plan

iv) generally support the implementation and content of the proposed amended Plan

v) support proceeding with the proposed controls on unowned cats provided more clarification and information is incorporated in the policy on the spatial extent of the approach

vi) support the possum containment policy applying across the region, including urban areas

vii) support greater enabling of community activities with the aim of reducing freshwater pests

c) delegate to the Environment and Infrastructure Portfolio lead and co-portfolio holder to prepare and submit further local board views on the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan

Further feedback on the recommended changes to the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan from Waitematā Local Board

Memorandum 13 December 2018

To: Penny Hulse, Chair, Environment and Community Committee
    Alf Filipaina, Deputy Chair, Environment and Community Committee

Cc: Sonja Tomovska, Governance Advisor
    All Waitematā Local Board members

Subject: Formal feedback on the recommended changes to the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan

From: Waitematā Local Board

Purpose

1. To provide Waitematā Local Board’s feedback on the recommended changes to the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan

Summary

- note that the residents in Waitematā Local Board area submitted the highest positive response to Auckland Council’s Long-term Plan introducing a targeted rate for managing pests
- support the key focus areas across the region to improve environmental outcomes to protect and enhance New Zealand’s unique native environment
• support the proposed regional focus and funding to improvements to Western Springs Lakeside Park & Auckland Domain in alignment with each Park Management Plan
• generally support the implementation and content of the proposed amended Plan
• support proceeding with the proposed controls on unowned cats provided more clarification and information is incorporated in the policy on the spatial extent of the approach
• support the possum containment policy applying across the region, including urban areas
• support greater enabling of community activities with the aim of reducing freshwater pests

Context/Background

2. The Waitematā Local Board Plan 2017 includes the following statement on protecting our natural heritage:

   Our valued natural ecosystems and biodiversity are under threat from pest plants and animals. To address this challenge we will maintain our ecological restoration programmes and grow community capacity around managing weeds and getting rid of pests. We want the council to eliminate agrichemical spraying and embrace its commitment to minimise agrichemical use. You have told us to support alternative weed management techniques, such as the use of hot water and mechanical edging in parks. As a local board we support the target to make New Zealand predator free by 2050.

3. The Waitematā Local Board has committed funding towards delivering agrichemical free parks at Western Park, Albert Park, Myers Park and the non-sport field sections of Victoria Park.

Key Focus Areas for Waitematā

Pest Management (mammal/ vegetation)

• The Waitematā Local Board supports a plan that encourages volunteerism and long-term contracts to reduce flora and fauna pests
• The local board supports community empowerment and education initiatives around pest control including advice to neighbours, equipment and structured help.
• The local board recommends that a community lead “Pest Free Waitemata” programme is developed with a target of having 1 in 5 Waitematā houses & businesses participating in rodent trapping and regular seasonal surging.
• We recommend that a region wide educational programme is introduced to reduce pest plants on private land and that schools involvement is actively sought
• Currently Arch Hill, St Mary’s Bay and Newmarket Park contain significant invasive pest plants. It is requested that these three additional areas are included for funding through the natural environment targeted rate
• We support putting in place the necessary regional “carrots & sticks” to encourage and enforce pest management on public & private land

Freshwater pests
• The Waitematā Local Board area contains two major freshwater bodies of water; Auckland Domain and Western Springs Lakeside Park
• We support the natural environment targeted rate being directed to improve the water quality at both the Auckland Domain and Western Springs Lakeside Park.
• Waitematā Local Board would also welcome partnering with Watercare and Stormwater Regional projects to maximise available funds that can be directed towards our current water restoration programme at Waipapa Stream in Parnell, Newmarket Stream, Meola Creek (Waitakiko) & Waiparuru (Symonds Street) to improve stream water quality and bio diversity.

Marine Biosecurity

• The Waitematā Local Board supports the Northern Region Integrated Marine Pest Pathogen Management Plan ahead of changes to MPI to tackle marine biosecurity.
• It is noted that our local board area has the region’s largest bio-security risk at Westhaven Marina, Viaduct Harbour, Cruise Ship Terminals, Ferry Terminals and Port operations. These operations along with large events such as the Auckland Boat Show, Volvo Around the World and America’s Cup events increases the introduction of further bio-security risks to marine life and transportation of marine pests to other parts of New Zealand.
• The Waitematā Local Board requests that regional funding is allocated to the Auckland’s City Centre waterfront to mitigate, reduce and remove existing and future bio security hazards through active management, active monitoring, strict enforcement of rules and education.
• The Waitematā Local Board has large scale pathogen waste water discharge issues from Meola Reef through to Hobson Bay. It is noted that Auckland Council is now supporting significant projects such as St Mary’s Bay Pump Station and the Central Interceptor to significantly reduce waste water.
• Waitematā Local Board are already jointly funding projects with other local boards to support initiatives such as the Meola Restoration project. We request that the council direct regional funding to support marine ecological restoration in parallel to these projects.
• The Waitematā Local Board encourages funding to be set aside over the next five years to assess the current state of the Niagara WWII wreckage and recommendations relating to mitigating crude oil leaks and/or removal of the oil of the ship to prevent the risk of a major oil spill.

Sanctuaries

• It is recommended that potential areas in the Waitematā Marine Area are identified to introduce a marine sanctuary eg. Meola Reef.
• It is recommended that potential areas in the Waitematā Urban Forrest are identified to introduce a wildlife sanctuary for the city centre eg. Western Springs and/or Auckland Domain.

Research & Development

• It is recommended that funding is set aside in partnership with MPI to prioritise university/private research into finding biosecurity solutions eg. Kauri Dieback and Styela Sea Squirt.
Measures

- It is recommended that KPIs and targets are developed for each of the environmental outcomes and that the “current state of play” is measured for each environmental outcome.
- It is requested that the Governing Body and local boards receive an annual report that allows progress to be monitored eg. Westhaven has % contamination of Styela Sea Squirt.

Whau Local Board

Resolution number WH/2018/133

That the Whau Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback from Whau residents on the Proposed Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan.

b) note the recommended changes to the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan based on consultation feedback.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To obtain confirmation from the Environment and Community Committee of the grant allocations to Tennis Auckland Region Inc. for the proposed staged redevelopment of the ASB Tennis Arena.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Tennis Auckland Region Inc. (Tennis Auckland) facility known as the ASB Tennis Arena, is located within the Auckland Domain on land leased from Auckland Council in accordance with the provisions of the Auckland Domain Act 1987 (the Act) and the lease issued pursuant to the Act.

3. Tennis Auckland wishes to undertake a staged redevelopment of the site to replace aging infrastructure (primarily stands) and add a retractable roof structure, as funding permits.

4. Replacement stands will enable the seating capacity to be increased to 3500, thereby meeting the minimum requirements of the WTA (Women’s Tennis Association) and ATP Tour (Association of Tennis Professionals).

5. The priority for Tennis Auckland is to increase the seating capacity to meet the minimum requirements to ensure future tournaments are secured for Auckland, ahead of the tournaments being allocated to rival cities.

6. International competition to host tournaments is fierce and Auckland is currently fending off challenges from other cities for the rights to host the tournaments. Increasing seating capacity to 3500 is critical to Tennis Auckland’s future bids to secure tournaments.

7. The terms of the lease require Auckland Council (as landlord/landowner) approval for the demolition of any part of the existing tennis facility, and the construction of new facilities. Separately, Tennis Auckland is seeking updated resource consent and building consent.

8. The Auckland Domain Committee considered the request from Tennis Auckland Region Inc. to redevelop the site and resolved to support the redevelopment plan subject to obtaining the necessary consents.

9. Tennis Auckland is seeking council approval to use the $5.5 million of grant funding towards the redevelopment of the South and West stands that would meet the minimum seating requirements of ATP / WTA.

10. Subject to Tennis Auckland obtaining the necessary regulatory approvals, it is recommended that the committee support Stages 1A and 1B of the redevelopment of the ASB Tennis Arena to ensure it meets the 3500 minimum seating requirements that will ensure the retention of future ATP/WTA tournaments. It is noted that a retractable roof is planned for later development stages within the next five – ten years.

11. It is also recommended that the committee confirm the grant funding of $5.5 million, be split between the stages as: Stages 1A ($2 million), and Stage 1B ($3.5 million).
Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) acknowledge the work undertaken by Tennis Auckland Region to progress a redevelopment plan that increases seating capacity to the minimum requirements of the international professional tennis bodies, with the view to securing future tournaments in Auckland.

b) confirm and approves the $3.0 million grant incorporated into the 2012 Long Term Plan for the redevelopment of the West and South stands - Stages 1A and 1B of the revised development plan.

c) approve the allocation of $2.5 million from allocated grant funding to the redevelopment of the West and South stands - Stages 1A and 1B of the revised development plan.

d) delegate the General Manager Parks, Sport and Recreation to prepare a Development Funding Agreement documenting the grant to Tennis Auckland Region, noting that the total grant pool of $5.5 million is recommended to be allocated as: $2.0 million to Stage 1A, and $3.5 million to Stage 1B.

Horopaki

Context

12. Tennis Auckland has previously advised Auckland Council of its intention to redevelop the ASB Tennis Arena. Originally works were to be undertaken to coincide with the Next Generation of Australia development in 2009/2010, however these did not proceed. Subsequent iterations of the designs were developed, and presentations made to council to consider further grant funding options.

13. In 2018, Tennis Auckland reviewed and revised its proposed redevelopment plans and is now seeking to prioritise the re-development of two stands to increase seating capacity to 3500. A retractable roof structure is still proposed, but this will be several years away from commencing, and is contingent on raising additional funds to complete this work.

14. Based on earlier proposals, Auckland Council has approved grants totalling $5.5 million towards the redevelopment of the ASB Tennis Arena that included the provision of a retractable roof structure.

15. The ASB Classic Tournaments ensure Tennis Auckland operates a sustainable business model and any surplus from the tournaments is invested into community tennis. Tennis Auckland’s community programme includes: development programmes for 9500 primary school aged children, services to 8400 members across 52 clubs, club competitions for 1264 inter-club teams, performance pathways for over 100 promising young players and three public tennis facilities in Glen Innes (Scarbro Tennis Centre), Manukau (Manukau Tennis Centre) and Mount Eden (Nicholson Park).

16. The ASB Classic tournaments result in economic benefit of over $11.95 million per year to Auckland, made up of: operating costs spent with local suppliers, food and beverage spend during the tournaments and visitation impact.

17. Significant international exposure is also received from the tournaments, WTA and ATP reports indicate that the television audience for the two weeks is 24.5 million (2018 figures). The WTA and ATP reports also indicate that total broadcast hours across the two weeks are 1730 hours and the social media reach of the four most high-profile women at the 2019 ASB Classic was 19.5 million.
18. The full redevelopment is proposed to occur in four stages over about eight years as detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
<th>NATURE OF WORKS</th>
<th>COST ($millions)</th>
<th>OVERALL COSTS ($millions)</th>
<th>FUNDED Y/N Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total budgets cost of Stage 1A (incl. fees and consents already fully funded)</td>
<td>$10.555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Pre 2019</td>
<td>Less costs already incurred and fully funded by Tennis Auckland</td>
<td>($2.798)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, fully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Balance of Costs to Demolish and Rebuild the West Stand</td>
<td>$7.758</td>
<td>$7.758</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Rebuild the South Stand</td>
<td>$9.118</td>
<td>$9.118</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal 1A and 1B (net of fees)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16.875</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Rebuild the North and East Stands</td>
<td>$5.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Construct the roof structure</td>
<td>$11.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL Gross Cost Stages 1A, 1B, 2 and 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35.673</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total budgets cost of Stage 1A (incl. fees and consents already fully funded)</td>
<td>$10.555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. There are two issues for consideration by Auckland Council:
   - Whether to approve the demolition and subsequent development of part of the existing structure (considered and approved by the Auckland Domain Committee on 19 February 2019), and
   - Whether to approve the allocation of the Council grants to the construction of two stands.

20. The new stands constructed as part of Stage 1A will increase capacity to the minimum of 3500; provide new female toilet facilities; a communications room; and an Uninterrupted Power Supply room.

21. The Tennis Auckland Project Plan anticipates awarding the construction contract with the preferred contractor in March 2019, the anticipated start date for construction is 1 April 2019, and the practical completion date for Stage 1A is 31 October 2019.

22. As Tennis Auckland is still fundraising for Stage 1B, no details of proposed construction dates have been provided for 2020. Tennis Auckland has stated that if insufficient funds have been raised to finance Stage 1B, the design may be changed and/or commencement date will be deferred until all funds have been secured.

**Decision-making authority**

23. The ASB Tennis Arena is located within Auckland Domain on a site leased from Auckland Council to Tennis Auckland Region Inc. Auckland Domain is governed by its own legislation: the Auckland Domain Act 1987 and is administered by Auckland Council in accordance with the provisions of the Act.
24. In 2008, the Act was amended to allow Auckland Council to enter into a lease with Tennis Auckland to enable the sub-leasing and redevelopment of part of the site in conjunction with Next Generation Clubs of Australia. This redevelopment was completed in 2011 but excluded the redevelopment of the Tennis Auckland facilities.

25. Decisions relating to most matters concerning the Auckland Domain have been delegated to the Auckland Domain Committee, including items of expenditure up to $2 million. For items exceeding this value, the matter must be referred to the relevant committee, in this instance, the Environment and Community Committee.

**Assessment of significance**

26. The ASB Tennis Arena is the host venue of the annual ASB Classic, part of the WTA (Women’s Tennis Association) and ATP Tour (Association of Tennis Professionals (men’s)) – both international events. The tournaments draw much local and international interest.

27. The redevelopment of the ASB Tennis Arena is significant, not only because it is the only New Zealand venue for WTA /ATP world tour events, but also due to the overall scale and value of the works being undertaken, and because it is located within Auckland Domain, being one of the premier parks in New Zealand.

28. Notwithstanding the importance of the site, the redevelopment of the tennis facility has been planned for many years; funders (including Auckland Council and its predecessor) have considered the proposed development on several occasions, and when the legislation was amended in 2008 the future redevelopment of the site was signalled through public notification as part of the Select Committee and legislative process.

**Previous decisions**

29. Auckland Council has previously considered requests from Tennis Auckland for financial assistance towards the redevelopment of the ASB Tennis Arena.

30. Of total funding allocated of $5.5M, $3M was allocated in the 2012-2022 Long Term Plan and a further $2.5M agreed in principle in 2016, subject to a number of terms and conditions being met.

31. In all previous deliberations, financial support has been granted based on the proposal including the redevelopment of the stands and a retractable roof structure.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

**Approvals**

32. The lease requires Tennis Auckland to obtain Council’s prior written approval (as landowner) for any building work which alters the external appearance of the facility. Additionally, Tennis Auckland must obtain Council’s prior written approval to pull down or remove any part of the tennis centre.

33. Council cannot withhold its consent arbitrarily or unreasonably if the conditions within the lease are met.

34. On 21 February 2019 the Auckland Domain Committee met and resolved as follows:

  Resolution number ADC/2019/1

  MOVED by IMSB Chair D Taipari, seconded by Cr D Simpson:

  That the Auckland Domain Committee:

  a) note the work undertaken to progress a redevelopment plan that increases seating capacity to the minimum requirements of the international professional tennis bodies, with the view to securing future tournaments in Auckland.

  b) approve in principle the redevelopment of the ASB Tennis Arena South and West stands subject to specific conditions and final funding approval of the Environment and Community Committee.
c) delegate authority to the General Manager Community Facilities to formalise land owner approval and set specific consent conditions.

d) recommend to the Environment and Community Committee that Council funding of $5.5 million be confirmed for the redevelopment of the South and West stands (Stages 1A and 1B) subject to terms determined by that committee.

e) note that the recommendations relate to Stage 1A and 1B only as defined in this report, and that subsequent stages of work will require further approval.

CARRIED

35. Tennis Auckland has revised its proposed redevelopment plans and is now seeking to prioritise the re-development of two stands to increase seating capacity to 3500. Tennis Auckland have sought that the funding be allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Auckland Council</th>
<th>Tennis Auckland</th>
<th>Other funders</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>$10.555 M</td>
<td>$4.000 M</td>
<td>$1.198 M</td>
<td>$7.350 M</td>
<td>$12.548 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>$9.118 M</td>
<td>$1.500 M</td>
<td>$2.000 M</td>
<td>$4.050 M</td>
<td>$7.550 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$19.673 M</td>
<td>$5.500 M</td>
<td>$3.198 M</td>
<td>$11.400 M</td>
<td>$20.098 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. As $2.798 million of fees and consent costs have already been fully funded by either Tennis Auckland and/or other grant funders, the net cost to complete Stage 1A is reduced to $7.758 million. The recommended split of Auckland Council funding is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Costs (net of costs already paid)</th>
<th>Auckland Council</th>
<th>Tennis Auckland</th>
<th>Other funders</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>$7.758 M</td>
<td>$2.000 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.758 M</td>
<td>$7.758 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>$9.118 M</td>
<td>$3.500 M</td>
<td>$2.000 M</td>
<td>$3.618 M</td>
<td>$9.118 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$16.875 M</td>
<td>$5.500 M</td>
<td>$2.000 M</td>
<td>$9.168 M</td>
<td>$20.098 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. If Auckland Council confirms its funding for this redevelopment, the Development Funding Agreement which documents the grant funding will incorporate all the conditions to be met to satisfy the terms of the lease, plus adds other conditions precedent that must be met prior to the construction contract being let; demolition commencing; or the release of any funding from Auckland Council.
38. These conditions cover matters such as, but not limited to:
   a. The total amount of the grant and how it is to be split between the stages
   b. All regulatory approvals that must be obtained and provided to Council
   c. All designs must be presented to Council to review (as landowner/landlord)
   d. Comprehensive construction budgets must be produced and agreed with Council
   e. Sufficient funding to cover the budgeted cost of the development must be secured before demolition or construction can commence
   f. An agreement with Council that details how any cost over-runs will be covered and by whom.

39. Tennis Auckland has applied for, and is awaiting resource and building consents for the proposed works.

40. It is noted that funding for Stage 1B will need to be fully secured and confirmed by February 2020 to enable demolition and construction to commence to be completed in time for the 2021 tournaments.

41. Council funding should be made available to each of Stages 1A and 1B to enable these to proceed, however access to the funds would only be available once evidence produced that each stage had been fully funded.

**Proposed development**

42. The current redevelopment plan is detailed below and illustrated in the plans included as Attachment A.

43. Originally conceived as one development, Tennis Auckland has determined that its current priority is ensuring there is sufficient seating within the arena to accommodate 3500 people, thereby meeting the WTA/ATP minimum requirements for seating.

44. International competition to host tournaments is fierce and Auckland is currently fending off challenges from other cities for the rights to host the tournaments. Increasing seating capacity to 3500 is critical to Tennis Auckland’s future bids to secure tournaments.

45. Tennis Auckland intend to undertake the redevelopment of the site in four stages, with the first two stages (1A and 1B) being undertaken in 2019 and 2020 respectively.

46. Tennis Auckland still needs to secure the balance for funding for Stage 1B. Should insufficient funds be raised to allow construction to commence in early 2020, Tennis Auckland has advised it will defer the works until all funding has been gained, and/or amend the plans for Stage 1B to ‘down-spec’ the works to come within the available budget.

47. Subject to fundraising, Stage 2 will involve the construction of a further two new stands, and Stage 3 will be the installation of the roof structure. Although signalled for 2023 and 2026 respectively, these stages are conditional on raising funds to undertake the work.

**Funding**

48. In addition to Auckland Council, Tennis Auckland has secured the support of several large funders, Foundation North, Lottery Grants Board, and Major Events NZ. In several instances, the on-going support of these funders is contingent on Auckland Council confirming its grant funding.

49. The conditions attached to some of the secured funding requires that the funding be expended by certain dates otherwise the grants will lapse. In many instances, the funding has already been ‘rolled-over’ several times.

50. If Auckland Council funding is withdrawn or reduced, there is a significant risk that other funders will withdraw their funding support and the whole project will not proceed.

51. It is important for Tennis Auckland to be able to illustrate to the WTA/ATP that it is actively working towards increasing seating capacity to 3500 in the foreseeable future so that future tournaments are secured.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
52. Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development support the ASB Classics Tournaments through event funding support.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
53. The Auckland Domain Committee was established to ensure the interests of both the Governing Body and the Waitemata Local Board were considered jointly and to facilitate decision making across both interested groups.
54. The resolutions of the Auckland Domain Committee, listed in paragraph 34 above, support the redevelopment and allocation of the recommended funding.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
55. Tennis Auckland advised it consulted with the following Iwi – Ngati Whatua Orakei, Ngai Te Ata Waiohua, Ngati Tai ki Tamaki, Ngati Maru. No further or subsequent consultation has occurred (since 2015).
56. Auckland Council has not undertaken any engagement with relevant Iwi regarding the proposed Tennis Auckland development.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
57. Funding of $5.5 million has been previously approved and allocated subject to approval for the Tennis Auckland development.
58. The $3 million allocated through the 2012-2022 LTP across years two, three and four has been accrued, the further $2.5 million allocated in principle subject to conditions has been provided for through existing budgets in 2018/2019; namely the former facility partnership fund.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
59. Tennis Auckland is confident of raising the funding for Stage 1B by 2020. However, this remains a risk until the required funds to complete the various stages of work are secured.
60. Auckland Council’s funding is critical to underpinning other funding grants for the project. Any further deferral of the redevelopment could result in the withdrawal of grants from other funders. Therefore, it is important for Tennis Auckland to commence the project, through a staged approach, in 2019 to deliver 3550 seat capacity by 2021.
61. Any further delay for the redevelopment is likely to result in cost increases, requiring further fundraising will be required and a further extension of the timetable.
62. Tennis Auckland currently has an exemption for not meeting the venue seating capacity (3500) and the commencement of Stage 1A and 1B is aimed at ensuring the future retention of the tournaments in Auckland.
63. Staff recommend that to minimise the risks of Council’s investment, that $2 million is allocated to Stage 1A, and $3.5 million to Stage 1B. The recommended Council funding split across stages 1A and 1B will ensure that there is foundation funding that supports the fund raising plan for Stage 1B.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

64. If the grant funding is confirmed, a Development Funding Agreement will be prepared detailing the terms and conditions precedent to be met prior to demolition commencing, and any construction occurring.

65. Tennis Auckland needs to obtain all consents necessary to enable the development to occur. Copies of the consents must be provided to Auckland Council (as landlord) prior to any works commencing.

66. Tennis Auckland must provide evidence that all the conditions precedent contained in the Auckland Council funding agreement have been satisfied.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval of the proposed exchange of 525m² of Cadness Loop Reserve, Northcote with 525m² of Housing New Zealand Corporation land in Cadness Street.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. To enable decision-making about the proposed land exchange, staff called for objections in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977.

3. The council received one objection out of a total of eight submissions. This submission states that the land exchange is not necessary and that the reserve is already fit-for-purpose.

4. The current layout of Cadness Loop Reserve does not align with the Open Space Provision Policy. It is surrounded by roads on all sides, which creates potential safety issues and hinders access. The narrow shape of the current reserve also constrains use.

5. The proposed land exchange is deemed to be a high priority when assessed against the council’s policy.

6. There is a low risk of the objector seeking a judicial review of council decision-making processes if the council proceeds with the land exchange. This can be mitigated by clear communication about the reasons for the land exchange.

7. The land exchange will be considered by the Finance and Performance Committee on 19 March 2019. Under delegated authority, the committee will need to authorise the disposal of 525m² of land within Lot 393 DP 48335 to complete the land exchange.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the exchange of 525m² of land in Cadness Loop Reserve (subject to survey) with 525m² of the land at 68-74 and 76-82 Cadness Street, Northcote (subject to survey) owned by Housing New Zealand Corporation.

b) recommend to the Finance and Performance Committee that, under delegated authority, it authorise the disposal of 525m² of land within Lot 393 DP 48335 to complete the land exchange.

Horopaki
Context

8. On 13 September 2018, the Environment and Community Committee approved the public notification of a proposed land exchange in Northcote under section 15(2) of the Reserves Act 1977 [ENV/2018/122 refers]. The proposal entailed an exchange of 525m² of Cadness Loop Reserve with 525m² of land at 68-74 and 76-82 Cadness Street, Northcote, owned by Housing New Zealand Corporation.
9. At the same time, the committee also approved the acquisition of additional land from Housing New Zealand and Auckland Transport to increase the size of the reserve from 1755m$^2$ to 3178m$^2$. This was to create a neighborhood park that would align with the Open Space Provision Policy.

10. Figure 1 below illustrates the proposed reconfiguration and extension of the reserve:

**Figure 1: Proposed reconfiguration and extension of Cadness Loop Reserve**

11. The existing reserve land that council owns consists of section 5 and 6. Council will acquire section 1 and 4. Section 5 will be exchanged for section 7 under the Reserves Act 1977.


13. A total of eight submissions were received during the public notification period. Only one submission opposed the land exchange.

14. Consultation was also undertaken with 11 iwi identified as having mana whenua association with Cadness Loop Reserve. None of the iwi groups objected to the land exchange including 10 groups who did not respond.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

15. Section 15 of the Reserves Act requires council to consider the objections to any proposal.

16. The solitary objector expressed a view that the land exchange is not necessary and that the reserve is already fit-for-purpose.

17. Staff reviewed these comments and note that the current layout of Cadness Loop Reserve does not align with the Open Space Provision Policy. The reserve is presently surrounded by roads on all sides, which creates potential safety issues and hinders access. The narrow shape of the current reserve also constrains use.

18. Staff recommend that the Environment and Community Committee approve the proposed land exchange. It is deemed to be a high priority when assessed against council policy (see Table 1 below).
19. The land exchange will improve safety and access to Cadness Loop Reserve by reducing the number of roads on its boundaries.

20. The land exchange will also allow council to provide a squarer-shaped reserve, which will provide increased recreational opportunities, including a ‘kick-around’ space.

Table 1: Assessment of the proposed land exchange in relation to Cadness Loop Reserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park type: Neighbourhood Park (Cadness Loop Reserve)</th>
<th>Number of new dwellings: 900 (300 existing dwellings are being replaced by 1200 new dwellings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density: High</td>
<td>Number of new residents: 2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitary plan zone: Residential – Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone</td>
<td>Size of proposed acquisition: Land exchange – approx. 525m²; acquisition of stopped road – approx. 657m²; acquisition of land from Housing New Zealand to increase the size of the reserve – approx. 539m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent valuation: N/A</td>
<td>Settlement: 2018/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential future features:

- Playground:
- Trees

Acquisition Criteria | Comment | Overall Rating
--- | --- | ---
Meeting community needs, now and in the future | High priority as: • the proposed land exchange and acquisitions will increase the capacity of Cadness Loop Reserve and meet the provision targets in the Open Space Provision Policy. | ✓
Connecting parks and open spaces | Not a priority as: • the reconfigured and enlarged reserve will not connect existing parks or open space. | |
Protecting and restoring Auckland’s unique features and meanings | Not a priority as: • the land has no known significant ecological, historic heritage, landscape, geological or cultural values. | |
Improving the parks and open spaces we already have | High priority as: • the land exchange and acquisitions will improve safety and accessibility as well as the functionality of Cadness Loop Reserve, which is located in a high-density area (as defined in the Open Space Provision Policy). | ✓

Development Costs: Local boards decide how local open space is developed. No development or concept plans have been prepared. Capital expenditure is allocated through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

Operational Costs: Up to $10,000 per annum for the reconfigured park. Maintenance costs for parks and open space land covered by Community Facilities’ operational budgets provided through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

---

3 Based on the average household size of 3.0 in Auckland at Census 2013.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

21. Road stopping that will increase the size of Cadness Loop Reserve is being implemented by Auckland Transport.

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

22. On 15 August 2018, the Kaipātiki Local Board resolved to support the notification of the proposed land exchange (resolution number KT/2018/166).

23. On 20 February 2019, the following resolution was passed where the Kaipātiki Local Board:
   a) recommend that the Environment and Community Committee approve the exchange of 525m² of Cadness Loop Reserve (subject to survey) with 525m² of the land at 68-74 and 76-82 Cadness Street, Northcote (subject to survey) owned by Housing New Zealand Corporation, to deliver a direct connection between the Cadness Loop Reserve and the Northcote Greenway.
   b) note that the playground and basketball court are outside of the land exchange process, however the local board has an expectation that the playground and basketball court will be reinstated into the newly configured reserve at no cost to the local board. (Resolution number KAI/2019/5).

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

24. The provision of quality parks and open spaces facilitates Māori participation in outdoor recreational activity.

25. Additional benefits include:
   • demonstrating Auckland Council’s commitment to the Active Protection (Tautiaki Ngangahau) Principle of the Treaty of Waitangi; and
   • helping make Auckland a green, resilient and healthy environment consistent with the Māori world view and their role as kaitiaki of the natural environment.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

26. The Reserves Act 1977 requires equity of exchange. Subject to approval, this will be achieved as there will be a ‘like for like’ exchange in land area.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

27. There is a low risk of the objector seeking a judicial review of council decision-making processes if the council proceeds with the land exchange. This can be mitigated by clear communication about the reasons for the land exchange.

28. Further information will be provided to the submitter to address their concerns.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

29. The land exchange will be considered by the Finance and Performance Committee on 19 March 2019. Under delegated authority, the committee will need to authorise the disposal of 525m² of land within Lot 393 DP 48335 as part of the land exchange.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.
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Submission to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) and the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) technical report “Process Heat in New Zealand: Opportunities and barriers to lowering emissions”.

File No.: CP2019/01922

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek endorsement of the staff submission to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) and the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) report “Process Heat in New Zealand: Opportunities and barriers to lowering emissions”.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. In January 2019, MBIE and EECA published a technical paper, “Process heat in New Zealand: Opportunities and barriers to lowering emissions.” Feedback was sought to understand if the technical report represents process heat use, and the opportunities and barriers to lowering process heat emissions from a user’s perspective. The paper identified that 40 per cent of New Zealand’s emissions are from the energy sector, with process heat responsible for 27 per cent thereof. The report highlights that process heat is an important focus area in New Zealand’s transition to a low carbon economy.

3. Process heat is the thermal energy used to manufacture products in industry. Use of process heat in industries contributes to approximately 20 per cent of Auckland’s emissions from the industrial sector (13 per cent), commercial sector (5 per cent) and agricultural sector (2.8 per cent). For context, the industrial sector contributes around 26 per cent to the local economy, equivalent to around $22 billion annually. Two distinct challenges that face this sector over the next thirty years are a diminishing natural gas supply and achieving Auckland’s emissions reduction targets.

4. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee approved the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan (ENV/2018/11). This plan will set a pathway to rapidly reduce Auckland’s emissions to keep within a 1.5°C target, while ensuring the region is resilient to future challenges. Process heat users in Auckland are both significant contributors to Auckland’s local economy and the emissions footprint. Therefore, addressing the challenges facing process heat users is an important area in the plan that will require a coordinated approach with central government to support the sectors’ transition to a resilient low emissions economy.
5. Auckland Council commissioned the Energy Research Group from the University of Waikato to understand and analyse the use of process heat in the region. Some of the key recommendations from this research that are included in the submission to MBIE and EECA, are:

- Targeted efficiency gains could only provide between 1 to 5 per cent reduction in energy use and emissions.
- Process heat in the low to medium temperature range (20 to 200°C), which accounts for approximately 70 per cent of Auckland’s process heat, could transition to electricity.
- The remaining process heat that cannot be transitioned to electricity is high temperature (200 to 400+°C). The use of electricity for high temperature process heat is currently not technically or economically feasible.

6. The submission to the MBIE was a staff submission, delivered on their deadline of 22 February 2019, without full political endorsement due to time constraints. The submission included a request to provide additional information or amended recommendations as necessary after political endorsement.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) retrospectively endorse the staff submission on process heat to MBIE’s and EECA’s technical document, ‘Process Heat in New Zealand: Opportunities and barriers to lowering emissions’.

Horopaki
Context

8. The report focuses on the transition to a low emissions economy by improving energy productivity and increasing renewable energy in industry. Key points addressed and highlighted in the New Zealand based research were:

- Process heat accounts for 34 per cent of New Zealand’s energy consumption.
- Energy sector contributes to 40 per cent of New Zealand’s emissions, with process heat responsible for 27 per cent thereof.
- Approximately 56 per cent of process heat is made through the burning of fossil fuels, predominantly coal and gas.
- Approximately 68 per cent of process heat is generated by boiler systems.
- The wood, pulp and paper manufacturing sector use the most process heat related energy.
9. The report lists a series of opportunities and barriers for process heat in New Zealand; some of the examples of the barriers listed were:

- the cost of emissions is not fully priced,
- there is a lack of information or aversion to new technologies in some industries,
- the electrical energy cost is high compared to other fuel sources,
- the woody biomass as an alternative source has an underdeveloped and complex supply chain.

10. Some of the opportunities listed were self-generation from renewable sources and hydrogen as a low emissions fuel source for process heat.

11. Process heat used in Auckland industries contributes to approximately 20 per cent of Auckland’s emissions from the industrial sector (13 per cent), commercial sector (5 per cent) and agricultural sector (2.8 per cent). For context, the industrial sector contributes around 26 per cent to the local economy, equivalent to around $22 billion annually. Two distinct challenges that face this sector over the next thirty years are a diminishing natural gas supply and achieving Auckland’s emissions reduction targets.

12. Auckland Council is currently leading the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan (ENV/2018/11). This plan will set a pathway to transition the region towards a 1.5°C warming target. The action plan will address both emission reduction pathway and building resilience for the impacted industries in collaboration with government.

13. In 2017, Auckland Council commissioned the Energy Research Group from the University of Waikato to understand the use of process heat in the region. The research report, “Process heat emissions and energy use in the Auckland region”, explored process heat in the Auckland context, analysing the main industries that use process heat and their process temperature bands (low, medium and high). The report identified the opportunities and barriers to reducing the associated emissions.

14. The main findings and recommendations of Auckland’s report that were also part of the staff submission to MBIE and EECA are:

- Process heat accounts for 20 per cent of Auckland’s energy consumption.
- Process heat is used in three main sectors: industry (13 per cent), commercial (5 per cent) and agriculture (2.8 per cent).
- Approximately 54.7 per cent of process heat is supplied through natural gas.
- The Primary Metal and Metal Product manufacturing sector uses the most process heat in the region.
- Targeted efficiency gains could only provide between 1 to 5 per cent reduction in energy use and emissions. Targeting efficiency alone does not account for greater opportunities for greenhouse gas emissions reductions.
- Process heat in the low to medium temperature range (20 to 200°C), which accounts for approximately 70 per cent of Auckland’s process heat, could transition to electricity. The transition could be enabled through a combination of new technology (e.g. high temperature heat pumps) and process optimisation.
- The remaining process heat that cannot be transitioned to electricity is high temperature (200 to 400°C). The use of electricity for high temperature process heat is currently not technically or economically feasible. New Zealand’s supply of natural gas is predicted to drop steeply after 2022, suggesting that natural gas be prioritised for industries that require high temperature process heat.
15. The final section in the MBIE and EECA report covers the future use of hydrogen in process heat. Hydrogen is not currently financially feasible, even with a carbon price exceeding $100 per ton of carbon. The report suggests this analysis should be revisited if major changes occur to the carbon or electricity price. The staff submission added that any further analysis should also consider the ramifications of a 100 per cent renewable electricity grid and future requirements to replace natural gas for process heat.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

16. Process heat is a significant source of emissions in the Auckland region. Auckland’s Climate Action Plan will therefore address reducing process heat related emissions in collaboration with government.

17. The research by University of Waikato identified three temperature bands, low, medium and high, and offered different solutions and challenges for each of these types of process heat.

18. Through this research, the Chief Sustainability Office has developed a list of recommendations for the region to reduce emissions from process heat that has been included in the process heat submission to MBIE and that will feed into the development of the climate action plan.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

**Council group impacts and views**

19. Auckland Council is a user of process heat in the operation of its buildings and facilities. The relevant Auckland Council divisions and teams are currently investigating opportunities to address reducing emissions from process heat.

20. Ports of Auckland is investigating the feasibility of using hydrogen in its processes, with a hydrogen pilot trial currently underway in partnership with Auckland Council.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

21. The submission timeline presented a challenge in gathering a complete understanding of local board views. However, the Chief Sustainability Office has engaged with all local boards on the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan. Local boards have been briefed on Auckland’s emissions profile, with process heat highlighted as a high emitting area. The local boards will be engaged again in workshops as part of the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

22. Iwi management plans (IMPs) have been consulted and highlight the importance of this kaupapa to mana whenua and to Māori. The IMPs identify climate change as a critical issue to be addressed in Auckland and the issue of emissions reduction as a fundamental component of this. A variety of interests are highlighted by iwi in the IMPs and specific areas that link to process heat are:

- participation in the development of domestic & global climate change policy,
- encouraging and supporting local energy efficiency initiatives.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

23. There are no direct financial implications related to this submission.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

24. A risk associated with the submission is that MBIE and EECA may not take Auckland Council’s position into account. The lack of central government support regarding process heat will present challenges to Auckland Council in reducing its process heat emissions. This is considered a low risk due to the strong relationship and alignment of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan development and central government’s expected Zero Carbon Bill.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

25. Any changes agreed by the committee will be communicated to EECA and MBIE after 12 March 2019.

26. MBIE and EECA will integrate the feedback into the future development of process heat strategy and policy in New Zealand.

27. Auckland council will continue its work with central government for a coordinated approach on process heat, as part of development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan.
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Mihi

Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,
ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,
ōna mana ā-īwi taketake mai, tauīwi atu.
Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini,
wenerau a te mano.
Kāhore tō rite i te ao.

I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place,
there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and flow of the tides of time,
and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who came those born of this land and the newcomers among us all.
Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the multitude, envy of thousands.
You are unique in the world
Environment and Community Committee
12 March 2019

Attachment A

Introduction

1. Auckland Council thanks the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) and the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) for the opportunity to provide a submission on Process Heat in New Zealand: Opportunities and barriers to lowering emissions - Technical paper.

2. Auckland Council supports the Government’s intent to address greenhouse gas emissions from process heat. The council is currently developing a climate action plan to reduce Auckland-wide emissions within a 1.5°C warming limit and to prepare for the impacts of climate change. In Auckland approximately 20 per cent of emissions are from the process heat sector (industrial energy at 13 per cent, commercial energy at 5 per cent, agricultural energy at 2.8 per cent), therefore it is important for the climate action plan to address these emissions.

3. Auckland Council has two perspectives on process heat, both as a user and a legislative body. It uses process heat in its corporate and community facility operations. The council has also developed strategic goals and commitments around energy resilience (e.g. process heat) which are included in both the Auckland Plan 2050 and Auckland’s Climate Action Plan (currently in development).

4. While it is essential to reduce process heat greenhouse gas emissions across all sectors, it is important to acknowledge that there are sectoral and regional differences in the use of process heat. The price of carbon through the revised New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS) will aid the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from process heat, but needs to be supported with additional initiatives, including a targeted approach for users of low-grade process heat.

5. The consultation seeks industry and public feedback on their understanding of the use of process heat, and the opportunities and barriers to lowering generated emissions. This submission is focused on the use of process heat in an Auckland context, highlights emissions reduction opportunities and presents feedback on the identified barriers.

6. This submission is being lodged as an officer submission without full political endorsement and will be discussed by the Environment and Community Committee on 12 March 2019. At that point, we request the ability to provide additional details or amended recommendations as necessary.

Auckland specific information

7. Process heat refers to the thermal energy used to manufacture products in industry, in the form of steam, hot water and hot gases. In Auckland, process heat is responsible for approximately 20 per cent of the region’s greenhouse gas emissions. The application of fossil fuels in process heat accounts for most of these emissions, from both burning (60 per cent) and electricity generation. The predominant fossil fuels used are coal, natural gas and diesel, with the majority of the coal used in high temperature process heat for metal production.

8. Auckland’s industrial sector contributes to 26 per cent of the local economy which is equivalent to $22B annually. This sector relies primarily on natural gas to provide heat for industrial processes, such as manufacturing, cleaning and sterilisation. Two distinct challenges this sector faces over the next thirty years are a diminishing natural gas supply and achieving Auckland’s emissions reduction targets.

9. Auckland Council and Waikato University have investigated the process heat demand in Auckland and the potential focus areas for emission reductions. The results from this work are outlined in
the report in "Process Heat Emissions & Energy use in the Auckland Region", March 2018. The council can provide copy of this report on request.

10. The main conclusions from this report are:

- Targeted efficiency gains could only provide between 1 to 5 per cent reduction in energy use and emissions. Targeting efficiency alone does not account for greater opportunities for greenhouse gas emissions reductions.

- Process heat in the low to medium temperature range (20 to 200°C), which accounts for approximately 70 per cent of Auckland’s process heat, could transition to electricity. The transition could be enabled through a combination of new technology (e.g. high temperature heat pumps) and process optimisation.

- The remaining process heat that cannot be transitioned to electricity is high temperature (200 to 400°C). The use of electricity for high temperature process heat is currently not technically or economically feasible. The New Zealand supply of natural gas is predicted to drop steeply after 2022 and the council recommends that natural gas to be prioritised for industries that require high temperature process heat.

Consultation questions (from Consultation Document)

11. Auckland Council has provided feedback on specific barriers from the “Process Heat in New Zealand: Opportunities and barriers to lowering emissions” technical report that are relevant to Auckland region.

Barrier A: The cost of emissions is not fully priced

12. This barrier relates to the ETS and proposed changes, including exposure of emissions intensive trade industries that are protected from ETS by the free allocation of units. Auckland Council found that the price of ETS units for carbon were too low to instigate a transition to renewable fuels. An increase in the price of ETS units to $50 would only add $5 to the cost of coal, just bringing it into parity with natural gas and wood pellets. An ETS price of $150 would be required to bring the cost of coal into parity with electricity.

Barrier I: High cost of electrical energy relative to other high carbon fuels

13. Auckland Council agrees that the use of electricity or alternative fuel sources has cost implications for industry. Generally, electricity costs approximately 3 times more than natural gas and up to 5 times more than coal. Biomass has a similar cost to natural gas and is twice the cost of coal. The use of high temperature heat pumps can lower energy requirements, enabling the required electricity costs to be more competitive with other energy sources such as natural gas. This price barrier is particularly relevant as a large percentage of process heat in Auckland is supplied by natural gas.

---

1 Atkins, M., 2018, Process Heat Emission and Energy Use in the Auckland Region
Barriers (L & M) to the use of woody biomass

14. In an Auckland context, the application of biomass as a fuel replacement has limited feasibility. There are limited opportunities for large-scale forestry in the Auckland region and replacement of current fossil fuels with biomass would require the biomass to be transported into the Auckland region. In addition, the low energy density of biomass (in comparison with fossil fuels) hinders its long-haul transportation capability, both economically and the associated emissions\(^1\). Biomass however could be a potential fuel replacement for other New Zealand cities where long-haul transportation is not required.

Hydrogen as a fuel for process heat

15. The final section of the report mentions that a research project has been set up to assess the use of hydrogen for process heat. The preliminary results indicate that hydrogen is not cost competitive for process heat even with a carbon price in excess of $100 per ton. The report mentions that this analysis may need to be revisited if major changes occur to the carbon price, cost of electricity and carbon capture or storage.

16. Auckland Council suggests that any analysis should also consider the ramifications of a 100 per cent renewable electricity grid and the future requirement to replace natural gas for medium to high temperature process heat. A 100 per cent renewable electricity grid will require some form of grid balancing (e.g. production of low to zero cost hydrogen) when the supply exceeds demand. The co-benefits of this and the use of hydrogen for process heat demand need to be part of any such analysis on the use of hydrogen.

17. Auckland Council welcomes an opportunity to review and discuss the results of this investigation when it has been completed, particularly given our regional emissions footprint.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To note progress on the forward work programme (Attachment A)
2. To provide a public record of memos, workshop or briefing papers that have been distributed for the Committee’s information since 12 February 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
3. This is regular information-only report which aims to provide public visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo or other means, where no decisions are required.
4. The following papers/memos were circulated to members:
   • 20190306_International Relations Unit memo
   • 20190228_Workshop: Piha Flooding response
   • 20190220_Workshop: Water work programmes of Central Government and Auckland Council
   • 20190212_Refresh of Global Partnerships and Strategy Unit and Global Engagement Activity update – February 2019
5. Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.
6. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/
   • at the top of the page, select meeting “Environment and Community Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
   • under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled “Extra Attachments”.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the summary of the Environment and Community Committee information report – 12 March 2019.
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## ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME 2018

This committee deals with strategy and policy decision-making that relates to the environmental, social, economic and cultural activities of Auckland as well as matters that are not the responsibility of another committee or the Governing Body.

### Committee Priorities:

1. Clearly demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
2. Enable green growth with a focus on improved water quality, pest eradication and ecological restoration
3. Strengthen communities and enable Aucklanders to be active and connected
4. Make measurable progress towards the social and community aspects of housing all Aucklanders in secure, healthy homes they can afford
5. Grow skills and a local workforce to support economic growth in Auckland

The work of the committee will:

- Deliver on the outcomes in the Auckland Plan
- Be focused on initiatives that have a high impact
- Meet the Council’s statutory obligations, including funding allocation decisions
- Increase the public’s trust and confidence in the organisation.

### Area of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic approach to Climate Change</td>
<td>To demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce emissions.</td>
<td>Strategic direction will be provided in the coming months. <strong>Progress to date:</strong> A summary of activities to prepare for climate change was given in the presentation on 8/8/17 meeting. Report was considered on 20/2/18, resolution ENV/2018/11 Dec 18 – approval for consultation Feb – Mar 19 - targeted public engagement Apr 19 – feedback presented to elected members Jun 19 – final strategy for adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Edited 6 November 2018**

Q2 (Dec)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14</th>
<th>Low carbon living</th>
<th>To deliver on Low Carbon Auckland Plan commitments by the design and implementation of awareness raising and incentives programmes to reduce household, community, business and schools carbon emissions by approximately 50% of current levels.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Strategic direction and endorse** programmes as part of the Low Carbon Auckland Plan implementation.

**Progress to date:**
Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec 18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group (IAG) was approved. Chairs Planning and Env & Community Ctees, an IMSB member and the Mayor’s office to decide on the membership of the IAG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q3 (Feb)</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1 (Sept)</th>
<th>Q2 (Dec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment A</th>
<th>Low Carbon Auckland / Climate Change Mitigation</th>
<th>Four-yearly review of strategic action plan due in 2018; increased engagement with and commitments via C40 Cities membership; development of proactive policy agenda to central government emerging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Climate Plan Workshop:**
- Risks and vulnerabilities (June)
  - Committee workshop on risks and vulnerabilities
  - Communication strategy for broader public engagement
  - Local Board workshops
  - Mana whenua engagement (integrated throughout)
  - Stakeholder workshops
- Prioritisation criteria and identified actions (Jul/Aug)
  - Cost benefit and total value analysis
  - Agree prioritisation criteria
  - Review all actions
  - Draft plan
  - Draft plan to committee (Dec 2018)
  - Consultation (linking to other plans, approach tbc)
  - Updates to action plan
  - Adoption of updated plan by council (Proposed December 2018)
  - Final Adoption of Climate Plan (Mar 09)

**Decision and endorsement** of strategic direction

**Progress to date:**
Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec 18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group was approved.

Workshops scheduled: 4/7/18 and 26/09/18. An update was included in the 12/06/18 meeting agenda.

Report reapplication for C40 Cities membership was considered at 13/11/2018 meeting. Res ENV/2018/149 reapplication for membership was approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q3 (Mar)</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2 (Dec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Forest Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic approach to delivering on the wider social, economic and environmental benefits of a growing urban forest in the context of rapid population growth and intensification.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Decision** on strategic direction and endorsement of strategy.

**Progress to date:**
A workshop was held on 14/06/17. Report was considered on 12/09/17 ENV/2017/116 a full draft of the strategy was considered 20/02/18, res ENV/2018/12 with a report back on the results of the LIDAR and an implementation plan on costs and benefits in Aug 2018. An update was included in the 14 Aug agenda regarding several workstreams covered by the 18 high level implementation actions. A report on a full progress on implementing the strategy will be in August 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1 (Aug19)</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund</th>
<th>Decision making over medium and large funds from the Waste Minimisation and Innovation fund in line with the fund’s adopted policy. Funds to contribute towards council’s aspirational goal of zero waste to landfill by 2040. Full review of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Decision** on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year.

Decision: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q3 (Mar)</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Auckland’s water strategy

The health of Auckland’s waters is a critical issue. Both freshwater and marine environments in Auckland are under pressure from historic under-investment, climate change and rapid growth. The draft Auckland Plan 2050 identifies the need to proactively adapt to a changing water future and develop long-term solutions.

**Progress to date:**
- Decision and strategic direction and priorities as part of the Auckland Plan.
- Consider the development of an Auckland’s waters strategy to be adopted for consultation December 2018.

**Progress to date:**
- A report was considered December 2018 - discussion document ahead of public consultation Res ENV/2018/168. Key timeframes:
  - Public consultation on discussion document 17 Feb – 17 March
  - Public engagement feedback to committee, April 2019
  - Draft options for the finalisation of Auckland’s water strategy, and associated work programmes to be present to committee in June 2019

**Key milestones:**
- June 2018 – develop a strategic summary of water related outcomes, identify integrated water outcomes,
- July-Oct 2018 – high level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes – consultation with mana whenua

### Regional Pest Management Plan review

Statutory obligations under the Biosecurity Act to control weeds and animal pests.
To ensure that the plan is consistent with the national policy direction and up to date.

**Progress to date:**
- Decision: Agreed to the inconsistencies in ACT at the 14 Feb 2017 ENV/2017/7 Item 12
- Workshops held on 4/04/17, 3/05/17 and 27/09/17
- Draft plan was approved for consultation in Nov 2017
- Funding for implementation of the proposed RPMP through LTP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 (Jul)</th>
<th>Q2 (Nov)</th>
<th>Q3 (Mar)</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information

- Updates, memos and briefings
- 12 March 2019

- Item 14
  - Will be undertaken. Outcomes provided with the section 17a review report in March 2019.

- Progress to date:
  - Report was considered on 4/12/18 to note allocations for the 2018/2019 small to med September funding round, res ENV/2018/176. Item C1 approval of medium to large grants September 2018 round
| Attachment A | Item 14 | Inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan | A memo was distributed and is attached to the July agenda. Key milestones:
- workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018
- workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018
- engagement with mana whenua – September – October 2018
- workshop with Environment and Community Committee – October – November 2018
- formal feedback from local boards at business meetings – October – November 2018
- approval of final plan by Environment and Community Committee – March 2019 |
| Allocation of the Regional Natural Heritage Grant | Decision-making over regional environment fund as per the grants funding policy and fund guidelines |
| National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management | Decision on the development of the discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan for public consultation. **Progress to date:** A memo was distributed on 31/05/18 advising the committee on the Auckland Council’s participation in the development of a discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan, through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity partnership. |
| | Allocation of the Regional Environmental Natural Heritage Grant for the 2017-2018 financial year was made on 6 Dec 2016_ENV/2016/11 Item 15 |
| | Council submission was approved on Central Govt. Clean Water Consultation 2017 process: Minutes of 4 April ENV/2017/54 Item 12. Follow up is required for resolution b) – a workshop held on 14 June. A supplementary submission on the Clean Water Consultation package was made on 25 May 2017, Item 14 13/06/17 Decision ENV/2018/14 on engagement approach for consultation on the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management in Feb 2018. A report was considered on 26/6/18 : Res ENV/2018/78 |
| | Progress to date: 
- June 2018: develop strategy
- July to Oct 2018 – High level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes in consultation with mana whenua, local boards and key stakeholders.
- Dec 2018- Draft Auckland’s waters strategy presented to... |
### Environment and Community Committee
12 March 2019

#### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Q3 (Mar)</th>
<th>TBC</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Policy Alliance</strong></td>
<td>To consider food policy alliance</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on food policy alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Auckland Growing Greener** | Statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act, Biosecurity Act and Local Government Act. Consideration of items to give effect to the adopted commitment of Auckland Council to grow greener. | **Strategic direction** and oversight into council’s role to improve the natural environment, and to endorse proposed incentives. This may include **endorsing**:  
- a framework to ensure planning and growth decisions are underpinned by relevant environmental data  
- proposed incentives for green growth  
- recommendations arising from a current state statutory obligations review. |

| **Hunua Aerial 1080 Operation** | Provide information on outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation | To note outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation. |

#### Parks, Sports and Recreation

| **Sport and Rec Strategic Partnership Grant to Aktive Auck Sports Rec** | Approval of $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auck & Sport to deliver on agreed priority initiatives.  
**2019 reporting schedule:**  
- January 2019 - Interim report from 1 July – 31 December 2018  
- June 2019 - confirm 2019/20 priorities, outcomes and measures  
- July 2019 – Annual report from 1 January 2019 – 30 June 2019  
- September 2019 - Audited Financial Statements from 1 July 2018 – 30 June 2019 | To approve the $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport & Recreation for 2017/2018  
**Progress to date:**  
*Report* was considered 5/12/17 Resolution ENV/2017/186 – report back against KPI every six months.  
A *report* was considered on 10 July 2018 to approve the strategic partnership grant of $552,000 per annum for a three-year term (2018-2021) Res ENV/2018/90  
A funding agreement will be prepared for Aktive that ensures clear accountability and KPIs for each of the four geographical areas (North, West, Central and Southern) for the investment. (TBA) |

| **Te Motu a Hiaroa (Puketutu Island)** | Status update on the Te Motu a Hiaroa Governance Trust | To note further update on progress of the governance trust. |

| **Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan** | Status report on implementation plan | **Direction** on future options for sport and recreation. |

| **Sports Investment Plan** | Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and | **Decision** on issues papers |

---

*Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information - updates, memos and briefings - 12 March 2019*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment A</th>
<th>Item 14</th>
<th>Golf Investment Plan</th>
<th>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in golf.</th>
<th>Draft Plan approval Finalise and adopt investment plan – approval of guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>Evaluation of current sports facilities investments and proposed changes was adopted on 14 March, resolution ENV/2017/39 Item 13 with the final draft investment plan to be adopted prior to consultation. An outcome measurement tool to support the Sports Facilities Investment Plan was considered and agreed at the 4 April 2017 meeting. Resolution ENV/2017/50 Item 9. The findings of the pilot will be reported in mid-2019 seeking a decision on the roll-out model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor Courts</th>
<th>Strategic business case for indoor courts investment</th>
<th>Decision on investment approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Springs Community School Partnership</th>
<th>Improve Community Access to school facilities</th>
<th>Decision on Business and Investment in indoor court facility at Western Springs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>The report was considered in May. Resolution ENV/2017/21. A business case will be prepared to outline the opportunity to fully invest in the indoor court development and can consider as part of the LTP 2018-2028.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Programme</th>
<th>Update on proposed growth funding allocation for 2018-2020</th>
<th>Decision on growth funding allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Sport and Recreation grants programme 2018/2020</th>
<th>Review of previous grants allocation and recommendation for next round</th>
<th>Decision on sport and recreation grants programme objectives and approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Nov)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Nov)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(May)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012: TOR**

The review will assess the efficacy of the guidelines in facilitating the council to deliver the best possible outcomes for Auckland through community leases.

**Decision** on the terms of reference for the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012

**Progress to date:**
- The TOR was approved for the review to commence and will report back in May/July 2018 subject to TLP.
- An update memo was circulated in August 2017 in response to feedback from the July 2017 meeting. Joint workshop with local board chairs held 20/8/18.
- Report was considered November 2018 and resolved ENV/2018/150.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Active Recreation Investment and Visitor Experience**

Council’s strategic approach to outcome, priorities and investment for active walking, cycling, waterways and visitor experience on open space, parks and regional parks.

**Decision** on scope and phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Takaro – Investing in Play discussion document**

Development of a play investment plan.

**Decision** on approval for public release

**Progress to date:**
- Approved on 16/05/17 for public release the discussion document and will report to E&C for approval in late 2017.
- Takaro was approved for release on 20 Feb 2018.
- A report back by August 2018 for approval to initiate public consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Parks Management Plan 2010 – variation to incorporate land at Piha into the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park**

To approve variation to incorporate land purchased at Piha to be known as Taitomo Special Management Zone as part of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park.

**Decision** on approval to a variation

**Progress to date:**
- Approved on 20/2/2018 Res ENV/2018/15 report
- Manager, Regional Parks, will prepare an integrated vegetation management and fire–risk reduction plan in consultation with the local community and report back on the resourcing needs for its effective implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**The Southern Initiative (TSI)**

Provide an update on the TSI approach, priorities and achievements.

**Strategic direction** of the TSI approach to social and community innovation in south Auckland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Global Engagement Strategy**

Provide an update and direction of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities. It has been three years since a new strategic direction was introduced, progress on this strategy will be presented.

**Strategic direction** of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Options to expand revenue streams for sport facilities investment**

Provide strategic direction to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft Sports Facilities Investment Plan

**strategic direction** to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft Sports Facilities Investment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>Social, Community, Cultural Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Network Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>A report was considered in Aug. Res ENV/2017/121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update on progress and report back on strategic business case for central west</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar)</td>
<td>Q4 (July)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>A progress report was considered on 14 March. Resolution ENV/2017/36 Item 11 to report back on an indicative business case for investment in the central-west area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and endorse the Sports Facilities Investment Plan to enable Auckland Council to take a more co-ordinated approach to its sports facilities investment.</td>
<td>Q1 (Sept)</td>
<td>Q2 (Dec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>The plan was endorsed on 12 Sept ENV/2017/118. Staff to report back on priorities and potential funding options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Regional Policy and Strategy resolution to progress work around Council’s strategic position on addressing homelessness (note this work will be informed by discussions at the Community Development and Safety Committee)</td>
<td>Q3 (Sept)</td>
<td>Q4 (Aug)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Partnerships Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved the scope policy 14 Feb Item 17. Auckland council’s position and role was considered at the August meeting report item 12. Staff to report back with an implementation plan. Resolution ENV/2017/118 of preferred position and role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the range of current council approaches to facility partnerships, issues, opportunities and agree next steps</td>
<td>Q3 (Dec)</td>
<td>Q4 (Dec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision on indicative business case for central west</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on sector’s investment priorities and investigate potential funding options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision on the Auckland Sport Sector : Facility Priorities Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 (Sept)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision on scope</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2 (Dec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision on role and direction addressing homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 (Dec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision on role and direction addressing homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q4 (Dec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision on facility partnership approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision to adopt Facility Partnership Framework in December 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update was given at 14 February meeting on Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approval was given on the proposed timelines for Phase 2 : Minutes 14 February Item 14 preferred option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A report seeking approval to engage on a draft facility partnerships policy on 12/06/18. Resolution ENV/2018/74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 (Dec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress to date: A report seeking approval of the Facility Partnerships Policy, Res ENV/2018/173</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2 (Dec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee Information - updates, memos and briefings - 12 March 2019</td>
<td>Page 307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Advice Bureaux Services</td>
<td>Review of the Citizens Advice Bureaux Services RSP decision in April 2016 [REG/2016/22]</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>July 2019 detailed operational design and testing continues. Benefits realisation plan developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 (Feb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Feb/Mar19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Community Housing Strategy and initiatives</td>
<td>Strategic overview of social and community housing initiatives. Wider housing portfolio and spatial outcomes of council’s role in housing is led by the Planning Committee.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Intervention</td>
<td>Understanding NZ and international interventions to address affordable housing</td>
<td>Decision on future Auckland Council approaches to affordable housing interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kauroa – Library Strategy</td>
<td>Libraries and Information is carrying out a change programme (Fit for the future) to accelerate the implementation of this 2013-2023 strategy (approved by the Governing Body)</td>
<td>Direction relating to priorities and to receive update on strategic direction and implementation progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>Approve an expanded and improved regional mobile library service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 (Sep)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central library strategic review</td>
<td>A strategic review of the Central Library has been commissioned to understand how the current building can meet future need and demand for services, assess the Central Library’s current and potential future role in the region, and guide decision making about future investment and development opportunities</td>
<td>Decide direction and receive the strategic review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Work around the integration with customer services</td>
<td>Decision on matters relating to regional aspects of the proposed integration (local boards will decide on local outcomes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Cities Network</td>
<td>Consideration of a proposal to join the Intercultural Cities Network to support implementation and monitoring of progress on ‘Inclusive Auckland’ actions.</td>
<td>Decide whether Auckland should be a member of the network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Aucklanders (Age Friendly City)</td>
<td>Identify issues and opportunities for an inclusive friendly city (Regional Policy and Strategy resolution REG/2016/92)</td>
<td>Strategic direction on the approach to a friendly, inclusive, diverse city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>Update reports were circulated on 18 April 2018 and 14 Dec 2017. Staff report findings and the proposed next phase in 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Jul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Committee Action</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Enterprise approaches for youth and long term unemployed</td>
<td>Improved understanding of social enterprise reach, impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on councils approach to social enterprise.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth volunteer programmes</td>
<td>Intervention assessment of youth volunteer programmes on long term education and employment – understanding impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on interventions approach</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Policy</td>
<td>A review of what is working well and what isn’t</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Policy Monitoring</td>
<td>Audit of the application of the Grants Policy</td>
<td>Decision on audit results</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toi Whātiki Strategy</td>
<td>Targeted analysis of social return on investment on specific art and culture investment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art Policy</td>
<td>Review of the Public Arts Policy: what’s working what’s not. Decisions relating to major public arts</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Development Contribution revenue and expenditure – funding for open space purposes</td>
<td>Highlight the new parks and open spaces for Aucklanders’ use and enjoyment</td>
<td>A report was considered on 14/08/17 on Open Space acquisition in 2017/18 financial year. resolution ENV/2018/104 to report back on DC revenue and expenditure by funding area for open space purposes based on current based on the current DC policy.</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation in North-West Community Provision</td>
<td>Investigation to identify any current gaps in services or facilities or in the future</td>
<td>Decision on the investigation findings</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGISLATION/CENTRAL GOVERNMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Environmental Standards</td>
<td>Council response on the National Direction for aquaculture expected following scheduled release of consultation document in April 2017. The National Direction is likely to address matters relating to re-consenting, bay-wide management, innovation and research, and biosecurity.</td>
<td>Direction Committee agreement to a council submission on the National Direction for Aquaculture</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic acquisition issues and opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding current acquisition issues and options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land acquisition for stormwater purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated responsibility of the committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To acquire land for stormwater management and development purposes, to either support a structure plan or ad-hoc development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to acquire land. Reports will come to committee as required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next report will be in Feb 2018 seeking authority to carry out compulsory acquisition of land in the Henderson area for a flood prevention project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 (Feb)</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing the development of the 2018-2028 Auckland Council Long-term Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>