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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 20 March 2019, as a true and correct record.

5 Leave of Absence

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

6 Acknowledgements

- Congratulations Krysta Hoani and Jennifer Feret – Brear of the Otahuhu Softball Club who have been named in the NZ Women’s White Sox team.

7 Petitions

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

8 Deputations

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

8.1 Deputation - South Harbour Business Association Inc

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Alex Holley would like to update the board on the South Harbour Business Association Inc.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thank Alex Holley for her presentation and attendance.
8.2 Deputation - Te Manawa Respite Centre

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Puti Wilson and Doug Wilson would like to discuss with the board the possibility of establishing a respite centre next to the Papatuanuku Marae at 161R Robertson Road, Mangere.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thank Puti and Doug Wilson for their presentation and attendance.

Attachments
A Te Manawa Respite Centre presentation .......................................................... 371

9 Public Forum

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

9.1 Public Forum - Crime Prevention Officer - Mangere & Mangere East Town Centre's

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Toni Helleur would like to give a progress report on crime prevention in Mangere and Mangere East Town Centre's.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thank Toni Helleur for her presentation and attendance.

9.2 Public Forum - Mangroves at Otahuhu and proposed Pontoon

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. James Papali'i would like to speak to the board regarding mangroves at Otahuhu and a pontoon to be built under the Mangere bridges Waterfront Road Reserve.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thank James Papali'i for his presentation and attendance.
10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. A period of time (10 Minutes) has been set aside for the Manukau Ward Councillors to have an opportunity to update the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on regional matters.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive the verbal reports from Cr Alf Filipaina and Cr Efeso Collins.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Purpose of the report

This item allows the local board members an opportunity to present verbal and written updates on their lead rolls, such as relevant actions, appointments and meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Impact Forum for Kohuora Corrections Facility</td>
<td>Makalita Kolo</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere Bridge BID</td>
<td>Tauanu‘u Nick Bakulich</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere Town Centre BID</td>
<td>Tafafuna‘i Tasi Lauese</td>
<td>Makalita Kolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere East Village BID</td>
<td>Tauanu‘u Nick Bakulich</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otahuhu Business Association</td>
<td>Christine O’Brien</td>
<td>Makalita Kolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Harbour Business Association BID</td>
<td>Carrol Elliott</td>
<td>Makalita Kolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Noise Community Consultative Group</td>
<td>Tafafuna‘i Tasi Lauese</td>
<td>Tauanu‘u Nick Bakulich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Estuary Environmental Forum</td>
<td>Carrol Elliott</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Connections South Local Governance Group (3 members)</td>
<td>Christine O’Brien, Makalita Kolo, Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
<td>Tauanu‘u Nick Bakulich (appointed 15 March 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori input into local board decision-making political steering group (1 lead, 1 alternate)</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pukaki Tapu O Poutukeka Historic Reserve &amp; Associated Lands Co-Management Committee</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambury Park Centre</td>
<td>Christine O’Brien</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere Mountain Education Trust</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government New Zealand Zone One Committee</td>
<td>Carrol Elliott (appointed 21 March 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Board Leads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Environmental Services lead</td>
<td>Carrol Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Community and Events lead</td>
<td>Tafafuna‘i Tasi Lauese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Sport and Recreation lead and Community Facilities</td>
<td>Tauanu‘u Nick Bakulich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries and Information Services lead</td>
<td>Christine O’Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local planning and heritage lead – includes responding to resource consent applications on behalf of board</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua (Planning)/ Carrol Elliott (Heritage)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ngā tūtohunga

**Recommendation/s**

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive the verbal and written reports from local board members.

### Ngā tāpirihanga

**Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

### Ngā kaihaina

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairpersons Report and Announcements

File No.: CP2019/01967

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. This item gives the Chairperson an opportunity to update the local board on any announcements and for the local board to receive the Chairperson’s written report.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive the verbal update and written report of the local board Chair.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Chairs report</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
Chair’s Report
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Acknowledgements:

- Māngere Arts Centre – 2129 people in the theatre last week. The highlight was Rosalina which was a sold out season and 40 per day for Sinarella rehearsals.
- Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board community for the wonderful event to acknowledge our Volunteers and their families, without their genuine support and hard work, commitment and aroha for our community, there are a number of events and activities whom would struggle to be completed week in and week out.
- Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board staff and Auckland Council Events team lead Cici Dwe for their commitment a very successful event was delivered to the community Thursday 28 March 2019.
- Māngere Bridge Safety working group have held its first initial meeting to discuss the issues facing Māngere Bridge Causeway. Acknowledge Māngere Bridge Residents and Ratepayers Executive, Māngere Bridge Association Executive, Police relieving Area Commander, Auckland Transport, Auckland Council officers and Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board members. The group has agreed to meet frequently until a clear action plan is resolved.
- Al Farooq Community Trust event Toia Recreational centre, peace vigil service from local Muslim community and surrounding neighbours attended by distinguished guests.
- Thanks to Hon Aupito Su’a W Sio and to member Makalita Kolo for the visit to Free Tongan Church Favona Road Māngere AGM Church conference – over 500 attended from nationwide and overseas to attend. I had the opportunity to address the audience hosted by President Rev Semisi Fonua, Reverend Ministers and hundreds in the audience from the Tongan Community.

Other:

- Māngere Wastewater Treatment Plant and Central Interceptor Project.
- Finance and Performance Committee 19 March 2019.
- Seafood Plant team proposed change of location. From Countdown Māngere Management.
- Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund open on Monday 1 April until Tuesday 30 April 2019.
- Waiheke Governance Pilot Activity Update action memo.
- Verbal Report on other matters.
- Complaints are being received regarding Mangere Town Centre public toilets and are being asked for these to be investigated, or review, as a higher standard of service may be required. Refer to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board facebook page for updated photos and community events updates on a regular basis.
- A few more verbal updates will be provided on the night of the meeting, (although I will provide Apologies for the early departure after presenting this Chair’s report on the night).

Lemauga Lydia Sosene
Chair
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
April 2019
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To present the Regional Facilities Auckland – Second Quarter Report 2018-2019 to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board for their information.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:


Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Regional Facilities Auckland - Second Quarter Report</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rina Tagore - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu &amp; Otara-Papatoetoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Facilities Auckland

This outlines the key performance of Regional Facilities Auckland for the Quarter ended 31 December 2018.
### Regional Facilities Auckland Q2 summary

#### Highlights & risks for the quarter

**Highlights**
- **Highlight 1:** Returning New Zealander Gregory Burke has been appointed Director of the Auckland Art Gallery in April. Burke was most recently CEO of the Remai Modern gallery in Saskatoon, Canada.
- **Highlight 2:** Auckland Live venues hosted multiple large-scale events, which included Taste Auckland at Queen’s Wharf for the first time, attracting 15,000 ticketholders, along with Diwali Festival and Farmer’s Santa Parade. Auckland Conventions and Events staged 96 events, including Cuisine Good Food Awards and the New Zealand Television Awards at The Civic.
- **Highlight 3:** Mt Smart Stadium hosted two major events: Taylor Swift’s Bad Reputation tour and the Monster Energy SX Open. Taylor Swift’s concert featured 140ft screens, huge props and a snake gondola, while days later the stadium was transformed with 6000 tonnes of dirt and 10,000 sqm of thick geo-tech cloth into a motocross track.

**Risks**
- **Risk 1:** The financial operational performance is currently forecasted at an unfavourable variance of approximately $1.5m (or 1.5% of total expenditure). Focus remains on securing revenue opportunities and deferral or cutting non-essential variable costs.
- **Risk 2:** Conventions, Stadiums, and Auckland Live revenue remains cyclical and volatile.
- **Risk 3:** Business interruption caused by the capital works at the Aotea Centre and Auckland Zoo may continue to have a more significant negative impact on revenue generation than originally budgeted.
- **Risk 4:** The loss of the VEC as a conventions venue will hamper the ability to grow the conventions market.

#### Financial commentary

- **Capital delivery:** Two major projects (Aotea Centre and the Zoo’s South East Asia precinct) are progressing well but will have revised cash flow with less spend in the FY19 than budgeted. These are contracted and expected to be completed in the beginning of the 2019/20 financial year.
- **Direct revenue:** Revenue is unfavourable to budget due to two large theatre events have been postponed and three outdoor concerts did not proceed as budgeted. This has also had a consequential flow on effect on other revenue.
- **Direct expenditure:** Overall direct expenditure is $2.5m favourable to budget as costs are actively controlled to offset the unfavourable revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial (million)</th>
<th>YTD actual</th>
<th>YTD budget</th>
<th>Actual vs Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital delivery</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct revenue</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct expenditure</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net direct expenditure</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key performance indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 2</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience RFA’s arts, environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td>869,700</td>
<td>816,606</td>
<td>914,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Maori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurua</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic focus area – Stadia

Key highlights and risks

**Highlights**
- **Highlight 1:** QBE Stadium – capital works on reconfiguration of the main field to accommodate baseball and roof access construction and repair is in procurement planning phase for development to commence later in the financial year.
- **Highlight 2:** Mt Smart Stadium – capital works on the lower west stand seating replacement is on track for completion and the Athletics track refurbishment works have been completed within budget.
- **Highlight 3:** Western Springs gears up for the summer outdoor concerts Fat Freddy’s Drop, Mumford Sons, and Six 60. Major renewals work to continue after these concerts.

**Risks**
- **Risk 1:** Projects underway and current seismic and supporting structure assessments may uncover unidentified issues which may lead to additional costs and time delay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QBE Baseball Reconfiguration</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Reconfiguration and construction to enable the hosting of the Auckland Tuatara’s home games for next season at QBE stadium</td>
<td>This project is currently in procurement phase with construction to commence in March and completed by October 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Smart Lower West Stand Seating Replacement</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>The replacement of the seating area entirely, including seats, structure and decking on the lower west stand of Mt Smart Stadium.</td>
<td>This renewals project for Mt Smart Stadium is required to ensure health and safety and tenancy obligations continue to be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBE Stadium Roof</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>To construct access to the QBE Grandstand roof and undertake roof repairs (renewals)</td>
<td>Project is currently in procurement with construction to commence in this financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Springs Renewal</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>The replacement of two toilet blocks, gate entry building, maintenance shed, concourse and Stadium Road upgrade works.</td>
<td>Essential renewals currently in the procurement phase and expected to commence in March with completion due in November 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic context**

RFA’s Venue Development Strategy (VDS) identifies the issues facing the current major outdoor stadiums in Auckland, and proposes key focus areas over the next 20 years to address these issues. These primarily provides more fit for purpose stadia which are better more financially sustainable, better utilised and provide improved value for money through less duplication.
Strategic focus area – Zoo development

Key highlights and risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Highlight 1: Renewal of the Old Elephant House to improve visitor amenities has been completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highlight 2: The development of a South East Asian Precinct is underway, and has completed its first year of construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Risk 1: The extent of the construction work may undermine the visitor experience and perception of value at the zoo whilst the project is underway. This has reduced visitation and associated revenues. A new pricing strategy has been implemented in an effort to increase the level of visitation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic context

RFA is continuing with development of a world class zoo and conservation facility by addressing aging infrastructure at Auckland Zoo and long-term under-investment through a phased programme of works. This has the aim of essential renewals to ensure that the Auckland Zoo meets the modern standards of animal welfare, visitor amenity, wildlife exhibition and health and safety obligations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. E. Asia Precinct development</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the central area within the zoo to provide modern standards of housing and care for the Zoo’s South East Asian species, and new catering facilities for zoo visitors</td>
<td>Largest renewals project ($60m) in the zoo’s history. Tracking to budget and expected to be completed in the 2019/20 financial year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Focus Area - Aotea Centre Development

#### Key Highlights and Risks

**Highlight 1:** Refurbishment of the interior of the Aotea Centre due for completion in March 2019.

**Highlight 2:** Refurbishment of the exterior of the Aotea Centre (weather-tightening) has commenced.

**Highlight 3:** Installation of an outdoor screen, the “Digital Stage” on Aotea Square, to provide live and enhanced digital experience for visitors to the Aotea Arts Precinct.

**Risk 1:** Changing consenting requirements in relation to “Greantil” is causing programme delays on the exterior for up to 6 to 9 months.

**Risk 2:** Unfavourable revenue impact from delays will be sought for the additional costs as part of the Annual Plan 2019/20 budget refresh.

**Risk 3:** Potential negative impact on the customer experience caused by ongoing construction works.

#### Key Programme of Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>The first significant refurbishment of the 20-year-old Centre, including additional space and addressing fire safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>A fixed planning approach to the development of the square, and its surrounds, to ensure the project meets its potential as a key arts and creative space for Aucklanders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

- Compliance with Council’s evolving consent requirements is causing programme delays to the project. Additional funding will be sought through the Council’s project risk fund or the Annual Plan 2019/20 budget refresh.
- The project is progressing well, with the architect undertaking design development work.
- This project is in its early stages, and it is envisaged that a funding proposal for the development will be sought in future LTPs.
Other letter of expectation focus areas

**Arts & culture strategy**
- Artist Ruth Buchanan was announced the winner of the biennial contemporary art award the Walters Prize 2018 at the Auckland Art Gallery.
- The Auckland Live Digital Stage launched in Aotea Square. Auckland’s newest outdoor screen showcases stories and profiles of arts companies, artists, and new and existing works from New Zealand and around the world.
- The exhibition Gordon Walters: New Vision closed at Auckland Art Gallery and reached its exhibition audience target with nearly 45,000 visitors.
- A Day at Auckland Live – Auckland Live’s school’s free accessibility and learning programme wrapped for 2018 with Let’s Dance! The programme was attended by more than 1500 school students.
- The exhibition Carving Water, Painting Voice opened at the Maritime Museum.
- The UNESCO Memory of the World New Zealand Trust announced the inscription of the Marti Friedlander Archive, held by Auckland Art Gallery’s E H McCormick Research Library, to its documentary heritage register, which highlights significant documentary heritage from around the world.
- Auckland Live launched its seasonal music programme Sounds of Summer which saw more than 32,000 attendees enjoy these activations in December alone.

**Sustainability and Climate change**
- NZ Maritime Museum received a Qualmark Gold Sustainable Tourism Business Award, recognising how the Museum has increased its commitment to delivering a socially sustainable experience.
- Auckland Stadiums launched a new sustainability initiative for concerts in October. The reusable Glovelet Cups help Auckland Stadiums greatly reduce the amount of plastic used at a concert and can be re-used for future events.
- A new sustainability themed family space has been installed at the Maritime Museum to communicate the importance of looking after our oceans and encourage responsible consumption and disposal of waste.
- Auckland Conventions has moved to ensure that all branded collateral is eco-friendly, with re-usable tote bags distributed at tradeshows and client meetings, along with a re-usable branded water bottle.
- In December, NZ Maritime Museum hosted the Northern NZ Seabirds Trust annual conference, Across all Realms: Sea, Land and Air – Our Seabird Toaonga. The sold-out two-day event highlighted marine threats to seabirds including bycatch, plastics, climate change and light pollution and exemplified the Maritime Museum as a hub for the maritime community.

**Contribution towards Maori outcomes**
- As part of a wayfinding improvement review at the new Aotea Centre, bilingual signage for rooms and public places are being developed. These provide a more user-friendly experience for visitors, correlating to their position in the building and also reflecting the unique geographical setting of Tamaki Makaurau.
- New Zealand Maritime Museum successfully trialed a waka programme for kura kaupapa Maori with a waka from Waikato. This programme is being developed in collaboration with Te Toki Voyaging Trust, as the kaitiaki of matauranga waka.
- The RFA Maori Responsiveness Plan was released in December 2018.
- Bi-cultural signage is being implemented at Auckland Stadium as part of its regular renewals programme.
- Management have met with Tupuna o Tamaki Makaurau Trust, with whom ownership of the Rarotonga Mt Smart resides to develop and strengthen the formal relationship.

**Local board engagement**
- In October and November all local boards received the RFA quarterly newsletter, the annual publication ‘Our Year’ as well as both the 2017-18 fourth quarter report and the 2018-19 first quarter report. While a number of local boards regularly include the reports in meeting agendas, it is pleasing that more boards are now doing so. This enables improved engagement between the boards and RFA.
- During the quarter there was a range of meetings with boards regarding various matters. The CEO and Director, Auckland Stadiums, visited Maungakiekie-Tamaki and Mangere-Ohauhunga Local Boards to discuss sporting facilities, including clarification of the roles of RFA and Auckland Council. The Director, Auckland Stadiums, met twice with Upper Harbour Local Board to maintain effective communications regarding QBE Stadium, and also visited Waitakera Local Board regard Western Springs Stadium. The CEO visited Devonport-Takapuna Local Board, and presented an update to the Local Board Chairs Forum.
- Some board members have requested and received more information about the ways RFA meets community needs, such as subsidised community rates, free activities, and in particular acknowledging the needs of young people.
### Direct operating performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 2</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net direct expenditure</strong></td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct revenue</strong></td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; user charges</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating grants and subsidies</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct revenue</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct expenditure</strong></td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, contributions &amp; sponsorship</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct expenditure</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other key operating lines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC operating funding (CCO only)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested assets</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net interest expense</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Commentary

**Comment 1:** Budget phasing has been evenly phased/allocated 6/12 and does not take into account seasonal fluctuations.

**Comment 2:** The RFA Internal Budget reflects a $270k favourable to budget variance as the budget has been phased to reflect seasonal event fluctuations.

**Comment 3:** Fees and user charges are unfavourable to budget due to planned events not occurring. Two large live theatre events have been postponed and two large outdoor concerts budgeted (but not secured) for the second half of the year will not proceed. This has also impacted food and beverage sales.

**Comment 4:** Overall direct expenditure is $2.5m favourable to budget. Reduced costs are in response to the lower revenue.

**Comment 5:** Employee Benefits contains $4.8m staff costs that are recharged against events. These recharges are budgeted under Cost of Goods Sold (COGS) within other direct expenses. Actual Staff costs are favourable to budget.

**Comment 6:** Other direct expenses contains COGS which includes salary recharges of $4.8m. The $4.8m recovery should offset against employee benefits - RFA will continue to work with Auckland Council Officers to rectify this reporting issue moving forward.

**Comment 7:** The forecasted operational position for the end of the year shows an unfavourable variance of approximately $1.5m (or 1.5% of total expenditure). Focus remains on securing revenue opportunities and deferral or cutting non-essential variable costs to reduce this variance.
### Regional Facilities Auckland Q2 performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key performance indicators</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 2</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience Regional facilities Auckland's arts, environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td>869,700</td>
<td>816,606</td>
<td>914,373</td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to Auckland Zoo</td>
<td>172,819</td>
<td>173,989</td>
<td>176,167</td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to Auckland Art Gallery</td>
<td>110,052</td>
<td>94,099</td>
<td>125,933</td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to the NZ Maritime Museum</td>
<td>34,770</td>
<td>43,800</td>
<td>43,349</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Auckland residents surveyed who value RFA venues and events</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Maintain or Improve</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Maori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Transport April 2019 update report

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on transport related matters in their area, including the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. A decision is not required this month but the report contains information about the following:
   - The wider ‘context’ involving a summary of the strategic projects or issues affecting the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu area, including information about the new Community Safety Fund.
   - Responses to recent resolutions made by the board.
   - An update on the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) that includes important new information about the following projects:
     - Discussion of potential Boggust Park project.
     - Upgrading the footpaths in and around the Māngere East Town Centre.
     - Building a roundabout at the intersection of Bader Drive and Idlewild Roads
     - Building a cycle path through Ashgrove Reserve
   - Progress on local board advocacy initiatives.
   - A summary of consultation about future Auckland Transport activities is included as Attachment B.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport April 2019 update report.

Horopaki
Context
3. Auckland Transport is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. Auckland Transport reports on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.
4. Auckland Transport continues to deliver a number of strategic projects in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, as discussed below.
Community Safety Fund

5. Established in the 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan, the Community Safety sees $20 million across all local board for local road safety initiatives. The fund is delivered in two tranches:
   - $5 million in the 19/20 Financial Year
   - $15 million in the 20/21 Financial Year

6. Funding is apportioned to local board areas by a formula that is based on the number of death and serious injury crashes in that area. Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s budget is $1,108,085 over the two years.

7. The Community Safety Fund is a capital budget that can be used to deliver projects raised by the local community to prevent, control or mitigate identified local safety hazards that could result in death or serious injury. Individual project cost is to be no greater than $1 million. The projects must consist of best practice components, conform to Auckland Transport standards and comply with New Zealand law.

8. The Community Safety Fund cannot be spent on projects that are already planned and funded or that clash with other planned projects (including renewals). Complex projects that may take longer than two years to deliver will also not be considered. Nor will projects containing unconventional or unproven components such as new trials or pilot projects.

9. Community Safety Fund projects must also be in the road corridor and be able to be cost effectively maintained. The project’s effect on network efficiency will also be reviewed and any that negatively affect the network will not be supported.

10. Soon Auckland Transport will engage with all local boards providing some ideas and seeking advice on where this fund could be best used. Part of the discussion will involve discussing potential safety around schools projects.

11. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has a first workshop booked on 16 April 2019 to start discussing use of the Community Safety Fund and must provide resolution identifying projects by 30 June 2019. The Community Safety Fund must be spent and will not be ‘carried over’ into future years.

Road Safety and Speed Management

12. In 2018 the New Zealand Government committed to deliver a new road safety strategy in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, Auckland Transport has been focussed on supporting a Vision Zero approach to traffic safety. This work includes:
   - Reviewing speed limits across the city and using the Speed Bylaw to reduce limits in high-risk areas.
   - Investing approx. $500 million over the next ten years building more traffic-calming infrastructure around the city.
   - Adjusting the focus of the Auckland Transport’s work to include more emphasis on safety generally.

13. This change helps to address an increasing problem in Auckland. In this city road, safety (including Māngere-Ōtāhuhu) has got worse over the last five years. The reasons why include population growth, new demands on the road network, and more people walking, cycling and motorcycling. Both central government and Auckland Transport’s leadership are keen to address this situation.

14. The first major step is establishing new Speed Bylaw that will consolidate the speed limit changes in a set of local speed restrictions designed to slow traffic down in high-risk areas. Overtime the areas covered by the new bylaw will increase but between 28 February and 31 March 2019 consultation about the first set of speed limit changes took place.
15. The consultation period is now complete. Auckland Transport worked very hard to engage with the wider community including:
   - Contacting approximately 500 stakeholder groups across Auckland.
   - Keeping local elected representatives informed and encouraging them to submit.
   - Radio, print and social media advertising.
   - Posting 110,000 letters to people directly affected by the changes.
   - Putting posters on public transport and in public places such as libraries, community centres, and Auckland Transport carparks.
   - Running public drop in sessions in the most affected areas.

16. When submissions closed on 31 March, Auckland Transport had received 11,007 submissions.

17. At this stage, Auckland Transport is still collating and considering the information gathered during the consultation period.

18. The Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board made a written submission and next month a more detailed response can be provided.

**Airport to Botany Rapid Transport Network (RTN)**

19. New Zealand Transport Agency, Auckland Airport and Auckland Transport are working together to plan and build a bus or light rail link between Auckland Airport and Botany. This project will help deliver Auckland Transport’s public transport strategy, providing an east-west RTN that links Auckland Airport with Botany via Manukau.

20. The project also includes early improvements projects, including the new Puhinui Interchange.

21. Auckland Transport spent November and December 2018 discussing the project with the community the information received has been reviewed and consolidated into the plan. The project team briefed the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board about the results on 3 April 2019.

22. Work on the Puhinui Station continues. The preliminary design is completed and Auckland Transport is technically reviewing it. At the same time, Auckland Transport is procuring a contractor for construction of the new station and planning its resource consent application. The contractor will need to meet local procurement and sustainability criteria because the Southern local boards were clear that they want local people and businesses involved in major projects. Auckland Transport is working to make sure this priority is supported.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

**Responding to Resolutions**

23. At the February 2019 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board meeting, the members passed a series of resolutions. Auckland Transport’s responses to these resolutions are recorded below. The resolution in **bold** font and the answer in normal font. A number of the resolutions may require an update in the future.

24. **Resolution Number MO/2019/22**

   b) That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board request Auckland Transport to investigate, options for improved lighting and safety in the Mangere Bridge causeway area, that the options include: rough order of costs and funding
opportunities that could include resources from New Zealand Transport Agency, to deliver this project.

Auckland Transport has been asked to re-investigate and is currently looking at whether other options for increasing the level of light on the causeway are workable.

At the time, this report was written the work had just started and a final report will need to be provided at the next meeting. New Zealand Transport Agency's project manager is aware of the issues and is able to liaise with Auckland Transport about future plans.

c) That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board request that New Zealand Transport Agency and Auckland Transport to work together and provide clear roles and responsibilities on how the disruption of the local community is minimized during the replacement of the Old Māngere Bridge.

Auckland Transport and New Zealand Transport Agency have robust procedures for working together to mitigate the impacts of construction projects. But both agencies have noted these concerns and they will be reported to both New Zealand Transport Agency's project manager and to Auckland Transport.

d) That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board request New Zealand Transport Agency and Auckland Transport to support the implementation of safety initiatives, like lighting, to be developed into the planning phase of replacing the Old Māngere Bridge.

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board's concern is noted and Auckland Transport and New Zealand Transport Agency would like to state that they will continue to work together to support each other and the community's safety both while Old Māngere Bridge is replaced and then into the future.

25. Resolution Number MO/2019/18

Resolutions from March that are still being addressed.

c) That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board requests that the board be updated on details of specific initiatives identified in the local board area, supported through the Auckland Community Bike Fund.

A number of applications for use of the Community Bike Fund were received from across Auckland. All of them were reviewed and there is one project scheduled for delivery in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu area. Contracts are not signed yet, but next month the name and details of the project can be reported.

d) That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board requests Auckland Transport develop a rough order of cost for bus shelters and progress with urgency the Local Board Transport Capital Fund initiative, ‘Bus Shelter Improvement Project' based on a list be provided by the board; further asks for a report at the 20 March 2019 meeting.

Auckland Transport has not received the list at this time and will discuss this project with the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board again at the next Local Board Transport Capital Fund workshop.

f) That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board requests that the overall public transport and bus infrastructure be made current as there are bus stop/s no longer in use, poles, yellow lines marked but bus routes have changed (e.g. route nos. 313, 309, 32) and only school buses pass through.

Last month Auckland Transport noted this resolution. It has been passed to the appropriate personnel with the organisation for review who responded by apologising for the issue and providing an explanation.

The explanation is that during the New Network’s rapid growth of bus services the team was team has focussed on delivering new bus stations and shelters. This involved a considerable
amount of work that had to be prioritised ahead of removing old stops. At this time, there is a need to consolidate the old bus shelter, poles and other infrastructure that is no longer required and remove it. Auckland Transport is doing this as quickly as resources allow.

**Local Board Transport Capital Fund**

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

- Be safe.
- Not impede network efficiency.
- Be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks may be considered if they support a transport outcome).

27. The fund allows local boards to build transport focused local improvements in their areas. Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s total funding in this term is approx. $1.4 million (including new money allocated during the recent Council budget process and shown in the ‘Financial Summary’). The following table provides an overall summary of the current LBTCF position, including the increased LBTCF approved by Council and applying from 1 March 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mangere Otahuhu Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Available in current political term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount committed to date on projects approved for design and/or construction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Budget left</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board assessed their programme in February 2019 and provided direction to officers who reported in March 2019. At this time, a workshop to discuss the information provided has been scheduled for 10 April 2019. This workshop will provide more direction for delivery of these projects. Below in Table 2 is a summary of all projects status.

**Table 2: Local Board Transport Capital Fund Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading the footpaths in and around the Mangere East Town Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bader Drive Roundabout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Widening Bader Drive in front of the Cosmopolitan Club | Completed

Ashgrove Reserve Cycle Route | A walking and cycling path through the Ashgrove Reserve.

Bus shelter improvement project | Local board members are putting together the list of stops.

Boggust Park | Improve the parking and pathways in or around Boggust Park.

**Detailed Project Progress Report**

**Upgrading the footpaths in and around the Mangere East Town Centre**

In mid-2018, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board requested that Auckland Transport re-start design work. In November 2018, a map with approximate costs was provided to the board and at a workshop on 1 February 2019, the members discussed this project and provided direction.

The board asked Auckland Transport to concentrate specifically on one section of the original area at the east end of the town centre and to price a new section of footpath from Yates Road to the Massey Homestead.

Auckland Transport reported that the cost estimates are approx.:

- Yates Road - $225,000
- Pathway around the north –east corner of Walter Massey Park - $125,000
- A new section of footpath from Yates Road to Massey Homestead $38-105,000 depending on which footpath option the board supported:
  - Replace with a 2m wide footpath costing approx. $38,000
  - Replace with a 3m wide footpath costing approx. $105,000. This option is considerably more expensive because it includes moving bus shelters and lights.

Based on this information the total cost of work requested by the local board is estimated at between $388,000 and $455,000.

**Bader Drive Roundabout**

Last month the final design was sent to the to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to review and was also included on the monthly update report. Consultation with the people living nearby is finished.

The next steps are:

- Completing the tender and procurement process.
• It is planned that construction will start in May 2019

The build time is likely to be a month to six weeks.

**Widening Bader Drive in front of the Cosmopolitan Club**

Completed.

**Ashgrove Reserve Cycle Route**

The Ashgrove Reserve Cycle Route is being worked through the design process, which has highlighted higher costs than originally reported.

The original cost estimate was approx. $480,000.

Since then Auckland Transport has accurately priced two options:

- A 3m wide shared path from Ashgrove Road to Mascot Ave with marker posts, re-fencing the reserves boundary fences and a speed table at the Ashgrove Road entrance costing approx. $575,000.

- A 3m wide shared path from the central track junction to Mascot Ave costing approx. $175,000

Auckland Transport has also now priced the cost of lighting both options providing costs of approx. $225,000 for the first option and $170,000 for the second option.

In summary this means that the total costs would be:

- A fully lit 3m wide shared path from Ashgrove Road to Mascot Ave with marker posts, re-fencing the reserves boundary fences and a speed table at the Ashgrove Road entrance costing approx. $800,000.

- A fully lit 3m wide shared path from the central track junction to Mascot Ave costing approx. $345,000

**Bus shelter improvement project**

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has stated by resolution that it will provide a list of the sites and has requested that upon receipt of this list Auckland Transport provides a cost estimate.

At the time, this report was written this list had not been provided.

**Boggust Park**

In August 2018, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board requested by resolution (see resolution number MO/2018/131) that Auckland Transport work with Auckland Council and see if
options existed for using the LBTCF to pay for elements of the planned upgrade of Boggust
Park.

In March 2019, Auckland Council finished the plan and both organisations are working
together to come up with options that can be presented for the local board’s consideration
at the scheduled workshop on 10 April 2016.

Local board advocacy

29. This section provides a regular report about how Auckland Transport is supporting the
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu’s Advocacy Initiatives. The board’s Advocacy Initiatives are recorded in
its Local Board Plan. In this month’s report, the board’s Advocacy Initiatives from the
2016/19 term have been recorded in the table below.

30. Table 3: Advocacy Initiative Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Description</th>
<th>Auckland Transport’s Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A well-connected area, part of a great, affordable public transport network that makes it easy for all to move around.</td>
<td>Deliver projects with the governing body and Auckland Transport including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving street connections between the Ōtāhuhu bus/train station and town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrading the street environment around Māngere East shopping area and community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completing the Māngere town centre bus station upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support walking and cycling connections around popular parks like Walter Massey and Māngere Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive, accessible and safe cycle ways and walkways.</td>
<td>Champion and support the Ōtāhuhu Portage route project to open the area for recreation, walking and cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An advocacy issue that Auckland Transport can help support but cannot lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement Norana path walkway and fund priority Local Paths projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An advocacy issue that Auckland Transport can help support but cannot lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue supporting Te Ara Mua-Future Streets and identify options to increase use of cycle ways and walkways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport’s Community Cycling Fund is likely to deliver a project in Māngere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with Te Wānanga o Aotearoa to use digital technology to popularise and increase use of new paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A local board project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe, attractive and well-maintained streets for all.</td>
<td>Develop and deliver improvements to Bader Drive, e.g. a roundabout at the Idelwild Road intersection and road widening near Māngere town centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Streets activation activities**

31. An advocacy issue for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is the supporting the Future Streets project and Auckland Transport is supporting this project by promoting use of the area for walking and cycling.

32. On 12 April 2019, Auckland Transport is collaborating with Mangere Bikefit to run the second Ladies Pink Bike Rave a female only cycling event in the local area. The event includes guided rides around the Māngere Te Ara Mua – Future Streets cycle-ways, free food and entertainment.

33. This month Auckland Transport has also completed the final draft if the Māngere Bikefit / Future Streets Walking and Cycling Map. The map provides lots of information about walking and cycling in Māngere and also about activities and community facilities. The draft map is included as Attachment A.

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

34. This is not a decision report and there are no significant impacts on other Council groups.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

Auckland Transport consultations

35. Over the last reporting period, Auckland Transport invited the local board to provide their feedback on one proposal that is included in Attachment B.

Traffic Control Committee resolutions

36. This section records Traffic Control Committee (TCC) decisions. In this reporting period, the TCC passed the following resolutions in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.

Table 4 – Traffic Control Committee Resolutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascot Road, Richard Pearse Drive, Kirkbride Road, Westney Road, Jordan Road</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times, Cycle Lane, Shared Cycle Path, Bus Stop, Bus Shelter, Lane Arrow Markings, Carriageway, Traffic Island, Pedestrian Crossing, Traffic Signal Control, Give-Way Control, Flush Median, Delineators, Keep Clear, Edge Line</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

37. In this reporting period no projects required iwi liaison

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

38. This month the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has no direct financial commitments. However, the status of the LBTCF is still a significant financial implication this month because there is a large amount of money in this fund. Approx. $1.4 million.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

39. At this time, the most significant financial risk for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board remains the unallocated portion of the LBTCF, approx. $1.4 million. The board continues to mitigate this risk with continued detailed investigation of a number of projects.

40. At this stage these project have a potential value of between approx. $550,000 and $1.3 million. This figure will increase as the potential work in Boggust Park and the Bus Shelter project is factored. This means that the board can mitigate the risk in this term.

41. On 10 April 2019 a workshop is scheduled to consider options and direction can then be provided by resolution at the May 2019 public meeting.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

42. Auckland Transport will provide another update report to the local board next month.
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Welcome to Te Ara Mua Community Trail:

The 1.6km trail provides a safe space for walking and cycling around our local community and features:

- Wide paths for family friendly access to the town centre
- Dots along the path show the way
- Posts with colour indicators every 100m to show your progress along the trail
- Playgrounds and parks
- Outdoor fitness equipment

The trail can be used in your everyday journeys, and provides a great space for you to get active your way. The complete trail takes approximately 15-30min to walk or 8 min to cycle, depending on your pace.

Local support:
For more details on local walking and cycling groups, contact:

Walking:
Māngere-Ötāhuhu Pool and Leisure Centre
66 Mason Ave, Māngere
Auckland 2022
Ph: 09-274 9979
Email: mangerepool@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Cycling:
Māngere BikeFIT
140 Robertson Road, Māngere Centre Park
Ph: 021 560 9368
Email: team.time2thrive@gmail.com

Have a go on a bike!

Dog related concerns can be directed to Auckland Council Animal Management:

- Urgent complaints - Ph: 0800 342 685
- Call Centre - Ph: 09 301 0101

If approached by a roaming dog while walking, Animal Management advise you:

- Stop
- Flee your area. Do not lock directly at it – don’t attempt to touch, call or interact with it in any way.
- Ignore it
- Back away slowly – do not run

Māngere Bike Fit Future Streets Map
### Summary of Consultation Information Sent to the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board in March/April 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Proposal</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New bus shelter on Robertson Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 April 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To update the Mangere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on progress to deliver the flag pole in front of the World War 1 (WW1) monument in Ōtāhuhu.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This initiative started as a request from the local board to support the Ōtāhuhu community ANZAC day commemorations held in front of the World War 1 (WW1) monument in Ōtāhuhu.
3. The Ōtāhuhu & District Returned and Services Association (RSA) host a ceremony every year.
4. Over the last 2 years Council has funded a temporary flag pole for the ANZAC ceremony.
5. Staff were asked to investigate a more permanent solution by installing a permanent flag pole. (Resolution number MO/2018/11).
6. The Ōtāhuhu War Memorial and Nixon Memorial site is category A, scheduled in the Auckland Unitary Plan-Operative in Part (AUP-OIP).
7. Council Heritage has approved the installation of the flag pole for events if the installation is within the conditions of a permitted event under the AUP-OIP.
8. This report is to update the local board on progress and confirm future operational costs.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
   a) receive the update on the delivery of a flag pole on Piki Thompson Way, Ōtāhuhu, near the World War I (WW1) monument.

Horopaki
Context
9. Anzac Day is a national day of commemoration observed annually on 25 April. It commemorates those who died serving New Zealand during the war while honoring returned and current servicemen and women past and present.
10. Every year the Otahuhu RSA hold an ANZAC service at the monument on the corner of Great South Road and Piki Thompson Way.
11. The site has heritage values that include its historical, physical attributes, aesthetic and contextual values. Staff have had to consider the effects of this initiative, not only on these four identified values, above but also against the historic heritage overlay rules.
12. On 14 September 2018, staff met on site with council contractors, RSA President, Secretary and the Ōtāhuhu Business Association Manager to discuss the scope.
13. Staff identified the following:
   - The flag pole will not only be used for ANZAC day, but also other key important events as directed by The New Zealand RSA National Office.
   - These events include and are not limited to, Anzac Day, Armistice Day and the passing of a Royal, government minister or important community leader.
   - Notice to raise the flag for a passing can be given in less than a few hours’ notice.
   - The flagpole will be stored at the Ōtāhuhu Business Association Office at 19 Hall Ave in Ōtāhuhu.

14. In October 2018, council staff presented the local board with findings from the site visit and a proposed workable solution, to install a permanent inground sleeve for the flagpole to be installed and removed when required, or as directed by New Zealand RSA National Office.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

15. The product details for the proposed removable flagpole are as follows:
   - Powder coated white aluminum flag pole with top cap, internal halyard with connectors and a lockable hatch is 6m high x 800mm diameter.
   - Location is in the northern garden bed (refer to Figure 1).
   - Concrete pad of 250mm x 250mm and approximately 400mm deep with 25mm mounting bolts will be formed within the garden. This involves excavation not exceeding 0.5 m³.
   - The mounting pad is flush with the ground within the garden. Planting is expected to cover the pad times when the flag pole is not in use.
   - When not required, the pole will be in storage at 19 Hall Avenue, Ōtāhuhu.

16. The RSA have been informed and agree to comply with all requirements stipulated below.

Heritage Values

17. The Historic Heritage Chapter of the Auckland Unitary Plan provides for temporary activities as a permitted activity. A permitted activity does not require a resource consent.

18. A permitted activity standard means the pole can only be in place for 21 consecutive days in any 60-day period.

19. The flag pole is considered to meet the permitted activity standards as it will be installed so it can be removed after each occasion or as stated in point 8 of this report.

Health and Safety

20. To meet Council Health and Safety requirements only Council contractors are permitted to install and remove the flag pole at any time on Council land.

21. The sleeve will be installed in the garden area to omit any safety concerns for pedestrians. See below Figure 2 and 2.1.
Figure 1:
Location of the temporary flag pole
Note: the red circle is shown large than the actual size of the base plate so it may be identified

Figure 2:
Location of the temporary flag pole
Note: the red circle indicates the size of the entire baseplate that will not be seen as it will be flush with the ground and within the garden bed
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

22. Council staff from Community Facilities, Community Services, Regulatory and Heritage have been consulted to form the advice in this report. Staff support the progression of this initiative.

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

23. This initiative aligns with the Mangere-Otahuhu local board plan outcomes:
   - Outcome 1 – a strong local community
   - Outcome 3 – Protecting our natural environment and heritage
   - Outcome 5 – facilities that meet diverse needs
   - Outcome 6 – a place where everyone thrives and belongs

24. For many years the local board have been attending the ANZAC day commemorations held in front of the WW1 monument in Otahuhu.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

25. All community assets contribute significantly to Māori well-being, values, culture and traditions. Where we anticipate any aspects of the proposed project having a significant impact on sites of importance to mana whenua, we will undertake appropriate engagement.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

26. In February 2018 the local board approved up to $8,000 of their LDI capex financial year 2017/2018 budget to install a flagpole at Piki Thompson Way.

27. Installation and removal of the flag pole on ANZAC day and Armistice day will be included in the Council Facility Maintenance (FM) contract.

28. A passing is an unpredictable circumstance, currently there is no funding to cover a call out fee.

29. If required a call out fee will be an extra expense charged to the RSA directly.

30. Council contractors call out fee to install and remove the flag pole outside of the FM contract is $660 exclusive of GST. This cost includes two staff members, transportation and health and safety requirements.

31. Possible funding channels to assist a callout fee could be:
   - Local community grant – lengthy process for unscheduled circumstances.
   - Opex – cannot be predicted to forecast.
   - Urgent decision by the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board.

32. Staff request delegation is given to the Local Board Chair and Deputy Chair to approve funding for a call out in the case of a passing.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

33. The passing of a significant person cannot be predicted. A decision from the local board to fund outside of the FM contract is required. Until then no further direction will be given to accommodate outside of ANZAC day and Armistice day.

34. The flag pole will be stored at the Otahuhu Business Association Office at 19 Hall Avenue. The site is open from Monday to Friday during normal business hours. Access to the flag pole outside of these hours will be organised by the RSA and Business Association directly with Council contractors.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

35. Procurement is complete. The physical works stage is being planned and delivery has been scheduled to start for 8 April 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

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

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.
3. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year.
4. This report presents the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Grants Programme 2019/2020 for adoption (see Attachment A).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) adopt the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Grants Programme 2019/2020.

Horopaki
Context
5. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.
6. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year. The local board grants programme guides community groups and individuals when making applications to the local board.
7. The local board community grants programme includes:
   - outcomes as identified in the local board plan
   - specific local board grant priorities
   - which grant types will operate, the number of grant rounds and opening and closing dates
   - any additional criteria or exclusions that will apply
   - other factors the local board consider to be significant to their decision-making.
8. Once the local board grants programme 2019/2020 has been adopted, the types of grants, grant rounds, criteria and eligibility will be advertised through an integrated communication and marketing approach which includes utilising the local board channels, e.g. local board Facebook page.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

9. The aim of the local board grant programme is to deliver projects and activities which align with the outcomes identified in the local board plan. The new Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Grants Programme has been workshopped with the local board and feedback incorporated into the grants programme for 2019/2020.

10. The new grant programme includes:

- grant round dates which exclude decision dates coinciding with the local government elections in October 2019

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

11. The grants programme has no identified impacts on council-controlled organisations and therefore their views are not required.

12. Based on the main focus of an application, a subject matter expert from the relevant council unit will provide input and advice. The main focus of an application is identified as arts, community, events, sport and recreation, environment or heritage.

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

13. The grants programme has been developed by the local board to set the direction of their grants programme. This programme is reviewed on an annual basis.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

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

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

15. The allocation of grants to community groups is within the adopted Long-term Plan 2018 - 2028 and local board agreements.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

16. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy. Therefore, there is minimal risk associated with the adoption of the grants programme.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

17. An implementation plan is underway and the local board grants programme will be locally advertised through the local board and council channels, including the council website, local board facebook page and communication with past recipients of grants.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
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Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

Community Grants Programme 2019/2020
Our Community Grants Programme aims to provide contestable community grants to local communities.

Outcomes sought from the local grants programme
Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the following outcomes, as outlined in our local board plan:

A strong local economy
- Improve skills training, increase employment opportunities for the local workforce especially Maori and Pacific youth

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is the heart of Maori and Pasifika arts and culture
- Our diverse communities enjoy arts and cultural facilities that are vibrant, creative hubs for connecting, engaging and learning, and expressing identity
- Increase opportunities for Maori and Pasifika arts and cultural expression

A place where environment and heritage are protected, enhanced and preserved
- Manukau Harbour and its coastline is clean, improved and protected.
- Local heritage is protected, enhanced and recognised.
- Reduce waste by improving waste management practices in the local area.

A well-connected area
- Attractive, accessible and safe cycleways and walkways
- Safe, attractive and well-maintained streets for all.

Facilities to meet diverse needs
- Collaboration and best use of local community assets and resources is encouraged.

A place where communities thrive and belong
- Our seniors are cared for and intergenerational projects are encouraged
- Young people are engaged and have a voice and contribute positively in local matters
- Increase the sense of safety in neighbourhoods and reduce harm from gambling, alcohol and synthetic drugs
- Increase opportunities for active living and community involvement and connectedness (see the Healthy Environment principles below)
Healthy Environment Principles

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has endorsed the Healthy Environment principles:

![5 ways to a healthy lifestyle diagram]

Applicants with the following messages and practices are encouraged to apply:

- smoke free
- zero waste
- alcohol and drug free
- healthy options for food and drink, including water as the first choice.
- active lifestyles

Lower Priorities:

We will also consider applications for other services, projects, events and activities. However, these may be considered a lower priority:

- Commercial entities and promotion of commercial entities
- Ticketed events
- Activities that primarily benefit communities outside the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area
- Activities that primarily benefit a third party (e.g. activity to gain money for an organisation)
- Grants to support the purchase of, or maintenance associated with, motor vehicles
- Wages or operational costs
- Grants to support equipment or items for one-off events
- Initiatives that are eligible and can be funded by central government

The local board will not fund (exclusions):

- Exclusion one: Applications for Liquor licenses
- Exclusion two: Core activities and tasks of business entities
- Exclusion three: Hiring of facilities for religious purposes
- Exclusion four: Applicants who have already had two successful grants applications within the current financial year. However these applicants may be eligible to receive funding if they are;
  - collaborating with other groups
  - contributing significantly to the project

Investment approach

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has allocated budgets to support the local grants programme as follows:

**Quick Response Grants**

- $2000 maximum amount per grant

**Local Grants:**

- Above $2000 per grant, two contestable rounds per annum
Event Grants
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board will, at their discretion, fund a few community events, projects or initiatives as part of regular calendar of events that align with the priorities of the local grants programme. Recipients are required to put in an application and provide accountability for the funding they have received in that financial year, report on the progress they have made and demonstrate they are meeting any key performance indicators before funds will be released for the following year. e.g., applicants are to provide information on expected number of participants and final numbers who attended.
These grants will be allocated through the events work programme and will be administered by the relevant departments:

- Ōtāhuhu Family Fun Day
- Māngere East Cultural Festival
- St. Patrick’s Day
- Māngere Town Centre Arts Festival
- Māngere Bridge Food and Wine Festival
- Counties Manukau Sporting Excellence Awards
- Eye on Nature
- Ōtāhuhu Ethnic Food Festival
- Portage Crossing

Application dates
Grant rounds for 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 will be as follows:

Quick Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>23 September 2019</td>
<td>18 October 2019</td>
<td>11 December 2019</td>
<td>13 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>13 April 2020</td>
<td>8 May 2020</td>
<td>17 June 2020</td>
<td>1 July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>17 June 2019</td>
<td>26 July 2019</td>
<td>18 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>18 February 2020</td>
<td>28 March 2020</td>
<td>20 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-board funding
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board will also consider funding multi-board grant applications in collaboration with other local boards. Applicants will need to clearly demonstrate how their intended project, event and/or activities will specifically benefit people and communities in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/2020 Multi-board Grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>18 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>20 January 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>21 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accountability measures**
The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board requires that all successful applicants to provide:
- success and outcomes of the project against local board outcomes and priorities
- photos and anecdotal narratives as supporting information
- Standard financial accountability, e.g. receipts and comparison of spending against budget.
- Information on community contributions
- Invite to events directly contributed to by the local board grant.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board three-year Engagement Strategy.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Local boards have a series of statutory responsibilities under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009. This includes decision-making responsibility for community engagement, consultation and advocacy.

3. The purpose of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Engagement Strategy is to set objectives to guide the local engagement and consultation programme. The engagement strategy will also enable delivery of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan by guiding improvements to the engagement work undertaken by Council staff on behalf of The Board. This will guide the plans we develop for engaging and consulting the local community on special consultative procedures including for the annual plan, 10-year budget and the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan.

4. The engagement strategy (Attachment A) seeks to demonstrate that Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board values diversity and inclusion through creating meaningful opportunities for engagement and participation with our local community, identifying and removing barriers to access in council processes, and being well-informed about who makes up our community. The local board is committed to improving Māori engagement through our Māori Responsiveness Framework.

5. Engagement will be evaluated to ensure effectiveness and to identify ongoing improvements.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) approve the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board engagement strategy.

Horopaki
Context
6. The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 requires local boards to:
   • communicate with community organisations
   • communicate the interests and preferences of people in relation to strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws (to the governing body)
   • use the local board plan process to provide an opportunity for people to participate in decision-making processes on the nature and level of local activities to be provided by council within the local board area.
7. The Local Government Act 2002 also establishes engagement principles:
   - a local authority should conduct its business in an open, transparent, and democratically accountable manner and give effect to its identified priorities and desired outcomes in an efficient and effective manner.
   - a local authority should make itself aware of, and should have regard to, the views or all its communities
   - when making a decision, a local authority should take account of the diversity of the community, and the community’s interests, within its district or region; and the interest of future as well as current communities; and the likely impact of any decision on them
   - a local authority should provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to its decision-making processes.

8. The Auckland Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy 2014:
   - identifies how and when communities can expect to be engaged in, or specifically consulted on, decisions about issues, proposals, assets, decisions and activities
   - enables the council and our communities to understand the significance that council places on certain issues, proposals, assets, decisions, and activities.

9. Evaluation of engagement across the wider council is needed to ensure reflective practice and ongoing improvement and this should occur at the local board level also.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Analysis – Formal Engagement

10. In 2013 the population of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu board area was 70,959, of which 60% Pacific, 20% European, 17% Asian, 16% Māori. It is anticipated that data from the 2018 census will show population growth overall. Our communities are increasingly diverse and hold a distinct Māori and Pacific identity that gives the area a wealth of cultural vibrancy. One fifth of Auckland’s Pacific people live here and we have the most youthful population in the city.

Low engagement – a key challenge

11. Demographic data from submissions on the 10-year Budget 2018/2028 (which includes local board priorities for 2018/19) and the Auckland Plan 2050 demonstrates the local community has a low level of engagement with council and the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board. The local board only received 320 submissions this - included written submissions, in-person/face-to-face submissions at community engagement events and social media engagements.

12. There low statistical trends have been similar throughout all types of engagement in the past year.

Other challenges

13. Numerous departments within Council undertake engagement with the community separately on various projects making it difficult to take a wholistic community-centric approach to engagement. Efforts to engage must be coordinated across departments to minimise costs and avoid saturation which can ‘turn off’ communities from remaining engaged.

14. The diverse capacities and capabilities in communities present challenges to outreach and effective engagement. This includes the linguistic diversity in the community and grasp of English, which is the main language through which council conducts business. Ongoing targeted capacity building can assist in enhancing the ability of communities to make the most of engagement opportunities and enabling them to be heard.
15. There will likely be many other challenges that we are not aware of so it will be important to continue to work with the community to identify barriers and identify shared understanding and solutions.

16. There is a need to educate the wider community about the Auckland Governance model, the role of local boards as well as decisions that are the responsibility of the regional governing body and central government agencies. Civic education can help residents engage with the right parts of council to address the different concerns and issues. Tools and methods such as static display and videos are being assist with public engagement.

**Advice**

17. This strategy will guide delivery of engagement, consultation and communication initiatives in the local board area. The engagement strategy sets the following objectives for all consultation, engagement and communication:

- Community is better informed and aware of local board services and activities and can participate in its engagement initiatives
- Community members feel inclusive, involved, empowered and a valued part of key decision making in their local area
- Local board is seen as a key driver in advocating for local communities’ interests, focusing on collaborating and forming relationships
- Local board will provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to our decision-making processes through its Māori Responsiveness Framework
- Local board will use a coordinated and consistent approach to communications and community engagement
- Staff will showcase continuous improvement and innovation are evident in how we work

18. Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy is embedded in this engagement strategy via multiple avenues including:

- Reporting on measures of success,
- Calendarising upcoming engagement and communications opportunities
- Regular Engagement Opportunities led by The Board
- High quality and effective communications
- Efforts to engage those communities often less-engaged
- Special efforts to engage with Maori, and
- Engagement with communities to enable effective advocacy

19. The amount and timing of engagement activities each year will be dictated by the work programme of each electoral cycle and will include statutory processes (eg annual plan, local board plan), work programme project needs etc. It will also be influenced by the availability of resources including staff capacity.

20. A coordinated approach to engagement will hopefully help us achieve other objectives eg greater youth representation, growing the database of people who receive notifications about Council activities and increase connections on social media platforms.

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

21. The local board is committed to meaningful engagement and improving engagement in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area. The local board recognises that new and innovative approaches will be needed including the use of digital strategies.
22. This engagement strategy has been developed by staff for the local board through the following activities facilitated by the engagement advisor:
   • attending an initial engagement workshop in November 2018 where the board gave feedback and direction
   • attending a subsequent engagement workshop in April 2019 at which the board indicated support for the proposed engagement activities.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

23. Local government has obligations to Māori through legislation and the local board is committed to honoring te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi.

24. Māori are a diverse group and the local board provides opportunities to Māori to contribute to its decision-making in its dialogue with:
   • mana whenua – currently represented by 19 tribal authorities in Auckland, and
   • matāwaka - which includes individuals, whanau and organisations.

25. The local board is desirous of improved engagement with Māori so that the views and preferences of Māori are considered and factored into its decision making.

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

26. The board's engagement activities are supported by the Engagement Advisor, Local Board Services. The position of the advisor is shared with Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board.

27. At modest costs, the board's governance budget supports, on an annual basis, purchase of innovative engagement resources, static display materials and production of a short video.

28. Additional funding will be required depending on the number of engagement and consultation activities and associated events and activities for example funding the live streaming of local board business meetings and delivery of the proposed diversity hui. Most programmes or projects that require consultation have a small budget but there will be instances where additional funding is required. These will be sought from the local board as and when they arise.

29. Promotion and communication costs associated with promotion of the board’s engagement activities in the community will be met through the Local Communications budget.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

30. Poor engagement can sometimes lead to decision making that doesn’t adequately respond to the needs of people. This strategy is aimed at increasing the quality of engagement so that the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board can better understand the range of needs and aspirations of its community. However, establishing a good understanding of all relevant issues for every decision will not always be possible as it is also dependent on the community’s desire, willingness and ability to engage and input.

31. The board could suffer a loss of reputation if the engagement strategy does not deliver improved meaningful engagement. Low engagement can risk the perception that the board is out of touch with the community.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

32. The Engagement Advisor will develop an annual engagement calendar to be delivered alongside the Local Board Plan.
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About this Strategy

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is committed to making sure that the board effectively engage with our local communities about what matters most to them. The board is responsible for decision-making on local issues, activities and services and providing input into regional strategies, policies and plans. In doing so, the board’s key role is to identify and communicate the views of our local communities to the governing body.

Effective public engagement is crucial to the performance of local board. In accordance with the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act (2009) a key focus for Auckland’s local boards is “enabling democratic decision making by, and on behalf of, communities” (LGACA 2009, s.10a).

They therefore engage with the public regularly to gain insight into community aspirations and concerns, and to work alongside other community actors. Council staff often coordinate this engagement, preparing material and organising events where board members engage directly with the public. In other cases, Council staff are the primary points of contact for the public, and public perspectives are communicated with the boards via reports.

Purpose

The purpose of this engagement strategy is to enable delivery of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan by guiding improvements to the engagement work done by Council staff on behalf of The Board.

Legislative requirement

The Board’s engagement occurs within a statutory framework, especially the Local Government Act (LGA) 2009. This strategy seeks to give effect to the principles of the Local Government Act 2002 via the framework provided by Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

Engagement Objectives

The local board will commit to the following objectives when undertaking Engagement:

1. Community is better informed and aware of local board services and activities and can participate in its engagement initiatives
2. Community members feel inclusive, involved and a valued part of key decision making in their local area
3. Local board is seen as a key driver in advocating for local communities’ interests, focusing on collaborating and forming relationships
4. Provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to our decision-making processes through our Māori Responsiveness Framework
5. Coordinated and consistent approach to communications and community engagement
6. Continuous improvement and innovation are evident in how we work
7. Improved skills in the organisation through education and training.

Implementation
This strategy is to be co-delivered by the Council departments that undertake engagement and communications, and those that build capacity for better engagement in delivering the Local Board Plan. Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy will be embedded in this work via multiple avenues including:
- Reporting on measures of success, (section 6)
- Calendarising upcoming engagement and communications opportunities (section 7),
- Regular Engagement Opportunities led by The Board (section 8),
- High quality and effective communications (section 9),
- Efforts to engage those communities often less-engaged (section 10),
- Special efforts to engage with Maori (section 11), and
- Engagement with communities to enable effective advocacy (section 12).

Engagement Calendar
To address the principles of the Local Government Act departments should seek to identify:
- The items on their work programmes for which public engagement or communication is appropriate
- The appropriate role of board members in any engagement or communications
- The significance of each item for which public communications are required
- The level of community engagement in any decisions
- The role of that department in engagement activities led by other departments
- Measures of success to which they contribute (either by facilitating engagement or building capacity for engagement)

Regular Engagement Mechanisms
The Board seeks to build and maintain ongoing relationships with its communities via the mechanisms outlined in Table 1, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Ongoing engagement mechanisms and opportunities*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association BID,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Impact Forum for Kohuora Corrections Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Noise Community Consultative Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Estuary Environmental Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Connections South Local Governance Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori input into local board decision-making political steering group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pukaki Tapu O Poutukeka Historic Reserve &amp; Associated Lands Co-Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere Mountain Education Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government New Zealand Zone One Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Opportunities will be sought to improve ongoing engagement mechanisms

**Communications Mechanisms and Services**

For engagement to be successful, high-quality and effective communication is essential. Priority communications mechanisms, their uses and measures of success are outlined in Appendix 1- table 2.

In addition to our key objective of ensuring quality, timely communications are delivered to our community, and encouraging interaction through use of these channels, Local Board Communications will provide the following support services to The Board:

- Communications planning for key projects,
- Media liaison, including advice on speaking to the media,
- Development of media releases for key board-led initiatives where appropriate
- Advice on future improvements to communications processes, plus feedback and evaluation of current methods

**Measures of Success**

In order to address the principles of the Local Government Act (2002), staff should gauge their contribution to the principles of the Local Government Act using the measures described in Table 2 below. These measures can be used by departments to report back to The Board on their work programmes, particularly with regards to programmed work to facilitate engagement or build capacity for better engagement.

Addressing these measures will require staff to actively record information about engagement and communications activities and feedback from the community on engagement processes. Staff should place emphasis on recording qualitative feedback to provide a more complete illustration of the value of engagement activities.
In addition to the measures recorded by staff, Local Board Services will investigate options for computer software to enable Council to systematically record information about The Board’s relationships with the community. This might allow The Board to gain insight into who they are communicating with and how, and to improve this communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public meeting attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of pieces of feedback per engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of plan/project changes made as result of public feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of new contacts added to local board contacts database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Number of new partners in project delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Qualitative community feedback on engagement methods, timing, and material provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Board Advocacy**

The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 deems the local boards responsible for “identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area” (LG(AC)A 2009, s.16b). Council staff should enable this advocacy by:

- Proactively seeking out engagement and communications opportunities to enable advocacy,
- Assisting stakeholders to connect or partner with The Board and discuss advocacy,
- Sharing board resolutions regarding advocacy with relevant stakeholders, and

Where appropriate, coordinating meetings between board members and stakeholders to enable collaborating in advocacy.

**Engaging with Māori**

Since the establishment of Auckland Council, The Board has sought to foster relationships with mana whenua and mataawaka, and to pursue mutual objectives collaboratively. The Board is committed to providing opportunities for Māori to contribute to decision-making processes through the Māori Responsiveness Framework.

**Engaging those Less-Engaged**

The Board sees potential benefit in engaging more widely within their communities and seeks to engage beyond “the usual suspects”. The above ongoing engagement mechanisms are intended to improve engagement with those less-engaged. In addition to these mechanisms, The Board compels staff to:

- actively seek engagement with those less-engaged where appropriate,
- build capacity among less-engaged groups to engage constructively with The Board,
- use engagement to increase the understanding of Council and the local boards within the community, and
- consider the use of languages other than English when seeking to communicate with or engage unique communities.

**Evaluation**

*Outlined in detail in Appendix 1 – Table 1.*
### Implementation and Evaluation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Actions/Deliverables</th>
<th>Outcomes: Success will look like:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community is better informed and aware of local board services and activities and can participate in its engagement initiatives | Publish all business meeting notices on platforms which are accessible widely such as social media, ethnic media and on its website.  
Undertake a review of the board’s website including content, structure and management model to improve the navigation, function and accessibility of website.  
Build on the use of social media as a two-way communication channel and consider how comments received via social media can inform board’s decision making.  
Educate the community about the role of local boards - develop a set of static display resources to promote role of local boards - investigate a short video that could include: the role of local boards, information about the CCO family and who to contact for types of issues, how to progress an idea for council, or get support from council to do something in the community | Publish all Business meeting notices on social media.  
Number of page views on website  
Comparison of results year to year in tailored survey of community perceptions  
Record the number of views of the video                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Community members feel inclusive, involved and a valued part of key decision making in their local area | Establish an ongoing community/Diversity Hui. This network will have representation from key service provider agencies and provide input on top level strategic decision making. The aim would be to engage at a higher more strategic level as well as provide a platform for service providers to have an opportunity to share their membership of the network, representing local communities  
Number of high level engagement activities carried out with the network  
Qualitative input and strength of influence on key |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to our decision-making processes through our Māori Responsiveness Framework</th>
<th>aspirations and outcomes with the local board.</th>
<th>strategic decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Agreements are maintained and developed with Mana Whenua. The local board continues to deliver the agreed outcomes from the Māori Responsiveness Plan Work with and take into account the advice of the IMSB on ensuring that mana whenua groups and mataawaka of Tāmaki Makaurau input is reflected in the council’s strategies, policies, and plans, and on other matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships become characterised as more ‘long term’ rather than ‘one-off’ engagement with key Māori stakeholders. Increase in responsiveness by Māori/Mana Whenua/Mataawaka to local board-initiated consultation and participation processes via the Project Delivery Reference Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local board is seen as a key driver in advocating for local communities’ interests, focusing on collaborating and forming relationships</td>
<td>complete a stakeholder and community group mapping exercise to identify communities of interest – geography, sector, interest, age, ethnicity Support forums for diverse communities to ensure that their views and interests are gathered: - Youth Forum - Nga Manga O Mangere network - Otahuhu Network meeting - Community Safety Network meetings - Business Association meetings - Safety Wardens meetings - Ethnic People’s Advisory Panel - Pacific People’s Advisory Panel - Seniors people’s network - Disability network</td>
<td>The local board and local board services staff have an accurate picture of the: - demographic profile of the population within the local board area - communities of interest in the area The feedback and views of these diverse groups are gathered through the consultation is incorporated in the final decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement and innovation are evident in how we work</td>
<td>Increase the reach of engagement - increase the number of people who engage with MOLB and within the MO Board area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that every regional consultation is promoted through e-news and given local context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook is used to promote regional consultations, particularly those of relevant to the local area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continue to run local engagement activities for the annual plan, 10-year budget and local board plan, including partnering with existing community groups to deliver engagement events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- provide a written engagement plan for annual plan, 10-year budget and local board plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- focus effort and emphasis on delivering a significant Local Board Plan engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- deliver local engagement events for the local board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ensure engagement with all the groups comprising the ethnic community – work alongside the Specialist advisor and strategic broker work to deliver the diversity/community hui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved skills in the organisation through education and training.</td>
<td>include the Engagement Strategy in the staff and Elected members induction program backed up by an ongoing training program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and share best practice in the field of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total number of submissions from all sources increase, resulting in a greater number of people engage with MOLB and Auckland Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of people who submit on the 10-year budget, annual plan and local board plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of engagement events run by local board services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of attendees at local board services run events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of participants at hui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>submissions reflect the ethnic profile of the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of new staff and Elected members attending the training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal news items of best practice in engagement within the local board space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1: Table 2: Communications Mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Tracking</th>
<th>Measurables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Facebook (regular)**   | • Promote a sense of community through localised themes  
                          • Provide timely, relevant and informative updates - local news, events, consultations  
                          • Build relationships with local groups, clubs etc. through sharing of information  
                          • Promote interactive engagement | • Scheduling of key posts using engagement/communications calendar (ie. events, openings, project launches, ceremonies etc.)  
                          • Online user survey to gauge interest/relevance in topic areas and inform future strategy | • Notifications and reporting on page likes, individual post reach, post ‘likes’ and shares | • Page traffic including likes  
                          • Interaction with followers such as comments, posts and photos uploaded  
                          • Feedback at promoted events that it was seen advertised on FB  
                          • Traffic through links included in posts |
| **Email Bulletins (monthly)** | • Inform and engage community with local board related news, activities, funding opportunities etc.  
                          • Raise awareness and seek feedback on local board initiatives | • Rejuvenate Template to include the use of visuals  
                          • Work closely with Advisors to capture the most important issues  
                          • Utilise Engagement and Comms calendar  
                          • Ubiquity database system | • *Monthly reporting including % of bulletins delivered, opened and click-through rates.  
                          • Online survey to gauge interest and receives feedback (preferably incentivised to encourage responses) | • Subscription rate  
                          • Traffic through links included in posts  
                          • Feedback |
## Our Auckland (monthly)
- One page per issue showcasing a key local board project/event
- Promote local board and individual members/dermal holders

## Engagement and Comms calendar to effectively schedule in key stories – i.e. events, openings, project launches, ceremonies etc.

## Annual readership survey
- Downloads for online articles

## Online readership
- Response to articles seeking community input

## Other
- Targeted communications specific to individual campaigns i.e. media releases, print collateral, paid-for advertising

- Dependant on factors including: proximity to date of event/activity, priority of activity, capacity, supplier lead-in times, media deadlines etc.

- Dependant on channel/method used

- Dependant on channel/method used
Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028

File No.: CP2019/04654

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve local financial matters for the local board agreement 2019/2020, which need to be considered by the Governing Body in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 process.

2. To seek feedback on regional topics in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

3. Auckland Council’s Annual Budget contains 21 local board agreements which are the responsibility of local boards. These agreements set out local funding priorities, budgets, levels of service and performance measures. This report seeks decisions on local financial matters for the local board agreement, including:
   - any new/amended business improvement district (BID) targeted rates
   - any new/amended local targeted rate proposals
   - proposed locally driven initiative (LDI) capital projects outside local boards’ decision-making responsibility
   - release of local board specific reserve funds
   - any advocacy initiatives (to be included in the appendix).

4. Auckland Council consulted with the public from 17 February to 17 March 2019 to seek community views on the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, and local board priorities to be included in the local board agreements. This report seeks local board views on both of these plans:
   - regional annual budget topics: including changes to rates and fees, the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2019/2020, and other budget information
   - the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers.

5. Auckland Council also consulted on the Our Water Future discussion document. A draft strategy from the Our Water Future discussion document will be developed. Local boards will have the opportunity to provide input into this in early 2020.

6. Local board views on these regional plans will be considered by the Governing Body (or relevant committee) before making final decisions on the plans.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board priorities for 2019/2020 (Appendix A).

b) recommend any new or amended business improvement district targeted rates to the Governing Body.

c) recommend the continuation of our local targeted rate set as a uniform charge per separately used or inhabited part of a property, on residential properties in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area, for the purpose of fully subsidising entry to swimming pools for persons 17 years and over, noting that the rate for 2019/2020 is estimated at approximately $32.71.

d) recommend that the Governing Body approves any proposed locally driven initiative capital projects, which are outside local boards’ decision-making responsibility.

e) recommend the release of local board specific reserve funds to the Governing Body.

f) approve its advocacy initiatives for inclusion to its 2019/2020 Local Board Agreement, to be tabled at the meeting.

g) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers from people or organisations based in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.

h) provide feedback on the Annual Budget 2019/2020.

i) provide feedback on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028.

Horopaki
Context

7. Local board agreements form part of the Auckland Council’s annual budget and set out local funding priorities, budgets, levels of service and performance measures. This report details local board decisions and recommendations that need to be made in April/early-May to allow them to be considered by the Governing Body in the annual budget process.

8. Local boards also advocate to the Governing Body for funding for projects that cannot be accommodated within their local budgets. These advocacy initiatives are attached as an appendix to the local board agreement.

9. Local boards are responsible for providing local input into regional strategies, policies and plans. Local board plans reflect community priorities and preferences and are key documents that guide both the development of local board agreements and input into regional plans.

10. Auckland Council publicly consulted on the following two plans from 17 February to 17 March 2019:
  • annual budget (which includes both regional issues and local board key priorities)
  • the proposed amendment to the 10-year budget.

11. Across the region, 2278 people attended 65 engagement events, including 3 in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area. Feedback was received through written, event and social media channels.
12. Consultation feedback on the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board priorities for 2019/2020 and on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year budget regarding property transfers from people or organisations based in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area are set out in Attachment A. The feedback on local board priorities will be considered by the local board before they agree their local board agreement in early June 2019.

13. All feedback collected during the public consultation from people in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area, including feedback from local events, are included in this report in Attachments B (written submissions), C (events feedback) and D (region wide social media feedback).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Local financial matters for the local board agreement
14. This report allows the local board to agree its input and recommend other local financial matters to the Governing Body in early May 2019. This is to allow time for the Governing Body to consider these items in the annual budget process (decisions made in June 2019).

Local targeted rate and business improvement district (BID) targeted rate proposals
15. Local boards are required to endorse any new locally targeted rate proposals or BID targeted rate proposals in their local board area (noting that any new local targeted rates and/or BIDs must have been consulted on before they can be implemented).

Funding for locally driven initiatives (LDI)
16. Local boards are allocated funding annually to spend on local projects or programmes that are important to their communities. This funding is for ‘locally driven initiatives’ or LDI. Local boards can approve LDI capital projects up to $1 million; projects over that amount need approval from the Governing Body.

17. Local boards can recommend to the Governing Body to convert LDI operational funding to capital expenditure for 2019/2020 if there is a specific need to do so, or Governing Body approval may be needed for the release of local board specific reserve funds, which are funds being held by the council for a specific purpose.

18. Local boards can defer LDI projects where there was an agreed scope and cost, but the project/s have not been delivered.

Local board advocacy
19. Local boards are requested to approve any advocacy initiatives for consideration by the Governing Body and inclusion to the 2019/2020 Local Board Agreement, noting that in this triennium, a longer-term approach has been taken to progress initiatives that are unable to be funded by local board budgets. The approach used the annual budget, 10-year budget and local board plan processes to progress and advise on a narrower range of local board initiatives in a more comprehensive way.

20. As part of the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, additional funding was provided to progress the priority advocacy initiative of each local board (the one local initiative (OLI)). All OLIs are progressing with funding either allocated or earmarked in the 10-year budget.

Local board input on regional plans
21. Local boards have a statutory responsibility for identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area in relation to the context of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of Auckland Council. This report provides an opportunity for the local board to provide input on two plans, the Annual Budget 2019/2020...
Regional issues in the Annual Budget 2019/2020

22. The annual budget sets out Auckland Council priorities and how it is going to pay for them. The regional consultation on the proposed annual budget focused on two topics:

- changes to rates and fees
  - annual waste management changes
  - food scraps targeted rate
  - Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate
  - urban boundary rating
  - rating of religious use properties
  - regulatory fees

23. The consultation on the annual budget also included key priorities for each local board area. Decisions on local board priorities will be made when local board agreements are considered in June 2019.

24. The feedback form contained one question relating to changes to rates and fees. Consultation feedback received from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area on key regional issues in the annual budget are summarised in Attachment A, along with an overview of any other areas of feedback on regional proposals with a local impact.

25. Local boards may wish to provide feedback on these regional issues for consideration by the Governing Body.

The proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers

26. The regional consultation on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 focused on a proposal to transfer the legal ownership of $790 million of city centre waterfront properties from Panuku to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility.

27. The feedback form contained one question relating to this proposed amendment. Consultation feedback received from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers is summarised in Attachment A.

28. Local boards may wish to provide feedback on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers for consideration by the Governing Body.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

29. The Annual Budget 2019/2020 is an Auckland Council group document and will include budgets at a consolidated group level. Consultation items and updates to budgets to reflect decisions and new information may include items from across the group.

30. The key impact of the proposed amendment to the 10-year budget regarding property transfers on the group is the potential impact on Panuku. Panuku staff and board have been engaged in the development of these options. Governing Body will make their decision regarding this on 20 June 2019.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
31. Local board decisions and feedback are being sought in this report. Local boards have a statutory role in providing local board feedback on regional plans.
32. Local boards play an important role in the development of the annual budget and local board agreements form part of the annual budget. Local board nominees have also attended Finance and Performance Committee workshops on the annual budget, and a special briefing was arranged on the proposed amendment to the 10-year budget regarding property transfers.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
33. Many local board decisions are of importance to and impact on Māori. Local board agreements and the annual budget are important tools that enable and can demonstrate council’s responsiveness to Māori.
34. Local board plans, which were developed in 2017 through engagement with the community including Māori, form the basis of local priorities. There is a need to continue to build relationships between local boards and iwi, and where relevant the wider Māori community.
35. Attachment A includes analysis of submissions made by mana whenua and mataawaka entities who have interests in the rohe/local board area.
36. Ongoing conversations will assist local boards and Māori to understand each other’s priorities and issues. This in turn can influence and encourage Māori participation in council’s decision-making processes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
37. This report is asking for local board decisions on financial matters in local board agreements that need to then be considered by the Governing Body.
38. Local boards are also providing input to regional plans. There is information in the consultation material for each plan with the financial implications of different options.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngāwhakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
39. Local boards need to make recommendations on these local financial matters for the Annual Budget 2019/2020 by 8 May 2019, in order for the Governing Body to be able to make decisions on them when considering the annual budget in May 2019.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
40. Local boards will approve their local board agreements and corresponding work programmes in June.
41. Recommendations and feedback from local boards will be provided to the relevant Governing Body committees for consideration during decision-making, as outlined in the table below:
**Decision dates for regional plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Decision-maker</th>
<th>Scheduled meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget 2019/2020</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
<td>22 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
<td>22 May 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Consultation Feedback report</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Written Submissions</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Events Feedback</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Regional Wide Social Media Feedback</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Corlett – Advisor Plans and Programmes</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Poe – Action Senior Local Board Advisor</td>
<td>Rina Tagore - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu &amp; Otara-Papatoetoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Budget 2019/2020 and Proposed Amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers consultation feedback report

Annual Budget 2019/2020 consultation feedback report for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

1. Purpose

This report summarises feedback relating to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board received through the Annual Budget 2019/2020 consultation. This includes:

- Feedback on the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board priorities for 2019/2020
- Feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 from people or organisations based in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area

The feedback received will inform the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board decisions on allocation of their local budgets in their local board agreement for 2019/2020. It will also inform the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s input and advocacy on regional budgets and proposals that will be agreed at their business meeting on 17 April 2019 and subsequently discussed with the Finance and Performance Committee on 8 May.

2. Executive Summary

This report summarises consultation feedback on the Annual Budget 2019/2020 (including on local board priorities for 2019/2020).

Council received feedback in person at community engagement events, through written forms (including online and hard copy forms, emails and letters) and through social media.

In summary the local board received the following feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hard copy   | 44      | Submissions
|             |         | • Online 39
|             |         | • Hard copy 3
|             |         | • Non-form 2
| Events      | 194     | Attended only
|             |         | 118 comments received from all three events
| Social media| 12      | ‘Likes’ only

Feedback on Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board priorities for 2019/2020

The local board consulted on the following priorities:

- Priority 1: Youth initiatives
- Priority 2: Reduce local waste and increase recycling
In total 44 submissions were received on Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board priorities for 2019/2020, showing 56% partial support, 35% support and 9% did not support.

Feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area

Out of the 2,953 submissions received on the regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020, 34 submissions were from people living in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area. The breakdown of changes to rates and fees are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes to rates and fees</th>
<th>Feedback total</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual waste management changes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food scraps targeted rate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory fees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious properties rates</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No feedback received for the following three issues: Draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2019/2020, Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate and Urban boundary rating.

Feedback on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers

Out of the 2,533 submissions received on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers, 30 submissions were from people living in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.

A total of 29 responses to this question showing the majority of submitters support (66%) and partially supported (28%) the amendment to the 10-year budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Year Budget Amendment</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your opinion about this proposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Context

Auckland Council consulted on its Annual Budget 2019/2020 and a proposed Amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers between 17 February and 17 March 2019.

The Annual Budget 2019/2020 must include a Local Board Agreement for the Mangere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board which sets out our priorities and how we’re going to pay for them.

Auckland Council also consulted on the Our Water Future discussion document at the same time. The feedback received on this discussion document will be presented at a later date.
Types of feedback
Overall Auckland Council received feedback from 5,249 people in the consultation period. This feedback was received through:

- Written feedback – 1,113 hard copy and 2,423 online forms, emails and letters
- In person – feedback was received through 14 have your say events and 51 community events.
- Social media – 25 comments were received through Facebook and Twitter.

4. Feedback received on Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board priorities for 2019/2020

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board consulted on the following priorities:

- Priority 1: Youth initiatives
- Priority 2: Reduce local waste and increase recycling

Key themes across all feedback received (through written, events and social media channels) were:

- more initiatives for our young people
- deliver education programmes and promotion on recycling and composting waste
- provide segregated rubbish bins at our facilities and town centres.

A summary of the feedback received through each channel is provided below.

Feedback received through written submissions

All 44 submissions were received on Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s local priorities for 2019/2020 the results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35% (12)</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56% (19)</td>
<td>Partially support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% (3)</td>
<td>Do not support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here are comments compiled of what was commented on the local board priorities and other themes:

1. Youth initiatives

Support

a. 787 - You seem to address the right policies

b. 1603 - A deeper focus on housing in the local area. More initiatives on safety — given the increase in criminal activities in Mangere bridge

c. 1957 - Important that the Mangere East community hub is progressed. Tourist trail? Lot needs to be done in our communities first. Assistance and resources for Maori and Pasifika people to set up businesses.
Partially support
a. 437 - I want to see more involvement and programs for youth. Internships/cadetships to show our young people pathways to earning higher incomes. Involvement in developments in area i.e: HLC and using local businesses to do some work. Push on with the Rail to Airport that crosses through Mangere, ensure this is a priority, to improve public transport for the area.

b. 592 - Unsure of how these changes affect Otahuhu. —Mangere ratepayers. It would help if everyday examples were given to elucidate each proposed change.

c. 1132 - for having a young population we need some adventurous parks like other areas of Auckland

d. We’d like to see more emphasis on dedicated youth spaces. These spaces would promote our community youth existing strengths for start-ups. Our youth are very entrepreneurial if given the space and resources. (Submission 592)

e. Ask our youth what they want: go into the schools, target the ones that hang around the town centres and bus stops causing grievance, our marae and kura children and include the parents and families if you can. (Submission 1358)

f. I think we are doing the best we can with our youth, how about free regular dance, music and acting classes. Whatever you start needs to be long term and sustainable, we don’t want to make promises that can’t be kept. (Submission 1358)

Do not support
a. 1507 - How many people use the cycle lanes around Mangere Town Centre, I can tell you its between zero and none except when mormon missionaries are in town. What standard are the public play grounds around Mangere and Otahuhu compared to other areas of Auckland?

b. 2251 - Money is wasted on feel good projects not important ones.

2. Waste reduction and increased recycling

Support
a. 2039 - Community educational programmes in various languages. Recycling models displaced in town centres so people can see ‘how to do it’ — could be huge posters or videos? Working with community groups to push the message out.

b. 492 - Increased availability and access to services. User pays will not work effectively in this area.

c. 787 - More advertising.

d. 1324 - Continue to have the red, blue and yellow bins at all local board sponsored events.

Partially
a. 437 - Have separate park bins separating recycling and general waste. Faster response to collection of rubbish in local areas. If left to build up then others will join in the dumping in that area. Install cameras in high dumping areas. Or have a quarterly street clean up, or a quarterly chipper for area to get rid of green waste and trees. Then use mulch for gardens.

b. 672 - More bin sets (the ones that have recycling, compost & landfill).

c. 954 - I want to see a local resource recovery centre, get the youth involved, challenge is getting a site, there must be somewhere that is handy to people, get the shop set up and hiring local people then start the fix it /reuse cafe and zero waste hub.

d. 1707 - traditional methods of recycling incorporated into modern techniques. for example, what to do with vegetable peels — compost — how?
e. 592 - Councils to subsidise composting resources and tools for families in the Mangere—Otahuhu. Reducing organic waste, transforming it into compost. However, the affordability of initially starting the process can be a challenge.

Do not support

a. 1507 - You need to make it cheaper for people to avoid dumping otherwise it will continue as it has been for years.

b. 2251 - It is fine as it is.

Feedback received through events

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board hosted two Drop-in events and one local community fono.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of people attended (total 194)</th>
<th>Total comments received from all three events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drop-in</td>
<td>Otahuhu</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-in</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community fono</td>
<td>Mangere East</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The key themes form these events are: changes to rates and fees (28), Mangere—Otahuhu Local Board (50), religious properties rates (13), Regional community services (10) other regional services (14).

Here are feedback examples received on the key themes from the local events:

- Changes to rates and fees
  
a. Changing religious organisations for "commercial uses, and not charging for the ministers' house. Believe that no charge should be on the chapel/hall etc. but their own residence should be charged. That there isn't a lot of Maori land left in Auckland area

b. Support non-payment of rates for all churches

c. Need a more simplified approach in explaining the rates proposal - increase and how ordinary people understand them

d. Waste charges going up

e. Want more elaboration to understand the different roles that happen on church lands.

f. Want - yellow bin/ red bin. China not seeing food scrap service

- Māngere—Otahuhu Local Board

  a. free community class run here on recycling - in different languages. Also can you share the type of rubbish we should recycle and how. Maybe do a poster and put it on the walls at the town centre and library

  b. can someone paint the town centre please. It looks very old.

  c. What can the council do on all the youth fighting in Māngere. Can we have some sort of plan for these young people. Can there be a working group looking after this matter with police?

  d. The students need assistance with travel discounts, esp. if the use of public transport is being promoted widely. Maybe AT can work out some deals with schools and offer hop cards from schools?

  e. Otahuhu Town centre regeneration: do not support the removal of car parks.

  f. we need better, cleaner parks in Otahuhu with more recycle bins to support the high use of parks. There needs to different types of bins as well - bottle, recycle and general rubbish. Can a clothing bin also be placed near the park.
**Religious properties rates**

a. Believes that if the ministers house is further away from church land – then it should not be rated.
b. Ministers houses being further away – it does not matter as long the ministers house is still on church land.
c. A minister’s house should be non-ratable – because he is a servant of God/still going the churches bidding.
d. Want more elaboration to understand the different roles that happen on church lands.

**Regional community services**

a. There’s a lights issue in south Auckland parks. Putting lights up might help communities to be more active because they’d feel safer to train in public places with lights, wouldn’t feel too dangerous.
b. Playgrounds in Auckland aren’t being taken care of as well as other parts of Auckland.
c. Need to put water in to our parks.
d. Having water fountains and parks (healthy kai, healthy families etc)
e. Need for lights in public parks/making things more visible (white lights)
f. Need for lights in South Auckland parks.
g. One parent urged the need for a Youth Strategy. With crime rates among youth on the rise, its important for us to start including youth (aged 9 and above) to start including them in these conversation so we can find ways forward. Theres nothing specific in place for youth aged 9-10yr olds (which is the age group that are most susceptible to crime and peer pressure).

**Local Community Services**

a. When connecting with Council, can there be a local person that we can talk to about our issues, rather then a customer services centre. These people don’t know about our area, or our people. It is often difficult to follow up too
b. We would like to see programme for young parents - mum and Dad’s in our local area. They are often faced with mental health issues. How can local board assist them and their wellbeing?
c. Can we have free gym passes for senior citizens please. Can this be linked to our gold card? Maybe 4 times a month, we can go to a gym and use the machine or spa
d. thank you for building a good bus station for us

d. **Other regional services**

a. One of the participants asked whether or not council support tangata whenua in Ihumatao. Council representative responded that they have always advised against building on Ihumatao land.
b. Participants from Mangere wished that the Fono could have been hosted in areas more accessible to members of the community, especially in areas that are being largely affecting by water and waste issues such as Mangere and Otara.
c. The Fono wasn’t well advertised. Participant also asked whether or not a notice had been sent out to schools and churches etc.
d. Discussions like this or the meetings like this should be implemented in primaries /high schools. The younger voices need to be heard
e. issues around rubbish/litter
f. Prevention might be more effective if young people were more informed – we need to include them in initiatives and allow more of an input from younger age groups.
Feedback received through social media channels

Feedback was received from the following social media channels:

A total of 25 comments were received through these platforms region wide.

- 12 people from Facebook
- 13 people from Twitter

The feedback received were varied commenting on transport, changes to rates and fees, regional community services organic waste management, council activities like, Movies in the Park, and animal management.

Twitter feedback

a. How do I make a submission against the plan to encroach on the harbour for the Americas Cup? I can't find it within the Have Your Say page. And if submissions finish tonight, then please take this as a submission AGAINST any further encroachments into the harbour. For the future's sake.

b. Please maintain path between Great South Road and Beaumonts way extension Manurewa. Safe ways to get to buses and trains are a must. #akhaveyoursay

c. The petrol tax in AKL. That's what we have paid more for. What is the SLA to get this infrastructure completed. Takanini is a disaster. I don't use this every day but I know so many commuters do. Especially when AKL workers are travelling from South to AKL. When we personally go away south during holiday periods its not that good. I'm sure a lot of commuters just going too and from work in AKL every day feel the same.

Facebook feedback

a. stop spending our money on free entertainment. Scrap movies and music in parks is a good start. Council is there to use OUR money provide essential services to the city. Want to put on events, make sure they turn a profit.

b. #akhaveyoursay I would like Council to reconsider the On-Line Accomodation Provider Targetted Rate (APTR) Bands in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 such that the lower Banding is brought into line with the Inland Revenue Departments value of 100 booking nights being considered the threshold for Business / Commercial rating.

c. No to 91 million for a cricket arena... no to Eden park 120 million debt bailout no to stadium on Port of Auckland. Address needs first

Mangere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area: The local board's Facebook only received 'likes' to the Annual Plan topic.

Information on submitters

The tables and graphs below indicate what demographic categories people identified with. This information only relates to those submitters who provided demographic information.
How feedback was received from 44 submissions:

- Online: 39
- Hard copy: 3
- Non form: 2

By submitter type from 44 submissions:

- An individual: 39
- Organisation: 5

By gender from 44 submissions:

- Female: 19
- Male: 16
- Gender diverse: 5

By age from 44 submissions:

- 75 years or older: 1
- 65 - 74 years: 9
- 55 - 64 years: 6
- 45 - 54 years: 7
- 35 - 44 years: 5
- 25 - 34 years: 5
- 15 - 24 years: 3
- 14 years or younger: 1
5. Overview of feedback received on the Annual Budget from Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area

The Annual Budget 2019/2020 sets out our priorities and how we’re going to pay for them. The regional consultation on the proposed Annual Budget focused on changes to rates and fees:

- Changes to rates and fees
  - Annual waste management changes
  - Food scraps targeted rate
  - Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate
  - Urban boundary rating
  - Religious properties rates
  - Regulatory fees

The 35 submissions received from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area is summarised below, along with an overview of other areas of feedback on regional proposals with a local impact.

Changes to rates and fees

Aucklanders were asked about a proposed small number of rating and fee changes.

**Question 1: We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020**

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2000 properties in the North Shore former trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020-2020/2021)
• adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)

• not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and

• an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes.

The tables below give an overview of the responses from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area. This table shows that 36 comments were received to changes to rates and fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating &amp; Fee changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows the submission that support, partially support, do not support the changes to rates and fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANGERE-OTAHUHU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to rates and fees (generally)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management targeted rate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food scraps collection targeted rate (North Shore trial area)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere rural sewerage service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban rating area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating of religious use properties</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory fees (generally)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource consent fees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building consent fees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour master fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal management fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to rating and fees (generally)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary most of local the submissions received are opposed to increased in regulatory fees. The local results reflects that of the regional trend in opposing the proposals. Here are the examples of comments from submissions received:

a. 12 - "Not Acceptable. Auckland is unaffordable there is to be no increase as salaries and wages have not increased like this in real terms. It is no wonder why there is a shortage of teachers, nurses & police officers in Auckland"

b. 492 - Sometimes we need to realise with a strong population, we need to be more sustainable.
c. 418 - "Due to a greater number of houses why do we have to have a rate increase? Council are collecting double rates off many properties and providing nothing more. Church Land should pay rates as many churches are making money."

d. 466 - "PLEASE REOPEN THE PORTAGE ROAD, WESTFIELD TRAIN STATION IN OTAHUHU"

e. 492 - I am really angry that rates are so high, how about the council looking overall at the way our money is spent. No more increases in rates should be necessary.

f. 571 - Waste should not be increasing by such a large percentage!

g. 592 - I don't know enough to comment

**Feedback on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2019/2020**

The local board did not receive feedback on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2019/2020.

**Feedback on other regional proposals with a local impact**

Feedback was received from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area on other regional proposals

The graph below shows the areas covered by this feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-Transport</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Water</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Regional Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Regional Community Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Other Regional Services</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Rating &amp; Funding</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Revenue &amp; Finance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Rates Remission and Postponement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Tūpuna Maunga</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Council Controlled Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-General Comments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Transport

a. 466 - PLEASE REOPEN THE PORTAGE ROAD, WESTFIELD TRAIN STATION IN OTAHUHU. LOCAL RESIDENTS IN THIS AREA NEED ACCESS TO AN EXTRA TRAIN STATION AS THE OTAHUHU STATION IS TOO FAR TO WALK TOO UNLESS YOU GET DROPPED OFF.

b. 1957 - That people and communities are treated fairly with an even distribution of resources. At the moment people seem to well resourced in metropolitan Auckland while those in South Auckland struggle to get simple things like a bus shelter.

c. 2617 - The proposed works included the removal of 117 street car parks. Despite a submission strongly objecting to their removal which was supported by letters from 77 local shop keepers, there has been no information on the outcome. The objection to the removal remains valid especially in view of (1) the projected significant increase in the Otahuhu population, (2) the opening of Apartment blocks where a majority of residents need to park on streets or public car parks because of lack of provision for on site parking, and (3) the increased need for train commuters to park on streets in the absence of any present or future park and ride facility.
2. Water
   a. 3409 - Water rate very expensive.

3. Regional Planning
   a. 492 - The noise issues in Mangere Bridge need sorting. A short, medium and long-term solution to the issues.
   b. 787 - Freedom camping in the Auckland region
   c. 2910 - should be lower to speed up housing needs

4. Regional Community Services
   a. 1707 - More programmes for seniors, esp free gym sessions, or events in the parks
   b. 1957 - That the threshold for rate rebates are lowered so more senior citizens can apply for them especially those in a single living arrangement. That people living in apartments especially aged apartments are not charged for removal of waste when they pay this to be done privately through their Body Corp fees...
   c. 3409 - My street need more-light as it too dark

5. Other Regional Services
   a. 292 - Sometimes we need to realise with growing population, we need to be more sustainable
   b. 1132 - the people at council who instigate their own personal agendas when carrying out council work too many people & too many layers of bureaucracy council having no control over the businesses of council
   c. 1707 - More community awareness on the importance of waste minimization
   d. 1957 - Assistance and resources for Maori and Pasifika people to set up businesses
   e. 2547 - Rubbish charges will lead to more dumping of rubbish.
   f. 2910 - "don't agree with extending wharf for huge cruise ships just

6. Rating and Funding
   a. 12 - That there be an ongoing programme of reduction of costs for the end user over a long term. People are foregoing food to cover these crazy costs.
   b. 470 - "I am really angry that rates are so high",
   c. 634 - The cost of rates. Also in my street there are homes where there are many, many incomes earners. calculated by all the cars parked outside and, on the street, yet that household pays only the same rates I do.
   d. 1324 - I have been thinking for some time that the resources required to address issues we see from alcohol sold by off—licences could or should be raised by way of a targeted rate on off—licence premises, including supermarkets. Targeted rates are used widely in local government (including Auckland Council and even the Mangere—Otahuhu Local Board—swimming pool targeted rate)...Targeted rates can be used to discourage problematic behaviour or promote desired outcomes...
   e. 1957 - Assistance and resources for Maori and Pasifika people to set up businesses
   f. 2251 - When is the council going to trim its costs to meet rates collected. It seems that this will continue to rise until the council takes all our money.
   g. 2473 - Fair and equitable distribution of costs, acknowledgment of tax paying residents and their contributions, recognition and support of those most in need.
7. Rates and Remission
   a. 2457 - Increase in rates

8. Council Controlled Services
   a. 2910 - "don't agree with extending wharf for huge cruise ships; just leave us with their waste to deal with"

9. General Comments
   a. 634 - As the example I have given in the previous question, the contracting out of public services to private company’s, is in SERIOUS Need of economic INVESTIGATION!! I have heard it said by council employees that the 'SUPER CITY', is hemorrhaging money like a DAM BURST,

6. Overview of feedback received on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers from Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area

The question and text below is directly from the feedback form. The feedback from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area is set out under the question.

Question 1:
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Year Budget Amendment</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your opinion about this proposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are written feedback examples received under support, partial support, do not support, in each category on the key regional themes.

Support

a. 592 - Strategic city assets owned by that city that should be kept in the hand of future residents. The council should be seen as guardians of the assets. Find ways to generate revenue for the city, then reinvested.

b. 634 - I am absolutely opposed to the contracting out of public services to the private sector, this ECONOMIC THEORY, has failed dramatically, & NO ONE is addressing this” Elephant in the room”

c. 672 - Sounds like it makes sense to cut out the middle man. I don’t use the waterfront often so I don’t really care too much.

d. 787 - I’ve lived in Auckland all my life and it’s awesome seeing the waterfront area being developed

e. 954 - These are an important asset so should be in public ownership, that is only if council can carry out the job efficiently and more so than panuku

f. 1132 - if it cuts duplication and the takes the control from bureaucrats great

Partially support

a. 466 - ”PLEASE REOPEN THE PORTAGE ROAD, WESTFIELD TRAIN STATION IN OTAHUHU. FURTHER, DONT MAKE THESE AREAS JUST AS BAR AND DRINKING AREAS, THEY SHOULD ALSO CATER FOR FAMILIES AND YOUNG PEOPLE SO THERE IS SAFE AND ACCESSIBLE ENJOYMENT FOR ALL.”

b. 1324 - I support as long as the costs of transferring the properties and ongoing costs bring about long-term benefits including cost benefits.

c. 1358 - ”Cost is a concern, is the work that they do going to be of any financial and environmental benefit to ratepayers. Currently we seem to be paying so many people in council which are or can be doing those jobs. The amount of money we are spending on administration, salaries and contracts is ridiculous is not cutting down our rates.”

d. 1987 - ”We believe that some of the port area should be more accessible to the people of Auckland for recreation and not filled with car holding lots. Return the coast to the people not fill it with cruise ships beside dolphins,”

e. 2473 - ”Will there be any limitations for public access? I would hope that any developments would not disrupt current views and/or change natural beauty of area”

f. 2910 - Not if it gives all rights to council

g. 3169 - No damage to our harbour the tanewhia is a force to be reckoned with...

Do not support

a. 470 - Any changes are way over administered and costly.

b. 2457 - Streamline processes; make it simple to understand both for public and government employees. Ownership and management equates to accountability. Split these and finger pointing starts when things go wrong.
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**Feedback**

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

   We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

   These changes include:

   - a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
   - extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
   - phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
   - adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
   - not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
   - an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

   Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Not Acceptable. Auckland is unaffordable there is to be no increase as salaries and wages have not increased like this in real terms. It is no wonder why there is a shortage of teachers, nurses & police officers in Auckland.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

That there be an ongoing programme of reduction of costs for the end user over a long term. People are foregoing food to cover these crazy costs.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
WE WANT YOUR FEEDBACK

This feedback form contains questions relating to:
- Annual Budget 2019/2020
- Proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers
- Our Water Future

Feedback must be received by Sunday 17 March 2019.

Please read the consultation document available at akhaveyoursay.nz or at any library, service centre, local board office or by phoning 09 301 0101 before you give feedback. It has more information about the issues and choices that we want your feedback on.

All of the questions below are optional. We encourage you to give feedback online at akhaveyoursay.nz, or you can complete this form and return it to us using one of the options below.

Email
Scan your completed form and email it to akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.

By post
Place your completed form in an envelope and send it to freepost address:
AK Have Your Say
Auckland Council
Freepost Authority 182382
Private Bag 92 300, Auckland 1142

Questions relating to the Annual Budget 2019/2020
To answer the following questions please read pages 16 and 17 of the consultation document.

Question 1: We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020

These changes include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2000 properties in the North Shore former trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020-2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

Sometimes we need to realign with a growing population, we need to be more sustainable.

CNSST
Question 2: Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Please comment:


Local board information
To answer the following questions, please read pages 18 to 33

Question 3a: Which local board does your feedback relate to?

Questions 3b: In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially
Please comment:


Question relating to the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers
To answer the following question please read pages 34 to 45 of the consultation document.

Question 1:
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
☐ Support ☐ Not support ☐ Partially support

Please comment:


Need more room? You can attach extra pages, but please make sure they are A4 and also include your name and contact information.
Outside of the Annual Budget we are also looking at the future of Auckland’s water.

### Our water future - consultation questions

To answer the following questions about our water future please view the full discussion document or executive summary at akhaveyoursay.nz.

All of these questions are optional.

**Question 1: Our values**

People value water for different reasons. We have identified five broad categories that we will use to evaluate our progress on water issues.

Do these values match what you value about water?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ecosystems: healthy water systems nourish the natural environment.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Water use: we can meet our everyday water needs safely, reliably and efficiently</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Recreation and amenity: we enjoy being in, on and near the water at beaches, lakes and streams.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Culture: water contributes to our identities and beliefs, as individuals and as part of communities.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Resilience: our communities, catchments and coastlines are resilient to natural hazards and the impacts of climate change</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please tell us why, and if there is anything else you value about water?

**Question 2: The big issues: what we need to work on**

We have identified four issues that are at the heart of Auckland’s water future.

How concerned are you about these issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cleaning up our waters, dealing with the pollution of our beaches and waterways, e.g. sediment, nutrients and contaminants from rural and urban activities and roads, litter and faecal contamination.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Growth in the right places, thinking about the water and wastewater impacts of where and how we grow.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3: Meeting our future water needs**

As we develop options for meeting our future drinking water needs, we want to understand which criteria you think are most important.

Which of the following criteria are most important to you? (Select your top two)

- Safety and quality of drinking water
- Reliable supply of drinking water
- Cost of infrastructure needed to provide drinking water
- Environmental impacts of the infrastructure for supplying drinking water
- Becoming less reliant on water sources outside the region by being more efficient and exploring other sources

Please tell us why these criteria matter to you, or if there are others you think are more important?
Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028
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All personal information that you provide in this submission will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.net.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. Our privacy policy explains how we may use and share the following information is optional but will help us know whether we are hearing from all Aucklanders.

Your feedback will be included in public documents.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

Due to a greater number of houses why do we have to have a rate increase? Council are collecting double rates off many properties and providing nothing more. Church Land should pay rates as many churches are making money.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Compulsory solar power on new builds of any category. Compulsory water catchment on new builds of any category. Compulsory wastewater management on new builds of any category. Illegal Dumping Fines enacted No Freedom Camping anywhere. Cat containment to cat owner's property - like dogs - pound then destroy wandering cats Light rail - to the airport, North Shore, Waitakere, Pukekohe Keep up the work on Bike paths. Tree path for bird migration - continuous and as wide as possible. Reduce immigration initiative as more houses would not be needed - strangely every year we need as many new houses as we receive immigrants DUH! Street parties, beach parties, park parties are escalating - ban alcohol and enforce it. Have a Time notified on parks re noise levels - 11pm or 12pm More public bins and emptied more often More public toilets Boat Owners initiative re mess in the Harbour - Responsibility and Fines Inorganic Collection Distribution sites advertised and updated with available products - not secret selection and priority for 'the boys' or whoever - update us on where our cast-offs are going

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $760 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Should have never been given to a CCO as that invites insider trading

Auckland Council
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Mangere-Ōtahuhu

Mangere-Ōtahuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

I want to see more involvement and programs for youth. Internships/cadetships to show our young people pathways to earning higher incomes. Involvement in developments in area i.e: HLC and using local businesses to do some work. Push on with the Rail to Airport that crosses through Mangere, ensure this is a priority, to improve public transport for the area.

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?

More involvement of the local board with youth programs. All I see is one or two local board members doing work around the community i.e: Sosene and Bakuich. The others I am not too sure of. Review the number of alcohol outlets and educate our youth on drugs and alcohol. Engage with at risk youth and implement programs to better utilise the skills for the community.

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

Have separate park bins separating recycling and general waste. Faster response to collection of rubbish in local areas. If left to build up then others will join in the dumping in that area. Install cameras in high dumping areas. Or have a quarterly street clean up, or a quarterly chipper for area to get rid of green waste and trees. Then use mulch for gardens.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Reducing the governance duplication is what I am for to speed up projects on improving our waterfront.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
PLEASE REOPEN THE PORTAGE ROAD, WESTFIELD TRAIN STATION IN OTAHUHU

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
PLEASE REOPEN THE PORTAGE ROAD, WESTFIELD TRAIN STATION IN OTAHUHU

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
PLEASE REOPEN THE PORTAGE ROAD, WESTFIELD TRAIN STATION IN OTAHUHU. LOCAL RESIDENTS IN THIS AREA NEED ACCESS TO AN EXTRA TRAIN STATION AS THE OTAHUHU STATION IS TOO FAR TO WALK TOO UNLESS YOU GET DROPPED OFF.
What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
PLEASE REOPEN THE PORTAGE ROAD, WESTFIELD TRAIN STATION IN OTAHUHU. FURTHER, ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT SHOULD BE FREE FOR FAMILIES AND YOUNG PEOPLE SO THEY HAVE ACCESS TO TRANSPORT, SO EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION AND THE ABILITY TO VISIT FRIENDS AND FAMILY IN OTHER AREAS OF AUCKLAND.
What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
PLEASE REOPEN THE PORTAGE ROAD, WESTFIELD TRAIN STATION IN OTAHUHU.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
PLEASE REOPEN THE PORTAGE ROAD, WESTFIELD TRAIN STATION IN OTAHUHU. FURTHER, DON'T MAKE THESE AREAS JUST AS BAR AND DRINKING AREAS. THEY SHOULD ALSO CATTER FOR FAMILIES AND YOUNG PEOPLE SO THERE IS SAFE AND
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I am really angry that rates are so high, how about the council looking overall at the way our money is spent. Too much is already spent on very inefficient waste management. No more increases in rates should be necessary.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
The cost of rates. Also in my street there are homes where there are many, many incomes earners, calculated by all the cars parked outside and on the street yet that household pays only the same rates I do.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
I have answered thus because I don’t know what they do.
What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
I want initiatives firstly to go to rubbish collection and libraries then you can look at other things. Core infrastructure first please.
What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
Anything that doesn’t cost more money

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Do not support
Any changes are way over administered and costly.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- A $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- Extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- Phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- Adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- Not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- An increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Waste should not be increasing by such a large percentage.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

The noise issues in Mangere Bridge need sorting. A short, medium and long term solution to the issues.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Yes

Comments

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?

Anything that keeps them off the streets......

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

Increased availability and access to services. User pays will not work effectively in this area.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Annual Budget feedback
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Charge rates to religions. Why do they get a pass? Don’t charge rates to actual charities who truly do good things for people now.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I don’t know enough to comment

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

None that would be pertinent to the proposed changes

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments:

Unsure of how those changes affect Otahuhu - Māngere ratepayers. It would help if everyday examples were given to elucidate each proposed change.

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?

We’d like to see more emphasis on dedicated youth spaces. These spaces would promote our community youth existing strengths for start-ups. Our youth are very entrepreneurial if given the space and resources.

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

Councils to subsidise composting resources and tools for families in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu. Reducing organic waste, transforming it into compost. However, the affordability of initially starting the process can be a challenge.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Strategic city assets owned by that city that should be kept in the hand of future residents. The council should be seen as guardians of the assets. Find ways to generate revenue for the city, then reinvested.
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 21 Feb 2019 00:34
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I am Absolutely Opposed to further rate increases, you refer as SMALL rate changes ie Increases full stop, Already Phill Goffs administration Has Imposed an extra Fuel tax on Aucklanders, 4 years ago my rates went UP by $500 as did thousands of other properties, what happened to this vast amount of revenue!. WHAT CHECKS & INVESTIGATION IS BEING LEVY-ED on CONTRACTED OUT SERVICES TO PRIVATE COMPANIES!! EG Auckland Transport that has unnecessary replaced good kerb stones, & proposed to build unnecessary traffic island in ordinary urban streets? here in Mangere Bridge under the guise of "improvements" multiply this practice across the city, SOMEONE IS SANCTIONING THIS DEPLOYMENT OF PUBLIC FUNDS!!

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

As the example I have given in the previous question, the contracting out of public services to private company's, is in SERIOUS Need of economic INVESTIGATION!! I have heard it said by council employees that the 'SUPER CITY', is hemorrhaging money like a DAM BURST,

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

I am absolutely opposed to the contracting out of public services to the private sector, this ECONOMIC THEORY, has failed dramatically, & NO ONE is addressing this "Elephant in the room"
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- A $20.07 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- Extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- Phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- Adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- Not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- An increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I’m 100% supportive of rate increases to cover things like wastemanagement when it includes recycling, composting and sustainable solutions. I’m 100% against religious organisations not having to pay rates, how is that fair? Not keen on regulatory fees increasing when associated with the building industry unless some relief comes with it - faster processing time for consents etc. Its already super expensive with rubbish service.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Ōtāhuhu

Mangere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
I feel like they could have made some progress/identified new areas of work.
What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
Littering education with corresponding logical and frequent placing of recycling/compost/waste bins. I walk my dog past the Leisure centre every morning and without fail, despite the people council has out during the day picking up rubbish, the ground is littered with plastic soft drink bottles and food wrappers, and often boxes of KFC bones etc. More and better bins needed!! Cheaper healthy food options. Where are we supposed to buy fresh veges and fruit? We have to go to Papatoetoe or Sylvia Park.

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
More bin sets (the ones that have recycling, compost & landfill).

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Sounds like it makes sense to cut out the middle man. I don’t use the waterfront often so I don’t
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>really care too much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 21 Feb 2019 12:29
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
We need to push as hard as we can to combating climate change and making NZ as sustainable as possible. $68.37/year may be too much to charge people for food scraps collection if this behaviour is to be encouraged.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

### Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I agree

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Freedom camping in the Auckland region

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
You seem to address the right policies
What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
Having somewhere for youth to get advice
What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
More advertising

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
I’ve lived in Auckland all my life and it’s awesome seeing the waterfront area being developed
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments
I want to see more shade and more money put into the childrens playgrounds, compare them with the playgrounds in other areas and ours need input and upgrade. Also more seats to stop and rest along kiwi esplanade. Lots of elderly and walkers need to sit down.

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
Community centres running youth programmes and youth getting involved in reuse and fix it cafes set up around the resource recovery centre

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
I want to see a local resource recovery centre, get the youth involved, challenge is getting a site, there must be somewhere that is handy to people, get the shop set up and hiring local people then start the fix it /reuse cafe and zero waste hub

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

These are an important asset so should be in public ownership, that is only if council can carry out the job efficiently and more so than panuku
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 27 Feb 2019 15:28
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
continue to not charge for land owned by religious organisations

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

the people at council who instigate their own personal agendas when carrying out council work too many people & too many layers of bureaucracy council having no control over the businesses of council

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

for having a young population we need some adventurous parks like other areas of Auckland

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?

A youth centre in the middle of Mangere. Adventurous parks

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

yes at no cost as council has a lot of duplication etc in the administration that could be restructured

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

if it cuts duplication and the takes the control from bureaucrats great
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
The idea of charging rates on land owned by religious organisations, if the land or the buildings on that land are not being used for business purposes, is ludicrous. Churches primarily operate as not-for-profit organisations and generally contribute to their local communities in a positive way. Most of them struggle financially and may be asset rich but definitely struggle to maintain those assets. Many of the churches around Auckland are also heritage buildings and imposing a significant further financial cost on church plant could have a very negative longer-term effect on the maintenance of that heritage. Is that a price the council is prepared to pay? While some churches may generate a small profit on a child-care centre, op shop or similar, the net effect on the total annual property budget for the entire church plant is likely to be minimal. Leave the churches alone to get on with the good community work they do.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
• an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees
and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
For people on a fixed NZ Super income, a $20.67 increase (or approximately 10%) to the annual
waste management charge is not a small increase especially when you put it against all the other
costs which always go up and never down But some will know that to come down is often
disappointing after a high.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
I have been thinking for some time that the resources required to address issues we see from
alcohol sold by off-licences could or should be raised by way of a targeted rate on off-licence
premises, including supermarkets. Targeted rates are used widely in local government (including
Auckland Council and even the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board – swimming pool targeted rate).
The Productivity Commission has highlighted that councils do not make the most of their existing
financial tools, such as targeted rates (NZPC, 2015a). Targeted rates can be used to discourage
problematic behaviour or promote desired outcomes. I, with others, are very concerned that the
sale and supply of alcohol by off-licence premises has the following impacts: • spoiling of
footpaths/streets, reserves/parks, and other public places with alcohol-related rubbish such as
bottles (often broken glass), cans, shot glasses, cardboard and plastic bags left behind by people
consuming alcohol in these places; • damage, vandalism and graffiti of council facilities and
infrastructure (e.g. signs, seating, buildings, children’s playgrounds, etc) from intoxicated people; •
disorderly behaviour and nuisance caused by people consuming alcohol in public places; and •
consumption of alcohol in alcohol ban areas contrary to bylaws. In the work a few of us have been
doing, people believe these negative effects, impacts and problematic behaviour (and the
consequent compliance and clean-up costs) caused by the sale and supply of alcohol from off-
licence premises should be more directly funded by the premises profiling from the sale and
supply of that alcohol. Such funding could come from a targeted rate on off-licence premises. In
the case of MOLB, this could be all off-licence premises in the MOLB area. The funding from the
targeted rate could be used to mitigate the problems and promote better outcomes, through, for
example, better signage, clean-up activities, community monitoring and Maori and Pacific warden
activities to ‘police’ alcohol ban areas, etc. It could also offset the cost of policy-making such as
alcohol ban bylaws and LAPs. Another benefit of a targeted rate is that it could be designed so
that larger premises, such as supermarkets, that sell more alcohol, would pay more of the targeted
rate. It could also perhaps influence closing times (if you close earlier, you pay less or no targeted
rate). Every off-licence premise is clearly identified with a licence (that also shows a
plan/size/layout of the licensed area). For supermarkets, such a rate may even have the
consequence of them considering reducing their alcohol area? There might even be an ability to
link the rate to sale of alcohol?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu
Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes

Comments
What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
Keep doing what you are doing as long as it is producing positive results

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
Continue to have the red, blue and yellow bins at all local board sponsored events

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

I support as long as the costs of transferring the properties and ongoing costs bring about long term benefits including cost benefits.

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
• an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

1) a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs. It depends on what the cover is for. In Mangere the amount of dumping is worse than terrible. The current system of picking up our organics has increased the amount of rubbish dumped and for some families in Mangere those red bins are too small. (a) I would agree to the increase if it reduced the dumping (ii) cameras in the areas where a lot dumping is done. (b) In Brisbane QLD and Sydney NSW they have four pick ups a year, and if rubbish is left behind they will go back within reason and pick it up. 2) extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available. Doesn't seem to be working, I notice a lot of our marae have abandoned the idea because it was getting expensive. 3) not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations. Agree if they meet the not for profit and / charitable status criteria. Many of them provide services that local and central government can't provide for free. 4) an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs. NO - Honestly, most of the increases go back into councils pockets for admin, the costs that the public have to absorb are ridiculous.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board Information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Ōtāhuhu

Mangere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially

Comments
There are some good priorities in there. 1) I would like to see that all local parks and playgrounds so they are safe, attractive and well-used. Since the Super City has taken over the maintenance and upkeep on our parks is terrible, we shouldn't have to call them when things need to be done. 2) Agree with the enhancement and improvement of the Mangere East precinct. Is there the possibility to tidy up Ōtāhuhu and Mangere Town Center including the eye sore block of shops by Middlemore bridge in Mangere, it should be shut down. Not a good look for Mangere.

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
Ask our youth what they want: go into the schools, target the ones that hang around the town centres and bus stops causing grief, our marae and kura children and include the parents and families if you can. I think we are doing the best we can with our youth, how about free regular
dance, music and acting classes. Whatever you start needs to be long term and sustainable, we don’t want to make promises that can’t be kept.

**What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?**

I’m not impressed with the amount of dumping in Mangere. (a) The current system of picking up our organics has increased the amount of rubbish dumped and for some families in Mangere those red bins are too small. Can we get cameras in the areas where a lot dumping is done. (b) Can we have more frequent or on request pick ups. In Brisbane QLD and Sydney NSW they have four pick ups a year, and if rubbish is left behind they will go back within reason and pick it up. (c) Can we get back the community bottle, cardboard and clothing recycle drop off bins at Mangere Town Centre and other places. (d) Is there the possibility of having return and earn recycling station https://www.campbelltownmall.com.au/home/news-and-events/news-details/campbelltown/2018/07/30/return-earn-recycling-station (e) Is there the possibility of bringing back the old bottle and paper drives. (f) There needs to be more education or a different way to get people to look at food waste. I notice a lot of our marae have abandoned the idea because it was getting expensive.

**Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment**

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

**What is your opinion about this proposal?**

Partially support

Cost is a concern, is the work that they do going to be of any financial and environmental benefit to ratepayers. Currently we seem to be paying so many people in council which are or can be doing those jobs. The amount of money we are spending on administration, salaries and contracts is ridiculous is not cutting down our rates.

---

**Auckland Council**
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
“not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations” - Why? Charge them like everyone else. Charge depending on size or parent church size. No free rides anymore. An increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs.” - Are you kidding? Make it cost more like the speed and service received will improve from its current crap status? If you’re going to speed up the turnaround from lodging to receiving approval, please raise the cost. You can’t keep lifting rates when the services received don’t improve. If your current suppliers are charging more, find new suppliers who would love to get a local government contract.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Equality between the different areas. Ensuring that our local board are in tune with the people and work to ensure all areas have the same great level of facilities.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
No

Comments

How many people use the cycle lanes around Mangere Town Centre, I can tell you its between zero and none except when mormon missionaries are in town. What standard are the public play grounds around Mangere and Otahuhu compared to other areas of Auckland?

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?

Well lit engaging, new and durable play areas. A water park opposite the town centre with new lit basket ball courts and park area. More presence at council owned parks and reserves, why wait until damage has been done?

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

You need to make it cheaper for people to avoid dumping otherwise it will continue as it has been for years.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is your opinion about this proposal?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why double up when you already have a department to handle that. Hurry up and build the world class water front stadium that should have happened before the last world cup!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Auckland Council**
From:  
Date:  Friday, 1 March 2019 4:02:00 PM  

Dear  

We reference to your letter of 19th February 2019 regarding the Rating Proposals for Religious Properties, I as a president of registered as incorporated under the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 dated at Auckland this 9th May 1989 would like to verify that our organization is a full non-profitable organization.  

This organization proving all Buddhism activities and festivals for all Lao and Thai esthetics in Auckland and nearby on a regular basis since May 1989. Please note that Lao and Thai speaking the same language, same backgrounds and respected to the same religion, Buddhist.  

We therefore would like to request you to kindly avoid the land rates payment for two religious properties . We used these two properties for Buddhist monastery and traditional ceremony actives according our culture and believes to remain in New Zealand for our youth and next generation.  

Yours sincerely  


Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 7 Mar 2019 11:00
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs - isn’t the
general rates increase going to cover this cost? Why are tax payers being hit twice? Also, more
needs to happen on educating Aucklanders around waste reduction to tackle the issue.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

An increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees)
to cover increased costs - as a first time home builder, I believe the cost of regulatory fees is too
high. The development tax is self is around $14,000. If council is proposing to increase, in addition
to these, no one will opt for building a house. You will get overcrowding and hike in houses prices,
look at ways to make it affordable for people to build. Council needs to meet Aucklanders mid way
with cost reduction. There is no contribution from council to first time home builders. Think about
offering some incentives if you want to increase costs. I don’t not support this.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Yes

Comments

A deeper focus on housing in the local area. More initiatives on safety - given the increase in
criminal activities in Mangere bridge

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?

- more youth activation - more free classes - art and sports for children, the sports club charge
  fees which are unaffordable for some families. - food for primary school children

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

- community workshops on recycling - local display on what recycling looks like - using traditional
  methods of recycling

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about
$790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership
of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The
resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with
other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are
strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
17 April 2019

Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to
the 10-year Budget 2018-2028

#1609

From: Auckland Council
To: AKHaveYourSay
Subject: Tuesday, 5 March 2019 3:44:32 PM

Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.

Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 5 Mar 2019 15:40
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area
to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period
  (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised
  areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees
  and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I agree

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Kaipatiki

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 8 Mar 2019 10:16
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs - as a rate payer in Mangere, we don't benefit from food scrap collection. The added cost shouldn't be transferred to us. In fact, the rubbish bins have gone smaller and more people are leaving their rubbish in public parks etc.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
- More community awareness on the importance of waste minimization - More programmes for seniors, esp free gym sessions, or events in the parks

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially

Comments
there are so many other ethnic groups in the local area, however, there aren't diverse events funded by the board. Where is the celebration of diversity? There is representation of diversity in the local programmes as well.

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
- Ethnic events celebrated - Ethnic festivals funded and supported by the board

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
- Traditional methods of recycling incorporated into modern techniques. For example, what to do with vegetable peels - compost - how?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I don’t agree with having to pay more for the waste management charge. The inorganic collection only happens once a year, and the amount allowed to be put out is 1 cubic metre - which is not much at all.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Submitter details

Date received: 12 Mar 2019 10:55
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
17 April 2019

Attachment B

Item 19

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?

I would like to see support of an environmental youth initiative.

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

Increased communication between the local board and community groups that are dealing directly with waste management issues.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

We agree with the Auckland Council in not charging rates on some parts of the property owned by religious organisations. However churches and religious organisations should be considered as separate entities because each one may serve their community in different ways, have varying amounts of land and property, have small or large congregations trying to keep property well maintained and fit for use, and are in well endowed communities or in struggling communities. If the Auckland Council wishes to be fair to all their communities then each church and its property must be seen as separate entities.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

That people and communities are treated fairly with an even distribution of resources. At the moment people seem to well resourced in metropolitan Auckland while those in South Auckland struggle to get simple things like a bus shelter. That the threshold for rate rebates are lowered so more senior citizens can apply for them especially those in a single living arrangement. That people living in apartments especially aged apartments are not charged for removal of waste when they pay this to be done privately through their Body Corp fees. Has a Seniors Advisory group been set up?

3. Local Board Information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Mangere-Otahuhu

---

**Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback**

**In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?**

Yes

**Comments**

Important that the Mangere East community hub is progressed. Assistance and resources for Maori and Pasifika people to set up businesses. Tourist trail? Lot needs to be done in our communities first.

**What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?**

Local initiatives to give well resourced outdoor areas as with housing intensification safe spaces will be limited. Need to find out from the youth what they want and encourage them into viable jobs. Use of school grounds for community uses perhaps.

**What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?**

More depots locally that are well publicised to recycle waste. Onehunga too far to go.

---

**Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment**

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership
of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

**What is your opinion about this proposal?**

**Partially support**

We believe that some of the port area should be more accessible to the people of Auckland for recreation and not filled with car holding lots. Return the coast to the people not fill it with cruise ships beside dolphins,
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
17 April 2019
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From: Auckland Council
To: AKHaveYouSaid
Subject: Annual Budget 2019-2020 feedback
Date: Wednesday, 13 March 2019 11:45:11 AM

Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.

Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 13 Mar 2019 11:42

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
See attached files.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
17 April 2019

12.03.19
SELWYN ANGLICAN CHURCH MANGERE EAST.

Section 1: Rating matters and fees and charges.
1.1. Rating of regions use of properties

This submission is a collective submission on behalf of the vestry of Selwyn Anglican Church, Mangere East.

Although we commend the Auckland Council for considering an amendment on behalf of religious property we would like council to consider the impact that the rating approach for land use will have on this community and the administrative body of this local church. The finances of this church are already precarious with the amount of monies required to keep buildings and grounds maintained with only a small group of parishioners and we can only afford a quarter stipend for the services of a priest. The application of fees and charges by the Auckland Council will cause affordability issues.

Therefore we ask that this church property be viewed separately as to its rateability.

We can only speak of our own situation which is as follows.
The address is listed as 330 Massey Road, or 3 Hain Ave Mangere East and is on the corner of Hain Ave and Massey Rd.
The vicarage is at 7 Hain Ave, Mangere East.
The wooden church was originally built in 1863 in Otahuhu as the Holy Trinity Church. It was given to the Mangere East parish in 1927 when it was transferred and restated where it stands today.
All the property is owned by the General Trust Board of the Anglican Diocese and is only administered by the church vestry on their behalf.
We receive no monetary assistance from the GTB for the repairs and maintenance of these heritage buildings and the environs.
The property consists of a heritage church being built in the Bishop Selwyn style of architecture. The church is joined to a small entrance lobby, and a small hall available to the local community, a kitchen and toilet area, and larger hall and outside play area. This larger hall and play area is the only part of the joined structure which is in commercial use by a preschool for children in a lower socio economic area of Mangere East.
There is an area of open ground which is unused at the moment behind these joined buildings which is currently being considered as a possible community garden area.
7 Hain Avenue, the vicarage of the said church, was previously rated separately from the other property.
Although it is leased to a social services agency it is used as offices and training area for Manaaki Tangata which is a group of social workers being employed by ME Family Services in Ferguson Street.
Therefore all of the property is being administered by a very small church of less then 50 people who have to find all the finances to keep a heritage church and other buildings maintained in a good state of repair, fit for use, by social agencies, community groups and their own congregations, which are diverse, representing the changing nature of New Zealand’s population.

In relation to additional waste charges. No waste is collected by Auckland Council from the church and preschool environment only waste water. Their waste and recyclables are collected privately.
It would seem to be unfair to charge for collection of waste when no collections are made. Waste and waste water is collected from 7 Hain Avenue.

With these facts in mind we would like the Auckland Council to consider:

- The previous agreement we had with Auckland Council rates and valuation team to rate only the vicarage at 7 Hain Ave and the area at 3 Hain Avenue which is only used as a childcare facility.
  
  Reference letter dated 17 April 2018

  Assessment 1234542246

  Reference MCC-200

  The Auckland Council needs to ensure that any ratings struck for 3 Hain Ave and 7 Hain Avenue must be done separately so we can tell which rates are for the vicarage and which are for the childcare facility, for budget and planning purposes.

- The possibility of zero rates for the majority of property at 3 Hain Avenue and at 7 Hain Avenue as the majority of the property is for community use and the small area leased by the preschool has shared areas with the church.

- The church is sharing its facilities with a diverse group of cultures within the community and providing well maintained buildings and grounds for the use of all people but especially for those who are young and in need of family support, and provide access to social services through the strong connection with ME Family Services.

- Therefore we are helping to promote a fair, safe and healthy Auckland, and we are helping to save the cultural heritage of Auckland.

- In 2016 We have brought together the history of the church through a publication titled “The Church on the Corner” by Christopher Paxton and we have just updated our Conservation Plan for the property for the next 10 years at considerable expense.

- This Conservation Plan allows us to apply for funds for historical maintenance on the church which is the only structure we can make funding applications for.

- Having to pay large rate demands may make the continuation of this church an unviable one.
13 March 2019

Dear

I have made a submission through the Auckland Council websites on behalf of the Selwyn Anglican Church in relation to the Proposed Rates changes for 2019/2020 which include changes to ratings of religious use properties.

As the person heading the local board committee we would like you to have a copy of our petition sent to Auckland Council.

Yours sincerely
17 April 2018

The General Trust Board of The Diocese of Auckland  
C/O Selwyn Anglican Church  
PO Box 86053  
Mangere East  
AUCKLAND 2158

To the ratepayer

Assessment:

Property Location:

Reference:

We wrote to you previously about our review of all non-rateable properties in the Auckland Council area. The purpose of the review was to ensure that all properties are correctly and consistently rated according to the provisions of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 (LGRA).

As part of this process, we reviewed all properties that were partly or fully non-rateable for reasons of religious education and/or worship.

As we advised -

Areas used mainly for worship and religious education will be non-rateable. Areas with other uses (e.g. administration offices) should be fully rated. Where there is a mix of rateable and non-rateable use, ancillary areas (e.g. storerooms, parking, kitchens) will be assessed on the way their use relates to the rateable and non-rateable land. Non-worship/education activities are permitted in non-rateable areas as long as the non-rateable activities are the principal use of that land.

We requested information about property use and this assisted our valuers in determining rateability.

As a result of this review, there will be no change to the current rating of this property.

If you have any queries about this process, please email us at rates.billinganddata@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Yours sincerely

135 Albert Street | Private Bag 92300, Auckland 1142 | aucklandcouncil.govt.nz | Ph 09 301 0101
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
17 April 2019
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**Feedback**

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
n increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs - council needs to offer incentives to first time home builders, instead of charging them more for consents. As a first home builder, we have experienced the cost, even to meet with a council officer, they bill us. How is this going to result in more homes being built in Auckland, if Council keeps on making it expensive.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Youths Waste - recycling Diverse events

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes

Comments

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
1. Youth - more programmes targeted for young people, which is free, focusing on non traditional topics, such as Maths, technology. 2. Encouraging celebrations of more diverse events in our local board area to reflect other cultures

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
1. Community educational programmes in various languages 2. Recycling models displaced in town centres so people can see 'how to do it' - could be huge posters or videos? 3. Working with community groups to push the message out

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
What about the extra charges called targeted rates. At present I have five of these. It is completely dishonest not to mention them and then pretend that rates increases have been held at 2.5%.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
When is the council going to trim its costs to meet rates collected. It seems that this will continue to rise until the council takes all our money. Also why is all the money taken from motorists used for anything other than roads. If public transport is so fabulous and efficient surely it does not need subsidising.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Ōtahuhu

Mangere-Ōtahuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
No
Comments
Money is wasted on feel good projects not important ones.
What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
Absolutely none.
What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
It is fine as it is.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.

Annual Budget feedback
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Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
17 April 2019

Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028

Charges need to be equitable with household use.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Increase in rates

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially

Comments:
Same areas with same services need same rates not preferential treatment especially with new suburbs.

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
Youth need skills training especially if they are unemployed and not studying. It would be good if businesses including local government would employ them under paid apprenticeships. There are many opportunities like hiring and training them in maintaining council lands, properties.

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
Sufficient proper waste disposals available and visible to the public.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Do not support

Streamline processes; make it simple to understand both for public and government employees. Ownership and management equates to accountability. Split these and finger pointing starts when things go wrong.
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
First 4 points make sense Not charging rates/religious organisations - not fair/congregations pays increasing contributions to their churches in good faith - why should parts of their land be rates free and not the ordinary residents? What increased services/improvements are provided to people as a result of increased fees?

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Fair and equitable distribution of costs, acknowledgment of tax paying residents and their contributions, recognition and support of those most in need.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Otara-Papatoetoe

Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Comments

Have not checked consultation document as yet - but will add to this when sighted.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

Will there be any limitations for public access? I would hope that any developments would not disrupt current views and/or change natural beauty of area.
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
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Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.
These changes include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area
to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period
(2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised
areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees
and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Religious organizations should not get special treatment, if they do then organizations like SPCA and charities should get some.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Rubbish charges will lead to more dumping of rubbish.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Reduce double up of functions, conserve money, use expertise already available at council

Auckland Council
Date: 13 March 2019 at 16:28
Subject: ANNUAL BUDGET 2019/2020 - MANGERE/OTAHUHU LOCAL BOARD

The Board advertised a meeting (12 - 2pm) for Thursday 7 March at Criterion Lane Otahuhu to allow people to become involved.

In preparation for that I obtained a copy of the Consultation Document as well as searching some websites under the heading of Annual Budget.

2017 - 2018 CONSULTATION

An issue that arose during that consultation was the splitting of the Board into two, Mangere and Otahuhu. This was to allow Otahuhu to have its representation at Council level. This was evidently not actioned by the Board and remains an issue to be addressed.

2017 - 2018 ANNUAL BUDGET

The Budget included $17m for the Otahuhu Business Centre Upgrade which was to be completed by August 2018. The majority of the work remains to be undertaken.

The proposed works included the removal of 117 street car parks. Despite a submission strongly objecting to their removal which was supported by letters from 77 local shop keepers, there has been no information on the outcome. The objection to the removal remains valid especially in view of (1) the projected significant increase in the Otahuhu population, (2) the opening of Apartment blocks where a majority of residents need to park on streets or public car parks because of lack of provision for on site parking, and (3) the increased need for train commuters to park on streets in the absence of any present or future park and ride facility.

The proposed work also included the removal of the Cook's pine tree in Criterion Lane. This was apparently planted to commemorate some event
which the Board have not been able to provide me details. The reason was given as the roots were entering sewer pipes.

If roots are so entering it is most likely from other trees in closer proximity to the pipes than from the remote Cooks Pine. Later it was said that the reason for the removal was to allow church groups a larger area to conduct gatherings. Whatever the reason to remove the tree that commemorates an event is highly disgraceful. The Board should erect a plaque to recognise the event.

The responsibilities of the Board include agreeing of the Annual Work Plan which will include the work set out in the 2017/2018 Annual Budget but not yet undertaken. Each of the above items should be revisited by the Board and include further consideration of community views.

2019 - 2020 ANNUAL BUDGET.

The Consultation Document shows $15m for Capital works of which $9.6m is Community Services and $5.4m is for planning.

The total absence of detail, which one normally expects in a budget, means that I can not express any view on the proposal other than question whether the documentation meets the requirements of disclosure required by the Act.
From: Auckland Council
To: AKHaveYourSay
Subject: Auckland Council
Date: Saturday, 16 March 2019 10:12:00 AM

Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.

Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 16 Mar 2019 10:07
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of these properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations; and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Waste management seems high. Also, recourse consents etc. should be lower to speed up housing needs.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
Don’t agree with extending wharf for huge cruise ships just leave us with their waste to deal with.

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
Not if it gives all rights to council
From: Auckland Council
To: AKiave@cityofauckland.govt.nz
Subject: Auckland Council
Date: Friday, 15 March 2019 2:13:44 PM

Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.

Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 15 Mar 2019 14:14
Attachment: Mangere East Samoa Parish.pdf
Language:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
See attachment for more info

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
THE METHODIST CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND
Te Haahi Weteriana O Aotearoa
MANGERE EAST - SAMOAN PARISH

Auckland Council
Freepost Authority 182382
Private Bag 92 300
Auckland 1142

7 March 2019

To the Auckland Council,

Re: AK Have Your Say

We would like to comment in favour of the proposal to not charge rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations. While we consider that religious organisations already have these exemptions under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 nevertheless council officers have determined that their legal advice states otherwise.

We represent the MANGERE EAST – SAMOAN PARISH in the Auckland Council area. Christian churches in our communities provide for the spiritual, social, educational and physical needs of not only their own parishioners but all members of society willing to receive their assistance. This has been consistently recognised by central government since 1876, by way of an exemption from rates for properties by churches for the furtherance of their religious worship.

It needs to be stressed that the religious worship of a modern church involves far more than Sunday services and the observance of communion and baptism at ceremonies in the so-called "sanctuary". A modern church is first and foremost founded upon the concept of community, a place where people can gather, to worship, fellowship, learn and support others. A modern church building will reflect these various aspects of modern living, offering spaces for fellowship around a meal. A large community church will naturally require a sizeable auditorium, supported by public meeting spaces, possibly a hall for kid's programmes and Sunday school, offices for staff and substantial parking spaces (as required by council). To suggest that these are not all integral to the activities of the church, making some of them rateable, is to lack understanding of how a modern church functions.

Our facilities are also made available for community use, covering a wide range of activities [eg: Community Meetings, Ecumenical gatherings, Weddings, Funerals etc.]. These uses are often not charged for or if they are they are not charged at commercial rates and provide a valuable community service. The unintended consequence of rating any of these activities will be that either the charges will need to be increased significantly, or church will need to move out of the central city where they can occupy cheaper land. This will result in a decrease in churches in the very location that council is trying to re-populate.
THE METHODIST CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND
Te Haahi Weteriana O Aotearoa
MANGERE EAST- SAMOAN PARISH
6 Ferguson Street, Mangere East
Auckland 2024

We strongly support the council’s plan in relation to exemptions from rates for religious organisations.

Kind regards,
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations; and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board Information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of these properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support

Auckland Council
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations; and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?
   Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board Information
   Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 15 Mar 2019 02:33
Attachment:  

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Waste water is made up of grey water with soaps, food scraps and black water excrement. The two have been a convenient way to remove from households. Earlier sewer lines combine both the sewer and storm water, which is the first of its kind and is still in use today. Cost of separating the two is a challenge, as we have an ecosystem that will not be able to cope with these pollutants in time. Cost of separating existing lines will be costly but not unachievable. Futureproofing would be a simpler task if new houses were made to comply with regulations that separated black water and storm water. We have been ignoring thinking the sewer and storm water that flows into both harbours is an acceptable solution in Australia. They reuse water, why can we not use the same practices in NZ? The new pipeline is a short-term fix to take the effluent to Mangere. Water care is not big enough to cope with thousands of new homes being built. We are an expanding city at a rate that happens 50 years from now. How many dwellings are expected in the next 10 years? Kelly Hall's early innovation for the eastern side is now no longer in use. The series of pumping stations to Hornsby would be on crown land. An idea or closer if a suitable Landmark. Thank you for the opportunity to share towards a solution to a growing problem.

2. What is important to you?

**Do you have any feedback on any other issues?**

The cemetery at Glen Eden and Kelston is our first cemetery in Symonds St. It took sixty years to fill it up. Capacities were not expected. Auckland to grow as large as it had a mile from the town. It was 1838 but when transferred to council in 1905, it was full of motorways to go through. Bodies were exhumed and moved to exhumed the bodies at Waitakere. Would cause quite a commotion. Crown land should be secured for a new cemetery. The Puhinui cemetery has forced the market garden to the extent to be the thirty-six acres of new cemetery extension. The bodies of the Anglican settlers have been abandoned. Under grafton bridge trees. Growing through most of the cemetery, in fact, not to let it be ruined by time and neglect as we cannot change what has been done but not let the mistakes from the past continue continue. The frontier settlers who forged this great city, we call Auckland need to be not lost under a bridge. For a mayor of Auckland who needed to get Logan's brewery ale to town along with his under owned Myers folly was a term used. I need the council to remember the history of Auckland. How Arthur Myers built a bridge over a cemetery and how he gifted the park to the children started the free kindergarten in 1912-15. Keep our city beautiful where his words the caretakers cottage was already built in 1960. Yet it sits abandoned for the last thirty years please restore what has been its our precious heritage.

3. Local Board information

**Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?**

Albert-Eden and Mangere-Ohauhu

### Albert-Eden Local Board feedback

**In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?**

Yes

**Comments:**

I lived in the city
Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes

Comments
I now own a house in mangere

What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?

What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

No damage to our harbour the tanawhia is a force to be reckoned with
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

We would like to comment in favour of the proposal to not charge rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations. While we consider that religious organisations already have these exemptions under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, nevertheless council officers have determined that their legal advice states otherwise. We represent the Mangere Central Samoa Parish in the Auckland Council area. Christian churches in our communities provide for the spiritual, social, educational and physical needs of not only their own parishioners but all members of society willing to receive their assistance. This has been consistently recognised by central government, since 1876, by way of an exemption from rates for properties by churches for the furtherance of their religious worship. It needs to be stressed that the religious worship of a modern church involves far more than Sunday services and the observance of communion and baptism at ceremonies in the so called “sanctuary”. A modern church is first and foremost founded upon the concept of community, a place where people can gather, to worship, fellowship, learn and support others. A modern church building will reflect these various aspects of modern living, often incorporating spaces for fellowship around a meal. A large community church will naturally require a sizeable auditorium, supported by public meeting spaces, possibly a hall for kids programs and Sunday school, offices for staff and substantial parking spaces (as required by council). To suggest that these are not all integral to the activities of the church, making some of them ratable, is to lack understanding of how a modern church functions. Our facilities are also made available for community use, covering a wide range of activities e.g. Community meetings, workshops, funerals and weddings. These uses are often not charged for or if they are they are not charged at commercial rates and provide a valuable community service. The unintended consequence of rating any of these activities will be that either the charges will need to be increased significantly, or churches will need to move out of the central city where they can occupy cheaper land. This will result in a decrease in churches in the very location that council is trying to re-populate. We strongly support the council’s plan in relation to exemptions from rates for religious organisations.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
My street need more light as it too dark Water rate very expensive Paid for our inorganic

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Would you please keep the alleyway clean and hedges / grass are all over it sometimes

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Mangere-Otahuhu

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (those receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Public transport is really bad right now. Please increase the number of school uses in particular.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Howick

Howick Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.
These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
ministers house should be free rates as this residence is inside the church compound.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
Annual Budget 2019-2020
Have Your Say Event Feedback
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave Chamberlain Park alone! We need a public 18 hole golf course. Western Springs is across the road for recreation.</td>
<td>AE Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop wasting ratepayers funds! No to Chamberlain Park development &amp; legal challenge.</td>
<td>AE Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is happening with the Regional Pest Management Plan?</td>
<td>Arl, land &amp; water monitoring &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hupu Hupu: We appreciate the buffer zone being put in place as part of the NERF-funded work in council parks.</td>
<td>Arl, land &amp; water monitoring &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hupu Hupu: Regional stakeholders like Conservation Volunteers and Trees for Survival are included in consultations</td>
<td>Arl, land &amp; water monitoring &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water is precious taonga - stop wasting this precious resource</td>
<td>Arl, land &amp; water monitoring &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWOR acknowledge the recent development of their new management plan and look forward to open dialogue with council regarding fresh water locking to rights based approach to benefits</td>
<td>Arl, land &amp; water monitoring &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nides central govt does not have mechanisms to discuss allocation of fresh water and recognises council’s role in maintaining rights regarding water take</td>
<td>Arl, land &amp; water monitoring &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The waterways are the Rte line of the Waitamata and Manukau are the line for people it is critical that we plan together to achieve better water outcomes</td>
<td>Arl, land &amp; water monitoring &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngati Whaiaara are willing to join current council decision-making opportunities regarding water</td>
<td>Arl, land &amp; water monitoring &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW have seen over the past few years there has been a change in philosophy to the approach to how the council and GOs are improving their environmental outcomes through the process.</td>
<td>Arl, land &amp; water monitoring &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why not a good idea to amalgamate Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and Watercare into one organisation so that money can be saved.</td>
<td>Auckland Council Investment Limited (ACIL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog walking - can we make it 6 instead of 7/7? I am too late.</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t change dogs on beaches to 6pm leave at 5pm</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No costs or notification about enforcing bylaws</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED billboards - need to be brought under consideration of the residents. Adrian - cigarette buds - street trading licence. No official view on this. Support of any council space being smoke free.</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need wayfinding signage for network</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of tagging in local parks</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs in area not on leash</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the dog inside the house. (Do not let them go on the road not safe for kids)</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who walk with dogs they should tie the dog with them.</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for kids (think people)</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku should be Maori Council. Why are we paying taxes?</td>
<td>Development Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku needs to build trust first. There is a lack of schools for our future generation.</td>
<td>Development Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku needs to close the loop on the previous consultation held in Pt Chev.</td>
<td>Development Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a very highly rated area and we have dirty beaches, unkempt streets and drains full of leaves</td>
<td>DT Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a very highly rated area and we have dirty beaches, unkempt streets and drains full of leaves</td>
<td>DT Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauri dieback has been caused by 1080</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauri dieback has been caused by kura kia</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is composting rubbish not encouraged to be done by residents themselves - it is easy to do, why do council have to do this?</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is there a fee for installing solar power equipment - as a group we would like to propose that these fees are scrapped</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot encourage their children to swim in area. Want to be involved in maintaining the water as a community</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group of people tested the water in Bethells area. Using a home laboratory, have tested a number of areas and found quite high levels of contaminants. Have been writing a report and applying for grants to support their work.</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 testing noted human faecal matter. Would like to see toilet in park area as residents find human waste near the bridge.</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor numbers have increased 3-5 years and will impact water quality - residents are worried of impact to their health and wellbeing.</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epic fail on the dumping of sludge near Great barrier island</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We got an international P&amp;L on the scale of trees/green reduction and removal. Let’s STOP!</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water safety is important</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The natural environment has no representation. No one has set up a group that gives this its focus</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to page 6 - admits more damage not less in the natural environment in its current budget</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will this affect everyone’s future? Within the capital expenditure, there is no reference to natural - where are the trees?</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to stream, how can these be cleaned when bylaws aren’t enforced.</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is climate change going to be mitigated when bylaws aren’t enforced.</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to historic Gulf Marine poster referred to sediment back to plan where it mentions all sediment will be removed. Called to enquire and was told “this is a pipe dream” … How can we have something in our plan and unable to achieve it.</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green development is a must</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council must somehow assist the creation of restoration.</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC. On empowering communities, how well did the meeting go compared to experience with Cockle Bay domain? - yes, people who are helping are missing the bigger picture. Has run 3 trials in Cockle Bay Domain on how to plant without them dying... and queried if they are going to plant with success.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB. Do you feel you need more support from trees dying? - yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that council is taking responsibility for environmental issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the birds and F”k the planet. There is poison being placed around the island and Kaka are dying. Saving the birds can not be the catchcry allowing poisoning of the planet, and even to the detriment of other animals. We must be able to save the birds in a better way that does none of the other bad things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biorecycling at the wharves. There is an opportunity at the wharves to meet visitors/locals and introduce the dogs, share information and educate people. This is not happening and it’s a wasted chance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education is the key for biorecycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More recycling bins at community locations eg Parks, town centres, supermarkets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the agrichemical weed control - want agreed levels of services. Support environmental initiatives - want Waitakura added to this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution - city centre residents - most at risk. Work together with everyone to prioritise change to provide clean air in the city. Better solution on commercial rubbish collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green infrastructure looks like in order to help our city become Climate Change Ready and the need to be investing in these climate change ready infrastructures. Climate change emergency - need to be more aggressive and innovative. Want WILF a 2 - 3 year partnership with the group to demonstrate what a climate change city looks like and use Waitakura as a model. Not feeling encouraged with climate change progress. Not easy to work and not aggressive enough in this space. Need a contractor to use environmentally friendly weed control. Better collaborative strategies with local government, central government and the communities. Climate change ready values and infrastructure that can be delivered. Urban regeneration strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental services**

| What is the situation around recycling within schools (cleaning up beaches/streamlets). |
| Planting more trees in Mangere / Otahuhu |
| Need more than 1 cubic meter for inorganic collections - because usually they have more to be collected but must wait another year for more collections. |
| Needs more active cleaning around South Auckland parks - especially graffiti on playground assets. |
| Concerned with the task of maintenance/cleaning work done in South Auckland. It appears that Council responds to more maintenance calls-outs in central parts of Auckland as opposed to South Auckland. |
| Council needs to see how often people are spending time in different areas cleaning to make sure that its fair. |
| Maybe should take Otahuhu-Mangere calls more seriously – spend more time cleaning. |
| Why are places like Epsom being cleaned more regularly. |
| Issues around rubbish/litter |
| Our recycling and environment, our water. |
| Waste timber from all the houses that are being built, should be recycled and given to our youths so they can make something out of it. |
| What is Council’s solution to waste and rubbish which is not recyclable and that’s not collected through the inorganic rubbish collection. Because residents aren’t aware of the options, they dump it illegally. |
| Can the process of organic rubbish collection be promoted to locals through mail and made very clear in terms of steps on what number to call and what happens when booking. It is very confusing being given a reference number etc. |
| Fix the shift floating around in the ocean, so we can swim in water and not other peoples shift. |
| Fix the “Floating around in the ocean and not other peoples shift” Revokes law/regulation change from several years ago which has lead to the massive reduction in trees in the Auckland urban area. |
| Follow many of the European Union’s rules about which plastics, etc. may be used esp. for packaging and one-way items. |
| Just damming rivers kills wildlife - no eels & fish. Where will the new water dam be at? |
| Water is too expensive, Rubbish fee expensive. |
| Clean water for houses. |
| Don’t dump rubbish on the streets. There should be more street lights. Vegetables are very expensive. |
| Don’t dump rubbish on the streets. |
| Rubbish on streets. Some people dump rubbish on the street. House rent is expensive. Houses are less in numbers. Property rates are very expensive. We can’t afford to buy house. Fruits and veges are expensive also. |
| Rubbish on streets. Some people dump rubbish on the street. |
| Lets not have so many highly paid managers. Let’s combine the comms team |
| There is a lack of accountability for council’s spending. |
| Growth in the size of council is bad |
| Examine costs rather than increasing the rates |
| Greater transparency needed for the council, the COOs and the fuel tax. I would like to see where my money is being spent |
| Business model is falling residents of Auckland. Referendum to stop the embattled financial management and review of the super city. |
| sort out your useless internal spending before calling us the ratepayers. |
| No new tax |

- The council needs to look at ways of lessening the burden on the taxpayer by cutting back on their own wasteful spending, inefficiencies, and staffing.

**Expenditure/debt**

**Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028**
Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to
the 10-year Budget 2018-2028

Item 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everything is going up, we need choices.</td>
<td>Expenditure/debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap doctors</td>
<td>Expenditure/debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want cheap food, cheap Doctors and cheap School Uniform</td>
<td>Expenditure/debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates for Church Hall held community, now profit groups, such as bai-chi for wellbeing, must not go up. Event cover costs cannot afford hall Hire donation fee increases.</td>
<td>Expenditure/debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why increase costs? Make better procurement decisions - stop spending so much on what we don’t need.</td>
<td>Focus on core services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused no focus on providing service. All costs are going up and service getting poorer. Transport: water increase, rubbish is a disaster.</td>
<td>Focus on core services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing Ngāti Hītia: Seeking support to implement the Te Ara Hīkoi - heritage trails - tohu, signage, trails themselves. Map and activation around Tip of Awhitu Peninsula and dramas/signage the identity sites along the Waikuku Trails project are possible focus projects. Presentation attached and submitter also intends to make a written submission - advised to be very clear in the support they are seeking.</td>
<td>FR Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing Beachlands Community Trust: Seeking support/funding to provide recycling and reuse activities and programming in Beachlands. Presentation attached and submitter also intend to make a written submission.</td>
<td>FR Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Island is setting a good example with its learning hub</td>
<td>GB Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm concerned about the status of ECE on the island</td>
<td>GB Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like support for new enterprises to be a priority for the local board</td>
<td>GB Local economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc solar system is going well. Using energy only for 14hrs per month with full housing capacity. Almost time for them to upgrade batteries.</td>
<td>GB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board did a great job opposing the coastal dumping (CLC consent). Concerned by marine pollution. Has been picking up lots of litter off the beach; plastic lids and plastic beads brought by coastal drift. Concerned for marine life, whales and dolphins.</td>
<td>GB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have been detouring boats on the shorelines for centuries. Recently I was told to stop. People can’t afford to go to Auckland to clean their boats so making it compulsory then there needs to be a better way for the locals to clean their boats without going all the way to Auckland.</td>
<td>GB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good to see all the protection for the birds at the beaches</td>
<td>GB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of ruru at the Kaitoke wetlands which is wonderful</td>
<td>GB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidise veges being grown on the island which will assist biosecurity and buy local</td>
<td>GB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More people should take water from their roofs. Council could look at subsidising tanks</td>
<td>GB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderfully taken care of. Delighted to see the board members out as it’s a good way of doing consultation.</td>
<td>GB Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery is an ok proposal</td>
<td>GB Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board do a great job</td>
<td>GB Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog exercise parks are required. Rents becoming tighter for dog owners and the rule is pretty much on leach everywhere. The live on beaches for off leash can be difficult with small children and bird life. And good comfort about where dogs can go on walks and tracks so dog owners don’t feel penalised</td>
<td>GB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not supportive of the education and research centre project at Glenfimmer. A lot of money was spent to upgrade Omana for Hilary Outdoors already. The project will not provide local employment. There will be lots of infrastructure upgrades to the rest of the community areas (ie, road sealing, more facilities) to support the project which would change the entire area/village core to community and demand change/growth for a tourism/external need driven by the community not for the benefit of the community. Keep the integrity of the sanctuary as a sanctuary.</td>
<td>GB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has happened with the horses and the horses trails is it in the Local Board Plan but nothing has happened with them. There is nowhere for horses to go outside of the road corridors. Looked at the possibility of a trail from Jennys to Rosalie Bay Road but nothing further has been done. Horses are a part of our heritage and could be a part of our tourism.</td>
<td>GB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board should focus on the backhaul for the technology. Antsley, Paul, Kit and himself are doing micro lives for individuals which is working but it’s the backbone that the board can strategise and assist with.</td>
<td>GB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the island and its people. The people of the island should direct its future not external people driven by tourism &amp; growth.</td>
<td>GB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m supportive of the projects that council has taken on</td>
<td>GB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roads and walkways are in good condition. We weren’t expecting much but there is really good infrastructure here</td>
<td>GB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medlands smells like a sewer. Can this not be cleared out?</td>
<td>GB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are quite lucky here really (in respect to rates, council, life, everything in general)</td>
<td>GB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealink prices and services are terrible. There was no freight on the boat for 12 days over xmas (due to taking passengers over freight loads) which severely impacted the businesses.</td>
<td>GB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealink is a monopoly and it’s bad. Central or local government must be able to step in and stop this monopoly or hold them accountable in some way. As they are involved in fuel and freight for businesses. The freight cost for the last shipment of chicken food was half the cost of the shipment. Not sure if subsidies are the answer but there has to be something.</td>
<td>GB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to the CLC dumping</td>
<td>GB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have shared roads with cyclists, walkers, horses and cars and speed limits need to be looked at before someone gets hurt</td>
<td>GB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our attitude needs to change where road users look out for horses and stock (and other animals) on the roads rather than people trying to set up rules and signs to keep animals out. Stop trying to change the Barrier to be more like Auckland with all these rules. Barrier should stay a place of nature with animals being allowed everywhere and people making allowances for that. 'Don't change/lose Barrier'</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are excluding animals as there is nowhere to take the dogs. No dog areas like in Auckland. Pushing them off the beaches but no other options, it's becoming anti-dog on the island at the moment.</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All things are insignificant in the face of Christchurch. We are not looking after our people very well.</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top marks to the local board</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a blocked drain on corner of Rosalie Bay Road on left coming into Shelly Bay Road outside the school house</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medlands swamp stinks</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census was a disaster so how can anyone plan going forward</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier is a happy place at the moment in general. Hearing happy things from the community with lots of little businesses starting up.</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to the CRL dumping</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The smell at Medlands is bad. Bad for tourism and bad for the island</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's all quiet at the moment so the local board must be doing well</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No signage. Too much signage - there must be a better way of getting the messages across than more and more signs that ruin the outlook.</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no parking available at the Clarks airport and this needs to be fixed. I needed to fly out for the weekend and there was nowhere to park. I suspect that the longterm parking maybe be filled with bech owners vehicles. We either need more parks created or the current system needs to be enforced. Maybe a signpost - look for the signs of motorists to indicate the issue.</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to the CRL dumping</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to the CRL dumping and marine pests/pollution</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a concern about concessions going to off island businesses. We recently applied for a DoC concession for the Sky walk and we were one on island concession application to ten off island concession applications that were granted. Benney is subcontracting to these other businesses for their walk but these off island businesses are getting the cream.</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to the CRL dumping and marine pests/pollution</td>
<td>Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication. We send things in but it takes ages or we may never get a reply</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General unhappiness with state of Auckland: governance pollution, lack of green spaces, housing standards, public transport, Auckland airport.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council liases, but don't act on requests of people</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% uptake in next election of voters - no mention of how this is going to be achieved</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets change, innovate and collaborate and fix what we can while we can.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS: In terms of getting support groups off the ground? What are the most important components? - funding is not the issue, talking is the first thing, wants to put in a plan, they don't put out plans because of the hazards associated with it.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC: Referring to plan and vision, how do you feel, what is your view on possible? - Already has a collaborative, unsuccessful</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice papers from council is not enforceable</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not happy with the annual budget consultation document - doesn't read easily for the public. Consultation documents are really poor. No options presented. More detailed questions about waterways than there are on the annual budget. Really difficult to navigate through the website. Lack of detail in the consultation document - no information to be absorbed.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decision making process - consultation process is poor. Consultation needs to be thought about a different way. Talk-stop-talk-stop. Should be doing better.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you expect from communities and how would they be included in making a difference</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council submission process should be made easier/more straightforward</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much are you going to take on board when it comes to the decision making</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council always say feedback is about numbers but that is a western democratic approach which perpetuates colonial processes and Eurocentric power and disenfranchises Tangata Whenua. Auckland Council needs to change the way it engages and collects feedback.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants from Mangere wished that the Fofo could have been hosted in areas more accessible to members of the community, especially in areas that are being largely affected by water and waste issues such as Mangere and Otara.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Fofo wasn't well advertised. Participant also asked whether or not a notice had been sent out to schools and churches etc.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions like this or the meetings like this should be implemented in primaries / high schools. The younger voices need to be heard.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention might be more effective if young people were more informed – we need to include them in initiatives and allow more of an input from younger age groups</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend:</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for community development projects</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for more regional funding from 3Waters targeted rate</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate and facilitate partnerships between Local Board, business and Corrections for waterway restoration (ie Savill Drive Tell/Smims Pacific Metal properties) both discharging to the local catchment for many years, with no maintenance of downstream environment</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crooks the lot of you.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More subsidies for Barrier</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahirangiwara (child) - would love to see more arts - Mini Golf in the area?</td>
<td>Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More activities like estuary arts open day needed. Love it!</td>
<td>HB Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love movies in the parks - would like one at Ride Park please</td>
<td>HB Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love local events especially good beyond Brown's Bay</td>
<td>HB Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard about this event through FB - and need LB asking other groups and BID's to promote HB Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>really like kite day, would like to have another event here</td>
<td>HB Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBRA - really like kite day. Would like to have another event here</td>
<td>HB Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love movies in the parks - would like one in the Ridgepark please</td>
<td>HB Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love local events especially good beyond Brown's Bay</td>
<td>HB Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to find rooms to use in Owera, there are not enough community facilities</td>
<td>HB Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a sense of community in HB2. Well connected</td>
<td>HB Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA groups need free meeting spaces. Link to Utube USA clip</td>
<td>HB Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for the elderly near the marae. Supported by the community - talk to Julia</td>
<td>HB Local economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Reserve, we like what you are doing at O’Only reserve</td>
<td>HB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like a community composting TB</td>
<td>HB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachwood Subdivision - Water retention ponds need checking. Full of weeds. (will talk to Frank in TV)</td>
<td>HB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an easement, have not been maintaining the SW pond, lots of weeds</td>
<td>HB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids would like to see a campaign for no plastic</td>
<td>HB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfields - Creek has dead fish and rubbish</td>
<td>HB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild ginger on the southern side of Moffat Road</td>
<td>HB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like wheelie bins for waste (residential)</td>
<td>HB Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3 - Heard about this through FB - and need asking other groups and BID's to tag HB10 FB page to promote</td>
<td>HB Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better signage on Te Ara Tahuna, Owera Estuary Walkway - this is a great asset and would like to see it extended through Millwater.</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the Owera Bridge, would like a bigger and higher platform and the rocks removed. This will stop people jumping off the bridge (and all which is dangerous). Also a water slide there would be great too.</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public pool (would like a)</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a Cycle trail along the Waiti River</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owera Skate Park needs another rail</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannmore Bay Leisure Centre is a great facility and their water safety programme is fantastic</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfields - Just asked if there was going to be a new playground, maybe some community might be helpful to the local community.</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Laves, Owera - Hatfields. Be great to have the children do a walk (walking school). Do we have plans for this yet again?</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any plans for a general leisure centre in Owera, limited options in Stannmore Bay? Northern Arena</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The estuary walkway has a lot of debuts at the moment but limited signage - need to talk to OPS and Auckland Transport</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Bay: Maintenance of the plantings - this is on CF's radar. * Complaints about the cell phone tower</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Bay - corner of Beach Road &amp; Lyra near the beach planting needs attention and gardens need maintaining</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees washing down the Estuary - causing concern, maybe from developments up the estuary? Walkway maintenance and adjoining parks reserves not being kept up to standard. Some residents are dumping their garden rubbish along the walkway side of their properties.</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckily we have great playgrounds and walking tracks. Great family community groups. Golden Circle (Halloween) be great to get some LB funding - Julia has suggested New World sponsorship.</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenced playgounds needed to help with all abilities.</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealy Reserve (Toitū) what are the development plans for it?</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the playground area would like more fenced playgrounds</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Cycling Tracks - that Children can use. Leave some of footpath for cyclists</td>
<td>HB Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sipas sun shades over playgrounds. More fenced playgrounds please</td>
<td>HB Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re all mugs, promoting the world and only ever charging for lack of services to Auckland</td>
<td>HM Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC - efforts for homelessness. Adam - Support creating of a night shelter. Support $5m for mission homecourage.</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support efforts to combat homelessness.</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere needs homeless shelter. What is council doing to help our homeless people. We give them food and clothes, but the community shouldn’t be doing this all the time. What ownership can council take?</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness and unemployment are increasing in our local area. What can offer as long term solution. Can we invite different agencies to come together and talk about these issues and make some suggestions.</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much car parking in the street. Many homeless walking around my house. We need more Police for safety streets.</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many homeless walking around my house. We need more Police for safety streets.</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing/Rental prices need to come down. This would be a long term project and will take some time to plan for.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough people on the ground at a council level, not enough people aware of cumulative effects of still housing. Limited awareness of regulation</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council and developers acknowledge the valuable role of mana whenua in providing input and design solutions in consents e.g. Te Aumarua Oakley Creek is an example of achieving multiple outcomes, including flood prevention, conservation and social environment outcomes.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative effects - still housing</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More State Houses (Housing NZ)</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently experiencing increase in crime especially in Highland Park. Have set up more neighborhood meeting, experiencing lack of funds. Seeking funding for neighborhood watch. Targeting for more street parties.</td>
<td>HW Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed preservation of the Cherrier plains</td>
<td>HW Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like the preservation of the Cherrier Plains, after unitary plan, assurance was given that this would be preserved. This hasn’t happened.</td>
<td>HW Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like assurance that cherrier plains would not be used as a base for maintenance work in the park.</td>
<td>HW Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciated the support from the board</td>
<td>HW Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC: this is the hearing for annual plan budget. Board will take this on board directed to apply to Council for a grant.</td>
<td>HW Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for fund general funding</td>
<td>HW Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred back to submission form, enquiries who were paying for all of this and friend had LOGO/MAD this and on what council has spent on un-elected Iwi advice between 2012 and 2018. $3.3m. COOs 2013-2016 averaging $3.5m per year - concluded $16.5m of council budget has gone paying un-elected Iwi advice for water. As a member of the public, the board needs to do something about this.</td>
<td>IMSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW: Quoted accuracy of amounts - response figures are correct.</td>
<td>IMSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC: When government set up council structure, set up maori statutory board, ensure if this can be changed. Are you aware that they will take an active government to change, this is not a local matter - response: you are the local face of council and required to act.</td>
<td>IMSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Lynn Reserve a slip has dropped rubbish into the water</td>
<td>LT Other comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure there is equity across the local boards over time for spend</td>
<td>LT Other comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewals: you’re from the south, what about transport - 108m to 184m into the transport building yet renewals budget reduced. -Lucie - not surprised, green in quaters, sadness that budgets cut in those areas all Southern counterparts putting additional rates for stormwater should not be a poor cousin</td>
<td>Local Board Funding Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Funding Policy</td>
<td>Local Board Funding Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions: no questions, a lot of support for the shared effort, 30 year plan down to 10 year plan due to Aucklanders investment with targeted rates, so that’s great start</td>
<td>Local Board Funding Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handover governance of everything to do with water to kil</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB: The central government obligation to the treaty of waitangi, there is zero to do with partnership and co-governance</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS: From the research presented, are you aware the recommendations mana whenua, are you unhappy with the outcomes from that? - response: at odds with giving one particular minority group this much power, feels this is racist</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and responsibilities of ma ta waka?</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council should be more engaging with ma ta waka</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you improve Māori participation given that it’s quite low</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you involve our flāngatā</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who owns the water? Mana whenua or Council?</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori o te wai</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorry whānau how can we ensure the koreto from our kaumātua is being heard and actioned</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mō te tārangata</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ō mā te tārangata</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka ao te tārangata</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Te Ake rangatira Rū Mihināikī ki roto i te whena</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get mana whenua and their interests in water in Tamaki Makaurau but what do you want from urban</td>
<td>Māori Auckland council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori Auckland council</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So what does engagement with Māori look like?</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we ensure the more from our elders are being heard and actioned by the council</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So they need Māori to do what</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorry whānau how can we ensure the koreto from our kaumātua is being heard and actioned</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands up in the audience how many here say Auckland Council could do more/ better with engaging with Māori and/or maatawakapōti?</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a moral right to our tūpuna, we need to be careful of what we say we want.</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to be braver at looking after our whena</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the participants asked whether or not council support tangata whenua in Tamakau. Council representatives responded that they have always added against building on whenua land</td>
<td>Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More youth programmes like free art classes, free IT design courses, free dance classes, free music classes - provide instruments as well</td>
<td>MO Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free dance classes for youth at risk, so they can embrace their emotions and find a way to express their feelings. There are dance groups all across south auckland, we only need to suggest partnerships and help with funding</td>
<td>MO Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be more activities for young people in Māngere, esp after school and during weekends. Motivational programmes, things which are new to our kids, such as e-gaming, IT stuff, Maths, interactive diverse programmes. The STEM programme at the art centre was a great initiative.</td>
<td>MO Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can there be more night activities? Like more night sports, or music, or fun activities for young people or free night classes</td>
<td>MO Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free community class run here on recycling - in different languages. Also can you share the type of rubbish we should recycle and how. Maybe do a poster and put it on the walls at the town centre and library</td>
<td>MO Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Toanui needs to be redeveloped for Māngere. We are the gateway for the international community to visit NZ and yet, such little investment is made in Māngere. We would like to see better facilities near our mountains, we would like to see more signage promote our local culture and history.</td>
<td>MO Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The O’StOne fields should be protected as a cultural heritage and promoted for tourism, not used for housing</td>
<td>MO Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When connecting with Council, can there be a local person that we can talk to about our issues, rather than a customer service centre. These people don’t know about our area, or our people. It is often difficult to follow up too.</td>
<td>MO Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like to see programme for young parents - mum and Dad’s in our local area. They are often faced with mental health issues. How can local board assist them and their wellbeing?</td>
<td>MO Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we have free gym passes for senior citizens please? Can this be linked to our gold card? Maybe 4 times a month we can go to a gym and use the machine or spa?</td>
<td>MO Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don’t get art displays in our town centre and Otahuhu is full of artists. Is there a way to promote our local talent</td>
<td>MO Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thank you for building a good bus station for us</td>
<td>MO Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how can bus fare be made affordable? It’s very expensive to use public transport</td>
<td>MO Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we need a multipurpose building to replace the Mangere East Community Centre. At the moment there are youth, adults, diverse groups using the rooms for English classes, art and craft lessons, for community gatherings and hub, foro etc. This building is very old and parts of it is falling part. We would like to advocate for an upgrade of the building</td>
<td>MO Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere East Community Centre needs more bins and different types of bins - for recycling, for bottles and for vegetable rubbish, which is piled by the shops here.</td>
<td>MO Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One's a year, there should be a free rubbish day, where rate payers don’t have to put their tags on the bins. That is a way council should reward rate payers</td>
<td>MO Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can council send us information about inorganic rubbish collection in our letter boxes, with easy to read information about how to book for a collection. There is such a long wait when we call the council number</td>
<td>MO Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once the local board organise 4 times per year, local clean up day. Give people T-shirts promoting environment clean up as their reward to participating, choose 4 local locations - could be our stream, creek or park, or Mangere bridge beach. Put some funding behind it and do community awareness on environment. This is how we look after our surroundings and sea. The young people will also get to learn</td>
<td>MO Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There isn’t much done in our area in schools and at work places promoting recycle of waste. It would be good to have posters in different languages, with our people in it, promoting waste minimisation and recycling</td>
<td>MO Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more bins in public places, esp along Mangere Bridge seaside. With clear signs not to put dog pooh in it</td>
<td>MO Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more options on what to do with recycling. How can we make products using waste. Can there be some classes on this, esp for seniors who don’t have much to do. We can make things and sell them at Mangere Market</td>
<td>MO Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>train some locals and have waste champions! People who can go to church and talk about our environment and waste and how as a whanau we can reduce it. The champions should be locals, who speak our language and should be paid!</td>
<td>MO Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more rubbish bins in Mangere town centre please, esp around the bus station</td>
<td>MO Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be free sports sessions for youths- starting from 4 years plus to 18 years for young people. Most often we have to pay for soccer, touch and rugby classes. These are not affordable to families in south. Local board should work on long term sports plan for this age group, so they can participate more. The out and about programme is not advertised widely as well. It doesn’t reach the groups who need to access free sports programmes. Use the churches, community centres, leisure centres to promote these opportunities</td>
<td>MO Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we have more swimming pools for our Tamariki’s, esp during summer, when the local pools are over crowded. During summer, can we more water programmes for young people as well, so they can keep out of trouble</td>
<td>MO Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our sports clubs aren’t up to standard when compared to the rest of Auckland. Local board parks</td>
<td>MO Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere needs an artificial turf for sports. There is none at the moment.</td>
<td>MO Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support should be offered to local schools during the beginning of the year for families who cannot afford to purchase stationery, school bag and food. Maybe the board can have a fund, which schools can apply for this purpose. Or have scholarships opening for primary and high school students for small amounts, so they can buy books and bags and school shoes, or give them vouchers</td>
<td>MO Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you please promote healthy eating in Mangere. We do zumba here and the filled chicken place is right next to us. We need a healthy food place here.</td>
<td>MO Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can the council do on all the youth fighting in Mangere. We can have some sort of plan for these young people. Can there be a working group looking after this matter with police?</td>
<td>MO Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More fundraising for our Tangatahi!!</td>
<td>MR Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maraeua hasn’t got a museum</td>
<td>MR Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more plastic on the beach (boy age 9)</td>
<td>MR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees (no more plastic on the beach) - need education on this issue</td>
<td>MR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never throw rubbish around Weymouth Leaver Place Park</td>
<td>MR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never throw rubbish on the floor</td>
<td>MR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To materialise more books</td>
<td>MR Local libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports the local board on their initiative with the pool usage and fees – especially for wellbeing use</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports the local board on their initiative with the swimming pool usage and fees – especially for wellbeing use</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like games in local parks</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set mini games on weekends</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park - dog poo bins</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New parks for kids! More parking! More fitness areas eg: pools, gyms (cheap!)</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean tagging from parks</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maruarena pools to be free for its residents like Otara and Mangere</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep supporting events like Maruarena fun run</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please don’t schedule for events on the same day as Round the Bays</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned gas down Weymouth</td>
<td>MR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Programme: Intergenerational celebrations &amp; interactions, more recreational activities and personal safety empowerment.</td>
<td>OP Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to support the growth of the Otara &amp; Papatoetoe Markets, so our locals can get opportunity to earn income.</td>
<td>OP Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kora Dinners are a great example of communities coming together and helping those in need. Can the board support such initiatives?</td>
<td>OP Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food street pantry is such a great community lead initiative. Can the local board support this long term?</td>
<td>OP Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can there be community days, with focus on Mental Health, Youths, Safety, Heritage etc. We can celebrate and learn about each-senior and issue.</td>
<td>OP Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we have a museum of Arts in our local area? There are so many talented artists coming from South Auckland, yet in our area, we don’t have a place where their art work is displayed for tourists to come see.</td>
<td>OP Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming programmes for youth, more competition, encouraging our youth to take on water sports</td>
<td>OP Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for community centre venue hire should be made affordable. Most community groups are run and managed by volunteers and there should be further discount or incentives for seniors to use community venues.</td>
<td>OP Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the seniors caring groups wants to give back to the local community. How can they work with the local board or council to help the homeless. Can connections be made to the group needing help?</td>
<td>OP Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined priority for seniors in the Southside what programmes and initiatives be put in place to Enhance People interaction beyond family.</td>
<td>OP Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can there be coverage for the seats at Burndale Park as no one can use them due to bird droppings. Also, can the toilets be reopened for public use?</td>
<td>OP Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wider local community needs cheaper and more affordable accessibility to the community centres The discounted rates are still quite expensive. We are paying rates and on top of that, paying for the use of community centres.</td>
<td>OP Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety camera and lights required at Puhinui railway station</td>
<td>OP Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Enviro School uptake, promotes the message of waste minimisation through schools and young people.</td>
<td>OP Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Minimisation classes in different languages, esp chinese, tongan and samoan. These should be delivered at community centres, which is easily accessible to communities.</td>
<td>OP Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Town centre needs different types of recycle bins. This will ensure that rubbish is disposed and collected in a proper way and that locals are also educated at the same time about waste and recycling.</td>
<td>OP Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for sustainability initiatives such as Enviroschoools, Gardens in schools, Pap Project.</td>
<td>OP Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal rubbish dumping should be punished.</td>
<td>OP Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enviro schools project needs to be promoted widely and supported by the wider community.</td>
<td>OP Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can ‘My river’ app be promoted for wider youth use in the local area - the group is open for partnerships with local board and community groups.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More local employment opportunities for young people. Working in partnership with local providers and businesses to promote this initiative.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve school kids/young people in co-designing/co-planning - Local Board Plan.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth to help identify solutions. Request for council to work more closely with community groups and youth networks.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What control does the local board has on ban on drugs and access to illicit drugs. Can youths be banned from entering the town centre from 10pm to 4am.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a local board funding should be targeted towards young children. Recognise that there is a huge number of children in the area. Support them to grow.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local board should reduce their funding for events through community grants and have diversity events funding - which targets the demographics of the local area. For example, funding for Vertskeel, Korean new year, refugee community celebrations etc.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the local board community grants, more importance should be placed on seniors and celebrating their importance through individual day of the older persons. Groups can be given funding and large celebrations should be organised for older people to share their stories, histories and achievements. Small business in the local area needs capacity building and help to engage people.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the board be partners in different languages around the town centres about recycling.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community projects need a long term funding approach for it to be effective. Usually council gives very short term small amounts of funds. These are good for events only and not if you want to make a long term impact eg, for e.g. youths and unemployment, seniors and recreational activities, celebrating diversity by offering other groups to experience each other cultures.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how can the Council help increase profile of Community groups? Can there be more community networking opportunities. Can community groups be invited to bigger council events to participate and profile themselves?</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should continue to reduce number of bottle stores.</td>
<td>OP Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More free programmes for youths e.g. at Tupu Library.</td>
<td>OP Local recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Field upgrade - Priority: EDIP, Pap- Kolmar and Ngati Otara.</td>
<td>OP Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OP Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Attachment C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The above fields are used regularly and frequently, however the quality of the fields doesn’t reflect the needs of users. For example, St Barrys Carls park.</td>
<td>OP Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Watson Park: There is a lack of green spaces in the area. It would be beneficial to have more parks in the area.</td>
<td>OP Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As a local board, funding should be targeted towards young children. Recognise that there is a huge number of children in the area who need support and opportunities to play outside.</td>
<td>OP Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramsey Street &amp; Kanderine Road need attention. The maintenance of these roads is poor.</td>
<td>OP Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mōhau park - staff from council don’t manage it, it’s difficult to keep it clean.</td>
<td>OR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kohimarama Forest should be on the priority list for NITR spend.</td>
<td>OR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s very important not to lose Churchill Park, it’s an important community asset.</td>
<td>OR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Churchhill Park is a large park and needs more regional significance.</td>
<td>OR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group is having a positive experience working with Council.</td>
<td>OR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s important that everyone works together.</td>
<td>OR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental spotlight should go on Orakei, lots of passionate volunteers means there’s likely to be a good return on investment in the area.</td>
<td>OR Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noticeable drop in retail spending, businesses are struggling.</td>
<td>OR Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School growing by 300-400 in next few years.</td>
<td>OR Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple schools in Remuera area, huge schools, parents deliver their children by car which causes its own problems.</td>
<td>OR Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing seems to happen despite multiple submissions.</td>
<td>OR Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council staff need to be more efficient. Not the Barrier council staff they are wonderful but the ones in town are not.</td>
<td>Organisational support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb continuing to intensify - development still happening, lots of apartments.</td>
<td>Other planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned about SG networks and impact on health - wondering what is Council’s role in protecting homeowners and residents.</td>
<td>Other planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council plans don’t fit - things aren’t lined up. Boards put in their own plans. Doesn’t work. Failure - community engagement. Community involvement doesn’t work.</td>
<td>Other planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding has not been given to the council, they may have a lease.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding has not been given to the council, they may have a lease.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding has not been given to the council, they may have a lease.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding has not been given to the council, they may have a lease.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Have Your Say booklet talks about a 2.5% rates increase. Does this include inflating house valuations for council purposes? It would appear that I am due a revaluation next year. Between the last two valuations (2014 and 2017) the council doubled their “value” of my house.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rates levels have been okay.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rates are great.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green space around St Matthews - Federal street extension - is not being proceeded due to council funding. Would like this to be considered for future funding options.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was not clear who would pay for the implementation of the development plan that council put together but St Matthews would not be able to pay for it.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get gist out of rates bill.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is a measure of &quot;truth&quot; if your house is worth more (usually because you work harder than others) that you pay more rates - it should be size related. Just because you work harder than some shouldn’t mean you pay more.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council must find other ways of saving significant amounts of money other than just taxing rate payers all the time.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benham had a mini walkway for kids that kids could practice their road safety, be great to have something similar.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need a Barrier Uber. Busy time during January and had to turn business away (usually focuses on businesses not a general public).</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Back up the need for a Barrier Uber. In peak times it’s just a little too busy for the normal shuttle services. People aren’t pre-booking transport. Public transport isn’t the answer but better short-term options for short trips.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s Barrier - why do visitors have to have it all so easy? We are not Waikato in relation to the Barrier (Uber conversation)</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The transport plan puts a low priority - make that no priority on leisure travel in cars. Two Sundays ago, driving back from the Far North, I got stuck in multiple traffic jams including one on the northern motorway. Last weekend it was the usual jams on the southern motorway going to Pukekohe and back, which will not improve when the proposed improvements eventually are completed. Vast amounts of money are appropriated for think big head projects like the Magic Roundabout (CRL), using the economic productivity excuse, but how can we have a liveable city if the roads are jammed seven days a week? The 10 year plan shows actual capacity and population growth improvements getting a paltry share of the money compared to narrow focus projects. Many of the people immigrating to New Zealand consider cars a status symbol and even multiple per family. And they will use them extensively all week to show off their status. Streets are filling with parked cars because the council is allowing subdivisions where there is no off-street parking. Can the council please explain the disconnect between reality and rhetoric?</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport - ferry situation in town. Set up transport groups but stops at Mātakau. One good come back if police want to cut speed more double deckers. AT decisions affect Mātakau. Consult with public again.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport system is a farce. More people are concerned about transport as a whole than anything else e.g. state of the Hauraki Gulf.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT digging up Quay Street - Devonport ferries arriving at Auckland. No new ferry berths - replacing existing, need a further 6. Fullers say too much traffic going in there. Carparking is shocking - motors on main road. Money comes in for this - a pile of money which should be come back to the island. Look at whole transport management. Trying to deal with it via downtown reconfiguration. Freight - AT said not their problem which is appalling. Belgrave Street - parking spaces not installed for business or public buildings. Onehunga beach parking is horrendous.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor relationships with Auckland Transport. Access for everyone - paediatricians to be the top priority</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport are reactive only.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Hop Cards for youths, so they can travel to sports classes</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that rates should cover cheaper parking costs around Auckland, and even public transport for their children.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a spokesperson for public transport news. Changes to the network routes / implementation for impact in the areas etc.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s happening with the Clendon Road carpark? Not enough carparks, so people aren’t going there to shop.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 63 School bus frequently runs late. Also takes 40 mins from Northcross to Torbay primary. Too long.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more driving licence instructors specially in rural areas. It will be really helpful for them to be independent.</td>
<td>Other transport comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of park and ride facilities commuter parking is an issue - all day parking</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No monitoring of illegal parking around the Remuera / Clendon area</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s happening with the Clendon Road carpark? Not enough carparks, so people aren’t going there to shop.</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter parking generally an issue for Remuera.</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A real lack of short term parking, lack of enforcement in Remuera.</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some parking issues in Parnell as Remuera, but they focus on how to change the mindset of visitors.</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking in Newmarket park</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid parking for Albany pool casual users isn’t fair</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Village parking is lacking.</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking at the farm currently as the Clark airport parking is extremely packed up. Have no complaints about parking at the Sandersons as its reasonable and easy but just questioning if the board will be making any changes to the carparking area to provide more availability.</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals cars are a problem at the airport and at FitzRoy. Angle parking maybe the solution at FitzRoy.</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve parking at Takapuna Train Station</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident parking zone - frustration. Can the local board work with AT and create cycle parking in the local town area. We are encouraged to cycle but there is no parking facility.</td>
<td>Parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like more events in Karaka Lakes</td>
<td>PPK Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support The Corner please</td>
<td>PPK Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins Theatre well used. I like the contrast of movies and live theatre and the new seats</td>
<td>PPK Local arts, culture &amp; events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellier communities and (more opportunities) for communities to come together</td>
<td>PPK Local community services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in South Auckland aren’t up to quality standard</td>
<td>PPK Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better and safer playgrounds</td>
<td>PPK Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Vista - make the area more user friendly and more seats</td>
<td>PPK Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love the skatepark but needs more evening lighting so can use after work</td>
<td>PPK Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of young people in Papakura - need to look after our youth - Smiths Ave</td>
<td>PPK Other comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for security guards at train station</td>
<td>PPK Other comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over double-decker consultation, things they weren’t asked about.</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on the new bus network - not happy with the new network.</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable, efficient public transport a priority.</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like drawing out of transport projects on a map to see where things are happening.</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT need better communication to commuters about re-routing during events.</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General unhappiness with state of Auckland’s governance, pollution, lack of green spaces, housing standards, public transport Auckland airport</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why aren’t train stations across Auckland doing multi storey park and</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rides?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All costs are going up and service getting poor.</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current chairman campaigned vigorously promising to assist</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commuters. The Board has set up and watched commuters expenses rise by</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to $1600 per year. In some cases, The Board did not support local</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation providers in their bid to rebid the increase in rates for</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation providers. There has been little done to improve</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amenities and roads on the island.</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free practice licence lesson for restricted to full licences</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No metrotikis in parks (it’s behind my house)</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For safety so many cars in streets roads, parks. It can be dangerous</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for other cars who drive way this street so must be do something on</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street park on roads.</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking areas</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not safe on the road for the children be safe from some people</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning driving programme in Arabic</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverdale Park and Ride needs to be bigger</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hibiscus Coast bus station has been sitting half finished for</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months now and I are told it is not due to be finished until</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well into mid winter. In the meantime all the people who use this</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station have to get soaked to the skin waiting for buses because</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is no adequate cover. GET YOURSELVES ORGANIZED AND GET THIS</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS STATION FINISHED NOW.</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More express buses to city</td>
<td>Public transport infrastructure - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing mentioned in plan about Howick, no infrastructure...why?</td>
<td>Public transport infrastructure - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominon Road light rail project is a waste of time and heavy rail</td>
<td>Public transport infrastructure - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be a better option</td>
<td>Public transport infrastructure - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General concern over double-decker buses, especially 75%</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity of bus routes - needs to serve the community a lot</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better than what is currently available</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability guide dogs need to be allowed in train stations</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus network not helpful needs to be improved</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride at Albany Mall isn’t working (not enough parks)</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry to Titirangi once a month from Gt at an affordable cost (costs</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same as fare from Auckland to Titirangi)</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The island would be lost without its plane and ferry service</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better (improve) network of trains to city</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.63 school bus frequently runs late. Also takes 40 mins from</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcross to Toby Primary - too long</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport remains inaccessible, expensive and inconvenient</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>especially when the weather is inclement</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport remains inaccessible, expensive and inconvenient</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>especially when the weather is inclement</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on improving public transport and the facilities for this, and</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic congestion plans for coping with the burgeoning number of</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>houses now being build in the Greaves, Millwater, Waiwera, Silverdale</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Milford areas.</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All - need better corridors to commuters about re-routing during</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>events.</td>
<td>Public transport services - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trains to Helensville</td>
<td>Public transport services - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trains to Helensville via Huapai</td>
<td>Public transport services - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like a ferry service at Browns Bay</td>
<td>Public transport services - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need a bus service near Kilmair Road</td>
<td>Public transport services - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support waste management charge</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support but only if we are exploring waste management disposal in NE</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s not send our crap to developing countries.</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway/Sweden importing waste have such a good system</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair enough - its reasonable</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management - Do not agree with increase should decrease and</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put the service back into community</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the increase in waste management charges</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste charging going up</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree due to issues with infrastructure</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you bastard’s know how to charge and do all, sort out your useless</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal spending before milking us</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am opposed to having to pay more for less. An increased waste</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management charge is unacceptable at this point in time and regulatory</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fees are already extremely high. Please find another way to cover</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your costs / decrease costs as simply putting a greater burden on</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate payers should be a last resort. What have you done to decrease</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>costs and work efficiently? What other options have you explored to</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keep costs down?</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential rubbish collection / recycling is a core service and</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be paid out of the basic rates, not charged separately.</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial operations should be charged on ‘user-pays’ basis</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with the change</td>
<td>Q1 General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally agree</td>
<td>Q1 General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Q1 General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree the changes stated on the left</td>
<td>Q1 General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Q1 General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Q1 General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only user pays</td>
<td>Q1 General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I endorse the council's options</td>
<td>Q1 General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community needs to be educated first for all these issues</td>
<td>Q1 General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more changes</td>
<td>Q1 General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Going through the budget, have read 46 pages and the figures outlined in this report are good but lacks substance and unclear how this will be rolled out. They have initiatives, but how are these going to be delivered.

Community initiatives should be looked at as solutions rather than charging more.

Why spend millions on waste water when the man and shovel clearing the drains regularly meant the streets and drains did not get clogged. Start at basics, not the expensive regulation.

You need to be charging rates fairly to ALL and everyone. It has to be inclusive and not exclude. Regardless of their status or situation.

If increasing rates please provide e.g. worm farm for each household for each community that would be suitable for collecting annual household food waste. 2) Also provide water tanks to be installed underground to collect rainwater to be used for toilets.

You b*****ds know how to charge and do it all sort cut our useless internal spending before milking us the ratepayers.

The changes should be presented with more details. This seems to be too abstract for me.

Do not support increasing regulatory fees                                | Q1 Regulatory fees     |
| Support increasing regulatory fees                                      | Q1 Regulatory fees     |
| Support increasing reg fees but not if it will delay further our need for more houses | Q1 Regulatory fees     |
| Support only if a better (quicker, more consistent knowledgeable) service can be provided | Q1 Regulatory fees     |
| Already too much. Just encourages DIY                                 | Q1 Regulatory fees     |
| Fees and charges - whole thing is bureaucratic overcharge.             | Q1 Regulatory fees     |
| Applicant should carry costs                                           | Q1 Regulatory fees     |
| Would there be any concession?                                         | Q1 Regulatory fees     |

Sometimes it has to be done to speed up process                           | Q1 Regulatory fees     |

Instead of putting up Resource consent fees Council should streamline operations and become more efficient.

Yes to an increase to some regulatory fees to cover increased costs      | Q1 Regulatory fees     |

Permits and resource consents are too expensive.                          | Q1 Regulatory fees     |

Do not support increased fees. We need more houses to be built. We need overseas visitors. | Q1 Regulatory fees     |
| Do not support - it already costs too much                              | Q1 Regulatory fees     |

Status quo for vessels in excess of 40m anchorages / dynamic positioning. The amount of these vessels owners pay in other areas (floot and wages etc) outweighs revenue.

I agree to an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs. - Disagree

There is no objection to the annual mooring fees being increased as long as the extra revenue is given directly to the harbour master in order for his department to enforce the anchoring plan. At the moment we have several mooring fields overcrowded with yachts. In the area and the rules are not being followed which makes it hard for people on the wait list to get a mooring. Muriwai being a typical example where a good number of the moorings are being occupied by illegal third party tenants and the harbour masters office seem unwittingly to act measurably through lack of funding.

Regulatory fees are already extremely high. Please find another way to cover your costs i decrease costs as simply putting a greater burden on ratepayers should be a last resort.

We don't agree to increase rates                                         | Q1 Regulatory fees     |

Regarding: Fees and Charges and increases to some fees to maintain cost recovery. I object to the nature of the fees for the following reasons: - resource consents – bundled consent deposit, tree consents, boundary adjustments (unit title and cross leases), change of condition (s127 and others) building control – lapped/refused building consent, waiver/modification of building code, extensions of time to start building has a negative work, solid fuel heater/electric wall application and others: 1) Fees for building improvement and land improvement in Auckland is already so high that it discourages building, house extensions and new houses builds. I was going to extend a rental property and add two bedrooms which would have helped the rental housing shortage, but decided against it due to council regulations, not tops & the unfair expense. For example, Just to get an answer about a consent I needed to pay $520 for a meeting that didn’t even give me a fee answer.

We disagree to increased payment                                          | Q1 Regulatory fees     |

These fees should not be increased or added. There should be efficiencies that can counteract these cost increases – which is exactly what Phil Cott said he would look for and implement when he was elected and we have seen ABSOLUTELY NOTHING OFF. The proposed increases in the regulatory fees are outrageous increases and should not be required when much of this work can be managed electronically.

Regulatory fees are already outrageously high and should not be increased. Another added cost to the price of being council must find other ways of saving money.

An increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs – no, these are core services so should be covered by an increase in basic rate bill for residential rate-payers but user-pays basis for commercial operations.

Q1 Regulatory fees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase in Mooring fees is acceptable. However AT, and or the Harbour Master needs to ensure that the vessel moored in Matiatia is safe. Visiting boats, generally out of Auckland, continually anchor in the Matiatia Mooring Field. This is particularly poor seamanship as the anchored vessel will behave differently when acted on by the wind and tide. This result in the moored vessels being damaged, usually with out the offending vessel being identified. The crew do not know, with any accuracy, as to where the mooring weights are situated on the sea floor. This results in the anchored vessel fouling the mooring weights. Larger vessels have dragged the moorings out of position trying to get their ground tackle free. Visiting vessels also continually pick up unoccupied Moorings. This is also poor seamanship, as the crew do not know the suitability and viability of the mooring they have attached to. This practice results in the Mooring owner finding in Matiatia with nowhere to safely moor their vessel. I have brought this problem to the attention of AT and the Harbour master on previous occasions without any result. AT, and or, the Harbour Master need to mitigate this source of constant frustration to mooring owners. You are increasing your charges while failing to provide a reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure I fully agree with increasing the resource consent (building control fees), we already have high housing costs and low income so why charge people to build an already cost cutting cheap and nasty home. If the fees go up I would hope [12] Auckland Housing is turning up wage and salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreee. Parking fee is already very high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instead of putting up Res ha fees council should streamline operation and become more efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just slamming rivers kills wildlife - no eels &amp; fish. Where will the new water dam be? I don’t think that Titirangi &amp; Haurua dams will be enough with all the extra ppl/moving to AKL region!!! Note drought this structure please; remember we bottled water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only if it speeds the process up (regulatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious properties should pay rates just like everyone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious ratings - should include other not-for-profit organisations regardless if religious or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for not rating religious organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches should not pay rates event if they have cafes as part of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches should be able to focus on their religious purpose and mission and not worry about having to pay rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating of religious properties - land use categories - food banks are not mentioned. These are important for religious properties. Concern regarding the clause on op shops - clause regarding rating for op shops and commercial rating for separate titles. Language is not clear. Fine with all the other criteria on the religious property ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating on Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The document is poorly written and questions - make no sense. Looks like the proposal is leading public to think that churches are exempt from rating is a new change - not a new change as this is status quo. Concerns that this will upset the public as to why should churches not have to pay rates - when this is always been the case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support in the current rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious properties being non-natitical (non-profit organisations). That different issues are being thought about including ways to move forward and improves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing religious organisations for commercial uses, and not charging for the ministers house. Believe that no charge should be on the chapel, hall etc. but their own residence should be charged. That there isn't a lot of Napier land left in Auckland area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support non payment of rates for all churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes in the fairness of a pre-school that is for profit, yet under the church is still rateable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports that the church lands should not be rate if it is solely for religious purposes. Accepts the fact that any activity for profit should be rated to ensure fairness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion needs to be made in regards to: How far can a church be from a Fairbairn's house before considered rateable? For example, a church in Māngere Bridge and a Fairbairn’s house in Botany?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support no payment of rate for all churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not support the ministers have not been charged. I feel the minister should pay rates just like everybody else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying rate on ministers house if not in same proximity as church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that if the ministers house is further away from church land – then it should not be rated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministers house being further away – it does not matter as long the ministers house is still on church land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minister's house should be non-rateable – because he is a servant of God!!! going the churches bidding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more elaboration to understand the different roles that happen on church lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrary to a council woman I heard on RNZ religious organisation are not rich. Charging rates is boastful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support - churching of people who do not have any money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATES - Religious Organisations - A new approach is needed to include community organisations and sports clubs - not just religious organisations as these have a primary focus on their members and adherents. ie Halls being made available to the public and not at commercial rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General agreement around looking at other organisations that support the community. Consider and address scenarios of community groups that don't own land in comparison with religious groups that do own land. Also, an obligation for the wider community to have access to halls, car parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residences owned by religious groups should be rated as residences as while in some religious orders leaders are not paid a wage or salary they are paid a cost of living allowance, provided with a residence, and rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think they are all stupid and religious properties should be paying rates and taxes like every other human.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think they are all stupid and religious properties should be paying rates and taxes like every other human.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious properties should be paying rates and taxes like every other human.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My wife and I are parishioners at St Peters Anglican Church Takapuna. We are strongly in favour of the option that sees parts of the land owned by religious organisations remitting &quot;rates free.&quot; Our church provides community and spiritual leadership which is sustained by an ageing (and decreasing) congregation, and cost increases impact negatively on the churches ability to remain a viable force for good in the North Shore area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organisations should be paying rates just like everyone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organisations should be paying rates just like everyone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree with the increases in fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should charge rates on the land owned by religious organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organisations should not have special exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any commercial aspect of property being used by a religious organization should be taxed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the exemption for rates on property owned by religious organisations. They provide a great deal of community support &amp; service (much of which would otherwise be picked up by councils) &amp; should not be subject to rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need to change &amp; charge churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need to change &amp; charge churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be unfair to charge religious organisations have serviced communities for many years &amp; have given hope to many people including money to help those less fortunate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches and church properties should not have to pay rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not charging rates on some parts of land owned by religious organisations. We support this proposal. As a community focused organisation we provide multiple services to our local community including a fun Club for those with Disabilities, Music &amp; Learning for preschool church, After-school Learning services for Primary aged Pasifika children, Youth &amp; family services who all use our facilities at a lower rate - roughly a donation only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in agreement with the proposal that religious organisations should be exempted from being charged rates for some of their land holdings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a weekly basis a live dancing class is held in our Parish Hall adjacent to our church - St Andrews Kohimarama. An average of 20 people attend each week for regular exercise - both physical and mental. This is also a very social exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw Churches are free of rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates for Church Hall held community activity groups, such as tai-chi for wellbeing must not go up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why would this even be considered?? They are business like anything else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches are Community Centres. So no rate increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extra rates for churches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges should not be made on all parts of the land used for religious and community purposes and not only on some parts if commercial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the reference to the matter marked - Churches struggle now to maintain their services and the same people (foster+family) who give churches indirectly support aged services. City missions, Drop in Centres, Anglican Trust for women and children and a whole range of supportive activities. An extra rate burden will ground some church communities into the ground. Church collection drop but the other work continues. The community needs it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree - most churches already feed back into the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not agree because they are doing this name of god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to adjusting the urban rating boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours - Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas - yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree with the increase in fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object very strongly to this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose proposed change to rates, want to retain the same pump out service via Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing was added to reduce impact of animal waste but hasn't done much to reduce contaminants. Can pinpoint stormwater drains where there is higher readings of contaminants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed businesses will make more money but the locals will suffer from the septic tank proposal. Have other concerns around proposals - compliance, lack of buy in from residents, cost increases for maintenance. Want council to look at water quality but asking if pump out proposal will change anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost saving that Council will make through proposal change should include costs to environment following up with them. Proposed change may make the issue worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wondered if the septic tanks are the real issue - how big of a difference will it actually make to water quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many issues with infrastructure and environmental concerns (particularly the flooding issues) that are alleviating water quality issues. Fear that council is making issue residents problem when council hasn’t done enough to rectify these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wondering why Waitakere model is proposed for this area when they are different people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning whether this is a cost savings for council versus the correct thing to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents like the service provided by council contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to work with council to improve system not remove it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel consultation is not long enough, lots of people only received their letters informing them of the proposal this week. Letters vague - don’t actually understand what council is proposing. Did not know how to provide information online as they didn’t understand it was under Annual Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking how council ensures compliance on waitakere and whether waitakere system actually works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for elderly, disabled or vulnerable people who may have to pay more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t be having that!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service targeted rates over a two year period - Why are they under prioritised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with phasing out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t be silly—great system that ensures EVERY tank is emptied and CHECKED—- If left to individuals to maybe do it ---some might and some wont and then will start the overflow problems due to neglect. Leave a functioning system as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t be silly—great system that ensures EVERY tank is emptied and CHECKED—- If left to individuals to maybe do it ---some might and some wont and then will start the overflow problems due to neglect. Leave a functioning system as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We oppose the removal of this service and associated targeted rate. There are a number of reasons for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In areas where it has historically been the owners' responsibility to pump out and check their septic tanks, it has been a disaster. Waiakeho is a prime example of this with years of issues with overflowing septic tanks. In the Waitakere area this has not been an issue due to the Council managed approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To push the responsibility to property owners will result in delays or inaction due to owners (1) not knowing who they can go to for their pump out service, (2) not knowing what they need to do / need to ask for from contractors. Being provided technical specifications of what need to be done by Council (no doubt written by an engineer in engineering gobbledegook) won't help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors will no doubt see this as an opportunity to boost profits and the charges for these services to property owners will be exorbitant. This will no doubt be exasperated by Council wanting more or different information once a pump out report has been provided to them, resulting in even more costs to property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instances of septic tanks falling / overflowing will increase due to owners not being able / willing / forgetting to arrange pump outs, resulting in a worse environmental outcome than current situation and additional compliance effort and cost to Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council will receive an increase in number of complaints about septic tank pump outs and issues with contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perception will be that this is another example of Council stopping a core / valued service with the associated reputational damage, especially if the standard of the maintenance you expect property owners to pay for is significantly higher than the standard of the Council service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not remove the current Waitakere rural sewage service. The reason given was that water quality has not improved since it was started, but this means that more work needs to be done and not less. The council can currently control the quality of the service provided by contractors, benefits from economy of scale and can ensure that pump outs are actually being performed. Replacing this with a service that monitors people is adding more unnecessary expense which could go towards investment on the upkeep of the septic systems. If the council increased the scope of their responsibilities (such as having contractors assess or service septic systems in addition to do the pump outs), I would happily pay an increased amount command to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it time to look at delivering sewage to parts of the Waitakere ranges that doesn't currently have it? This will definitely improve water quality. Monitoring and maintaining septic systems can only do so much. Some septic repairs that are identified as part of the proposed monitoring might cause financial hardship for a lot of families. Maybe an interest-free loan scheme to assist where repairs are required and necessary for the environment would be a good option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree with the increase in fee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No need to phase out the sewage service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This charge and service needs to stay in place and not be removed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object very strongly to this</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes no sense to stop this service. As it is now, council have control over septic tank drainouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree with this. The implications are not good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORGET IT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very silly thing to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wonder what agenda is driving this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support land transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to dodge tax is a crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more information and understanding of the actual benefits for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland council does a poor job of the properties they own already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anytime the council gets involved things get worse instead of better. Costs inevitably rise and the ratepayer ends up footing the bill. If it's not broken, don't fix it!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases are only a sign of how inefficient the council is. Do not increase costs, get a proper job &amp; your reducing our access to the coast, polluting beaches with his stupid bloody storage size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland council does a poor job of the properties they own already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more information and understanding of the actual benefits for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anytime the council gets involved things get worse instead of better. Costs inevitably rise and the ratepayer ends up footing the bill. If it's not broken, don't fix it!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because you will ask us for more money to run them when you secure them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many responsibilities for Auckland Council. They are already slow in minding things happen or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing things, no need to add more responsibility to them if they cannot act fast enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to dodge tax is a crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No I do not support. Whopping big stadiums mothballing on our city Sails Waterfront - leave the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boat and slip ports and beaches off. They are for people to enjoy &amp; marine life to have fisheries there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost savings and less duplications sounds good, but would it impact on democracy (i.e. consultations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already spent ratepayers funds transferring land to Panuku. Stop wasting our rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially support land transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku does not seem to work for the ratepayers. The profligacy of council assets to pay down debt is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollowing out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total disregard from central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST is a disgrace on us ratepayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total disregard from central government GST is a disgrace on us ratepayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku does not seem to work for the ratepayers. The profligacy of council assets to pay down debt is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollowing out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no faith in Auckland Council's ability to manage this transfer well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally the council-owned operations are too independent of the Auckland Council and elected office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as the Mayor e.g. Watercare. Presumably this applies to Panuku too. However, this land should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally NOT be sold off but kept by council for ratepayers and future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did they manage to own $730 million in the first place? Was it sold to them to increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenue for the council initially? Which is now potentially going to cost a lot more than what it was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably initial sold for. Backward thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What proportion of these properties are in Maori handownership? And what finances advantages do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they want? Who/what is Panuku?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support land transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku - Don't manage properties well at all. In favour of disestablishing Panuku &amp; transferring back to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>council. The panuku acquisition process update - the prioritisation of the rates update as well general update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the rates proposed. Also the waste management increase/exploitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure of the negative aspects of this, so what's suggested and written above sounds good. Only down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>side is that the council then decides to transfer ownership elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce costs by amalgamating resources and eliminate duplications. And do it tomorrow. We have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been waiting for streamlining and council efficiencies since Phil Goff said he would achieve these when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>becoming mayor and nothing has happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial for resource integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized management is beneficial for increasing efficiency. Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize financial expenditure. Reduce organisational duplication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven't seen here, eels ladder at creek. They threaten to close Mt. Albert Wave Pools - in case of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drought/water shortage. Where will we go? Is there any main catchment systems around us. Do civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defence groups know where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop allowing building to be built in Devonsport, Bayswater, and Belmont, buildings should be built in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know what they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know what they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the board considered the area of land by the golf club for affordable housing? Flooding could be a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner housing is a concern but no easy solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like an all tide boat ramp in Puriri Bay by Buster's boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the lighting projects in Rodney as it could impact Barrier’s Dark Sky Sanctuary status long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term. AT and governing body will need to take some ownership of the sanctuary status as it's of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional value not just local. Local board will also need to think about the governance structure for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAG long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing - will need to change the district plan in order to address this issue. The district plan should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have moved under the Unitary Plan already - when is that happening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be good to see young people being able to find houses to buy and upgrade. And have well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned jobs on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of housing on the Island is the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm concerned about housing and lack of rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealsly Rest (Toitou) What are the development plans for it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the Orewa Beach - save it from erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangaparaoa Road is so frustrating - the volume of traffic and length of time it takes. Having another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roundabout would help, especially when there is accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orewa beach - support the sea wall. The beach is being used by a lot more people now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penlink is good - but it is important to be aesthetically pleasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oppose penlink</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028

### Attachment C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whangaparaoa Centre plan objectives need to be part of budget</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orewa Beach/Orewa is a destination</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orewa beach is number 1 for Orewa, it has to be saved!</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the beach Orewa!!</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Penlink</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More hang out places for youth in Orewa</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking in Browns Bay is Impossible</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the Estuary and arts and crafts. Grow the Arts Centre. Need a safe space for the Raku Firing (?)</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would like to build a fit for purpose building. Suggested the arts centre apply for a grant. Little art studio, want to create a kitchenthe area for health and well being classes.</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanmore Bay - want a playground (Woodbridge Estate) submission</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankles Bay - Penlink need it ASAP.</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penlink and Orewa seawall need to happen!</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanmore Bay end of Brian Crescent has dark and shady walkways and feels unsafe</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orewa Beach project supports</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penlink - ASAP it lane include cycle lane.</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support building the Kahu - Marine View seawall.</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanmore Bay need to happen!</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support sun shades over playgrounds</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More fenced playgrounds please</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure, more needs to be done around local roads in our area. More houses= more traffic= more does done to factor this in.</td>
<td>Q3 HB Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanly no focus on providing service. All coats are going up and service getting poor. Transport, water increase, rubbish is a disaster</td>
<td>Q3 HM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re all mugs, promising the world and only over charging for lack of services to Auckland</td>
<td>Q3 HM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members consult regularly and try to secure what we as residents require</td>
<td>Q3 HW Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is someone paint the town centre please. It looks very old.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can there be signage around the traffic lights to say that window washing is illegal. People are risking their lives and the drivers lives by doing window washing</td>
<td>Q3 MO Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otahuhu Town centre regeneration, do not support the removal of car parks.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we need better, cleaner parks in Otahuhu with more recycle bins to support the high use of parks. There needs to different types of bins as well - bottle, recycle and general rubbish. Can a clothing bin also be placed near the park.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council needs to put clear sign in public places that illegal rubbish dumping is a crime. We get so many illegal rubbish dumped near Robertson Road roundabout, also at the back of Mangere bridge near the airport. Who is taking ownership of that? No one.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to attend a workshop on recycling in Tongan Language, as I cannot read proper English. Can the board help?</td>
<td>Q3 MO Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please put at least two bins at each bus stop. People are leaving rubbish behind as there are no bins. Next to the bins, put message about bin tidy day.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we have more clothing bins in Otahuhu with sign against them saying this is not a rubbish dump site. People are leaving their house rubbish around</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can there be more educational workshops on waste recycling - the Otahuhu BID's can help in coordinating these.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Waste Management services, I would be good to see the contracts being given to locals, who can then be advocates of waste minimization.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like to request for more recycling rubbish bins in the town centre and in our public places.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Otahuhu, can there be multilingual posters and signages saying do not litter, use the rubbish bins. Or be a tidy local.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People need to be sent reminders that they need to sort their business rubbish as its making the town centre look dirty and ugly.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more signages on proper rubbish disposal, esp. for young people. We need to be proud of our environment and look after it. Educating the young ones is a start.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are we asked to pay more for waste collection rates? On top of that, there will be a 2% increase in general rates. We also have targeted rates for our board. Council wants too much money from us and doesn’t give us much.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can local kitchen waste be collected and used as a compost for community use. Can the board think about this project.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more education is needed on recycling, esp. kitchen waste</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay the residents who will bring recycling waste depending on the kilos of the waste</td>
<td>Q3 MO Reducing waste and increasing recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students need assistance with travel discounts, esp. if the use of public transport is being promoted widely. Maybe AT can work out some deals with schools and offer two cards from schools?</td>
<td>Q3 MO Youth Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can the local board do to provide the youth who don’t go to school with volunteer work opportunities. Can they work with an org to support these young people so they are productive</td>
<td>Q3 MO Youth initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we have more exercise programmes for youth. Could be dance classes, or water sports.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Youth initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something which is accessible and available after school</td>
<td>Q3 MO Youth initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need free sports classes across Otahuhu for young people from toddler to older youth. Programmes which are engaging and not just ones a year.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Youth initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we work with schools to promote healthy eating and donate fruits to schools. In this way, those who cannot afford to eat, will get some fresh fruit and we promote healthy snacking</td>
<td>Q3 MO Youth initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please try to access to fizzy drinks for young people. It is unhealthy.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Youth initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local board should have a fund for youth related events only and it should offer diverse programmes  e.g. sports, festivals, art expression, dance competition, story telling, painting, IT and Engineering workshops.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Youth initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more supported is needed from schools for community support, esp. to offer after hours programmes. Can there be a discussion with schools in the local area to see if they can do this.</td>
<td>Q3 MO Youth initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and order</td>
<td>Q3 MO Youth initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing playgrounds around Manurewa</td>
<td>Q1 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more rubbish dumping - Vibeisha</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean green Aoteaaroa</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking hazard outside Glendon (eg) outside Pak n Save</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraps for glass bottle refund to stop idiots throwing them out in the street</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too sure if traditional inmirance will work</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai priority is to support community FR to reducing waste (eg - par 5)</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional inmirance has always worked</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add something to Glendon. It’s so ugglish! But some parks.</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Keith Park - YES. But please can we improve safety - cars often speed around there or play loud music and drinking. Policy put but they need help too.</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade of Glendon shopping to include safer car parking &amp; security</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal dumping top priority</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal dumping happening every week - Warumahia</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre at Glendon Reserve</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New park requirement: Slides, swings, monkey bars - Niuera 11</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens is attractive - Glendon</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to environmental waste</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need proper bins around Rewa Pippy - organic recycle &amp; landfill</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add some light to Glendon</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree but want to prioritise 1. reduce waste 2. To Mata 3. Illegal dumping - shorten the timeframe</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Keith Park like seriously</td>
<td>Q3 MR Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for more games for youths in local board public places.</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital platform for youths and by youths</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike programmes in Parks</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there should be an event for seniors, where they can share their stories and background - maybe for seniors day.</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Watch is needed in Otara for health and safety of our Whanau</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road maintenance Free food, soup kitchens etc. should be available on a regular basis and funded by the local board. This should be promoted through community grants, so people know that they can apply for such goodwill programmes</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better accessibility for public transport, especially around Koãiwrr road</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Capacity building workshops for youths and community groups, esp. codeign local board youth programmes, financial capability, better partnerships</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the local board should fund celebration of diverse events, for example, Korean, Chinese, Indian, Pacific, Samoan, Tongan, refugees etc. There should be a diversity policy around funding</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for programmes for seniors should be made free</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Strategy - the hu and Mana Whanau have a cultural bond with water and so does other cultures.</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our approach to water use should incorporate our cultural element as well. We don’t want more rates on water</td>
<td>Q3 OP Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for sports needs assessment - encourage youth sports</td>
<td>Q3 PPK Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Takanini hub</td>
<td>Q3 PPK Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Takanini community hub and library</td>
<td>Q3 PPK Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not 100% aware of the priorities for the local board area in 2019/2020.</td>
<td>Q3 RD Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avondale is on a flood plain and the road is in a dam (missing in Whau) Bus service has gone from 1/2 hour to 1 hour</td>
<td>Q3 WH Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Enjoy doing this in the area) live safe</td>
<td>Q3 WH Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(missing in area) a carpark without broken glass + rubbish. Having the car park in the old 3 guys area is great for parking when a train but unfortunately I have had punctures from the broken glass (Avondale)</td>
<td>Q3 WH Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully support halls going to community groups for management ie. Sbufale. Rangiaoua SPMP is very important. Little Onesca has been going on too long. lots of other areas experiencing similar issues. Should have been done years ago. Housing - isn’t enough for tradesmen etc. Affordable Onetangi beach has a lot of vacant houses - number of long term resident are dropping.</td>
<td>Q3 WHK Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capex - toilet provision - more money to be spent on them. Obviously needs doing particularly in Otahuhu where there are no public toilets. Cleaner does a great job. Otahuhu Domain is just coming good now. Managed well. Why the right people involved shows what can be done.</td>
<td>Q3 WHK Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are not aware of proposed priorities for Waiuku</td>
<td>Q3 WHT Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress on project on 35 Arapito Road is slow - setting up a residence for writers. Going West has carried out a number of steps that has been required of it. Still convinced it is a viable project. Progress of moving from Panuku to Going West is challenging. System is broken because council processes have policies that prevent it.</td>
<td>Q3 WTK Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see a focus on transport in particular how the board can use their transport capital fund to assist on prioritizing safe cycleways and footpaths that link to neighbouring boards - i.e. Swanson/Bethells cycle connectors to the North Western cycleway.</td>
<td>Q3 WTK Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the LB understanding and commitment with the attitude that city centre residents chose to live there so have to deal with this. Better maintenance on public spaces. Street furniture gets damaged and not replaced.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle Meville - fantastic -would like the lb to drive the efforts to achieve an operations and management plan that prioritises city centre residents. Need support for dense residential areas are prioritised.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great town centres - Wynyard quarter. Needs to be called a village not town in the LB plan.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge the difference between villages and town centres - in local board plan. Urbanisation and village scope.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you explain how you'll make the Ponsonby communities vision for Ponsonby Park a reality and how this will be achieved financially? Will it continue to be community led?</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the cost difference between maintaining parks with agrichemical-free methods vs conventional spray methods. It's better for the environment obviously but what's the cost/benefit analysis?</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently eels and kokopu were found in Waiparauru Stream. What will you be doing to protect and enhance this stream following this discovery? Can you talk more about your other stream restoration programmes, how much are you allocating to each stream and the rationale for each.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLG priorities - Glandale playground upgrade - what is happening there. Why is this not a priority. Support Ponsonby Park initiative. Support the Waiparauru stream projects.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual budget feedback and Newmarket's priorities for WLG budget. Does not support 254 Ponsonby road - it's nice to have but it doesn't have. Newmarket has a lack of green spaces and civic space. Elderly gentlemen that fell on roadway - need better infrastructure in public spaces. Teed street crossing desperately in need for recreation spaces for young people - no recreational space for children and youth. Not enough urgency is put on this need - board needs.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to priorities: 2. Youth recreation facility 3. Action and delivery on enhancements at station square. Needs softening, grass, areas to sit etc.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wishlist project - support and resources to continue the roll out of streetscape projects as in the laneways masterplan. Include Merit and York Street. Supportive of the 3km speed limit in Broadway.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more traffic calming mechanisms - level of traffic increasing.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would love green streetscapes and planters - and make it look more village friendly. Help to invest in the retail streetscape. Want support from Council and placemaking. No feedback coming back from State in A T when emails go out.</td>
<td>Q3 WTM Local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Rates retention replacement scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need higher rates and less flexibility to punish those imperialists who work and produce income.</td>
<td>Rates retention replacement scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A kaupapa Māori approach is needed</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fact that rates are going up when Auckland Council are still building houses -- they should be focusing on living cost decrease.</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland property values have gone up</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNZ also pay rates - gov pays rates but not hnz tenants</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private home owners do pay rates.</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase in Māngere might be a bit more because of the re-evaluation affect. The areas that went up first were the properties in the city and slowly had a ripple affect on those on the outskirts of central auckland (where the properties first started going up).</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support increase in rates</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping rates cool down as already to high for young families like my self.</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a cock up if they that if your house is worth more (usually because you work harder than others) that you pay more rates - it should be size related. Just because you work harder than some shouldn't mean you pay more.</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have you done to decrease costs and work efficiently? What other options have you explored to keep costs down</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please reduce your annual salary bill as promised when Phil Goff campaigned for Mayor and leave the rates as they are</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher rates mean higher rents.</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much is the total increase?</td>
<td>Rating policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want the Rodney Local Board to continue to fund Kumeu Arts Centre.</td>
<td>RD Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want to have the same facilities as at Nauset Hill Park, for Westford Centennial Park. E.g. new surfaces on hard courts, lighting, perimeter path</td>
<td>RD Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Springs Speedway - keep it open</td>
<td>Regional arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>events, free pools, services provided, free internet out in communities</td>
<td>Regional arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports incorporation of ram into the strategy, but notes the inclusion of Maori. Matarangi mayor / regional what view is place based which is different to a te ao maori approach. Gives opportunity for reciprocal exchange.</td>
<td>Regional arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of feedback the positive impact – opportunity that must take and get an audience similar to this with International shareholders.</td>
<td>Regional arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like an animal 'no kill' shelter</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing Women of Waiuku, Seeking an olympic sized pool and recreation centre in Waiuku. Present a petition from 1635 people supporting their request. Petition and paper submission will be forwarded to central</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer streets, more cops on the beat</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that council and the local board supports community led development</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of maintenance work in South Auckland</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent urged the need for a Youth Strategy. With crime rates among youth on the rise, it's important for us to start including youth (aged 9 and above) to start including them in these conversations so we can find ways forward. There's nothing specific in place for youth aged 9-10yr olds (which is the age group that are most susceptible to crime and peer pressure)</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dame Ngapika noted the challenge in delivery when people still grappling with the concept of Kaitiakitanga</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One thing that came up on Monday night at the hui was the issue around mataa waka - Mihi world view, it is place based, applying this approach gives the opportunity for reciprocal exchange of stewardship and care, comprehensive integrated two worldviews.</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better service all round - provision of value for rates</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want Auckland Council to provide asset based funding for Rodney's Arts Facilities equal to that other Wards in Auckland receive</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Supply Bins</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet (Public) not clean</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water is too expensive. Clean water for houses. Rubbish fee expensive. Free lunch for kids at school.</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free lunch for kids at school</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water is too expensive. Lunch for kids at school free. Clean water for houses. Transport expensive (bus, trains). Rubbish (free collection)</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playcentre - Manurewa East needs concert effort for development as current facility has been operating at maximum capacity for another of years and is not meeting demand for community, community education and skills provision. There is huge potential for innovative multiple designed facility to be constructed based on past 20 years of operation and associated learning and insights - lets take on the challenge!</td>
<td>Regional community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's Bay water project. In light of a change in the fundamental purpose of the project. Seek the boards support on the St Mary's Bay/Masefield beach water project. Enforce recent AC - Watercare decision to separate sewage and stormwater pipes - provide a budget for separation. Withdraw or suspension of budget for the project pending review. Progress: decision to separate (end February 2019)</td>
<td>Regional Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to achieve in similar timeframe and at similar cost. But tunnel still profitable - an additional $44 million. This ignores potential 90%+ of savings and retains adverse construction effects. Recognize that the decision to separate has changed the St Mary's Bay/Masefield project fundamentally: The reason for the big storage pipe has gone. Change must call for (independent) review of need for, and reconsideration of expenditure on, the tunnel. Existing mechanism - the Western lymphatics programme, Opportunity to make this a Council/community collaboration - valuable precedent, Unanimous support for separation and stopping the tunnel. Change the decision and the change of the project must call for an independent review of the need of the tunnel. Western lymphatics programme is an existing mechanism to address this. Clear issue - do we build a tunnel or do we operate it. Now the decision has been made to separate it. So surely the tunnel will not be needed. Tunnel is an</td>
<td>Regional Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See support for the central water strategy developed - see the ships moved to cooks wharf.</td>
<td>Regional Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love our libraries!</td>
<td>Regional libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User pays in the library for the meeting rooms - it used to be free, and charges are high on the senior citizen groups, and they are now using other places</td>
<td>Regional libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakes in parks</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional parks, like Wenderholm - to book a site is a nightmare, and if you cancel due to [bad] weather there is no refund</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a specific park for freedom camping - for self contained units like in O'sboro and Harner Springs. No need to provide facilities ie toilets etc. and can charge a small overnight fee - like DOC camps</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Camping - Don't mind if it is self contained. Have concern about homeless people</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General unhappiness with state of Auckland's governance, pollution, lack of green spaces, housing standards, public transport, Auckland airport</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like Council to consider having a splash pad here (Ridge Park, Long Bay). Albion pool is limited in numbers</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is the flying fox at Long Bay Regional Park not working?</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for more public space - and pocket parks, Playground and public space for the goods and bad</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading community parks and playgrounds</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There's a lights issue in south auckland parks. Putting lights up might help communities to be more active because they'd feel safer to stay in public places with lights, wouldnt feel too dangerous</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds in Auckland aren't being taken care of as well as other parts of auckland</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to put water in to our parks.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Item 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanging water fountains and parks (healthily kai, healthy families etc)</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for lights in public parks/making things more visible (white lights)</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for lights in South Auckland parks.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Hulse acknowledge the thoughtful presentation and to acknowledge Tamei’s role in the MRTFF. Acknowledge Te Kāinga o Māki no opening of tracks regarding kauri die back represents informal co-governance decisions.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledges erudite and thoughtful presentation, and notes the comfortable decision-making relationship around the Hanua Ranges with Kaiwha, Wonders when we get to the point where we get to first principles with mana whenua in that governance role.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous trees – as heritage trees any thoughts about that? Lucie would like to see a council policy that says new trees planted, all trees have a right to life so, not wanting to comment too much about that, as exciting is to think them out and replace only on basics.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucie notes here is additional replaces all plastic, replaces 4 x carbon monoxide plus the rest of its benefits.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the connection between the targeted rates, easy to look at this around post management and.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you, what is the message? We cannot separate out the messages about water, talking about targeted rates we are thinking about this in its entirety, not in slices. Today, my most important issue to talk to is around overseas investment offices to sell land to Chinese owners of waste management – not blind, something needs to happen as we grow, but consent to be passed is in total conflict with our council policy waste management – going against everything that this Water Strategy discussion doc stands for and Te Mana o Te Wai Unit local policy statement.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should consider having a plush pad here. Albany Pool is limited in numbers</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is the flying fox at long Bay Regional Park not working</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need big playgrounds with more equipment.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need big parks, sport &amp; recreation.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a penalty applied to the council if the building permit is over the 21 days stipulated.</td>
<td>Regulatory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent should be involving all those in the surrounding areas not just council to decide who to grant consent to.</td>
<td>Regulatory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like it that so many dogs were put down at the Wiri pound. I read an article that said, 2000 dogs were put down at the Wiri pound in 2017 or 2018? But 3000 dogs were put down across the whole of Auckland. Wiri pound needs to be investigated with regards to their procedures for putting down animals.</td>
<td>Regulatory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants asked whether or not Local boards influence on takeaway stores. Because, takeaway restaurants are all centralised in south Auckland and only contribute more to the health crisis among Māori and Pacific people.</td>
<td>Regulatory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put more money into enforcement. Dogs on Pt Chev beach not on leads</td>
<td>Regulatory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get out of rates bill.</td>
<td>Revenue and Finance Policy changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But why we still pay get tax on tax</td>
<td>Revenue and Finance Policy changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Revenue and Finance Policy changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orakei Road, truck nearly killed someone turning left into Remuera Road, with dangerous turning.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks getting heavier.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuera is a hill suburb, not easy to walk there.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like a traffic island on Remuera Rd outside the library, people crossing have nowhere to stand.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support board’s proposal to improve safety at Bonnie Brae/Meadowbank Road intersection.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like speed limit in Meadowbank shopping centre to be reduced to 30km</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need lower speed limit in residential roads, e.g. Norman Lesser, Gowing Drive – not appropriate to be same speed as big roads like Birthday Drive</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the speed reduction in shopping areas 30km and support a reduction to 40km on residential roads such as Gowing Drive</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep an eye on slip lanes at Solent Street and The Strand – dangerous for vulnerable users</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports advocacy for biker to stop trucks on local roads</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervene suburb, narrow roads</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to see a clear plan on how traffic is going to be managed in Stonelands</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bees for Whangaparaoa Rd is a priority</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flesh the footpaths in Lagoon Way</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do it in stages need road from Papakura through Howick</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic from Waiuku Pa needs to be improved</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blynea Drive to Waiata Shores should remained closed</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection on southern motorway getting into Auckland needs to improving</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoved temporary road, this has created damage, unnecessary, this has never been used as a base for maintenance work.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Stewart: the temporary road prior to this, was this grass and when it was, it wasn’t a problem? It was grass right up to the foot of the pathway, showed picture.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purtin Bay Road and Schooner Bay Road needs maintenance and repair. The pot holes on Purrit Bay Road are terrible and corrugations on Schooner Bay Road are really bad. Safety is a big concern, this needs to be addressed urgently. There was a petition by the roads users a while ago. Please don’t forget about it and please can this be fixed</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Purrit Bay Road &amp; Schooner Bay Road sealed. Get it sealed and get it sorted. Will take too long to look at future fees and needs to be fixed now</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are four slips along Purrit Bay Road that need to be fixed. The one opposite Tipi and Bob’s is so bad the road itself has become compromised and is now subsiding. Really urgent</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths – existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dust along Puriri Bay Road is unbearable - it gets into the water and onto all the tables. A health and safety hazard. Especially when people are walking along the road. The road is the busiest it’s ever been. Lots of traffic every night.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How real is a long term fix for Puriri Bay Road? I would like the Puriri Bay Road fixed now (ie. before a long term non-coastal solution). Coastal erosion is a concern but surely the cost of putting in a new road would be way more than repairing the existing road, and take a long period of time when we need a repair job now while you are looking at the long term fix. Use to be able to sit in the middle of the road and have a party all day long and get maybe 3 cars but now the traffic count is really high - it’s getting quite unsafe for that fix.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Puriri Bay Road and Schooner Bay Road sealed. Don’t cater to the tourist - should cater to the locals first!</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puriri Bay Road should be sealed as it’s wearing out the back tyres of my car.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tar seal Puriri Bay Road</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the other roads (except Puriri Bay Road &amp; Schooner Bay Road) are fantastic</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puriri Bay Road and Schooner Bay Road need sealing</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see Puriri Bay Road sealed</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see Puriri Bay Road sealed as I have an accommodation business at the other end of the road so big concern.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tar seal Puriri Bay Road and Schooner Bay Road. Do what can be done immediately because the pot holes can be a real concern when it’s wet and the corrugations along Schooner Bay Road are bad.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the dips and seal Puriri Bay Road. We can’t wait for future solutions, need to repair it now. AT need to talk to the locals about what the road use to be like and what it could be like. AT should consult with us.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A request for Orana road to be looked at. There are lots of accidents on this road and I have lost of photos from over the years. The road needs to be widened in places, have passing lanes and mirrors installed on the blind corners. The road is used by the school bus, by visiting school kids and families. The road has high usage as Orana has 20,000 best nights a year.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning onto East Coast Road from Orana Road is a nightmare. Very unsafe.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please complete central cycleway network. Strong support for local residents to build and expand on cycling network. Partly completed cycleway.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath at Heritage Park needs to be urgently repaired</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recent resurfacing of roads in Sandringham have made a mess of the road. There was nothing wrong with the road of Arabi St, Patternson St, and nearby streets but Auckland Transport still came in and resurfaced these roads. Now the road has unsealed gravel and it poses a danger to pedestrians walking on the footpath.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and traffic management remain huge issues. I note that getting anywhere in Auckland is a trial and often roadworks have not been adequately planned so areas where work is being done overlaps causing greater congestion instead of solving an issue. On the North shore, our bus lane is still a T3 which is inconsistent with other parts of Auckland. One way Rd is such that cars can still park down the left hand side in the afternoons which makes accessing the city harder than necessary and at times is extremely dangerous as buses don’t have a clear path and often need to change lanes to avoid parked cars.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and traffic management remain huge issues. I note that getting anywhere in Auckland is a trial and often roadworks have not been adequately planned so areas where work is being done overlaps causing greater congestion instead of solving an issue. On the North shore, our bus lane is still a T3 which is inconsistent with other parts of Auckland. One way Rd is such that cars can still park down the left hand side in the afternoons which makes accessing the city harder than necessary and at times is extremely dangerous as buses don’t have a clear path and often need to change lanes to avoid parked cars.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recent resurfacing of roads in Sandringham have made a mess of the road. There was nothing wrong with the road of Arabi St, Patternson St, and nearby streets but Auckland Transport still came in and resurfaced these roads. Now the road has unsealed gravel and it poses a danger to pedestrians walking on the footpath. The seal flies off and damages the cars. This should work cannot be rectified by AT.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Roads are dark. We need more lights.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very pleased that the council contractors have taken over the streets - tidy up</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be more street lights.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support G21D and local connections.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support connections into G21D.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Need) Walkway to connect Karaka Lakes Harbourside to Papakura.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford road will be great to focus on Improving</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park between Brown st and Richmond road needs more playground infrastructure. Same with Gunson Street.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footpaths in Herne Bay</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warakau urgent needs improved reading and especially kerbing and footpaths. The current infrastructure can’t cope with the estimated 1 million visitors per year. Would like a formalised footpath between Ridge Park and the beach.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Park - no footpaths to cross road to get to the park - Te Oneroa.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic linking, needs to start 30 minutes earlier and finish 30 minutes later. Add extra lane to motorway to avoid pinch point at entry motorway. Need off ramp between Silverdale and Otahuhu Valley Road - facing both directions. The turn into New World on Whangaparaoa Rd is a major safety issue and needs looking at.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If new road seal project is intending to only go to Akapoua then request it be extended out to gardens grave as a number of people walk the distance of Akapoua to gardens grave and it’s a dust nuisance for the walk.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing Beachlands Community Trust, Seeking support/funding to provide recycling and reuse activities and programmes in Beachlands. Presentation attached and submittals also intend to make a written submission.</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no bins on the island for the ‘odd bit of rubbish’. Concerned that tourists will end up dumping rubbish in the bushes as there is no where to put it.</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a rubbish bin at the airport</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissue that waste minimisation is treated seriously by council and that they are working closely with other community groups in this space.</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy with everything - except bring back our dump stations. Dogs get into the yellow bins</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring back the rubbish dump stations at the airport. And the rubbish bins at the beaches as I walk along the beach with the dog (on a leash) and there is lots of little bits of litter around</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddened by the loss of the dump station bins. The yellow bins are an eyesore and they lie around the roadsides for ages. Lots of additional rubbish being left on the roadsides too. There was a lack of consultation about the changes to the waste service and it feels like a step backwards</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of rubbish left lying around by visitors. Being dumped in kerbside bins and being dumped at the airport bins (to overflowing). The yellow bins are also overflowing. This needs to be addressed</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rubbish fix for the island needs to be a bespoke solution and can’t be an Auckland model imposed here.</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish is a concern. Council should support innovation. Barrier could be a way to trial innovations. For example, the recycling and re-use of tyres and plastics in building materials. It’s a concern that we are doing the ‘lightweighting’ by recycling and separating our plastics but in the end it goes to the dump and is buried. We need to have long term solutions. It might be very costly to start but in the long term it will be good for ‘earnings’, good for the planet and maybe even local employment (ie, the innovative trials)</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More recycling bins at community e.g. Parks, towncentres, supermarkets</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish Collection</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be easy $150 fine imposed on the idiots who are still throwing plastics and metal/aluminium cans into the red organic collection bins. Do employ an extra inspector to 1 check the red bin and 2. since trucks R computerised fine the address R!</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish (free collection)</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street cleaning in Auckland city and suburbs, particularly 5th. Auckland is abysmal. Rubbish dumping has been loosened slightly to what it was. Yes. Auckland City Council pays handsomely to attend to above - so where is the money going? Over-inflated council salaries and perks.</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What we experience is where there is only one house on one section and then the council gives consent to build two other houses using the same water infrastructure - it cannot cope with three houses all at once</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish A concern. Council should support innovation. Barriers could be a way to trial innovations. For example, the recycling and re-use of tyres and plastics in building materials. It’s a concern that we are doing the ‘lightweighting’ by recycling and separating our plastics but in the end it goes to the dump and is buried. We need to have long term solutions. It might be very costly to start but in the long term it will be good for – ‘earnings’, good for the planet and maybe even local employment (ie, the innovative trials)</td>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House is not current tenanted, it is unsafe, it will be demolished. The habitable space within the house is healthy. Foundation is fine and can sustain workers who would provide upgrades. Other renovations work is not a requirement to get a lease, it will be done at a later stage.</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to know how the auditing process works - understand that council will work with industry and homeowners to improve standards</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building in rural areas is not good – more care on the road</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General unhappiness with state of Auckland - governance, pollution, lack of green spaces, housing standards, public transport, Auckland airport.</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 new houses between Parakai and Kumeu. This will change the water table - suburban developments change where the water table runs into the aquifers</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For what we’ve started first - bike lanes, intercept tunnel railway, CRL</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 notes opportunity to have people engaged in governance conversation</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity is having people engaged, any amount of legal advice is not going to cut it – the opportunity the water discussion presents us in the Auckland context</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop allowing building to be built in Devonport, Bayswater, and Belmont, buildings should be built in the City</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being fair to all as per my question 1. More boating facilities - ramps, parking etc. Slow the ferrys down - bloody dangerous for small vessels in the harbour - everyone also has to slow to 12 knots</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-rent property in Auckland. In my family only one person is doing job which is not enough</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rent cost</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need playground in my area</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property rates are very high and also rental property very expeaneous. It is hard when one person in family who is working and no other help to financially</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggling for finding job (Due to English language)</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No good kindergartens in Papakura area. (Fees 20 hours one)</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't think that Titirangi &amp; Hunua dams will be enough with all the extra ppl/incoming to AKLD region!!! Note drought this structure please, remember we national water</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need parks... shame for parking</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm just a bit concerned about area around schools. The roundabout at Blockhouse Bay (Donovan st, Blockhouse Bay, etc that close to Countdown is really busy, have lots roads into one roundabout. While a lot of kids walking to and from school to that area, and there is only one traffic light there. Can we think more safe things for kids to walk around? Recently, we heard about few stranger-dangers toward school kids around Blockhouse Bay. I really hope that sorted out, because we really don't feel safe for our kids anymore</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much car parking in the street.</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night time, some streets are so dark, I hope more streetlight and feeling more safe.</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Patrol</td>
<td>Spatial, strategic &amp; infrastructure planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The waste and storm water system is really old and there are so many new developments and high intensity building in some areas - the system can't cope. We think the council needs to be more careful about the consents it gives out.</td>
<td>Stormwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unroofed transport priority is walking and cycling safety on the roads.</td>
<td>Stormwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian needs to swing back towards safety of pedestrians, parents, children.</td>
<td>Walking and cycling improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need people to be walking and cycling, need roads to be safer for them.</td>
<td>Walking and cycling improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School children currently not doing enough walking and cycling but roads need to be safer for this.</td>
<td>Walking and cycling improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling proficiency not a priority have like in UK or Europe.</td>
<td>Walking and cycling improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of cyclists drive, not many drivers cycle, results in lack of empathy.</td>
<td>Walking and cycling improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-powered bikes mean cyclists going much faster.</td>
<td>Walking and cycling improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS children will never be able to cycle to school due to volume of traffic</td>
<td>Walking and cycling improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Park Long Bay - no pedestrian crossings to cross road to get to the park. Te Ono area is quite busy.</td>
<td>Walking and cycling improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see a focus on transport in particular how the board can use their transport capital fund to assist on prioritising safe cycleways and footpaths that link to neighbouring boards - e.g.</td>
<td>Walking and cycling improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The waste and storm water system is really old and there are so many new developments and high intensity building in some areas - the system can't cope. We think the council needs to be more careful about the consents it gives out.</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why spend millions on waste water when the man and shovel clearing the drains regularly meant the streets and drains did not get clogged. Start at basics, not the expensive calculation</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - smart meters on water usage i.e. like power companies, this would enable people to have more informed control over their usage.</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch water off drain</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More taps for drinking water</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More water founds</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply the drinking water in separate tap so the other use water can used to parity.</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean water for houses</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A big NO to the waterfront stadium</td>
<td>Waterfront development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(improve visibility of local board) come out and meet the groups and people around the community</td>
<td>WH Local board, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Enjoy doing this in the area) Attend kids up dub in New Lynn</td>
<td>WH Local board, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(missing in area) swim in salt water pool, less chemical, eco friendly, mineral and trace element enhancement for the body</td>
<td>WH Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(enjoy in area) walk on the boardwalks. Visit local shops</td>
<td>WH Local community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(missing in area) A decent pub!!!</td>
<td>WH Local economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(missing in area) robust legislation regarding poison usage</td>
<td>WH Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(improve visibility of local board) use the power you have by forcing large organisations e.g. housing co's, ban use of domestic poisons with their properties, therefore improving 'water quality' from runoff</td>
<td>WH Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(missing in area) some visual improvement</td>
<td>WH Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(missing in area) please improve footpaths, avoid the Terrible mess, dangerous.</td>
<td>WH Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(improve visibility of local board) answer phone calls - mag please</td>
<td>WH Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(missing in area) comprehensive ears</td>
<td>WH Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(improve visibility of board) more functions + advertising in the western leader</td>
<td>WH Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(missing in area) swimming pool</td>
<td>WH Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore option for pool of 'salt water' (i.e. Parnell) as more eco-friendly than chlorine saturated pool</td>
<td>WH Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(enjoy dining in area) venue for our whau walking sound makan <em>wánake</em></td>
<td>WH Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(visiting in area) swimming pool for our community in wánake. Community hub, Community hall</td>
<td>WH Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ulling in area) delivery of the wainui leader (Kawerau Road)</td>
<td>WH Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going West has carried out a number of steps including procuring quotes and applying for consent.</td>
<td>WTK Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local board and staff are good and supportive of the Trust</td>
<td>WTK Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General concern about natural environment - including Waiakere Tracks, intensification of housing, rubbish dumping etc.</td>
<td>WTK Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We spoke with a number of people about the water strategy and board plans, didn’t receive feedback as such but promised our work and sponsored projects</td>
<td>WTK Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m really interested in your thoughts on environment - what else do you have planned around protecting, preserving and cleaning up our community?</td>
<td>WTM Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralised local composting hubs</td>
<td>WTM Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero refill carbon emissions. Have we efficiently sequenced the roll.</td>
<td>WTM Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to do composting in Ponsonby - local OMG. For all of the restaurants in Ponsonby Road. The business association asked to have composting on 254 Ponsonby Road. Keen to get that incorporated on the design. Can the boxes get in there while it’s still a car park? Board here on decentralising composting. Could a recycling centre be another option for WBD over at western springs?</td>
<td>WTM Local environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimum solution is to do the composting where you knew your food.</td>
<td>WTM Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having our streets cleaned. Having the trees cut. Having the drains unblocked in the roads on a weekly basis. Tress trimmed everywhere.</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need moral support and want to be in the centre of the boards strategy</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape upgrade - Council has committed to this but community has not seen the plans.</td>
<td>WTM Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the collective legacy that you are going to leave for Parnell - Tell them to account. Going to pushing for line items in the work programme. Wants to see more projects for the Parnell business association in the 1920s work programme.</td>
<td>WTM Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support more funding for city centre community events.</td>
<td>WTM Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Spraying in September, October or November - Save the bees!</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives in Mahuru Crescent raised a range of concerns about cleaning of the park and streets, drug taking and general issues with being an apartment resident.</td>
<td>WTM Local governance &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for benches in the Domain in locations where it is convenient to drop off elderly people and her concern about the lack of footpaths/pedestrian safety in the Domain</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIDS PLAYGROUND IN NEWMARKET PARK</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid's space activations have gone really well at station square. Need somewhere that kids can use recreationally after school and for families etc.</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Resolution Reserve - hardscaping has been done - there has been no landscaping</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effort has been made to remove the woods. Professional landscaper needs to come up with a landscaping plan. Why is Pt Resolution Taranaki deemed a second class citizen when it comes to centralizing on its world class location.</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request an amount be set aside for Pt Resolution improvements. Adriana - pt resolution is huge for traffic going through there. Is dog off leash? Is there a place in Parnell for community garden? Yes - scarborough reserve. Pt Resolution - opportunities to tell stories in the area. (Heritage) Waiwera stream regeneration - not a lot of money but huge $5 goes in and out. Could do with more budget for the planting to be done there this year.</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street furniture and $55 spent in Head Park</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swings seem to be getting thinner and the bucket swings seem to be being replaced with those with chains which are not good for small kids.</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western park and Cox's bay playgrounds great for little kids!</td>
<td>WTM Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Springs joint management plan with the community</td>
<td>WTM Other comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support council family wide effort in the implementation of the amenity plan. Support efforts to make the streets safer</td>
<td>WTM Other comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Budget 2019/2020

Social Media Feedback
Item 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRING BACK THE OLD INORGANIC RUBBISH COLLECTION</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRING IN A FEE TO USE RUBBISH BAGS FOR EXTRA RUBBISH PEOPLE CAN’T GET INTO THE USELESS RED BINS. THE HAVE THEM IN CLARKS BEACH... part of the priority</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRAP THE ARTS BUDGET &amp; PUT RUBBISH RECYCLE CENTRES IN HANDY LOCATIONS ACROSS AUCKLAND</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIVE ALL RATE PAYERS A TIP PASS</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop spending our money on free entertainment. Scrap movies and music in parks is a good start. Council is there to use OUR money provide essential services to the city. Want to put on events, make sure they turn a profit.</td>
<td>Regional arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not!!!! I have attended so many of the free events in the city - Diwali, Day of the dead Carnival, Christmas at SkyCity, many of the movies at the slop park, and I loved them all!!! They are one of my favourite things about living in this city - it really makes me feel like I’m part of a community, not just living in some soulless concrete jungle!!!</td>
<td>Regional arts, culture &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to 95 million for a cricket arena... no to Eden Park 120 million debt bailout no to stadium on Port of Auckland. Address needs first.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The petrol tax in AKL. That’s what we have paid for. What is the SLA to get this infrastructure completed. Takanini is a disaster. I don’t use this everyday but I know so many commuters do. Especially when AKL workers are travelling from South to Akl. When we personally go away south during holiday periods its not that good. I’m sure a lot of commuters just going too and from them wish in Akl everyday feel the same.</td>
<td>Public transport - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to a super expensive rapidly deteriorating plastic tunnel under the harbour bridge, just build the bike lane under existing tunnels (new) without the crappy plastic tube like other normal countries do and have done since forever. Less plastic is better too. Changing out an aged plastic tunnel will cost a fortune in 5 or 10 years time, bad economics building plastic stuff with the NZ UV levels. Not even more funds for Eden Park and Rugby which is a game without much of a future, more people play badminton and ACC doesn’t get laden with life altering accidents from badminton. Rugby is a full grown business and can say their own stadium IMA.</td>
<td>Public transport infrastructure - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop spending our money on useless projects!! Billions to get a train up Queen St, New Zealanders worked 4 a century?</td>
<td>Public transport infrastructure - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The green and red buses do a very good job? Could have paid half of the cost to get train in to the shore and save millions on congestion?</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed free line goes much further than just up and down Queen Street.</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please bring back annual tip passes for ratepayers.</td>
<td>Q1 Annual waste management changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More fenced in dog exercise areas please.</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in our public parks and help families keep active without breaking the bank and spend quality time with family.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would to make a suggestion on our Water Dispute Submissions. Currently you cannot save your submission and return. This video is really helpful to Aucklanders trying to have their say as the submission takes time and thorough consideration – which takes time and currently haven’t done it all in one go ask quite an ask.</td>
<td>Governance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop spending our money on free entertainment. Scrap movies and music in parks is a good start. Council is there to use OUR money provide essential services to the city. Want to put on events, make sure they turn a profit.</td>
<td>Focus on core services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to even more funds for Eden Park and Rugby which is a game without much of a future, more people play badminton and ACC don’t get laden with life altering accidents from badminton. Rugby is a full grown business and can say their own stadium IMA.</td>
<td>Regional parks, sport &amp; recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkawaycountry - Off leash dog parks and beaches. Dogs are a big part of family in NZ and we want to keep them safe as well as the community. These designated areas could also be great places for education for dog owners to help people make good choices for the future of these for baby. Let’s be the first area to be dog friendly in Auckland!!!</td>
<td>Waterfront development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I make a submission against the plan to encroach on the harbour for the America Cup? Can’t find it within the Have Your Say page.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The budget allocations Walkawaycountry I would like Council to reconsider the On-Line Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (APTR) Bands in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 such that the lower Banding is brought into line with the Inland Revenue Departments value of 100 booking nights being considered the threshold for Business / Commercial rating.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The budget allocations Walkawaycountry I would like Council to reconsider the On-Line Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (APTR) Bands in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 such that the lower Banding is brought into line with the Inland Revenue Departments value of 100 booking nights being considered the threshold for Business / Commercial rating.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The budget allocations Walkawaycountry I would like Council to reconsider the On-Line Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (APTR) Bands in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 such that the lower Banding is brought into line with the Inland Revenue Departments value of 100 booking nights being considered the threshold for Business / Commercial rating.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The budget allocations Walkawaycountry I would like Council to reconsider the On-Line Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (APTR) Bands in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 such that the lower Banding is brought into line with the Inland Revenue Departments value of 100 booking nights being considered the threshold for Business / Commercial rating.</td>
<td>Other rating and funding comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please maintain path between Great South Road and Bentums way extension Manurewa. Safe ways to get to buses and there are a must. Walkawaycountry</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To receive a resolution from the Governing Body and provide feedback on the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw Statement of Proposal.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary


Resolution number GB/2019/10

MOVED by Cr L Cooper, seconded by Deputy Mayor BC Cashmore:

That the Governing Body:

a) adopt the statement of proposal in Attachment B of the agenda report for public consultation, as amended, and confirms that the draft bylaw:
   i) is the most appropriate and proportionate way to implement aspects of the policy
   ii) is not inconsistent with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990.

b) forward to local boards and advisory panels:
   i) the statement of proposal in Attachment B of the agenda report for their views
   ii) this agenda report and attachments for their information.

c) note delegated authority to the chair of the Regulatory Committee to make replacement appointments to the panel if a member of the panel is unavailable.

d) note delegated authority through the chief executive to staff approved by a manager responsible for bylaws to receive public feedback at ‘Have Your Say’ events.

e) note delegated authority through the chief executive to a manager responsible for bylaws to make any amendments to the statement of proposal in Attachment B of the agenda report to correct errors, omissions or to reflect decisions made by the Regulatory Committee or the Governing Body.

f) note the Regulatory Committee’s agreement that the statement of proposal be amended to include an option outlining the ability for local boards to determine the time and season provisions for their local board areas.

3. The Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw Statement of Proposal is included as Attachment B.

4. The Hearings Panel will meet on 3 May 2019 and local boards will have an opportunity to present views.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:


b) consider whether to provide views on the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw Statement of Proposal to the hearings panel on the 3 May 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>28 February 2019 - Governing Body report</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Statement of Proposal Auckland Council’s new policy on dogs and dog management bylaw</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Sarndra O'Toole - Team Leader Governance Advisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Marguerite Delbet - General Manager Democracy Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rina Tagore - Relationship Manager Mangere-Ōtahuhu &amp; Otara-Papatoetoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw Statement of Proposal referred from the Regulatory Committee

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To receive the recommendation from the Regulatory Committee and adopt the statement of proposal.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. At its meeting of 14 February 2019, the Regulatory Committee considered the attached report and resolved as follows:

Resolution number REG/2019/1

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson BC Cashmore, seconded by IMSB Chair D Taipari:
That the Regulatory Committee:

a) recommend that the Governing Body adopt the statement of proposal in Attachment A of the agenda report for public consultation and confirms that the draft bylaw:
   i) is the most appropriate and proportionate way to implement aspects of the policy
   ii) is not inconsistent with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990.

b) recommend that the Governing Body forwards to local boards and advisory panels:
   i) the statement of proposal in Attachment A of the agenda report for their views
   ii) this agenda report and attachments for their information.

c) appoint a minimum of three panel members, including a chair Cr Cooper and Cr Casey, Cr Wayne Walker, from councillors and the Independent Maori Statutory Board Member Glenn Wilcox to:
   i) attend ‘Have Your Say’ events
   ii) deliberate and make recommendations to the Governing Body based on public feedback on the statement of proposal in Attachment A of the agenda report.

d) delegate authority to the chair of the Regulatory Committee to make replacement appointments to the panel if a member of the panel is unavailable.

e) delegate authority through the chief executive to staff approved by a manager responsible for bylaws to receive public feedback at ‘Have Your Say’ events.

f) delegate authority through the chief executive to a manager responsible for bylaws to make any amendments to the statement of proposal in Attachment A of the agenda report to correct errors, omissions or to reflect decisions made by the Regulatory Committee or the Governing Body.

g) rescind the previous direction to “apply dog access rules that protect wildlife in Mahurangi Regional Park to allow dogs under control on-leash on Mita Bay Loop Track and prohibited from Cudlip Point Loop Track, and that a dog-friendly campground be created” [REG/2018/79] and instead retain the status-quo rules for the Mahurangi Regional Park.
h) agree that the statement of proposal be amended to include an option outlining the ability for local boards to determine the time and season provisions for their local board areas.

3. The original report only to the 14 February 2019 Regulatory Committee is appended at Attachment A.

4. The Regulatory Committee requested changes to the Statement of Proposal prior to it being presented to the Governing Body. Those changes have been made and an amended Statement of Proposal with changes highlighted is appended at Attachment B.

Ngā tūtorhunga
Recommendation/s

That the Governing Body:

a) adopt the statement of proposal in Attachment B of the agenda report for public consultation and confirms that the draft bylaw:
   i) is the most appropriate and proportionate way to implement aspects of the policy
   ii) is not inconsistent with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990.

b) forward to local boards and advisory panels:
   i) the statement of proposal in Attachment B of the agenda report for their views
   ii) this agenda report and attachments for their information.

c) note delegated authority to the chair of the Regulatory Committee to make replacement appointments to the panel if a member of the panel is unavailable.

d) note delegated authority through the chief executive to staff approved by a manager responsible for bylaws to receive public feedback at ‘Have Your Say’ events.

e) note delegated authority through the chief executive to a manager responsible for bylaws to make any amendments to the statement of proposal in Attachment B of the agenda report to correct errors, omissions or to reflect decisions made by the Regulatory Committee or the Governing Body.

f) note the Regulatory Committee’s agreement that the statement of proposal be amended to include an option outlining the ability for local boards to determine the time and season provisions for their local board areas.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>14 February 2018 - Original Agenda Report</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to the Regulatory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Amended Statement of Proposal with changes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>highlighted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

Authors  Samdra O’Toole - Team Leader Governance Advisors

Authorisers Stephen Town - Chief Executive
Statement of Proposal

Auckland Council’s New Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw
February 2019
1 Have your say

Under the Dog Control Act 1996 (the Act), Auckland Council must adopt a policy on dogs. The Act lists several requirements that the council must include in its policy. The Act also enables the council to make a bylaw to implement aspects of the policy.

Auckland Council last adopted its Auckland Policy on Dogs (the Policy) and Dog Management Bylaw (the Bylaw) in 2012. In November 2018, the Regulatory Committee completed its statutory review of the Policy and Bylaw and agreed that they should be amended. This document highlights the proposed changes to the Policy and Bylaw to ensure they meet the future needs of Auckland.

What Auckland Council does

Public places in Auckland are used for a variety of purposes, including exercising dogs. However, not all people enjoy the company of dogs. We make rules and provide services that aim to better manage dogs in Auckland. We do this through promoting responsible dog ownership, classifying dogs as dangerous or menacing, developing access rules, and taking measures to minimise nuisance caused by dogs, as set out in the Policy and Bylaw.

Improving dog access, while minimising the harm caused by dogs

The council recently reviewed how the current approach to dog management is working. The main changes we propose to make are to:

- reorganise the Policy and Bylaw information into user friendly themes
- remove duplication from the Bylaw, which will also simplify future amendments
- reduce confusion about dog access rules and improve voluntary compliance by:
  - presenting the rules in the schedule in a consistent manner
  - applying a consistent definition of time and season
  - applying consistent rules to multiple dog ownership
- address emerging issues around dog management by:
  - including specific reference to the Code of Welfare
  - extending environmental protection to include flora
  - clarifying delegations and processes for additional designated exercise areas
  - clarifying the enforcement requirement to neuter uncontrolled dogs
  - clarifying the council’s jurisdiction on privately owned public spaces
  - promoting responsible dog ownership amongst owners of dogs classified as ‘menacing’ on the basis of their behaviour
  - reviewing access rules in regional parks.

What is not changing

This review of the current Policy and Bylaw is not intended to change local dog access rules (where dogs are allowed under control on leash, off leash or prohibited areas and designated dog exercise areas). Local dog access rules are determined by local boards.
We want to know what you think
Starting on 1 April through to 10 May 2019, we want you to tell us what you think about the proposed changes to the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2012 and Dog Management Bylaw 2012. Please visit www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/ have-your-say to find out more information, give your feedback and find out where you can drop in to a ‘Have Your Say’ event.
2 What is the Policy?

Kaupapa mo ngā Kuri 2012 (The Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2012) sets out the framework for dog management in Auckland. The Policy aims to keep dogs as a positive part of Aucklanders' lives. This is achieved by maintaining opportunities for dog owners to take their dogs into public places, while adopting measures to minimise the problems caused by dogs.

Policy requirements as listed in the Dog Control Act 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specify the nature and application of bylaws.</th>
<th>Identify areas or parts of the district in respect of which no public places or areas are to be identified as prohibited generally or at specified times or under control on a leash.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify public places in which dogs are to be prohibited, generally or at specified times.</td>
<td>State whether dogs classified as menacing are required to be neutered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify public places or parts of the district in which dogs are required to be under control on a leash.</td>
<td>State whether dogs classified as menacing by any other territorial authority and registered with council are required to be neutered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify areas as designated dog exercise areas.</td>
<td>Shall include other details, as council sees fit, including but not limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• fees or proposed fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• owner education programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dog obedience courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• classification of owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• disqualification of owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• issuing of infringement notices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In adopting a policy, the council must have regard to:

- minimising danger, distress and nuisance to the community generally
- avoiding the inherent danger in allowing dogs to have uncontrolled access to public places that are frequented by children, whether or not accompanied by adults
- enabling, to the extent practicable, the public (including families) to use streets and public amenities without fear of attack or intimidation by dogs
- the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners.

In addition to the above, every policy adopted:

- must identify any land within the district that is:
  - a controlled dog area or open dog area under section 26Z3 of the Conservation Act 1987
  - a national park constituted under the National Parks Act 1980
  - Te Urewera, as defined in section 7 of the Te Urewera Act 2014.
- may contain other information and advice related to dogs as the territorial authority deems necessary.
3 What is the Bylaw?

Under the Dog Control Act 1996, Auckland Council can make a bylaw for certain aspects of dog management. Ture a Rohe Tiakiho Kuri, (The Dog Management Bylaw 2012) currently:

- regulates public places where a dog may be taken by its owner and the means of control of the dog
- limits the number of dogs that may be kept on any land or premises
- requires the owner of any dog that defecates in any public place or on land or premises other than that occupied by the owner to immediately remove the faeces
- requires any female dog to be confined but adequately exercised while in season
- requires the owner of any dog (being a dog that, on more than one occasion, has not been kept under control) to neuter it.

The Bylaw does not determine the dog access rules on individual parks, beaches and foreshore areas, as these are contained within the schedules of the Policy. Local dog access rules are determined by the local boards.
4 How we implement the Policy and Bylaw

The council uses a ‘graduated response’ when responding to complaints and concerns surrounding dog management (Figure 1). This means that the types of response and response times will vary depending on the level of risk, seriousness of harm, people’s attitude towards compliance, and what is most practical.

Lower risk issues are first addressed with education, advice, and informal warnings. If this doesn’t work, the council may issue formal warnings. For serious or ongoing bylaw breaches, the council may take enforcement measures such as issuing an infringement notice or prosecuting individuals.

Figure 1: Council’s risk-based, ‘graduated response’ approach

- **Send a message**
  - **Goal:** send a message and increase perception of risk and consequence
  - **Primary tools:**
    - Monitoring
    - Strong, well-targeted enforcement action and communication aimed at making an example
    - Communicate consequences of non-compliance

- **No compromise**
  - **Goal:** to actively identify areas of risk, deter non-compliance, and respond quickly to identified harm.
  - **Primary tools:**
    - Monitoring
    - Strong, well-targeted enforcement action and communication
    - Strong and fast response
    - Communicate consequence of non-compliance

- **Make it easy**
  - **Goal:** make compliance low cost and easy
  - **Primary tools:**
    - Clear, passive (web) communication
    - Easy to use, accessible services

- **Help them out**
  - **Goal:** make it easy to comply and actively monitor risk
  - **Primary tools:**
    - As for ‘Make it easy’ plus
    - Active monitoring or risk areas
    - More active engagement and partnership with regulated parties in higher risk areas

**Notes:**
- **An effective regulatory approach requires both:**
  - Focusing on the right things – targeting efforts at the areas where there is the greatest risk of potential harm.
  - Applying the right approach – selecting the compliance tool based on the attitude and motivation of regulated parties towards compliance.

**The matrix to the right shows the approaches that may be required when these two elements are combined.**

**Effective intelligence gathering, and data analysis is fundamental to inform the focus and approach to take.**
5 What council proposes to change

The council recently reviewed the current Policy framework and identified some improvements that could be made.

The changes that the council is proposing to make to the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2012 and Dog Management Bylaw 2012 are summarised below. These are reflected in the attached proposed policy and bylaw.

Proposed amendments to the current Policy and Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed amendment</th>
<th>Reason for proposed change</th>
<th>Change in Policy</th>
<th>Change in Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of Policy content</td>
<td>The proposed policy has been reorganised into user friendly themes. It also better highlights the relationship between the Policy and the Bylaw, and clearly states what is expected of dog owners and what activities Auckland Council will undertake to manage dogs.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of duplicate information</td>
<td>Schedules 1 and 2 are duplicated in the current Policy and Bylaw. These have been removed from the proposed bylaw and are now contained in the proposed policy only. This change will also make it easier for local boards to make future amendments to local dog access rules.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference the Code of Welfare for dogs</td>
<td>The Code of Welfare for Dogs from the Animal Welfare Act 1999 is now referenced in the proposed Policy. Reference to the Code highlights owner obligations. These are already used by council staff.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and season definition 10am to 7pm from Saturday of Labour Weekend to 31 March</td>
<td>Please see information below for more detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying the council’s jurisdiction on privately owned public spaces</td>
<td>Schedule 1 of the current Policy identifies dog access rules for council controlled public places.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dog access to public places not under control of council is prohibited, unless permission is obtained by the person in charge of that place or there is signage indicating that dogs are allowed.</strong> An explanatory note has been added to the proposed Policy to clarify that public places under co-governance arrangements are considered privately-owned public spaces, therefore governed by this rule, unless they are specifically stated in Schedule 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardise the way local dog access rules are organised in Schedule 2.</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current Policy assumes a default rule of dogs being under control on leash. Local boards have introduced rules into Schedule 2 which have created different default rules for their areas. Schedule 2 of the proposed policy no longer contains different default rules. Rules are presented in a consistent format which will make it easier for owners to know where they can take their dog. This will not change the types of access rules that are currently applied in any local beach, park or reserve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased protection for flora that are vulnerable to dogs.</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council is proposing to extend its ability to make temporary changes to dog access rules to protect flora vulnerable to dogs, such as kauri.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owners will only require a multiple dog ownership licence for more than two dogs in properties zoned as urban residential in the Unitary Plan.</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current Policy and Bylaw have different rules for multiple dog ownership depending on where the dog owner lives. The proposed policy and bylaw standardises the rule across Auckland. Most residential properties are adequate to home two dogs, however greater issues tend to arise where three or more dogs are kept on the property. The purpose of the licence is to ensure the aspects of dog welfare are addressed.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouraging responsible dog ownership for menacing dog owners.</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed policy allows for owners of dogs classified as menacing due to behaviour, to have the opportunity to have their dog’s classification reviewed if the owner provides evidence of completing a dog obedience course (at the owner’s expense), and the owner has not obtained any infringements in relation to the dog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement to neuter an uncontrolled dog.</th>
<th>within a 12-month period. The removal of classification of the dog is at the discretion of council. This change is intended to incentivise dog owners to modify their dog’s behaviour and promote responsible dog ownership.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying intent of owners picking up after their dog.</td>
<td>The proposed bylaw includes an explanatory note to clarify that owners who do not comply with current requirements to neuter their dog, if it is not under control on more than one occasion over a 12-month period, may be subject to an infringement and would still be required to neuter their dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to regional parks</td>
<td>Clause 11 of the Bylaw requires owners to immediately pick up after their dog after it defaecates. This section has been reworded to clarify the intent of this clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a standard time and season definition of 10.00 am to 7.00 pm from the Saturday of Labour Weekend to 31 March</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a standard lambing season rule to prohibit dogs from 1 July to 1 December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• amend dog access rules to protect wildlife in the following region parks: o Glenfern Sanctuary o Mumwai Regional Park o Long Bay Regional Park o Waitakere Ranges Regional Park - Whatipu</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What council is proposing for the time and season definition**

The purpose of a time and season rule is to minimise the conflict between dogs, their owners and other users of busy public places. The time and season rules does this by prioritising different users at different times of the day (morning, daytime and evening) during the busy summer period.

**Local boards are responsible for deciding:**

- where a time and season rule applies (location)
- the type of dog access (i.e. prohibited, on-leash, off-leash or designated dog exercise area)
- what the winter time access rule will be.
For example, a local board may decide that a beach is off-leash before 10am, prohibited between 10.00am and 7.00pm and off-leash after 7.00pm.

The previous policy had the time and season definition of 10.00am to 5.00pm from Saturday of Labour Weekend to 1 March. Local boards have chosen to adopt variations to this definition, which has resulted in thirteen local board variations and only one local board is using the current definition in areas within their local board area.

What we are proposing

The proposed policy is recommending a time and season definition of 10.00am to 7.00pm from Saturday of Labour Weekend to 31 March to be applied to those areas that have been identified by local boards. A standard time and season would make it easier for dog owners to know when and where they can take their dogs and make enforcement easier for Animal Management Officers.

Local beaches, parks or foreshores that apply a time and season rule may have their hours of access changed as a result of this review.

Concerns raised

On 14 February 2019, the Regulatory Committee debated concerns around proposed time and season definition and raised the following issues:

- 7.00pm being too late in the evening
- Whether there is a need for a regionally consistent time and season definition
- Local variation allows for the needs of communities to be met.

Alternative option

The alternative option to having a regionally consistent time and season definition would be to have a default definition in the Policy, and enable local boards to introduce variations to this through the local rules in Schedule 2 of the Policy. Auckland council is also seeking feedback on this alternative option.
6 How we got here

Decisions leading to the proposed changes

The Local Government Act 2002, requires council to review its bylaws every five years to determine whether they are effective, efficient and still needed.

The Dog Control Act 1996, states that the bylaw and policy must not inconsistent. Therefore, the review of the Policy must precede the review of the Bylaw.

Auckland Council reviewed dog management in the region. Staff have reported these findings and considered its options at meetings in June and September 2018, these are summarised below:

March 2017
REG/2017/16

June 2018
REG/2018/44
Council considers the findings of the effectiveness of the current Policy and Bylaw

August 2018
Local board resolutions included feedback on issues under review.

8 November 2018
REG/2018/78
REG/2018/79
Council considers key issues and options for the regional review and dog access rules in regional parks. Council agrees to amend the current Policy and Bylaw.

To access a copy of the above decisions, go to: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/have-your-say
7 We want your input

You have an opportunity to tell us your views

We would like to know what you think about the proposed Policy and Bylaw that will impact the future of dog management in Auckland.

Give us your feedback

Starting on 1 April 2019 through to 10 May 2019 we will be seeking feedback on the Policy and Bylaw.

You can give your feedback:

- in person at one of our six ‘Have Your Say’ events – visit our website for details
- online at our website, www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/your-say
- online services and paper copies of the materials are available at our libraries.

Your name and feedback will be available to the public in our reports and online. All other personal details will remain private.
Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2019

April 2019
Kaupapapa mo ngā Kuri 2019
Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2019

As at X month 2019
Resolution: GB/2019/XX
Xx month 2019

Pursuant section 10 of the Dog Control Act 1996, the Auckland Council adopts this policy on dogs. This policy applies to the district of Auckland.

Commencement
This policy comes into force on X month 2019.

Objective
To keep dogs as a positive part of the life of Aucklanders by maintaining opportunities for owners to take their dogs into public places, while adopting measures to minimise the problems caused by dogs.

How will Auckland Council achieve this Policy Objectives?

1. Registration and Classification
   Promote dog registration across all of Auckland.

2. Responsible Dog Ownership
   Educate and inform dog owners how to take care of their dogs.

3. Dog Access Principles
   Provide a balanced approach to dog access in council-controlled public places.

4. Monitoring measures of success
   Annually report to the Governing Body (through a public agenda report) and to the national government as required by the Dog Control Act 1996.

Interpretation
Access way has the meaning given by section 315 the Local Government Act 1974.

Beach means and includes the following:

(a) the foreshore as defined by section 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991
(b) the inter-tidal zone above the mean low water spring
(c) any adjacent area that can reasonably be considered part of the beach environment including areas of sand, pebbles, shingle, dunes or coastal vegetation and includes the adjacent coastal marine.

Cemetery means any land or premises for the burial and/or cremation of the dead and includes a closed cemetery and urupā.

Control in relation to a dog, means that the owner is able to obtain an immediate and desired response from the dog.
Council-controlled public place means all public places owned or managed by Auckland Council or a substantive council-controlled organisation (as defined in section 4(1) of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009). This includes land owned or managed by Auckland Transport.

Footpath has the meaning given by section 315 of the Local Government Act 1974.

Foreshore has the meaning given by section 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Licence means a licence, permit or approval to do something under the Dog Management Bylaw 2019 and includes all conditions to which the licence is subject.

Owner has the meaning given by section 2 the Dog Control Act 1996.

Park/Reserve any land vested in or administered by the council under the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977 or any park, domain or recreational area under the control or ownership of the council.

Playground means an outdoor area developed that contains children’s play equipment or objects. Use of a playground means that the playground is currently being used or occupied by one or more persons.

Public place has the meaning given by section 2 of the Dog Control Act 1996, includes:

(a) any aircraft, hovercraft, ship or ferry or other vessel, train, or vehicle carrying, or available to carry passengers for reward

(b) any council controlled public place.

Road has the meaning given by section 315 of of the Local Government Act 1974 except that where a road is adjacent to a park, and the land within the road and park is developed in an integrated way, the common boundary between the road and park will be reduced or extended to:

(a) a line parallel to the road that follows any physical separation between the road and park (e.g. fence or bollards); or

(b) where no physical separation exists, a line parallel to the road that follows the edge of the road carriageway, footpath or cycle track that is closest to the centre of the park.

Service lane has the meaning given by section 315 the Local Government Act 1974.

Sports surface includes any area developed or marked out, for example those used for soccer, rugby, or rugby league, artificial turf, sports range, sports park or velodrome. Use of a sports surface means that the area is being used for sport events or training for sports events by one or more persons.

Working Dog has the meaning given by section 2 of the Dog Control Act 1996.

Related information
Working dogs include disability assist dogs, dogs kept by state departments such as police dogs and customs dogs, pest control dogs and dogs kept solely or principally as stock or herding dogs. A full list can be found in section 2 of the Dog Control Act 1996.
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Registration and Classification

All dogs in Auckland, including dangerous and menacing dogs, will be registered with council

What will Auckland Council do?

1. Provide registration administration services including:
   (a) maintain a record of all dogs registered in Auckland, including those classified as dangerous and menacing
   (b) maintain a record of probationary and disqualified owners
   (c) inform and educate dog owners through the registration process
   (d) set fees to cover costs of essential services to support dog management activities in Auckland
   (e) provide incentives to promote responsible dog ownership
   (f) follow up on non-registered dogs and non-compliance with local authority bylaws.

2. Provide incentives, information, education and services (e.g. school education programmes)

3. Maintain dog compliance and enforcement best-practice that proactively uses Auckland Council’s powers¹ to:
   (a) enforce registration (including through the use of seizure powers) and micro-chipping of dogs
   (b) enforce the de-sexing of uncontrolled dogs
   (c) seize and hold dogs that are a threat to public safety
   (d) classify dogs identified in Schedule 4 of the Dog Control Act 1996, to be dangerous or menacing
   (e) ensure compliance with classification requirements.

Classification requirements for dangerous dogs
- The owner of a dangerous dog must pay 150% of the applicable registration fee. Ownership of the dog cannot change without consent from council.
- The dog must be:
  i. kept within a securely fenced portion of the owner’s property which provides dog-free access to at least one door of any dwelling on the property
  ii. muzzled in any public place or private way except when confined in a vehicle or cage
  iii. controlled on a leash (except when in a designated dog exercise area)
  iv. neutered.

¹ powers include issuing warnings and instant fines (infringement notices), powers to seize, destroy, or take custody of dogs and to classify dogs, and to the classify, prosecute and recover costs from owners.

Attachment B

Item 20
Classification requirements for menacing dogs
A dog classified as menacing must be:
- muzzled in any public place or private way except when confined in a vehicle or cage
- neutered
- these requirements apply to dogs classified by any other council and registered with Auckland Council.

What does Auckland Council expect of dog owners?
1. Register your dog(s)
2. Obtain a licence to keep multiple dogs on a premise
3. Owners of dogs classified as dangerous or menacing must meet the expectations under the Dog Control Act 1996 (section 32 and section 33E)
4. Owners classified as probationary or disqualified must meet the requirements under the Dog Control Act 1996 (section 21 and section 25).

What is covered by the Dog Management Bylaw 2019?
1. Owners of more than two dogs must hold a valid multiple dog ownership licence
2. Owners of dogs classified as menacing due to the behaviour of the dog, are encouraged to undertake steps towards responsible dog ownership to be eligible to have the classification of their dog(s) reviewed.

Owners that do not comply with the above are in breach of the Dog Management Bylaw 2019 and may be subject to an infringement.
responsible Dog Ownership

Dog owners will care for their dogs and control them around people to protect wildlife, other animals, property and natural habitats

What will Auckland Council do?

1. Provide services that support promoting responsible dog management, including:
   (a) 24-hour dog management service
   (b) dog education community events and the production of supporting publications
   (c) advice on dog related problems
   (d) emergency assistance with dogs involved in accidents or police operations
   (e) street patrols
   (f) investigation and resolution of incidents of:
      i. wandering, barking, fouling, aggressive, and menacing or dangerous dogs
      ii. impounding and kennel maintenance
      iii. proceedings against dog owners for offences where all other means have failed
      iv. livestock concerns
      v. abandoned dogs.


3. Reduce the danger and nuisance caused by dogs by:
   (a) receiving, investigating and resolving dog complaints
   (b) providing community education to increase public awareness on how to be safe around dogs (target children, families and people working in the community)
   (c) promoting dog safe communities through encouraging compliance and undertaking enforcement
   (d) ensuring public safety and comfort, changing attitudes and behaviours of irresponsible dog owners, and where appropriate penalising irresponsible dog owners.

What does Auckland Council expect of dog owners?

1. Know and comply with the laws concerning the management of your dog
2. To be responsible for your dog’s behaviour
3. Provide proper care and attention to your dog, including providing sufficient food, water, shelter and adequate exercise
4. Consider neutering your dog at an early age
5. Microchip your dog
6. Take all reasonable steps to ensure your dog does not cause a nuisance to any other person. Be particularly vigilant near children and closely supervise interaction
7. Keep your dog under control at all times, this may include putting your dog on a leash, or a shortened leash in areas where your dog is likely to ignore commands (even if it is an off-leash or designated dog exercise area)
8. Respect other people's personal space. Public places are for everyone’s enjoyment and not everyone is fond of dogs
9. Ensure your dog cannot leave your property by itself
10. Know when your dog must be on a leash, and always carry a leash in public.

What is covered by the Dog Management Bylaw 2019?
1. When in a public place or premise, dog owners must ensure the immediate removal and disposal of their dog’s faeces in a way that does not cause nuisance
2. Dog owners must neuter their dog, if the dog has been found to be uncontrolled more than once in a 12-month period.

*Owners that do not comply with the above are in breach of the Dog Management Bylaw 2019 and may be subject to an infringement.*
Dog Access Principles

Provide a balanced use of public places for dogs and their owners, while minimising the harm caused by dogs

What will Auckland Council do?

1. Provide dog access rules that are comprehensive, consistent and easy to understand and comply with the following approaches:
   (a) Recognise dog owners as legitimate users of public places and dog access is essential for dog welfare
   (b) Provide opportunities for dog owners to take their dog to public places that are accessible, desirable, and provide diversity of experience for both the dog and owner
   (c) Consider access on a comprehensive region-wide basis, as well as a place-by-place basis
   (d) Promote safe interaction between dogs and people using public places and private ways to ensure that dogs do not injure, endanger, intimidate or otherwise cause distress to any person, in particular, children and vulnerable adults
   (e) Manage the conflict between dogs and protected wildlife, stock, poultry, domestic animals, property and natural habitat.

2. Maintain rules on dog access in public places and private ways (see Schedule 1 and 2)
   The types of dog access rules are:
   (a) prohibited area – a place where dogs are not permitted to be, and other users have absolute priority
   (b) on-leash area – a place shared with other users, where dogs must be on a leash and under control at all times
   (c) off-leash area – a place shared with other users, where dogs may be off a leash but must still be under control at all times
   (d) designated dog exercise area – a place where dog owners are the priority user. Dog owners may take their dogs off a leash (including Dangerous Dogs) but they must be under control at all times
   (e) time and season areas – a place shared with other users, where the dog access rules will be different depending on the time of day during the summer season. This is to minimise the conflict between dogs and other users of the space during peak hours.

3. Apply default dog access rules to ensure that there is a rule applied to all public places in Auckland
   (a) Dogs must be under control on-leash in council-controlled public places unless otherwise stated in Schedule 1 and 2. This includes:
(b) Dogs are prohibited from any public place not under the control of council where rules have not been specified by the person in charge.

4. **Apply the following time and season definition**
   (a) 10.00am to 7.00pm between the Saturday of Labour Weekend and 31 March (summer)

   **Explanatory Note:**
   The relevant authority (local boards or delegated council committee) will decide:
   - where a time and season rule applies (location)
   - the type of dog access (i.e. prohibited, on-leash, off-leash or designated dog exercise area)
   - what the winter time access rule will be.

   For example, a local board may decide that a beach is off-leash before 10am, prohibited between 10.00am and 7.00pm and off-leash after 7.00pm.

5. **Consider the following before making any change to a dog access rule on parks and beaches that would provide more dog access:**
   (a) Identify and assess current and future uses of the place and whether there may be any potential conflicts to ensure the change would not result in any significant risk\(^2\) to any:
   - person (in particular children or vulnerable adults)
   - protected wildlife vulnerable to dogs (in particular ground nesting birds)
   - protected flora vulnerable to dogs (in particular kauri dieback)
   - stock, poultry, or domestic animal
   - property (in particular natural habitat and public amenities).

6. **Consider the following before making any change to a dog access rule on parks and beaches that would provide less dog access:**
   (a) Consider whether there are practicable alternative solutions to address the conflict between uses of the place\(^3\)
   (b) Ensure, to the extent that is practicable, that displaced dog owners and their dogs have access to other places or that such access is provided as part of the same decision.

---

\(^2\) Significant risk includes, but is not limited to, injury, danger or distress to people or animals stated, or nuisance to people.

\(^3\) Design and management solutions include fencing, different zones in one place, time-share arrangements, and under control on a leash dog access in relation to considering a change to prohibited dog access.
7. Before making any change or developing a park or beach as a designated dog exercise area, ensure that the –
   a. matters contained in section 5 above are satisfied
   b. area is well-located with vehicular and pedestrian access
   c. area has clearly visible boundaries. This may be achieved through transition zones, vegetation, topography and fencing. Boundary treatment will vary depending on the risks identified
   d. area is of sufficient size to provide dog owners with adequate space to exercise their dog
   e. area has sufficient sight lines that enable dog owners to be aware of the presence of other dogs and their owners
   f. area has adequate signage which clearly specifies the access rule
   g. provision of dog owner and dog amenities has been considered. Such amenities may include, but are not limited to, seats, bins and bag dispensers for dog faeces, and water stations.

8. Temporary changes to dog access rules
   a. From time to time, the council may make temporary changes to dog access rules in Schedule 1 and 2 in relation to:
      i. leisure and cultural events (including dog friendly events)
      ii. dog training
      iii. protect wildlife vulnerable to dogs
      iv. protect flora vulnerable to dogs
      v. pest control in any park and/or beach
      vi. other circumstances of a comparative nature.

What does Auckland Council expect of dog owners?

1. The owner of any female dog in season must ensure that dog does not enter or remain in any public place or private way unless:
   a. the dog is confined in a vehicle or cage for the purposes of transportation;
   b. the owner of that dog has the permission of the occupier or person controlling the public place and complies with any reasonable conditions imposed

2. Dog owners make reasonable effort to determine and comply with the dog access rule that applies in a park or beach before taking their dog(s) into the area

Additional information:
- Dogs confined in a vehicle or cage are not exempt from prohibited dog access rules. They are exempt from under control on-leash dog access rules.
- Dog access rules in Schedule 1 and 2 do not apply to any working dog (disability assist and police dogs).

What is covered by the Dog Management Bylaw 2019?
- Owners must exercise their dog(s) in locations or ways that are consistent with the dog access rules. This includes ensuring the dog is under control on-leash, off-leash or in a designated dog exercise area as specified.
- Dog owners must ensure that their dog is kept under control in public places or private ways.

Owners that do not comply with the above are in breach of the Dog Management Bylaw 2019 and may be subject to an infringement.
Schedule 1

General dog access rules

Dog access rules below apply and take precedence over a general access rule applied to the wider area (Schedule 2). For example, if a park (that contains a playground) allows dogs to be under control on-leash, dogs are prohibited from the playground.

(1) Playgrounds under the control of the council
   Dogs are prohibited on any playground at all times and must be under control on a leash in the vicinity of any playground when in use.

(2) Sports surfaces under the control of the council
   Dogs are prohibited on any sports surface at all times and must be kept under control on a leash in the vicinity of any sports surface when in use, unless the area is specified in Schedule 2.

(3) Council cemeteries, council camping grounds and council holiday parks
   Dogs are prohibited from all other council-controlled cemeteries unless stated in Schedule 2, unless:
   - permission is obtained from an authorised council officer, or
   - signage indicates dogs are allowed, provided that the person who is accompanying the dog complies with any reasonable conditions imposed by the council in relation to the dog.

Camping grounds and holiday parks under the control of the council
   Dogs are prohibited from all council-controlled camping grounds and holiday parks unless:
   - permission is obtained from an authorised council officer, or
   - signage indicates dogs are allowed, provided that the person who is accompanying the dog complies with any reasonable conditions imposed by the council in relation to the dog.

(4) Default dog access rules
   Unless otherwise stated in Schedule 2 the following default rules apply to:
   (a) Dogs must be under control on a leash in all council-controlled public places where there are no physical restrictions to access (such as fences or other indoor facilities)
   (b) Dogs are prohibited in all council controlled public places with restricted access (such as fenced sports stadiums, libraries) unless:
      i. permission is obtained from an authorised council officer, or
      ii. there is official council signage which indicates dogs are permitted.
   (c) Dogs are prohibited from all other public places not under control of council (such as cafes, shopping malls, school grounds, non-council cemeteries and urupā) unless:
      i. permission is obtained from the person in charge of the place, or
      ii. there is signage indicating that dogs are permitted.
(d) Where dog access is permitted under clauses 5(b) or 5(c) dog owners must comply with any reasonable conditions imposed by the council in relation to the dog.

Explanatory Note:
For the avoidance of doubt, areas under co-governance arrangement, such as the Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority are not council-controlled public places. Subject to clause (c) to (d) above unless they are specifically listed in Schedule 2.
Schedule 2: Dog Access Rules
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Albert-Eden Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following designated dog exercise areas:
   a) **Mangawhai Domain** - The fenced paddock between Clive Road entrance and Summit Road (Mt Eden Rd, Mt Eden)
   b) **Owairaka Domain** (Summit Drive, Mt Eden)
   c) **Tahaki Reserve** north-east of the bowl demarcated by the bush and pathway (Mt Eden Rd, Mt Eden)

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas:
   a) **Balmoral Heights Reserve**
   b) **Fowlds Park** Northern slope between Western Springs Rd and the park’s internal road
   c) **Harbutt Reserve**
   d) **Heron Park** west of the western end of the playground and bounded on the western boundary by the stream
   e) **Kerr Taylor**
   f) **Point Chevalier Beach** - east of the northern headland
   g) **Rawalpindi Reserve**
   h) **Tutuki Street Reserve**
   i) **Watea Reserve**
   j) **Waterview Esplanade Reserve**
   k) **Windmill Park** - grassed area at top of bank

3) Dogs are allowed at the following times –

   a) From the marker post located at the northern most access from Eric Armishaw Park onto the beach to the northern headland of Point Chevalier Beach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>Before 10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off a leash*</td>
<td>Under control off a leash*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>Under control on a leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm</td>
<td>After 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control on a leash</td>
<td>Under control off a leash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dogs are prohibited at all times from safe swimming areas or lanes marked out or identified by council on Point Chevalier Beach.
b) Dogs are allowed at the following times at Coyle Park -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10 am</td>
<td>Before 10 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>10 am to 4 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control on a leash</td>
<td>Under control on a leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7 pm</td>
<td>After 4 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Dogs are allowed at the following times at Watling Reserve -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10 am</td>
<td>Before 9 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>9 am to 5 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control on a leash</td>
<td>Under control on a leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7 pm</td>
<td>After 5 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas to protect wildlife –

a) **Eric Armishaw Park** – except for the open grass areas, boardwalks and walkways where dogs are allowed under control on a leash.

b) **Point Chevalier Beach** - from safe swimming areas or lanes marked out or identified by Council
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas:
   a) Achilles Crescent Reserve
   b) Alison Park
   c) Anakiwa Reserve
   d) Aramoana Reserve
   e) Auburn Street Reserve
   f) Augusta Reserve
   g) Baltimore Reserve
   h) Bardia Esplanade Reserve
   i) Barry’s Point Reserve
   j) Bayswater Esplanade Reserve
   k) Bayswater Park
   l) Becroft Park Reserve
   m) Belle Verde Reserve
   n) Belmont Park
   o) Blair Park
   p) Blakeborough Reserve
   q) Bond Reserve
   r) Brian Byrnes Reserve
   s) Calliope Reserve
   t) Charles Reserve
   u) Commodore Parry Reserve
   v) Crown Hill Reserve
   w) Devonport Domain
   x) Esmonde Road Reserve
   y) Fraser Reserve
   z) From the Devonport Boat Club to the stairs opposite 5 King Edward Parade. foreshore and beach
      aa) From the western side of Victoria Wharf to Spring Street, beach and foreshore
      ab) Fuji Reserve
      ac) Gair Lockout
      ad) Greville Reserve
      ae) Guiniven Reserve
      af) Hanlon Crescent Reserve
      ag) Hanlon Reserve
      ah) Hauraki Corner Reserve
      ai) Hill Park
      aj) Hurstmere Green
      ak) Jutland Reserve
      al) Kawerau Reserve
      am) Kenmure Reserve
      an) Kennedy Park beach and foreshore. Prohibited North of southern hedge of the observation post.
      ao) Kennedy Point Reserve
      ap) Killarney Park
      aq) Kings Store Reserve
      ar) Kitchener Park
      as) Kiwi Reserve
      at) Knightsbridge Reserve Green
      au) Lake Town Green
      av) Lansdowne Reserve
      aw) Laurina Reserve
      ax) Linwood Reserve
      ay) Marine Parade Reserve
      az) Marsh Reserve
      ba) Melrose Reserve
      bb) Midway Reserve
      bc) Montgomery Reserve
      bd) Mount Cambria Reserve
      be) Mount Victoria
      bf) Napier Reserve
      bg) Ngatararinga Bay Reserves
      bh) Nile Reserve
      bi) Northboro Reserve
      bj) Northcroft Esplanade Reserve
      bk) Norwood Road Esplanade Reserve
The following time and season rule applies to the following areas –

a) Dogs are allowed at the following times at the beaches and foreshores identified below -

i) From the northern end of Castor Bay to northern headland of Saint Leonards Beach (including Milford Beach, Thorne Bay and Takapuna Beach)

ii) From the northern headland of Narrow Neck Beach to the Devonport Boat Club (including Chellenham Beach, Torpedo Bay and Duder’s Beach) –

iii) Stanley Bay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>Before 10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>10am to 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>Under control on leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm</td>
<td>After 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Dogs are allowed at the following times at the parks identified below -

i) Balmain Reserve

ii) Bath Street Reserve

iii) Chellenham Beach Reserve

iv) Milford Reserve

v) Narrow Neck Beach Reserve

vi) Stanley Bay Beach Reserve

vii) Takapuna Beach Reserve

viii) Torpedo Bay Reserve

ix) Woodall Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>Before 10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>10am to 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control on leash</td>
<td>Under control on leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm</td>
<td>After 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas:
   a) **Kennedy Park** – North of the southern hedge of the observation post.
   b) **Ngatarina Bay** – Shell banks adjacent to Ngatarina Bay Access Road and Plymouth Reserve
   c) **Shoal Bay** – Shell banks, foreshore and associated mangrove areas from Esmonde (excluding formed boardwalks and bridges and foreshore west of Sandy Bay Road to Ngatarina Bay)

5) Dogs are allowed under control and on a leash in the following council controlled cemeteries:
   a) O’Neill's Point Cemetery
Franklin Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following designated dog exercise areas-
   a) Cape Hill Reserve, excluding the signposted area at the north/western corner.
   b) East Coast Rd Reserves, foreshore only
   c) Esplanade reserve from Hula Street to Totara Street, with access from fenced grazed area.
   d) Hickey's Reserve from Paerata Road to Childs Avenue.
   e) Karioitahi Beach, south of a line extending east/west from the southern wall of the Karioitahi Beach Lifesaving Clubrooms and north of a line extending east/west from the northern wall of the Public Toilet Block facility.
   f) Orua Bay, from the Orua Bay creek to Mako Point.
   g) Patumahoe Recreation Reserve in the Rata Street
   h) Reserve area along estuary access from Edgewater parade and Riverside Drive
   i) Roosevelt Reserve excluding the fenced grazed area
   j) The catchment reserve between Jackson Place and Ward Street

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas:
   a) Albacore Reserve
   b) Beachlands Domain
   c) Clevedon Kawakawa Bridge
   d) Clevedon Old Post Office Grounds
   e) Clevedon Scenic Reserve
   f) Clevedon Township Recreation Reserve
   g) Clevedon War Memorial
   h) Clevedon Wharf Reserve
   i) Constellation Park
   j) Green Bay Reserve
   k) Hawke Crescent Accessway
   l) Hunua Bowling Club and Field
   m) Hunua Domain Recreation Reserve
   n) Hunua Hall, Tennis and Netball Courts
   o) Hunua Rd Esplanade Reserves
   p) Hunua Township Field
   q) Hyland Place Esplanade Reserve
   r) Intrepid Crescent Reserve
   s) Jack Lachlan Drive Esplanade Reserve
   t) Jacobs Way Park
   u) Kawakawa Bay Coast Road Stream
   v) Kawakawa Coast Road Reserve

   w) Kawakawa Bay Foreshore
   x) Ken Parker Reserve
   y) Leigh Auton Reserve
   z) Liberty Park
   aa) Maraetai Dressing Sheds Reserve
   ab) Maraetai Park
   ac) Monico Homestead
   ad) Mihaka Park
   ae) Monument Road Reserve
   af) Motukaraka Reserve
   ag) Moumoukai Road Esplanade Reserve
   ah) North Road Reserve
   ai) Omana Avenue Esplanade Reserve
   aj) Omana Esplanade
   ak) Orere Point Hall Grounds
   al) Pine Harbour Park
   am) Platt Mills Reserve
   an) Pohutukawa Park
   ao) Pony Park Reserve
   ap) Porterfield Rd Esplanade Reserve
   aq) Potts Rd Esplanade Reserve
   ar) Puriri Rd Accessway
   as) Rautawa Place Reserve
   at) Shelly Bay Reserve
   au) Snapper Rock Reserve
3) The time and season rule applies to the following areas –
   a) Dogs are allowed at the following times at the beaches, foreshores and adjoining parks
      listed below -
      i) **Karioitahi Beach** - within an area bounded by two lines extending east/west from the
         southern wall of the Karioitahi Beach Lifesaving Clubrooms and the northern wall of the
         public toilet block facility
      ii) Kawakawa Bay Beach
      iii) Magazine Bay
      iv) Maraeai Beach
      v) Ohama Beach
      vi) Orere Beach
      vii) Sunkist Bay Beach
      viii) Waionamu Beach
     ix) Waiti Beach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>All times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control Off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Dogs are allowed at the following times at the beaches and foreshores identified
   below -
   i) All those beaches and adjoining parks from the south east boundary of Auckland
      (north of Wharekawa) northwards to and including Lot 1 2 DP 12729 (north
      of Matingarahati), except those areas identified as a dog exercise area.
   ii) Beach Road and the boat ramp at Grahams Beach.
   iv) Big Bay
   v) Clarks Beach from and including the beach frontage at Camp Morley and all
      adjoining beach and accessway reserves west of Camp Morley
   vi) Esplanade Reserve at the end of Brook Road, Awhitu
   vii) Glenbrook Beach and Glenbrook Landing Reserve.
   viii) Hamiltons Gap, within 250m either side of the creek mouth at the end of West
         Coast Road.
   ix) Hudsons Beach, between the boat ramp at the end of Hudsons
   x) Matakawau Point, Matakawau Beach and Sergeants Beach.
xi) Orua Bay, west of the Orua Bay creek.
  xii) Pollok Wharf.
  xiii) Te Toro.
  xiv) Waiaru Beach.
  xv) Wattle Bay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>All times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control on leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm to 10am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas
   a) George Kern Nature Reserve – protected wildlife areas
   b) Harris Nature Reserve - protected wildlife areas

5) The prohibition on any sports surface does not apply to the following areas when the
   sports surface is not in use or closed any area developed or marked out as a grass
   sports surface (sports field) in the former Franklin District.
Great Barrier Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following designated dog exercise area
   a) Okiwi northern side of airstrip next to the Okiwi airfield.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off leash in the following beaches -
   a) Awana Beach - from the Council access south to the point; prohibited North of the Council access
   b) Gooseberry Flat - from northern headland of Pah Beach south to the northern end of the playground on Gooseberry Flat. On a leash east of a line drawn from the public toilets at Pah Beach to southern headland of Pah Beach, continuing south east across the headland to a point in line with the ramp opposite 11 Blackwell Drive.
   c) Medlands Beach from the beach access beach access at The Lane walkway to the south, stopping 100 metres north of the creek. On a leash from beach access at The Lane walkway north and from 100 metres north of the creek.
   d) Mulberry Grove - the southern bank of the northern creek south to the northern bank of the southern creek
   e) Okupu
      Explanatory Note: Dogs are prohibited from the Okupu Bay Crown foreshore (DOC Map 6.33)

3) There are no time and season rules in the Great Barrier Local Board area.

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following area-
   a) Awana Beach - north of the Council access. South off Council access are allowed off leash

5) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash when the dog is swimming or walking in areas of the water in the following areas -
   a) Cecilia Sudden Bay
   b) Kairarara Bay
   c) Kiwiriki Bay
   d) Komahunga Bay
   e) Korotiti Bay
   f) Oneroa Bay
   g) Rangihawakaa Bay
   h) Rarohara Bay
   i) Sandy Bay
   j) Smokehouse Bay
   k) Waipapa Bay
   l) Wairahi Bay
   m) Whangawahia Bay - excludes DOC prohibited area

Explanatory note: dogs are allowed under control on a leash on the beach not covered by water, and are allowed under control off leash in the water.
## Henderson-Massey Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in Henderson-Massey Local Board area.
2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas:

<p>| a) Alan Reserve                     | ao) Emerald Valley Park          |
| b) Armada Reserve                  | ap) Epping Esplanade            |
| c) Astelia Grandis Reserve         | aq) Espalier Reserve            |
| d) Awaroa Park                     | ar) Fairden Reserve             |
| e) Babich Reserve                  | as) Falls Park                  |
| f) Barrys Reserve                  | at) Ferngrove Park              |
| g) Birdwood Park                   | au) Flanshaw Esplanade Reserve  |
| h) Bluebridge Reserve              | av) Flainty Reserve             |
| i) Border Road Esplanade           | aw) Forest Hill Park            |
| j) Bosun Reserve                   | ax) Fred Taylor Park            |
| k) Bridge Avenue Reserve           | ay) Gallony Park                |
| l) Bruce McLaren Memorial Park     | az) Glen Norman Reserve         |
| m) Buckingham Common               | ba) Giendene Reserve            |
| n) Buisson Glade Reserve           | bb) Gloria Park                 |
| o) Cartmel Reserve                 | bc) Greenberry Reserve          |
| p) Catherine Esplanade             | bd) Gus Nola Park               |
| q) Cellarmans Corner               | be) Halcyon Common              |
| r) Chilcott Brae                   | bf) Hamblin Reserve             |
| s) Chorley Reserve                 | bg) Harbourview Corner          |
| t) Claverdon Park                  | bh) Harbourview Oranghina the grass area to the West of the carpark, between carpark and Te Atatu Rd |
| u) Colwill Esplanade Reserve       |                                      |
| v) Corban Reserve                  |                                      |
| w) Corbans Estate                 | bi) Hart Domain                 |
| x) Coroglen Reserve                | bj) Harvest Reserve             |
| y) Corran Reserve                  | bk) Helena Park                 |
| z) Covil Park                      | bl) Henderson Creek Park        |
| aa) Cranwell Park                  | bm) Henderson Park              |
| ab) Cron Reserve                   | bn) Henderson Valley Green      |
| ac) Crosby Reserve                 | bo) Henderson Valley Park       |
| ad) Cyclorama Reserve              | bp) Hepburn Esplanade Reserve   |
| ae) Dalmatia Green                 | bq) Hilda Griffin Reserve       |
| af) Danica Reserve                 | br) Hindmarsh Green             |
| ag) Daytona Reserve                | bs) Holmes Reserve              |
| ah) Daytona Strand                 | bt) Howard Reserve              |
| ai) Divich Reserve                 | bu) Huruhuru Esplanade          |
| aj) Don Buck Corner                | bv) Jaemont Strand              |
| ak) Don Buck Prim Rec Reserve      | bw) Kaikoura Reserve            |
| al) DurhamGreen                    | bx) Kaumataua Reserve           |
| am) Edgelea Park                   | by) Kayle Glen Walk             |
| an) Elvira Walk                    | bz) Keegan Park                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a) Kelvin Strand | ed) Reynella Reserve |
| cb) Kemp Park | ee) Rhinevale Close |
| cc) Kensington Gardens | ef) Riverglade Esplanade |
| cd) Kevil Park | eg) Riverpark Reserve |
| ce) Kingdale Reserve | eh) Roberts Field |
| cf) Kopupaka Reserve | ei) Roberts Green |
| cg) Kopupaka Stream Reserve | ej) Roby Reserve |
| ch) Landow Reserve | ek) Rotary Park |
| ci) Laurieston Park | el) Royal Heights Park |
| cJ) Lavelle Reserve | en) Rush Creek Reserve |
| ck) Liburn Crescent Reserve | eq) San Bernadino Reserve |
| cl) Lincoln Park | ep) Sarajevo Reserve |
| cm) Lincoln Road Plant Reserve | eq) Semilion Reserve |
| cn) Lloyd Morgan Lions Club Park | er) Sherwood Reserve |
| co) Lockington Green | es) Spargo Reserve |
| cp) Lone Tree Park | et) Spinnaker Strand |
| cq) Lowtherhurst Reserve | eu) Springbank Esplanade |
| cr) Lydford Green | ev) St Margarets Park |
| cs) Makora Park | ew) Starforth Reserve |
| ct) Manutewhau Reserve | ex) Starling Park |
| cu) Marinich Reserve | ey) Sunhill Scenic Reserve |
| cv) Marlene Glade | ez) Sunline Park |
| cw) Martin Jugum Reserve | fa) Sunshine Boulevard Reserve |
| cx) Matipo Reserve | fb) Swan Arch Reserve |
| cy) Mcclintock Reserve | fc) Taipari Strand |
| cz) Mccormick Green | fd) Taitapu Park |
| da) McKinley Park | fe) Tatyana Park |
| db) McLeod Park | ff) Tawa Esplanade |
| dc) Meadow Glade | fg) Te Hauaru |
| dd) Mella Reserve | fh) Te Rangi Hiroa |
| de) Midgley Park | fi) Thehma Stream Reserve |
| df) Mill Way South Reserve | fj) Tirimana Reserve |
| dg) Millbrook Road Reserve | fk) Tracey Park |
| dh) Moire Park | fl) Trading Esplanade |
| dj) Mona Vale Reserve | fm) Triangle Park |
| dk) Murillo Reserve | fn) Trig Reserve |
| dl) Opanuku Reserve | fo) Trusts Esplanade Reserve |
| dm) Opanuku Stream Reserve | fp) Tuscan Green |
| dn) Pahi Park | fq) Urlich Esplanade Reserve |
| do) Pamalino Esplanade | fr) Valron Esplanade |
| dp) Parempaka Esplanade | fs) Vintage Reserve |
| dq) Parempuka Lakeside | ft) Vitasovich Esplanade |
| dr) Penfold Park | fu) Vodanovich Reserve |
| ds) Pioneer Park | fv) Waimanu Bay Reserve |
| dt) Plumer Domain | fw) Waimoko Glen Reserve |
| du) Pooks Reserve | fx) Waimoko Glen Reserve |
| dv) Provence Green | fy) Waitemata Corner |
| dw) Raelene Reserve | fz) Wakeling Park |
| dx) Railside Esplanade Reserve | ga) West Harbour Esplanade |
| dy) Ramlea Park | gb) Westgate Drive Park |
| dz) Ranui Domain | gc) Westglen Park |
| ea) Ranui Station Park | gd) Windy Ridge |
| eb) Realm Esplanade | ge) Woodford Reserve |
| ec) Rena Place Rec Reserve | gf) Woodside Reserve |
gg) Xena Park

gh) Zita Maria Park

3) There are no time and season rules in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area.

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas for the protection of wildlife -
   a) All beach and foreshore areas (except from 72R Spinnaker Strand to North East beach of Kelvin Strand

5) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash for two hours either side of high tide, to the north east beach of Kelvin Strand. Dogs are allowed under control on leash for the rest of the day.
Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas -

- Aicken Reserve
- Albatross Reserve
- Alverna Heights
- Amorino Reserve and beach
- Ardern Lookout Reserve
- Arklow Reserve
- Ascot Way Reserve
- Awanohi Reserve Redvales
- Awaruku Reserve
- Balboa Reserve
- Barwick Reserve
- Bayside Drive
- Bellbird Rise Reserve
- Blake Greens Millwater
- Blue Heron Rise Esplanade
- Brandon Reserve
- Brookvale Reserve
- Browns Walk Reserve
- Bruce Scott Reserve
- Brunton Park Reserve
- Buccaneer Court Recreation Reserve
- Burwood Reserve
- Bush Glen Reserve
- Buster Elliot Memorial Landing Reserve
- Cairnbrae Reserve
- Campbell Glade Reserve
- Cape Cod Drive
- Cedar Reserve
- Centreway and Florence Reserve Corner
- Centreway Reserve
- Chatham Hill Reserve
- Chevleton Reserve
- Churchill Reserve and beach
- Cochran Mckenzie Reserve
- Coventry Reserve
- Crampton Court Reserve
- Cranston Street Reserve
- Crocodile Island
- Crown Reserve
- Dacre Grove Reserve
- Dacre Historic and Esplanade Reserve
- Deborah Reserve
- Double Bay Place Reserve
- Duncansby Lookout and Esplanade Reserve
- East Avenue Tiri Road Esplanade
- Edith Hopper Park
- Elan Reserve
- Emlyn Place
- Everard Reserve
- Farnell Cascaden Reserve
- Ferry Rd/ Hawaiian Pde Junction
- Ferry Road Reserve
- Fitzwilliam Drive Reserve
- Flexman Place Landing Reserve
- Francis Avenue Reserve
- Galbraith Greens
- Garroway Green Reserve
- Gerontius Reserve
- Gilsenmann Reserve
- Glenelg Reserve
- Glenvar Glade Reserve
- Grant Park
- Grovenor Drive Reserve
- Gut Greens
- Gulf Harbour Drive Plantation Reserve
- Gulf Harbour Marina Hammerhead Reserve
- Gulf Harbour Recreation Reserve
- Hardley Reserve
- Hauraki Heights
- Hebron Reserve
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Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw Statement of Proposal resolution from Governing Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| bs) Higham Ferrers Reserve | dv) Rakauananga Point Esplanade |
| bt) Hunters Reserve       | dw) Red Beach Waterfront Reserve |
| bu) James Tifford Reserve | dx) Regency Park Drive Plantation Reserve |
| bv) Jamie Hansen Park     | dy) Regency Park Drive Reserve |
| bw) Jelas Saltwood Pond Reserve | dz) Ringwood Street |
| bx) Joydon Place Reserve  | ea) Riverside Road Esplanade |
| by) Kate Sheppard Reserve | eb) Roberta Crescent |
| bz) Kelly Greens          | ec) Rock Isle Beach Reserve |
| ca) Kensington Terrace Reserve | ed) Rosario Reserve |
| cb) Knights Reserve       | ee) Saddleback Reserve |
| cc) Kowhai Road Reserve   | ef) Seaforde Place Reserve |
| cd) Laurie Southwick Parade | eg) Seagate Reserve |
| ce) Longmead Reserve      | eh) Sealy Reserve |
| cf) Loop Road Reserve     | ei) Settlers Grove Reserve East |
| cg) Major Henry Greens    | ej) Settlers Grove Reserve West |
| ch) Marellens Drive Beach Reserve | ek) Shadon Reserve |
| ci) Matakaitia Beachfront Reserve | el) Shakespeare Esplanade Reserve |
| cj) Matakaitia Parade Reserve | em) Shakespeare Road Reserve |
| ck) Matakaitia Scenic Reserve | en) Sherwood Reserve |
| cl) Maygrove Esplanade Reserve | eo) Shuttleworth Reserve |
| cm) Maygrove Reserve      | ep) Siesta Terrace Reserve |
| cn) McKenzie Avenue Park  | eq) Silverdale Reserve |
| co) Metro Park North      | er) Silverdale War Memorial Park |
| cp) Millwater Park Bush Reserve | es) South Avenue Reserve |
| cq) Millwater Park Playground Reserve | et) Speedy Bush Reserve |
| cr) Moenui Avenue Reserve | eu) Stanmore Bay East Beach Reserve |
| cs) Moffat Esplanade Reserve | ev) Stanmore Bay West Beach Reserve |
| ct) Mollyhawk Reserve     | ew) Stanmore Bay West Reserve |
| cu) Montrose Terrace      | ex) Stanmore Bay Park, (grass between Stanmore Bay beach and open drainage are time and season) |
| cv) Moore Road Millwater  | ey) Stillwater Reserve |
| cw) Moreton Drive Bush Reserve | e2) Stony Homestead Silverdale |
| cx) Ngahere Jelas Reserve | fa) Strand Reserve Waiwera |
| cy) Nickell Place Reserve | fb) Stredwick Reserve |
| cz) Nukumeea Common Reserve | fc) Sundown Reserve |
| db) Oaktree Palliser Corner Reserve | fd) Swell Park |
| da) Oaktree Reserve       | fe) Taioatea Reserve |
| dc) Ocean View Road Plantation Reserve | ff) Tavern Road Esplanade Reserve |
| dd) Okoromai Reserve      | fg) Timberlands Reserve |
| de) Okura Esplanade Reserve | fh) Tindalls Bay Road Plantation Reserve |
| df) Okura Reserve         | fi) Tindalls to Crown Road Esplanade |
| dg) Orewa Marine Parade Reserve | fj) Tiri Reserve |
| dh) Otanerua Reserve      | fk) Titan Place Reserve |
| di) Owens Reserve         | fl) Totara Views Reserve |
| dj) Palmgreen Reserve     | fm) Vaughans Road |
| dk) Penguin Drive         | fn) Victor Eaves Park |
| dl) Penzance Road Reserve | fo) Vipond Road Beach Reserve |
| dm) Percy Greens          | fp) Wade Landing Reserve |
| dn) Pinecrest Drive       | fq) Waiake Esplanade Reserve |
| dp) Pinehill Lookout      | fr) Waiora Reserve |
| dq) Poplar Road Esplanade Reserve | fs) Waiwera Place Reserve |
| dr) Portal Place          | ft) Waiwera Road Esplanade Reserve |
| ds) Portland Greens       | fu) Waldorf Reserve |
| dt) Possum Ladder         |  |
3) The following time and season rule applies to the following areas –
   a) Dogs are allowed at the following times at the beaches and foreshores identified below
      i) Arkles Bay headland to headland
      ii) Big Manly Beach headland to headland
      iii) Browns Bay Beach
      iv) Campbells Bay Beach, including grass area at end of The Esplanade
      v) Fisherman's Rock
      vi) Hatfields Beach headland to headland
      vii) Little Manly Beach headland to headland
      viii) Mairangi Bay Beach
      ix) Matakana Bay headland to headland
      x) Murphys Bay Beach
      xi) Orewa Beach North Headland to Estuary Bridge Southern end
      xii) Red Beach headland to headland
      xiii) Rothesay Bay Beach
      xiv) Stanmore Bay headland to headland
      xv) Swann Beach headland to headland
      xvi) Tindalls Beach headland to headland
      xvii) Waiake Beach (including Rock Isle Beach)
      xviii) Waipuwa Beach from The Strand roundabout to southern headland.
      xix) Winstones Cove beach and reserve (Torbay)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>All times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm to 10am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Dogs are allowed at the following times at the identified areas below -
   i) Arkles Bay Beach - Front Reserve (grass)
   ii) Big Manly Beach - grass between The Esplanade and Browns Street
   iii) Browns Bay Beach Reserve (grass) and grass areas adjacent to Manly esplanade.
   iv) Campbells Bay Reserve (grass) (also known as Huntly Road Reserve)
   v) De Luen Avenue Beachfront Reserve (grass)
   vi) Mairangi Bay – Mairangi Bay Beach Reserve (grass) between Montrose Terrace and
       stream next to surf club*** and reserves opposite beach
   vii) Montrose Terrace and stream next to surf club*** and reserves opposite beach
   viii) opposite beach
   ix) Manly Park on the northern side of Laurence Street
   x) Matakana Parade Beach Front Reserve (grass)
   xi) Montrose Terrace and stream next to surf club and reserves
   xii) Murrays Bay – grass adjacent to Beach Road and Gulfview Road
xiii) Orewa Domain
xiv) Orewa Reserve Layby and Orewa Recreation Reserve (grass areas between holiday park and sand dunes)
 xv) Red Beach Waterfront Reserve (grass)
 xvi) Rothesay Bay Beach Reserve
 xvii) Stanmore Bay – grass between Stanmore Bay Beach and the open drainage channel. Dogs are allowed under control off-leash at all times on all other areas of Stanmore Bay Park.
 xvii) Waiake Beach Reserve (grass)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>All times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control on leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm to 10am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas to protect birdlife vulnerable to dogs
a) Orewa Estuary on all intertidal areas upstream of road bridge (SEAM2-72 and SEA-M2-72w1 in Unitary Plan)
b) The Strand roundabout and around the northern headland.
c) Walwera Beach from the public land, beach and foreshore north of
d) Walwera Bird Lookout (opposite 79 Weraunui Road).
e) Whiti Estuary Chenier Spits and Stillwater section of the Okura Bush Walkway (all of Pt Lot 4 DP 95984, East Coast Road, Redvale)
Howick Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in the Howick Local Board area.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas-
   a) Aberfeldy Park
   b) Annalong Park
   c) Armoy Park
   d) Aspatria Place reserve
   e) Aviemore Drive drainage reserve
   f) Baverstock Park
   g) Bell Reserve
   h) Blanche Park
   i) Bleakhouse Road Promontory Reserve
   j) Bob Charles Park
   k) Borolee Park
   l) Bradbury Park
   m) Browns Park
   n) Bucklands Beach Domain
   o) Bucklands Beach from Devon Road, around the foreshore of Musick Point Esplanade Reserve to northern water pipe on Eastern Beach
   p) Burswood Esplanade Reserve
   q) Burswood Park
   r) Cairngorm Park
   s) Caithness Park
   t) Cascades Walkways
   u) Charles Dickens Park
   v) Clavoy Park
   w) Clydesdale Park
   x) Coachman Park
   y) Cockle Bay Domain
   z) Cornelian Park
   aa) Corta Bella Place Reserve
   ab) Crawford Reserve
   ac) Curacao Place Esplanade Reserve
   ad) Dairyland Park
   ae) Dalwhinnie Park
   af) Darren Park
   ag) Earnslaw Park
   ah) Eastern Beach (north of northernmost water pipe, near Cloverley walkway)
   aj) Edendale Park
   ak) Elm Park
   al) Ennis Avenue Reserve
   am) Fortunes Park
   an) Fortyfoot Park
   ao) Frank Nobilo Esplanade reserve, including Pebble Beach Place Reserve
   ap) Fratley Park
   aq) Fremantle Place Esplanade Reserve
   ar) Galloway Park
   as) Geranium Park
   at) Gillard Reserve
   au) Glenhouse Reserve
   av) Glenlea Park
   aw) Glenmore Park
   ax) Glenoaks Reserve
   ay) Golfland Park
   az) Gossamer Park
   aaa) Grace Campbell Reserve
   ba) Gracechurch Reserve
   bb) Guys Reserve
   bc) Haven Park
   bd) Hawthornden Park
   be) Hayes Park
   bf) Highland Park
   bg) Hilltop Park
   bh) Himalaya Park
   bi) Hope Farm Avenue Esplanade Reserve
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bo) Kellaway Drive Reserve
cs) Reelick Park
bp) Kilimanjaro Park
cr) Reeves Park
bq) Kilkenny Park
cu) Rialto Park
br) Lexington Park
cv) Richard Park
bs) Lloyd Elsmore Park
cw) Riverhills Park
bt) Logan Carr Reserve
cx) Riverina Place Esplanade Reserve
bu) Macleans Reserve
cy) Salford Park
bv) Marine Parade Esplanade Reserve
cz) Seymour Road Esplanade Reserve
bw) Marrandillas Reserve
da) Sheffield Place Reserve
bx) Mattson Road Esplanade Reserve
ea) Somerville Park
by) McLeay Reserve
eb) Spalding Rise Reserve
bz) Medvale Park (Richmond Reserve)
ec) Spencer Park
cal) Mellons Bay (west of water pipe)
ed) Springs Road Reserve
cba) Millen Avenue Reserve
ee) Stevenson Reserve
cca) Mission Heights Reserve
ef) Stonedon Drive Esplanade Reserve
cda) Mulroy Park
eg) Tarnica Park
ce) Murphy's Bush in the open grass area
eh) The Boulevard Park
to the north of the car park
edi) Ti Rakau Corner Reserve
cf) Murvile Reserve
 ej) Ti Rakau Park
cgg) Musick Point Esplanade Reserve
el) Tigertail Park
ch) Neil Morrison Park
em) Tiara Place Reserve
cj) Orangewood Park
en) Tirauma Drive Reserve
cjk) Pakuranga Golf Club Esplanade
eo) Trugood Esplanade Reserve
ck) Pandora Park
ep) Tuscany Heights Reserve
cy) Pandora Place Esplanade Reserve
eq) Waitakirua Reserve
cnj) Paul Place Reserve
er) Wakaharanga Creek Reserve
cno) Pixie Place Reserve
es) Wayne Francis Park
cor) Point View Reserve in open grass
et) West Fairway Park
areas
eu) Whaka Maumahara Park
cot) Raewyn Place Esplanade Reserve
ev) Whitesares Park
crt) Redcastle Park
ew) Whitford Park

c) The following time and season rule applies to the beaches and foreshores identified
d) below –
e) Bucklands Beach (including the grass between the beach and The Parade) to south of
f) the boat ramp opposite Devon Road
b) Cockle Bay Beach
c) Eastern Beach south of northernmost water pipe (including grass between the beach
d) and The Esplanade) but does not include the Eastern Beach Caravan Park
e) Howick Beach from western most boat ramp to Rangitoto View Road
f) Little Bucklands Beach (including grass strip between the beach and The Parade) to
Warran Boardwalk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>All times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After 7pm</th>
<th>Under control off leash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4) Dogs are prohibited on the foreshore areas of:
   a) Bramley Drive Reserve
   b) Burswood Esplanade Reserve
   c) Chisbury Terrace Reserve
   d) Curacao Place Esplanade Reserve
   e) Dayspring Way Esplanade Reserve
   f) Edgewater Drive Esplanade Reserve
   g) Ennis Avenue Reserve
   h) Fisher Parade Esplanade Reserve
   i) Frank Nobilo Esplanade Reserve
   j) Fremantle Place Esplanade Reserve
   k) Hope Farm Esplanade Reserve
   l) Mangemangeroa Reserve
   m) Mattson Road Esplanade Reserve
   n) Millen Avenue Esplanade Reserve
   o) Pakuranga Country Club Esplanade Reserve
   p) Pandora Place Esplanade Reserve
   q) Pohutukawa Avenue Esplanade Reserve
   r) Raewyn Place Esplanade Reserve
   s) Riverhills Park
   t) Riverina Place Esplanade Reserve
   u) Rotary Reserve
   v) Stonedon Esplanade Reserve
   w) Tamaki Bay Drive Reserve
   x) The Sandspit (Mangemangeroa Creek)
   y) Tiraumea Park
   z) Trugood Esplanade Reserve
   aa) Williams Avenue Esplanade Reserve
   ab) All foreshore (intertidal, mangrove and saltmarsh) areas from Wakaaranga Creek to Highbrook Creek, including the Pakuranga Creek.
Kaipātaki Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in the Kaipātaki Local Board area.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas -

a) A F Thomas Park
b) Adah Reserve
c) Aeroview Drive Esplanade Reserve
d) Agincourt Reserve
e) Akoranga Reserve
f) Alan Tanner Reserve
g) Alice Place Reserve
h) Amelia Place Esplanade Reserve
i) Anne McLean Reserve
j) Arcadia Reserve
k) Ayton Reserve
l) Birkenhead War Memorial Park
m) Bonito Scenic Reserve
n) Brasseys Road Reserve
o) Cadness Loop
p) Cadness Reserve
q) Camelot Reserve
r) Castleton Reid Reserve
s) Celeste Reserve
t) Chelsea Bay
u) Chelsea Estate Heritage Park - park is off-leash but bushwalk is on leash
v) City View Reserve
w) Creasta Avenue Esplanade Reserve
x) Debbie Chamberlain Reserve
y) Diana Reserve
z) Downing Street Reserve
aa) Dudding Avenue Reserve
ab) Elliott Reserve
ac) Embassy Reserve
ad) Ferriglen Reserve
ae) Fernwood Grove
af) Fitzpatrick Bay
ag) Fowler Reserve
ah) Francis Kendall Reserve
ai) Fred Andersen Reserve
aj) Glencourt Reserve
ak) Glendhu Scenic Reserve
al) Glenfield Domain
am) Gold Hole
an) Greenslade Reserve
ao) Greenvalley Reserve
ap) Gretel Scenic Reserve
aq) Hadfield Street Reserve
ar) Halls Beach and Reserve
as) Heath Reserve
at) Highgrove Reserve
au) Hillcrest Reserve
av) Holland Reserve
aw) Holyoake Place Reserve
ax) Homewood Reserve
ay) Inwards Reserve
az) Island Bay
ba) Island Bay Reserve
bb) Jacaranda Avenue Reserve
bc) Jean Sampson Reserve
bd) Jessie Tonar Reserve
be) John Kay Park
bf) Kahika Point Reserve
bg) Kaipātaki Esplanade Reserve
bh) Kaipātaki Park
bi) Kathleen Reserve
bj) Kauri Glen Reserve
bk) Kauri Park
bl) Kauri Point Centennial Park
bm) Kelmar Scenic Reserve
bn) King Street Reserve
bo) Kitewao Street Esplanade Reserve
bp) Lancelot Reserve
bq) Lauderdale Reserve
br) Leiden Reserve
bs) Lenihan Reserve
bt) Lindisfarne Park
bu) Linley Reserve
bv) Locket Reserve
bw) Lynn Reserve
bx) Lysander Crescent Reserve
by) Manuka Road - foreshore to the north-east of the boat ramp (approximately 50m in width) to the mean mid tide springs
d) Rawene Road Reserve
df) Rewi Alley Reserve
dg) Ridgewood Reserve
dh) Rosie Bolt Reserve
bz) Manuka Neighbourhood Reserve
di) Ross Reserve
dj) Rotary Grove
dk) Sapphire Reserve
dl) Shepherds Park
dm) Sispara Place Reserve
dn) Spinella Reserve
df) Mick Stanley Memorial Reserve
no) Staffor Park
cg) Miraka Place Reserve
np) Stanaway Reserve
ch) Monarch Park
nq) Stanchich Reserve
ci) Monte Cassino Reserve
nr) Stanish Reserve
cj) Muriel Fisher Reserve
ds) Stokes Point
ck) Neal Reserve
dt) Sunnybrae Green
cl) Needles Eye Reserve
du) Sunnyhaven Avenue Reserve
cm) Nell Fisher Reserve
dv) Tamahere Reserve
cn) Neptune Avenue Reserve
dw) Target Reserve
co) Nikau Reserve
dx) Taurus Crescent Reserve
cp) Normanton Reserve
dy) Tenbless Reserve
cq) Odin Place Reserve
dz) Teviot Reserve
cr) Onepoto Domain
e) Totaravale Reserve
cs) Onewa Domain
eb) Tree View Reserve
c) Opaketai Beach Haven Garden
ec) Trelawny Reserve
cu) Oruamo Place Esplanade Reserve
ed) Trias Reserve
cv) Oruamo Reserve
ee) Tui Park
cw) Park Hill Reserve
ef) Vandelur Reserve
cx) Park Reserve
eg) Verran Road Esplanade Reserve
cy) Pemberton Reserve
eh) Waimana Avenue Foreshore
cz) Plantation Reserve
el) Winitia Reserve
da) Portsea Reserve
ej) Windy Ridge Reserve
db) Powrie Reserve
ek) Withford Scenic Reserve
dc) Raleigh Road Reserve
el) Woodcote Scenic Reserve
dd) Rangatira Reserve
em) Zion Hill Reserve

3) The following time and season rule applies to the beaches and foreshores identified below -
   a) From south of the Tennyson Street pedestrian underpass to the eastern headland of
      Chelsea Bay
   b) From the western headland of Chelsea Bay to the eastern headland of Fitzpatrick Bay
   c) From the western headland of Fitzpatrick Bay to the western headland of Beach Haven
      Beach (Hilders Park Beach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before 10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under control of leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under control on leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm to 10am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas due to special wildlife interest -
a) **Tuff Crater** – foreshore and mangrove due to special wildlife interest
b) East of the motorway and north of the Tennyson Street pedestrian under pass due to special wildlife interest
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following designated dog exercise areas:
   - Portage Canal Foreshore Reserve
   - Portage Canal Reserve
   - Seaside Park Foreshore
   - Stringers Point Reserve

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas:
   - Anarahi Park
   - Archboyd Road Reserve
   - Ashgrove Reserve
   - Atkinson Corner
   - Bader Drive Reserve
   - Beach Road Esplanade
   - Beach Road Reserve
   - Ben Lora Park
   - Black Bridge Reserve
   - Blake Road Reserve
   - Boggust Park
   - Buckland Park
   - Calvert Park
   - Church Street Foreshore Reserve
   - Cinnamon Road Reserve
   - Clare Place Reserve
   - Cottingham Reserve
   - Court Town Place Reserve
   - Crawford Road Reserve
   - Criterion Street Reserve
   - Cyclamen Park
   - David Lange Park
   - Deas Reserve
   - Dawhurst Park
   - Digby's Patch
   - Donnell Corner Park
   - Donnell Park
   - Eliets Beach
   - Favona Road Reserve
   - Ferguson Street Reserve
   - Gadsby Park
   - Gee Place Reserve
   - George Cox Reserve
   - Golden Acre Park
   - Hall Avenue Reserve

These areas are noted in Schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs.
3) Dogs are allowed at the following times –
a) Dogs are allowed at the following times at Shelly Bay Beach -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>All times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daytime</strong></td>
<td><strong>Daytime</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited from beach and Kiwi Esplanade from Mangere Boat Club to Shortt Ave**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unless for the purpose of moving through the park and boat club and the dog is under control on a leash.

4) There are no areas in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area where dogs are prohibited.
**Manurewa Local Board area**

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in the Manurewa Local Board area.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas-
   - Alex Maich Park
   - Afton Park
   - Alice Park
   - Anderson Park
   - Arline Schutz Park
   - Aronia Way Reserve
   - Azalea Park
   - Balfour Road Reserve
   - Balmore Park
   - Banyan Drive Reserve
   - Beaumonts Park
   - Becker Drive Reserve
   - Beihlers Road Foreshore
   - Berrima Place Reserve
   - Blackgate Reserve
   - Bluewater Place Foreshore
   - Browns Road Reserve
   - Burundi Avenue Foreshore
   - Cairnsvale Rise Reserve
   - Calluna Crescent Reserve
   - Camouftle Drive Foreshore
   - Carter Park Sharland Avenue Reserve
   - Centaph Park
   - Central Park
   - Charles Prevoist Drive Reserve
   - Clendon Community Centre Reserve
   - Correa Park
   - De Haviland Drive Drainage Reserve
   - Drucoses Road Reserve
   - Everglade Drive Park
   - Everglade Water Park
   - Fairchild Avenue Reserve
   - Fairchild Park
   - Feasegate Park
   - Felicia Park
   - Ferguson Street Reserve Manurewa
   - Finlayson Avenue Reserve
   - Finlayson Community House Reserve
   - Finlayson Park
   - Foxlaw Park
   - Frangipani Avenue Reserve
   - Frohisher Park
   - Gallowaer Park
   - Glenross Drive Foreshore
   - Glenveagh Park Drive Reserve
   - Gloucester Road Reserve
   - Goodwood Drive Reserve
   - Greenmeadows Reserve
   - Greens Road Foreshore
   - Hanford Place Foreshore
   - Hazards Road Foreshore
   - Helms Park
   - Heron Point Reserve
   - Hillcrest Grove Reserve
   - Holmes Road Reserve
   - Honey Park
   - Hyperion Park
   - Index Place Reserve
   - Innismara Park
   - Inverell Park
   - Jellicoe Park
   - John Walker Park
   - Kaimoana Street Esplanade Reserve
   - Kauri Point Reserve
   - Keri Anne Park
   - Kingsclere Place Reserve
   - Kirton Crescent Reserve
   - Kuripaka Crescent Reserve
   - Laurie Gibbons Memorial Park
   - Leabank Park
   - Leaver Park
   - Lemonwood Place Reserve
   - Lupton Road Reserve
   - Macadamia Park
   - Mahia Road Reserve
   - Manurewa Recreation Centre
   - Manurewa War Memorial Park
   - McLaughlins Road Reserve
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3) Dogs are allowed on the following times:

   a) Dogs are allowed on Shallow Water Beach from Rays Road to Gibbons Road and adjoining parks (including Keith Park) at the following times:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas:

   a) **Wattle Farm Reserve** in the wildlife protection area.
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in the Maungakiekie Tāmaki Local Board area.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas-
   a) Alcock Reserve
   b) Alfred St Reserve
   c) Allenby Reserve
   d) Captain Springs Reserve
   e) Dunkirk Reserve
   f) Eastview Reserve
   g) Fernwood Reserve the open area between Inglewood and Silverton Streets
   h) Flatrock Reserve Foreshore
   i) Gloucester Park northern side
   j) Maroa Reserve
   k) Niall Burgess Reserve
   l) Onehunga Bay
   m) Paihia Reserve
   n) Point England Esplanade Walkway
   o) Point England Foreshore
   p) Riverside Reserve
   q) Vic Cowan Reserve
   r) Wimbledon Reserve

3) The following time and season rule applies to the following areas --
   a) All beaches excluding Onehunga foreshore on the southern side of Orpheus Drive between the coastline below 54A Seadcliffe Road and the Manukau Cruising Club.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>Before 10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash if swimming or</td>
<td>Under control off leash everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walking in areas of water*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control on leash on areas not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>covered by water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>Under control on leash on areas not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>covered by water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under control off leash when the dog is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>swimming or walking in areas of the water*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash if swimming or</td>
<td>After 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walking in areas of water*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control on leash on areas not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>covered by water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dogs are prohibited at all times from safe swimming areas or lanes marked out by council.
4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas to protect wildlife -
 a) The eastern wildlife area of the Onehunga foreshore (the park (Taumanu Reserve) and beach areas on the southern side of Orpheus Drive located to the south and east of the westernmost path connecting the beachfront path to the eastern bridge) to the Manukau Cruising Club.
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**Örākei Local Board area**

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas Örākei Local Board area.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off in the following areas:

   a) Allen Johnstone Reserve
   b) Aotea Street Reserve
   c) Atkin Reserve
   d) Canon Park also known as Kenneth Small Reserve
   e) Cawley Street Reserve
   f) Churchill Park, excluding the area on eastern side of Churchill Park School from the Riddell Road entrance to 366B Riddell Road.
   g) Derby Downs
   h) Dingle Dell Reserve restricted to the flat-grassed areas only. The paths are for dogs on leashes only
   i) Fancourt Reserve
   j) Gentleman's Bay
   k) Glendowie Park
   l) Kelvin Reserve
   m) Koraha Reserve
   n) Ladies Bay
   o) Lingarth Reserve
   p) Mary Atkin Reserve
   q) Maskell Street Reserve
   r) Merton Road Reserve
   s) Michaels Ave Reserve - southern end of the reserve only
   t) Morin Road Reserve
   u) Norman Lesser Reserve/Pyatt Reserve
   v) Örākei Basin West and East Reserve from the car park from Örākei Rd and from the pathway from Upland Rd to the bottom of the Lucerne Rd access way
   w) Patteson Reserve
   x) Regents Park
   aa) Roberta Reserve - the off-leash area finishes at the bottom of Vista

   a) Shore Reserve East
   ac) Shore Road Reserve
   ad) Sierra Reserve
   af) Tautari Reserve
   ag) Thomas Bloodworth Park and on the Hobson Bay Walkway north of the stream where dogs are allowed under control on-leash
   ah) Ventnor Rd Reserve
   a) Waiata Reserve

   a) Waiautau Reserve - except in wetland areas where dogs are prohibited (including the main central wetland area (which includes the viewing platforms but excluding pond on eastern edge where dogs are allowed under control off-leash), and the smaller wetland area to the west and two smaller wetland areas to the east of the main central wetland area), and on tracks between the wetland areas and in the western part of the reserve where dogs are allowed under control on a leash (includes area off Grand Drive containing the car park, playground, basketball court and skateboard bowl to the fence before the open grass areas)

   ak) Waitararoba Reserve also known as Portland Reserve. The grassed area only, at the intersection of Portland and Shore Roads (Shore Rd, Remuera). Dogs are prohibited.
3) The following time and season rule applies to the following areas -
   a) Okahu Bay foreshore, and beach and foreshore areas after Okahu Bay to the Glendowie Boating Club, excluding Ladies Bay and Gentlemans Bay (including Mission Bay Beach, Kohimarama Beach, St Heliers Beach and Karaka Bay Beach) and on Wilson’s Beach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>Before 10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash*</td>
<td>Under control off leash *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited everywhere</td>
<td>Under control off leash*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm</td>
<td>After 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash *</td>
<td>Under control off leash *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Under control off leash in the water, under control on leash everywhere else

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas:
   a) From the marked swimming areas on Kohimarama beach and St Heliers Beach (area in front of the bathing sheds)
   b) On Tahuna Torea Reserve and the associated beach and foreshore, from the public walkway between 24 and 26 Vista Crescent to its boundary on West Tamaki and Tahaki Roads.
   c) On the foreshore after the Glendowie Boating Club to the public walkway between 24 and 26 Vista Crescent. This does not include in the water of the streammouth on the seaward side of the bridge on Roberta Reserve in which dogs are allowed under control off-leash.

5) The prohibition on any sports surface does not apply to the following areas when the sports surface is not in use or closed –
   a) Glover Park
   b) Madills Farm
Ötara-Papatoetoe Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following designated dog exercise area -
   a) 310 Te Irirangi Drive within the fenced area only

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas to protect wildlife
   a) Alexander Park
   b) Antrim Crescent Esplanade Reserve
   c) Aore Park
   d) Ashton Park (Motorway Off Ramp)
   e) Bairds Road 21r
   f) Beaufort Reserve
   g) Billington Esplanade Reserve (Wyomondley Road, Otara)
   h) Birmingham Park (Birmingham 1)
   i) Birmingham Reserve (Birmingham 2)
   j) Blair Park – Ötara
   k) Boundary Park
   l) Carlingbah Park
   m) Chamit Park
   n) Clayton Park
   o) Clutha Park
   p) Cooper Park (Whitley No 2 Reserve)
   q) Derimore Park
   r) Dismeyer Park
   s) Ferndown No 1 (65R)
   t) Ferndown Park (24R)
   u) Fisher Park
   v) Flinders Park
   w) Gaye Crescent/Eccles Place
   x) Gordon Park
   y) Hamill Reserve
   z) Harwood Reserve - Ötara
   aa) Hayman park
   ab) Israel Drainage Reserve
   ac) Kingswood Reserve
   ad) Kohuora Park
   ae) Kurt-Elsa Park
   af) Lappington Park
   ag) Laxon Esplanade Reserve
   ah) Lendfield Reserve
   ai) Mahon Park
   aj) Malaspina Reserve
   ak) Mathews Park
   al) Maxwell Park
   am) Mayfield Park
   an) Milton Park
   ao) Ngati Ötara Park on the open area to the west of the sportsfields adjacent to
   ap) Ötara Road
  aq) Omana Park
   ar) Orlando Park
   as) Ötara Creek (North)
   at) Ötara Creek Reserve
   au) Ötara Creek Reserve South
   av) Othello Park
   aw) Papatoetoe Recreation Ground
   ax) Pearl Baker Reserve
   ay) Penion Park
   az) Preston Road Reserve
   aaa) Puhinui Road 204 & 206 House
   Gmds Parks
   abb) Rainbows End Reserve
   bba) Redoubt Road Corner Reserve
   bb) Robert White Park
   bc) Rongomai Park
3) There are no time and season rules in the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board area.

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas to protect wildlife:
   a) Foreshore of the Tamaki Estuary within the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board area
      (including the foreshore adjacent to Highbrook Drive and Ngati Ōtara Reserves)
   b) Foreshore of the Manukau Harbour within the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board area
      (including adjacent to Puhinui Reserve and Colin Dale Park)
   c) Colin Dale Park
Papakura Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in the Papakura Local Board area.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas-
   a) Boundary Road Reserve (east of Lipton Grove)
   b) Brylee Reserve north of the stormwater channel
   c) Jack Farrell Park
   d) Longford Park Esplanade Reserve (also partially known as Wellington Park)
   e) Pahurehure Esplanade Reserve and boardwalk (foreshore walkway around Pahurehure Inlet from Longford Park Esplanade Reserve (also partially known as Wellington Park) to the Southern motorway boundary)
   f) Red Hill Scenic Reserve (between Red Hill Road and Hays stream)
   g) The Children’s Forest
   h) The reserve situated along the southern edge of the Papakura stream extending from the Southern Motorway to Porchester Road ( southern side of Trindon Street Reserve)
   i) Walter Stevens Reserve (south of car park to Pine Tree Point)

3) There are no time and season rules in the Papakura Local Board area.

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas
   a) Dogs are prohibited in the following foreshore areas to protect wildlife-
      i) Pahurehure Inlet foreshore
      a) Brylee foreshore and wetland
      b) Longford Park Esplanade Reserve (also partially known as Wellington Park)
      c) Harbourside Drive Esplanade
      d) Capriana Drive Esplanade
      e) Paraekau Road Esplanade
      f) Oakland Road Esplanade
      g) Hayfield Way Esplanade
      h) Conifer Grove Esplanade Reserve
      i) Drury Esplanade Reserve
      j) Waimana Reserve
   b) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas -
      i) Bruce Pulman Park
      ii) Central Park Reserve
      iii) Drury Domain
      iv) Pukekawiriki Paa
      v) Rollerson Park
vi) Southern Park (excluding 5 metre strip along western boundary of Kirks Bush)

vii) Village Green (bounded by Coles Crescent, Queen Street and East Street)
Puketāpapa Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-lease areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas Puketāpapa Local Board area

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas-
   a) Arkell Reserve
   b) Arthur Richards Park
   c) Big King Reserve
   d) Freeland Reserve
   e) Lynfield Cove on the beach and foreshore area—eastward to the boat ramp at Faulkner Bay (Waikowhai Park).
   f) Lynfield Reserve
   g) Monte Cecelia Park in the naturally formed bowl on the north-easterly side of the park between Pah Homestead and the Knoll.
   h) Nirvana Reserve
   i) The grassy area on the northern part of Manukau Domain from 137 Halsey Drive to 47 Sylvania Crescent,
   j) Underwood Park
   k) Waikowhai Park in the grassy area marked on the south west side only, not bush area or beach
   l) Walmley Park

3) There are no time and season rules in the Puketāpapa Local Board area

4) There aren’t any prohibited areas in the Puketāpapa Local Board area
Rodney Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in Schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports fields and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following designated dog exercise area:
   a) Centennial Park. The fenced area of Centennial Park bordered by Centennial Park Road to the south and east and by the athletics area to the west.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas:
   a) Albert Dennis Reserve
   b) Amanda Reserve
   c) Awaroa Stream Esplanade
   d) Batten Street Scout Reserve
   e) Beach Street Esplanade Reserve
   f) Big Omaha Wharf Reserve
   g) Bourne Dean Recreation Reserve
   h) Buckleton Beach and Reserve
   i) Buttercup Reserve
   j) Cabeleigh Drive Pond Reserve
   k) Cabeleigh Reserves
   l) Christopher Lane Reserve
   m) Church Hill Reserve
   n) Coatesville Recreation Reserve
   o) Cumberland Street Reserve
   p) Currys Bush Reserve
   q) Dairy Flat Reserve
   r) Darroch Shipyards Bridge Reserve
   s) Dawson Road Reserve
   t) Domin Road Esplanade Reserve
   u) Edward Jenkings Reserve
   v) Elizabeth Street Reserve
   w) Excelsior Way Reserve
   x) Fairy Hill Road Esplanade
   y) Falls Road River Esplanade Reserve
   z) Fidalis Avenue Reserve
   aa) Freshfield Road Reserve
   ab) Glasgow Park
   ac) Goldsworthy Bay
   ad) Goodall Reserve
   ae) Golf Course Reserve
   af) Green Lane Reserve
   ag) Green Point Reserve
   ah) Hamilton Road Esplanade Reserve
   ai) Harbour View Road Coastal Reserve
   aj) Helensville Civic Centre Grounds
   ak) Helensville River Reserve

   al) Highfield Garden and The Glade Reserve
   am) Horseshoe Bay Reserve
   an) Hoteo North Recreation Reserve
   ao) Hoteo Recreational Domain
   ap) Huapai Recreation Reserve Huapai Domain
   aq) Ida Way Reserve
   ar) Jamie Lane Reserve
   as) Jamieson Bay Esplanade Reserve and the beach
   at) Jane Gifford Reserve
   au) Kaipara Crescent Reserve
   av) Kaipara Flats Road Recreation Reserve
   aw) Kanuka Reserve
   ax) Kaukapakapa Hall and Library
   ay) Kaukapakapa Plantation Reserve
   az) Kelly Thompson Memorial
   ba) Kendale Reserve
   bb) Kewi Street Reserve
   bc) Kings Farm
   bd) Kokopu Street Reserve
   be) Kowhai Park
   bf) Laby Haddon Esplanade Reserve
   bg) Langridge Reserve
   bh) Lax Reserve
   bi) Lucy Moore Memorial Park
   bj) Mahurangi West Road Esplanade
   bk) Makarau Bridge Reserve
   bl) Mangakura Reserve
   bm) Manukir Reserve
   bn) Matakana Diamond Jubilee Park
   bo) Matakana River Esplanades
   bp) Matakana Wharf Reserve
   bq) McElroy Reserve
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>br) McElroy Scenic Reserve</th>
<th>dd) Spray Crescent Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bs) Merlot Heights Reserve</td>
<td>de) Springs Road Wharf and Boat Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bt) Morrison Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>df) Stables Landing Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu) Mosquito Bay</td>
<td>dg) Takatu Road Esplanades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bv) Muriwai Beach Playground Reserve</td>
<td>dh) Tapora Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bw) Murray Jones Reserve</td>
<td>di) Tapu Bush Esplanade Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bx) Naumai Domain Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>dj) Tauhoa Landing Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by) Opahi Bay</td>
<td>dk) Taylor Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bz) Oneru Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>dl) Taylor Road Esplanade Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca) Oparao Creek Reserve</td>
<td>dm) Te Hana Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cb) Pakiri Hall Grounds</td>
<td>dn) Te Moa Reserve and River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc) Parakai Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>d) Esplanade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd) Parry Kauri Park</td>
<td>do) Te Whau Esplanade Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ce) Piccadilly Circus Reserve</td>
<td>dp) The Landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf) Pinotage Esplanade Reserve</td>
<td>dq) Thomas Grace Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cg) Pipiriki Reserve</td>
<td>dr) Ti Point Road Esplanade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch) Port Albert Wharf Reserve</td>
<td>ds) Ti Point Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ci) Puhoi Esplanade Land</td>
<td>dt) Tuna Place Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cj) Puhoi Pioneers Memorial Park Domain</td>
<td>du) Upper Waiwera Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ck) Puhoi River Wendeholme Esplanade</td>
<td>dv) Valerie Close Esplanade Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cl) Puipuka Road Esplanades</td>
<td>dw) View Road Bush Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm) Pukenmateko Reserve</td>
<td>dx) Vivian Bay, Kawau Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cn) Rahui Te Kiri Reserve</td>
<td>dy) Waitakoukou Valley Esplanade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co) Rata Reserve</td>
<td>Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cp) Rautawhiri Park</td>
<td>d) Waianamu Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cq) Rautawhiri Reserve</td>
<td>ea) Warkworth Service Centre and Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr) Riverhead Triangle Reserve</td>
<td>eb) Warkworth Showgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs) Riverhead War Memorial Park</td>
<td>ec) Warkworth Town Hall Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ct) Riverleigh Drive Pond Reserve</td>
<td>ed) Watson Place Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cu) Robinia Place Reserve</td>
<td>ee) Wellsford War Memorial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv) Rosella Grove Reserve</td>
<td>ef) West Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cw) Rosemount Road Esplanade Reserve</td>
<td>eg) Whangateau Holiday Park Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cx) Run Road Esplanades</td>
<td>eh) Whisper Cove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cy) Sarah Todd Reserve</td>
<td>ei) Whitaker Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cz) Sharp Road Matakania Esplanade Reserve</td>
<td>ej) William Fraser Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da) Shoemsmith Domain Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>ek) Wonderview Road Esplanade Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>db) Silver Hill Road Esplanade Reserve</td>
<td>el) Woodocks Kawaka Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dc) Solan Drive Reserve</td>
<td>em) Woodlands Avenue Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3) Dogs are allowed on the following times- |
| a) Snells Beach northwards of the Sunburst Reserve boat ramp to protect wildlife and public safety and comfort - |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am Under control on leash</td>
<td>Under control on leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime Prohibited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm Under control on leash *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Dogs are allowed on the following beaches at the following times -

i) Algies Bay headland to headland
ii) Baddeleys Beach headland to headland
iii) Brick Bay headland to head
iv) Campbells Beach headland to headland
v) Martins Bay headland to headland
vi) Matheson Bay headland to headland
vii) Omaha Beach (eastern coastline) southwards from access track to beach at northern end of Rita Way (Ida Way - Rita Way Reserve) to southern headland
viii) Point Wells beach and foreshore area adjacent to Point Wells Foreshore Reserve from Boat ramp off Riverside Drive to entrance at 36 Harbour View Road
ix) Sandspit (eastern coastline) from the wharf to the area adjacent to the eastern end of the campground (k) Shelly Beach headland to headland (l)

b) Snells Beach south of the Sunburst Reserve boat ramp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>Under control on a leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm</td>
<td>Under control off leash +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Dogs are allowed at the following parks
   i) Algies Bay (all reserves adjacent to Algies Bay Beach) including -
      a. Algies Bay Reserve,
      b. Alexander Recreation Reserve,
      c. Williames Esplanade and Recreation Reserve,
      d. Mariner Grove
      e. Algies Bay Esplanade Reserve.
   ii) Snells Beach (All reserves and parts of reserves south of the Sunburst Reserve car park entrance) including -
      a. Sunburst Reserve
      b. Tamatea Esplanade Reserve,
      c. Ariki Reserve,
      d. Sunrise Boulevard
      e. Dalton Road Reserve
      f. Snells Beach Esplanade Reserve.

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas to protect wildlife
   a) **Birds Beach, Okahukura Peninsula**: Beach and foreshore area adjacent to Birds Beach Reserve
   b) **Omaha South Quarry Reserve**: All wetland areas.
   c) **Omaha (east)**: Omaha Beach Reserve and adjacent beach and foreshore areas:
      Northwards of the access track to beach at northern end of Rita Way (Ida way - Rita Way Reserve)
   d) **Omaha (west)**: Whangateau Harbour Esplanade Reserve and adjacent beach and foreshore area: Northwards from access point and car park at 267 Omaha Drive.
e) **Omaha (west)**: Whangateau Harbour Esplanade Reserve: from Broadlands Drive to southern end of Omaha estuary.

f) **Point Wells**, south of Broadlands Drive: Omaha Estuary Causeway Reserve and Omaha Estuary Reserve

g) **Port Albert**: Beach and foreshore area adjacent to Port Albert Wharf Reserve.

h) **Sandspit**: All areas of Sandspit Reserve from the footbridge access point at the eastern edge of the grass area opposite the intersection of Sandspit Road and Brick Bay Drive including the part of the reserve known as Dean’s Island and all of the western beach and foreshore area to the wharf at the end of the spit.

i) **Whangateau/Horseshoe Island**: Whangateau Recreation Reserve
Upper Harbour Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following designated dog exercise area—

a) Sanders Reserve (Paeremoremo) - within the designated fenced area on the south eastern part of the reserve. Dogs are allowed under control on a leash in all other parts of the reserve

3) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas-

a) Aberley Reserve
b) Admirals Court Reserve
c) Albany Domain
d) Albany Heights Reserve
e) Albany Heights West Reserve
f) Anaharta Reserve
 g) Antares Place Reserve
h) Apollo Drive Reserve
i) Arrenway Reserve
j) Ashurst Reserve
k) Atwood Reserve
l) Awatahi Reserve
m) Baker Street Link Reserve
n) Baker Street Reserve
o) Ballintra Accessway
p) Bannings Way Reserve
q) Barbados Reserve
r) Bass Reserve
s) Berechiah Gardens
t) Bernecker's Landing
u) Bill Moir Reserve
v) Bluebird Reserve
w) Borneo Reserve
x) Bronzewing Reserve
y) Brookfield Park
z) Brookfield Stream Reserve
aa) Bur Oak Reserve
ab) Bushlands Park
ac) Canaveral Drive Reserve
ad) Carmen Reserve
ae) Catlins Reserve
af) Centorian Reserve
ag) Chatham Reserve
ah) Clarks Lane Reserve
ai) Clear Reserve
aj) Connemara Reserve
ak) Constellation Reserve
al) Crimson Park
am) Da Vinci Park
an) Days Bridge Esplanade Reserve
ao) Dene Court Reserve
ap) Devonshire Reserve
aq) Douglas Alexander Reserve
ar) Duke Esplanade
as) Eastvale Reserve
at) English Oak Reserve
au) Fairview Esplanade Reserve
av) Fairview Reserve
aw) George Pannill Reserve
ax) Gold Street Reserve
ay) Greenough Reserve
az) Greenhills Upper Harbour Reserve
ba) Greenhills War Memorial Park
bb) Gully Reserve
bc) Hooton Reserve
bd) Hosking Reserve
be) Houhere Reserve
bf) Huntington Reserve
bg) Ilam Reserve
bh) Kanuka Reserve
bi) Kaui Esplanade
bj) Kerema Reserve
bk) Kereru Reserve
bl) Kingfisher Esplanade Reserve
bm) Kingfisher Reserve
bn) Kingsway Reserve
bo) Koki Reserve
bp) Kowhai Beach Reserve
bq) Kyle Reserve
dj) Rame Reserve
br) Kyle Road Reserve
dk) Redfern Nature Reserve
bs) Lady Phoenix Reserve
dl) Reflection Reserve
bt) Lagoon Way Reserve
dm) Remu Reserve
bu) Landing Reserve
dn) Ridge Reserve
bv) Laurel Oak Reserve
do) Rising Reserve
bw) Living Stream Road Reserve
dp) Riverlea Reserve
bx) Lorikeet Reserve
dq) Rodney Brown Reserve
by) Mackwell Reserve
dr) Rock Reserve
bz) Malin Place Reserve
ds) Rosses Reserve
c) Marae Reserve
dt) Saltfish Reserve
cb) Marae Road Esplanade Reserve
du) Saint Lucia Reserve
cc) Marina Esplanade
dv) Saunders Reserve
cd) Marina View Reserve
dw) Schopolo East
cf) Medallion Reserve
ea) Schopolo Reserve
cg) Meharg Reserve
eb) Scott Reserve
ci) Meridian Reserve
eb) Serenity Reserve
ch) Monterey Esplanade Reserve
ed) Silver Moon Reserve
ck) Marohe Reserve
eg) Spencer Ridge Reserve
cj) Newbury Reserve
eh) Spoonbill Reserve
ck) Northcross Reserve
eg) Stanford Reserve
ci) Northwood Reserve
eh) Tainui Historical Reserve
cm) Norton Reserve
el) Taroka Reserve
cn) Oak Manor Reserve
ej) Tauhinu Reserve
c0) Obrien Reserve
ek) Tawa Reserve
cp) Obrien Reserve North
el) Te Hoe Reserve
cq) Omega Reserve
em) Te Wharau Reserve
cr) Oraya Reserve
en) Tenbless Reserve
cs) Oratara Reserve
eo) The Landing
cf) Orchard Reserve
ep) Tornado Reserve
cu) Oteha Valley Reserve
eq) Travis View Reserve
cv) Outlook Reserve
er) Unsworth Quarry
cw) Pahihi Reserve
es) Valdena Avenue Reserve
cx) Palm Hill
et) Waimarie Beach
cy) Parkhead Reserve
eu) Wainoni Downs
da) Parkwood Reserve
ev) Wainoni Park North
db) Pharlap Reserve
ew) Wainoni Park South
dc) Picasso Reserve
ex) West Harbour Reserve
dd) Pigeonwood Reserve
ey) Wharepapa Reserve
de) Pinehill Reserve
ez) William Gamble Reserve
df) Pohutukawa Esplanade
fa) William Pickering Reserve
dg) Pounamu Reserve
fb) Windsor Park
dh) Rahui Reserve
fc) Wiseley Esplanade
dj) Rame Esplanade Reserve
fd) Wiseley Reserve

d) There are no time and season rules in the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

e) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas on the shell banks to protect wildlife -
   i) Bomb Bay
   ii) Limeburner’s Bay
   iii) Orukuwai Point
6) Dogs are allowed under control and on a leash in the following council controlled cemeteries:
   (a) North Shore Memorial Park
Waiheke Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in the Waiheke Local Board area.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas -
   a) Alison Park
   b) Arran Bay Esplanade Reserve
   c) Awaawaroa Esplanade Reserve
   d) Blackpool beach (eastwards of Moa Avenue). Westwards of Moa Avenue under control on a leash
   e) Burrell Ocean View Walkway point of the beach below the access
   f) Catherine Mitchell Reserve track off Delamore Drive to the point
   g) Causeway Beach and associated park, beach and foreshore Owhanake Reserve (the northern edge of the grass area).
   h) Citrus Corner
   i) Cowes Bay Esplanade Reserve
   j) Crosby Reserve
   k) Glen Brook Reserve
   l) Goodwin North Reserve
   m) Goodwin South Reserve
   n) Gordons Road Esplanade Reserve
   o) Homershams Reserve
   p) Hooks Lane Beach - and all park, beach and foreshore
   q) Hunterville Reserve
   r) Karaka Reserve
   s) Kennedy Reserve
   t) Kuakatau Bay Forest
   u) Jackpool Park
   v) Makara South Reserve
   w) Man O’War Bay
   x) Mary Wilson Reserve
   y) Matapana Reserve
   z) Matarahui Bay
   aa) Mawhitipana Reserve
   ab) McKenzie Reserve
   ac) Maitai Road Reserve
   ad) Natzke Road Foreshore
   ae) Okoka Road Quarry Reserve
   af) Omiha Bay/Rocky Bay park beach and foreshore
   ag) Omiha Beach Reserve
   ah) Onetangi Historic Village
   ai) Owhanake Beach – from the Southern point of the beach below the access
   aj) Owhanake Matiatia Walkway
   ak) Park Road Reserve
   al) Piritaha Esplanade Reserve
   am) Pohutukawa Reserve
   an) Pohutukawa Reserve Onetangi
   ao) Sea View Road Reserve
   ap) Stanimoroff Walkway
   aq) Te Awaawa O Makoha
   ar) Te Matuku Stockyard Reserve
   as) Te Toki Reserve
   at) Te Un Karaka Te Waera Reserve
   au) Third Reserve
   av) Tin Boat Reserve
   aw) Trig Hill Farm Reserve
   ax) Victoria Reserve
   ay) Waiheke Island Reserve
   az) Walkopou Bay Esplanade Reserve
   ba) Wairua South Reserve
   bb) Wharf Road Esplanade Reserve
   bc) Wharf Road Walkway
   bd) Wharoa Basin
   be) Wilma Hills Reserve
   bf) Wilma Reserve
   bg) Woodside Bay Esplanade Walkway

3) The following time and season rule applies to the following areas –
a) beaches and foreshores identified below –
   i) Big Oneroa Beach
   ii) Enclosure Bay
   iii) Little Oneroa Beach Reserve
   iv) Onetangi Beach: from rocky outcrop at western end of beach to eastern end of the beach area
   v) Palm Beach (including Little Palm Beach)
   vi) Sandy Bay
   vii) Shelley Beach/Shelley Bay (Putaki Bay)
   viii) Surfdale Beach east of Blake Street (excluding Hooks Lane Beach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>All times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off-leash</td>
<td>Under control off-leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off-leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas to protect wildlife -
   a) Beach and foreshore area between eastern end of Little Oneroa Beach and the western end of Hekerua Bay
   b) Belle Terrace Foreshore Reserve and adjacent foreshore area
   c) Cable Bay
   d) Great Barrier Foreshore Reserve - Between Enclosure Bay and Matarahui Bay
   e) Onetangi Beach - westwards of rocky outcrop at northern end of Opopo Bay to western end of Onetangi Beach
   f) Onetangi Beach to Piemelon Bay
   g) Park Point Walkway
   h) Seaview Esplanade Reserve A
   i) Te Matuku Bay Esplanade Reserve
   j) Te Wharau Bay

Explanatory note: Te Ara Hura – Walk Waiheke - between Trig Hill Road and Awaawaroa Road and between Awaawaroa Road and Oraipu Road is associated with private land, is prohibited to dogs, and included here for completeness.
Waitākere Ranges Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area.

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas-
   a) Armour Bay Reserve - all reserve except on grass area immediately adjacent to beach where dogs are allowed under control on a leash
   b) Clayburn Reserve
   c) Davies Bay beach and foreshore
   d) Foster Bay beach and foreshore
   e) Glen Eden Depot
   f) Glucina Reserve
   g) Herrings Bay beach and foreshore
   h) Jenkins Bay beach and foreshore
   i) Kaurilands Domain - off leash on the grass area in South-Western corner of park and bordered by the path
   j) Kotinga Reserve
   k) Kowhai Reserve
   l) Maywood Reserve
   m) Mt Atkinson Park - off-leash on the grass area only
   n) Oataru Bay beach and foreshore
   o) Owen’s Green - off leash on the area accessible off Laingfield Terrace and Laingrange Place
   p) Parrs Park - off leash on the grass area to the north of the sports fields accessible from Tuck Nathan Drive and the northern entrance and car park area off Seymour Road
   q) Perkins Bay beach and foreshore
   r) Piha Domain and the adjacent lagoon area up to the point where the beach area opens out to the south and north and as marked by appropriate marker poles
   s) South Titirangi/Laingholm (beach from Laingholm Point to and including beach area at entrance from Tamaki Reserve)
   t) Swanson Scenic Reserve - off-leash on the grass area only
   u) Tamaki Reserve - off leash on the grass area only
   v) Tangiwai Reserve
   w) Te Henga Reserve – off leash on grass area of Te Henga Park bordered by Bethells Road and the car park driveway and car park area of Te Henga/Bethells Beach
   x) Terrace and Laingrange Place
   y) Waitakere War Memorial Park
   z) Warner Park - off-leash on the grass area adjacent to beach, and beach and foreshore

3) There are no time and season rules in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas -
   a) North Piha Beach – 190 metres north of North Piha Rd
b) **Piha** – South of Little Lion Rock Corner (at the beginning of Marine Parade North) to the southern end of Piha Beach

c) **Te Henga/Bethells Beach** –
   i) **O’Neill’s Bay**;
   ii) Southwards of the small headland at the southern end of the beach as marked by appropriate marker poles
   iii) The rest of Te Henga Park: excluding the car park, café area and on the track leading to the lagoon and beach, and the beach.

5) Dogs are allowed under control and on a leash in the following council controlled cemetery:
   a) Waikumete Cemetery

6) For the protection of wildlife, dogs are allowed under control on a leash between sunset and sunrise at Piha Beach southwards of Monkey Rock to the access track at Little Lion Rock Corner (at the beginning of Marine Parade North). At all other times dogs are allowed under control off leash.
Waitematā Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following designated dog exercise areas -
   a) *Corner of George and Carlton Gore Streets* - that part of the Auckland Domain known as Gum Tree Hill
   b) *Meola Reef Reserve* - within the designated fenced area on the western side of the reserve. Dogs are allowed under control on a leash in all other parts of the reserve

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas -
   a) Alberon Park
   b) Awatea Reserve
   c) Ayr St Reserve
   d) Bayfield Park - northern side of Cox’s Creek and south of Herne Bay Tennis Club
   e) East of Garter Road up to Western headland of Marine Parade Beach
   f) Grey Lynn Park - the two triangular areas between Baidon and Dryden Streets and north of the path between Dryden and Arnold Streets
   g) Jaggers Bush - the open grassed area off Meola Rd
   h) Moa Reserve - grassed area outside of the fenced playground are
   j) Moira Reserve
   k) Newmarket Park - grassed area only
   l) Pt Erin Park - west of the car park, Pt Erin Pool and extending to the area at the base of the St Mary’s Bay cliff line. This lower area is fenced off from the motorway and is accessed by pathways from Pt Erin Park and from the northern end of St Mary’s Road (Sheily Beach Rd and St Mary’s Rd, St Mary’s Bay) The under control off a leash area at Pt Erin Park extends east along the base of the cliff to the west of the pedestrian bridge over the motorway.
   m) Scarborough Reserve
   n) Toile Reserve - north side of path extending from Toile to Clarence Streets
   o) West of Meola Reef Reserve (foreshore North of Meola Reef reserve including mangroves and reef are prohibited). East of Meola Reef Reserve up to Garnet Road under control on a leash.

3) The following time and season rule applies to the following areas –
   a) The reserves identified below –
      i) Costley Reserve
      ii) Cox’s Bay Reserve excluding the wetland/mangrove areas and those parts of the park on the west side of the park’s internal access road which extends from West End Rd through to Kingsley St.
      iii) Vermont Reserve - the grassed area outside of the fenced playground area
### Item 20

#### The following reserves –
1. Arch Hill Reserve,
2. Francis Reserve
3. Lemington Reserve - open grassed area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Before 10am
  Water: under control off leash | Before 9.30am
  Under control off leash |
| Daytime
  Under control on leash | 9.30am to 5pm
  Under control on leash |
| 7pm to 10am
  Under control off leash | After 5pm
  Under control off leash |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Before 10am
  Under control off leash | Before 8am
  Under control off leash |
| Daytime
  Under control on leash | 9am to 5pm
  Under control on leash |
| 7pm to 10am
  Under control off leash | After 5pm
  Under control off leash |

#### The Western headland of Marine Parade Beach to the Western end of Curran Street and at Judges Bay –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Before 10am
  Under control off leash*** | Before 10am
  Under control off leash everywhere |
| Daytime
  Prohibited everywhere | 10am to 4pm
  Under control off leash *** |
| After 7pm
  Under control off leash *** | After 4pm
  Under control off leash everywhere |

***Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the water. Dogs are allowed under control on a leash in the sand.

4) **Dogs are prohibited in the following areas –**
   a) Foreshore area north of Meola Reef Reserve (including mangroves and reef).
Whau Local Board area

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on all local beaches and foreshore areas, local parks and reserves not specifically listed below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (on playgrounds, sports field and carparking areas) continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

1) There are no designated dog exercise areas in the Whau Local Board area

2) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas –

   a) Akatea Park  
   b) Alan Wood Reserve  
   c) Archibald Park  
   d) Bancroft Park  
   e) Barron Green  
   f) Blockhouse Bay Recreation Reserve  
   g) Brains Park  
   h) Copley Reserve  
   i) Cobham Reserve  
   j) Craigmavon Park  
   k) Crum Park  
   l) Cutler Reserve  
   m) Dickey Reserve  
   n) Grandison Green  
   o) Green Bay Community Corner  
   p) Green Bay Domain  
   q) Harmel Reserve  
   r) Heversham Green  
   s) Hinau Reserve  
   t) Kelman Square  
   u) Lawson Park  
   v) Manuka Park  
   w) Mason Park  
   x) Maui Reserve  
   y) Miranda Reserve  
   z) Nile Reserve  
   aa) Northall Park  
   ab) Queen Mary Reserve  
   ac) Rua Reserve  
   ad) St Georges Reserve  
   ae) Taupiko Reserve  
   af) Tony Segedin Esplanade Reserve  
   ag) Waitati Place Reserve

3) There are no time and season rules in the Whau Local Board area.

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas to protect wildlife –
a) Gittos Domain/ Sandy Bay Reserve  
b) Manukau Harbour beach and foreshore (including Green Bay beach, Blockhouse Bay, Sandy Bay and Lynbrooke Avenue headland)  
c) Wairau Creek beach foreshore and associated mangrove areas  
d) Whau River beach foreshore and associated mangrove areas

Explanatory Note: The region-wide rule that prohibits dogs on any sports surface (unless exceptions are stated) and that requires dogs to be kept under control on a leash in the vicinity of any sports surface when in use as stated in Schedule 1, Rule 1(2) continues to apply. This note is specified in relation to particular parks where a sportsfield is known to exist to assist readers. Last updated 1 July 2017

Explanatory Note: The region-wide rule that prohibits dogs on any playgrounds and that requires dogs to be kept under control on a leash in the vicinity of any playground when in use as stated in Schedule 1, Rule 1(1) continues to apply. This note is specified in relation to particular parks where a playground is known to exist to assist readers.
**Dog access rules in regional parks**

Dogs are allowed under control on-leash on beaches and foreshore areas and areas of the reserve not specifically covered by the rules below.

The regional rules described in schedule 1 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs continue to apply where relevant in the designated dog exercise area, under-control off-leash areas and time and season area listed below.

Where a lambing season prohibition is in place the definition of lambing season in the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs (1 July to 1 December) will apply to the area specified.

1) Ambury Regional Park
   a) Dogs are allowed under control on a leash on the Ambury Farm loop road connecting Kiwi Esplanade to Ambury Road.
   b) Dogs are prohibited at all times from all other areas of Ambury Regional Park and associated foreshore (including foreshore associated with the Mangere Waste Water Treatment Plant).

2) Ātiu Creek Regional Park
   a) Dogs are prohibited from the regional park and associated beach and foreshore for the protection of wildlife.

3) Auckland Botanic Gardens
   a) Dogs are prohibited in the restaurant area and on cultivated garden areas.
   b) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in area generally north of rose garden

4) Āwhitu Regional Park
   a) Dogs are allowed under control on a leash on the Esplanade Reserve area of the park at the end of Brook Road
   b) Dogs are prohibited on all other areas of the park and on the associated beaches

5) Duder Regional Park
   a) Dogs are prohibited from the regional park and associated foreshore.

6) Glenfern Sanctuary
   a) Dogs are prohibited from the regional park and the associated foreshore.

7) Hunua Ranges Regional Park
   a) Dogs are prohibited in picnic areas, exclusive areas around and including the water supply dams and on the Kohukohunui Track.
   b) Dogs are prohibited during lambing season.

Explanatory Note: Dogs prohibited in camping areas under Schedule 1

8) Long Bay Regional Park
   a) Dogs are prohibited North of Vaughan’s stream.
   b) The following time and season rule applies to the beach south of Vaughan’s stream-
### Summer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>Under control on leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm to 10am</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Winter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All times</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mahurangi Regional Park

- **a)** Dogs are allowed under control on a leash –
  - i) In Mahurangi Regional Park West on coastal area around Opahi Bay, Mita Bay beach, Mita Bay Loop Track;
  - ii) On Culpid Point Loop Track during the summer season.
- **b)** The following time and season rule applies - In Mahurangi Regional Park East at Scott Point and associated beaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>All times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>Under control on leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm to 10am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Muriwai Regional Park

- **a)** On Muriwai beach, dogs are allowed under control off a leash at all times north of the surf tower.
- **b)** Dogs are prohibited south of the surf tower to protect the gannet colony.

### Mutukaroa/Hamilins-Hills Regional Park

- **a)** Dogs are allowed under control on a leash

### Ōmana Regional Park

- **a)** Dogs are allowed under control off a leash on the perimeter walk and associated foreshore (excluding Ōmana Beach) at all times
- **b)** Dogs are allowed under control on a leash in the arrival area, and on the Beachlands to Maraetai walk/cycle way.
- **c)** Dogs are prohibited in all other areas of the park.
d) Dogs are prohibited during lambing season.

13) Ōrere Point Regional Park
   a) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the regional park and associated beach.

14) Pakiri Regional Park
   a) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash on the associated beach
   b) Dogs are prohibited from the regional park.

15) Scandrett Regional Park
   a) Dogs are prohibited from the regional park to protect wildlife

16) Shakespear Regional Park
   a) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash on the land between Army Bay and Okoromai Bay.
   b) The following time and season rule applies -
      On Army Bay and Okoromai Bay beaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 10am</td>
<td>All times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm to 10am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Except as provided for in a) and b) above, dogs are prohibited from Shakespear Regional Park

17) Tāpapakanga Regional Park
   a) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash on the associated beach
   b) Dogs are allowed under control on a leash on the park between Saturday Labour Weekend and 31 March.
   c) Dogs are prohibited during lambing season.

18) Tāwharanui Regional Park
   a) Dogs are prohibited from regional park and associated beaches.
   b) Dogs are prohibited on the park adjoining to the entrance of Tawharanui Regional Park

19) Tawhitokino Regional Park
   a) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the regional park and associated beach.
20) **Te Arai Regional Park**  
   a) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the dog exercise area of Eyres Point, Te Arai: the disused quarry area, excluding the wetlands.

21) **Te Muri Regional Park**  
   a) Dogs are prohibited from the regional park and associated foreshore.

22) **Te Rau Puriri Regional Park**  
   a) Dogs are prohibited from the associated beach and foreshore area.  
   b) Dogs are prohibited during lambing season.

23) **Waitawa Regional Park**  
   a) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash on the associated beach.  
   b) Dogs are allowed under control on a leash on the park.  
   c) Dogs are prohibited during lambing season.  

Explanatory Note: Dogs prohibited in camping areas under Schedule 1.

24) **Wenderholm Regional Park**  
   a) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash on the grassed areas adjoining the entrance road when not occupied by stock.  
   b) Dogs are allowed under control on a leash on the walking track to the Waierua Estuary and Kokuru Bay, the farmed areas west of the main entrance area, and on the Schischka block.  
   c) Dogs are prohibited from all other areas of the park and associated beach and foreshore areas, including the main car park, bush headlands tracks, picnic areas, along the Puhoi river and wetlands.  
   d) Dogs are prohibited during lambing season.

25) **Whakanewha Regional Park**  
   1) Dogs are allowed under control on a leash in areas of the park on the landward side of Gordons Road.  
   2) Dogs are prohibited in all areas of the park and associated beach and foreshore areas on the seaward side of Gordons Road

26) **Waitākere Ranges Regional Park**  
   a) Dogs are allowed under control off a leash in the following areas –  
      i) Cornwallis Beach sand area from sunrise until 9am daily  
      ii) Open areas of Kakamatau Inlet including beach and foreshore area. Dogs are allowed under control on a leash in all other parts of Kakamatau SMZ (in particular Kakamatau Beach Walk, Orpheus Graves Walk and Kakamatau Inlet Track)  
   b) Dogs are allowed under control on a leash in Waitākere Ranges Regional Park, Exhibition Drive Walk (Tiritangi), and associated beach and foreshore areas not specifically identified as a prohibited or off-leash area.  
   c) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas –  
      i) In all designated picnic areas;
ii) On all grassed areas at Cornwallis Beach within Cornwallis special management zone (SMZ);

iii) In water supply buffer lands and reservoirs within the Water Catchment Area SMZ

iv) In the following SMZs – Whātāpu Scientific Reserve SMZ, Pararaha Valley SMZ, Lion Rock SMZ, North Piha SMZ, Tasman and Gap Lookouts SMZ, Lake Wainamu SMZ, Cascades Kauri Ark-in-the-Park SMZ.

v) Dogs are prohibited West of Don McLean Rd, from Walker Ridge Track and South. All tracks including Gibbons Tracks, Signal House Track, Kura Track, Omanawanui Track, Puriri Ridge and Destruction Gully Track

vi) The following tracks - Anawhata Beach Track (Anawhata SMZ); ACW Falls Track, Anderson Track, Andersons Southern Access, Auckland City Walk, Cascade Track, Lower Kauri Track, Upper Kauri Track, Robinson Ridge Track, Waitakere Tramline Walk, West Tunnel Mouth Track, Fence Line Track, Pukematekao Track and Whatititi Track (Ark in the Park SMZ); Laird Thompson Track (North Piha SMZ); Lion Rock Track (Piha SMZ); Tasman Lookout Track (South Piha SMZ); Lake Wainamu Track (Lake Wainamu SMZ); Muir Track and Pararaha Valley Track (Pararaha Valley SMZ); Whātāpu Caves Track and Whātāpu Coast Walk (Whātāpu Scientific Reserve SMZ).

Explanatory Note: Dogs prohibited in camping areas under Schedule 1 and temporary restrictions may apply under Clause 10 of Dog Management Bylaw.
DOG ACCESS RULES ON DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
(DOC)LAND

1) Dogs are allowed under control on a leash in the following areas to protect wildlife—
   a) Araparera River Marginal Strip\(^3\) (DOC Map 11.1).
   b) Hamatana Marginal Strip\(^2\) (DOC Map 9.2).
   c) Kaipara Harbour Crown Foreshore (adjacent to Okahukura Peninsula)\(^3\) (DOC Map 11.5).
   d) Karaka Point Marginal Strip\(^3\) (DOC Map 10.1).
   e) Makarau Conservation Area\(^3\) (DOC Map 11.2).
   f) Muriwai Beach Marginal Strip and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^3\) (DOC Map 10.2).
   g) Rangitira Beach Marginal Strip and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^3\) (DOC Map 10.4).
   h) Tauhoa Conservation Area\(^3\) (DOC Map 11.6).
   i) Tauhoa River Marginal Strip and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^3\) (DOC Map 11.4).
   j) Te Pahi Creek Marginal Strip\(^3\) (DOC Map 11.7).
   k) Ti Point Marginal Strip\(^3\) (DOC Map 10.5).
   l) Torkington Bay Marginal Strip\(^3\) (DOC Map 10.6).

2) Dog owners require a permit throughout the year with conditions for management and/or
   recreational hunting in the following areas—
   a) Browns Island Recreation Reserve\(^4\) (DOC Map 7.1).
   b) Dome Forest Conservation Area\(^3\) (DOC Map 7.2).
   c) Great Barrier Forest Conservation Area\(^3\) (DOC Map 7.3, 7.4).
   d) Hirakimata/Kaitoke Swamp Ecological Area\(^3\) (DOC Map Ref 7.5).
   e) Long Bay Marine Reserve foreshore from Western end of Pihinui Point to Toroa Point\(^6\)
      (DOC Map 9.1).
   f) Motuihe Island Recreation Reserve\(^3\) (DOC Map 7.6).
   g) Motutapu Island Recreation Reserve\(^3\) (DOC Map 7.8).
   h) Motuora Island Recreation Reserve and Crown foreshore\(^3\) (DOC Map 7.7).
   i) North Head Historic Reserve\(^5\) (DOC Map Ref 10.3).
   j) Okiwi Recreation Reserve\(^3\) (DOC Map Ref 7.9).
   k) Omaha Ecological Area\(^3\) (DOC Map 7.10).
   l) Rakitu Island Scenic Reserve\(^3\) (DOC Map Ref 7.11).
   m) Te Paparahi Conservation Area\(^3\) (DOC Map Ref 7.12).
   n) Wairahi Forest Sanctuary\(^2\) (DOC Map Ref 7.13).

3) Dog owners require a permit May-June for recreational duck hunting in the following areas—
   a) Kaipara Harbour Foreshore adjacent to Oyster Point, Jordans Farm\(^4\) (DOC Map 8.1).
   b) Slipper Lake Marginal Strip\(^4\) (DOC Map Ref 8.2).
   c) Spectacle Lake Marginal Strip\(^4\) (DOC Map Ref 8.3).

4) Dogs are prohibited in the following areas to protect wildlife—
   a) Awana Stream Marginal Strip\(^1\) (DOC Map Ref 5.1).
b) Awana Stream Recreation Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.2, 6.1).

c) Beehive Island Recreation Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1} (DOC Maps 5.3, 6.2).

d) Burgess Island Scenic Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Map 5.4, 6.3).

e) Burma Road Scenic Reserve\textsuperscript{1} (DOC Map 5.5).

f) Bushy Beach Recreational Reserve\textsuperscript{1} (DOC Map 5.6).

g) Cape Rodney-Omakakari Point Marine Reserve Foreshore\textsuperscript{1} (DOC Map 5.59).

h) Clarks Beach Marginal Strip and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.7, 6.5).

i) Clifton Bay Marginal Strip and Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.8, 6.6).

j) Crown foreshore adjacent to Ovatons Beach Marginal Strip, Korotiri Bay Conservation Area and Whakataututu Point Marginal Strip\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.35).

k) Crown foreshore adjacent Whangateau Harbour\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Maps Ref 6.67, 6.68, 6.69).

l) Crown foreshore around Browns Island\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.4).

m) Crown foreshore adjacent to Tawharanui Regional Park\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.54).

n) Crown foreshore around Omaha Spit\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.34).

o) Crown foreshore of Browns Island (DOC Map 6.4).

p) Crown foreshore of Motuihe Island Recreational Reserve\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.27).

q) Crown foreshore of Motutapu Island Recreational Reserve\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.28).

r) Crown foreshore of Rangihi Creek and surrounds\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.43).

s) Crown foreshore of Te Matuku Bay\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.55).

t) Crown foreshore of Weti River and Karepiro Bay\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Maps 6.71).

u) Crown foreshore of Tryphena Harbour (excluding [any dog exercise area])\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.60).

v) Crown foreshore of Wakaaranga Creek Tamaki River\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.85).

w) Fitzgerald Bay Landing Recreation Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.9, 6.8).

x) Goat Island Scientific Reserve\textsuperscript{1,2} and adjacent Crown foreshore (DOC Maps 5.10, 6.9).

y) Harataonga Bay Marginal Strip and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.11, 6.10).

z) Harataonga Recreation Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Map 5.12, 6.11).

aa) Hargreaves Basin Marginal Strip and Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.13, 6.12).

ab) Kaitoke Beach Marginal Strip and Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.14, 6.13).

ac) Kaitoke Creek Marginal Strip and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.15, 6.14).

ad) Kawau Island Historic Reserve and Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.16 and 6.15).

ae) Kawau Island Scenic Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.17, 6.16).

af) Kermadec Islands Nature Reserve and Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.18, 5.19, 6.17).

ag) Kohatuura Scenic Reserve\textsuperscript{1,2} and adjacent Crown foreshore (DOC Maps 5.20, 6.18).

ah) Lake Ototoa Scenic Reserve\textsuperscript{1} (DOC Map 5.21).

ai) Leigh Recreation Reserve\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 5.60).

aj) Long Bay Marine Reserve foreshore from Western end of Piripiri Point to Toroa Point\textsuperscript{3} (DOC Map 9.1).

ak) Logues Bush Scenic Reserve\textsuperscript{1} (DOC Map 5.23).

al) Little Barrier Island Nature Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.22, 6.19).

am) Mangawhai Marginal Strip and adjacent crown foreshore(DOC Map 5.24, 6.20).

an) Manukapua Government Purpose (Wildlife Management) Reserve and adjacent Crown Foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.50, 6.53).

ao) Medlands Beach Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{2} (DOC Map 6.21).

ap) Medlands Wildlife Management Reserve\textsuperscript{1} (DOC Map 5.25).

aq) Mokohinau Islands Nature Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.29, 6.25).

ar) Moturekareka Island Scenic Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.30, 6.26).

as) Moturemu Island Scenic Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\textsuperscript{1,2} (DOC Maps 5.31, 6.29).
at) Motutara Island Scenic Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.32, 6.30).
au) Okahukura Conservation Area and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.33, 6.31).
av) Okupu Bay Crown foreshore\(^2\) (DOC Map 6.33).
aw) Okura Beach Marginal Strip and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.61, 6.32).
ay) On Crown foreshore adjacent to and including the Puhinui Wildlife Refuge\(^2\) (DOC Map 6.40).
az) On Crown foreshore adjacent to Pollen Island and Traherne Island (DOC Map 6.41), including foreshore of Harbourview-Orangihina area.
ba) Orouawharo Creek Government Purpose (Wildlife Management) Reserve\(^1\) (DOC Map 5.34).
bba) Pakiri Block Conservation Area\(^1\) (DOC Map 5.36).
bba) Pakiri Marginal Strip and Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.35, 6.36).
bcb) Papakanui Conservation Area and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Map 5.38, 6.38).
bdc) Papakanui Spit Wildlife Refuge and Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Map 5.37, 6.37).
bde) Papepape Marginal Strip and Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Map 5.39, 6.39).
bdf) Rahuioki Marginal Strip.
bfg) Rangitoto Island Scenic Reserve and adjacent Crown Foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.63, 6.44).
bhh) Rosalie Bay Marginal Strip and Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.41, 6.45).
bii) Schoolhouse Bay Recreation Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.43, 6.47).
bij) Sharp Point Scenic Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.44, 6.48).
bik) Smeltinghouse Bay Scenic Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.45, 6.49).
bil) Smeltinghouse Historic Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.46, 6.50).
bm) South Head Conservation Area and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.48, 6.52).
bn) South Head Road Scientific Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.47, 6.51).
bo) Stony Hill Recreation Reserve\(^1\) (DOC Maps 5.49).
bp) Tauhoa Scientific Reserve\(^1\) (DOC Map 5.51).
boq) Te Haupa (Saddle) Island Scenic Reserve and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.42, 6.46).
br) Te Henga Recreation Reserve\(^1\) (DOC Maps 5.64).
bs) Ti Tree Island Conservation Area and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^1\) (DOC Maps 5.53, 6.58).
bts) Tiniriri Matangi Island Scientific Reserve\(^1\) and adjacent Crown foreshore (DOC Maps 5.54, 6.56).
but) Turanga Creek Conservation Area and Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.55, 6.59).
by) Waikoupa Creek Conservation Area Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.56, 6.61).
bw) Waionui Inlet Marginal Strip and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^1\) (DOC Maps Ref 5.57, 6.62).
bx) Waipipi Creek Crown foreshore\(^2\) (DOC Map 6.63).
by) Wairoa Estuary and Bay Crown foreshore\(^2\) (DOC Map 6.64).
cb) Whangapoua Conservation Area and adjacent Crown foreshore\(^{1,2}\) (DOC Maps 5.58, 6.66).
Ture a Rohe Tiakina Kuri 2019
Dog Management Bylaw 2019
(as at x month 2019)

Made by the Governing Body of Auckland Council

In resolution GB XXXXX on x month 2019

Pursuant to sections 10 and 20 of the Dog Control Act 1996, the Governing Body of Auckland Council revokes and replaces bylaws about dog matters with the following bylaw.
Summary

This summary is not part of the Bylaw. The intention of this summary is to explain the general effect of this Bylaw.

Kaupapa mo ngā Kuri 2019, the Auckland Council’s Policy on Dogs 2019 aims to integrate dogs into public places. This is achieved by balancing the needs of both dog owners and non-dog owners, and is outlined through policy principles.

The Dog Control Act 1996 is the legislation under which the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2019 and this Bylaw are made. The Dog Control Act 1996 outlines the various obligations placed on dog owners.

The purpose of this Bylaw is to:

- **Regulate the public places** where dogs may be taken by their owner

- **Require owners of multiple dogs to obtain a licence**

- **Require owners to pick up after their dog** when it defecates in any public place or premises

- **Prohibit the owner of any female dog in season** to take that dog into any public place

- **Require owners to neuter their dog** if it has not been kept under control on more than one occasion

- **Provide a review process** for owners of dogs classified as menacing due to behavior.
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1 Title
(1) This Bylaw is the Ture a Rohe Tiakina Kuri 2019, Dog Management Bylaw 2019.

2 Commencement
(1) This Bylaw comes into force on X month 2019.

3 Application
(1) This Bylaw applies to Auckland.

Part 1
Preliminary provisions

4 Purpose
(1) The purpose of this Bylaw is to give effect to Auckland Council’s Policy on Dogs 2019 by –
   (a) Prohibiting dogs, whether under control or not, from specified public places;
   (b) Requiring dogs to be controlled on-leash in specified public places;
   (c) Regulating and controlling dogs in any other public place;
   (d) Ensuring the number of dogs kept on a premise are suitable;
   (e) Requiring the owner of any dog that defecates in a public place or on land or premises other than that occupied by the owner to immediately remove the faeces;
   (f) Requiring any female dog in season to be confined but adequately exercised;
   (g) Requiring the owner of any dog which has not been kept under control on more than one occasion to have that dog neutered;
   (h) Providing a review process for owners of dogs classified as menacing by behaviour.

5 Interpretation
(1) In this Bylaw, unless the context otherwise requires, -

Auckland has the meaning given by section 4(1) of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009.
Council for the purposes of this bylaw, means the governing body of the Auckland Council or any person, committee or local board delegated to act on its behalf in relation to this Bylaw. A list of delegations are attached to this Bylaw.

Council-controlled public place means all public places owned or managed by Auckland Council or a substantive council-controlled organisation (as defined in section 4(1) of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009). This includes land owned or managed by Auckland Transport.

Control in relation to a dog, means that the owner is able to obtain an immediate and desired response from the dog.

Dangerous Dog means a dog which has been classified as a dangerous dog under section 31 of the Dog Control Act 1996.

Licence means a licence, permit or approval to do something under this Bylaw and includes all conditions to which the licence is subject.

Menacing dog means a dog that has been classified as a menacing dog under section 33A of the Dog Control Act 1996.

Neutered dog has the meaning given by section 2 of the Dog Control Act 1996.

Owner has the meaning given by section 2 the Dog Control Act 1996.

Park/Reserve means –
(a) any land vested in or administered by the council under the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977; or
(b) any park, domain or recreational area under the control or ownership of the Council.

Premises means any land, dwelling, storehouse, warehouse, shop, cellar, yard, building, or part of the same, or enclosed space separately occupied. All lands, buildings, and places adjoining each other and occupied together are deemed to be the same premises.

Private Way has the meaning given by section 315 of the Local Government Act 1974.
Public place has the meaning given by section 2 the Dog Control Act 1996.

Road has the meaning given by section 315 of the Local Government Act 1974 except that where a road is adjacent to a park, and the land within the road and park is developed in an integrated way, the common boundary between the road and park will be reduced or extended to:

(a) a line parallel to the road that follows any physical separation between the road and park (e.g. fence or bollards), or
(b) where no physical separation exists, a line parallel to the road that follows the edge of the road carriageway, footpath or cycle track that is closest to the centre of the park.

Working Dog has the meaning given by section 2 of the Dog Control Act 1996.

(2) The Interpretation Act 1999 applies to this Bylaw.

(3) Any related and additional information contained in this Bylaw are for information purposes only, do not form part of this Bylaw, and may be made, amended, revoked or replaced by the council at any time.

Part 2
Regulation and control of dogs

6 Prohibition of dogs in public places

(1) The owner of any dog must ensure that their dog (including when confined in a vehicle or cage) does not enter or remain in any public place specified as prohibited in Schedule 1 or 2 of the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs 2019.

(2) Subclause (1) does not apply to any working dog accompanying and assisting a person or accompanying a person engaged in the dog’s training.

(3) The owner of any female dog in season must ensure the dog does not enter or remain in any public place or private way unless –
(a) that dog is confined in a vehicle or cage for the purposes of transportation; or
(b) the owner of that dog has the permission of the occupier or person
controlling the public place; and complies with any reasonable conditions
imposed.

7 Dogs on a leash in public places and private ways
(1) The owner of any dog must ensure that the dog is controlled on a leash in any
public place and private way specified as such in Schedule 1 or 2 of the Auckland

(2) Subclause (1) does not apply to—
(a) any dog confined in a vehicle or cage; or
(b) any working dog accompanying and assisting a person or accompanying a
person engaged in the dog’s training.

8 Dogs off a leash in public places
(1) The owner of any dog (other than a Dangerous Dog) may take that dog off a
leash in public places specified as such in Schedule 2 of the Auckland Council
Policy on Dogs 2019, provided that dog is kept under control.

9 Dogs in designated dog exercise area
(1) The owner of any dog (including a Dangerous Dog) may take that dog off leash in
a designated dog exercise area specified as such in Schedule 2 of the Auckland
Council Policy on Dogs 2019 provided that dog is kept under control.

(2) In all other public places not specified as designated dog exercise areas in
Schedule 2, dogs classified as Dangerous Dogs must be muzzled at all times.

10 Temporary changes to dog access rules
(1) The council may make temporary changes to Schedules 1 and 2 of the Auckland
Council Policy on Dogs 2019 in relation to—
(a) leisure and cultural events (including dog friendly events);
(b) dog training;
(c) protected wildlife that are vulnerable to dogs;
(d) flora that are vulnerable to dogs;
(e) pest control in any park and/or beach; and
(f) other circumstances of a comparative nature to subclause (1)(a) to (e)
inclusive.

(2) In making or removing a temporary change to Schedules 1 and 2 of the Auckland
Council Policy on Dogs 2019 in subclause (1), the council must—
(a) have regard to section 1 of Dog Access Principles in the Auckland Council
Policy on Dogs 2019;
(b) specify in writing the reasons, location and timeframe the temporary change
is to apply;
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(c) give public notice of the temporary change in a manner that the council considers appropriate in the circumstances; and

(d) clearly indicate the area subject to the temporary change by 1 or more clearly legible notices affixed in 1 or more conspicuous places on, or adjacent to, the place to which the notice relates, unless it is impracticable or unreasonable to do so.

11 Dog faeces

(1) When in a public place or premise dog owners must ensure the immediate removal and disposal of their dog’s faeces. This must be done in a way that does not cause a nuisance.

(2) Subclause (1) does not apply to a premise occupied by the owner.

(3) Subclause (1) does not apply to any dog herding or driving stock on a road where the dog is kept solely or principally for the purposes of herding or driving stock.

12 Keeping more than two dogs

(1) No person may keep more than two dogs over the age of 3 months on any premises zoned as urban residential under the Unitary Plan for more than 14 consecutive days.

(2) Subclause (1) does not apply if –
(a) allowed by a licence; or
(b) an application for a licence under subclause (2)(a) has been made within 14 days of the dogs first being kept on that premises.

(3) Subclause (1) applies whether or not the dogs on the premises have the same owner.

(4) Any application under subclause (2)(b) is a joint application by all the dog owners on the premises.

13 Licence for keeping more than two dogs on premises

(1) The council may make controls and set fees for any or all of the following matters in relation to a licence required in clause 12 –
(a) application for a licence, including forms and information;
(b) assessment of application for a licence, including inspection;
(c) the granting or declining of an application for a licence following an assessment;
(d) conditions that may be imposed on a licence if granted;
(e) duration of a licence if granted;
(f) objection to the council in relation to a decision to decline a licence, including the period of objection;
(g) objection to the council in relation to any condition of a licence, including the period of objection;
(h) inspection to ensure compliance with any licence and any conditions;
(i) review of any licence or any conditions;
(j) transferability of a licence;
(k) refund or waiver of fees;
(l) suspension or cancellation of a licence;
(m) objection to the council in relation to a decision to suspend or cancel a licence, including the period of objection.

(2) Unless otherwise stated in the conditions of the licence granted under subclause (1), the licence will remain valid as long as the circumstances described on the licence remain unchanged.

(3) The licence cannot be transferred to another person or another premise.

14 Requirement to neuter uncontrolled dog

(1) The council may require the owner of a dog to have that dog neutered if:
(a) the dog has not been kept under control on more than one occasion within a 12-month period; and
(b) dog owner has received an infringement relating to subclause (1)(a).

15 Objection to requirement to neuter uncontrolled dog

(1) If a dog is required to be neutered under clause 14, the owner of that dog—
(a) may, within 14 days of receiving the notice, object to the requirement by way of writing to the council; and
(b) has the right to be heard in support of their objection under subclause (1)(a).

(2) The council when considering an objection under subclause (1) may uphold or rescind the requirement. In making its determination, the council must have regard to—
(a) the evidence which formed the basis for the requirement;
(b) the matters relied upon in support of the objection; and
(c) any other relevant matters.

(3) Following its consideration of an objection under subclause (2), the council must, as soon as practicable, give written notice to the owner of—
(a) its determination of the objection; and
(b) the reasons for its determination.
16 Effect of requirement to neuter uncontrolled dog

(1) If a dog is required to be neutered under clause 14, the owner of that dog must, within 1 month of receiving the notice of the requirement, produce to the council a certificate issued by a veterinarian certifying –
   (a) that the dog is or has been neutered; or
   (b) that for reasons that are specified in the certificate, the dog will not be in a fit condition to be neutered before a date specified in the certificate.

(2) If a certificate under subclause (1)(b) is produced to the council, the owner must produce to the council, within 1 month after the date specified in that certificate, a further certificate under subclause (1)(a).

17 Owners of dogs classified as menacing due to behaviour

(1) If a dog has been classified as menacing due to their behaviour, under section 33A of the Dog Control Act 1996, the owner may request the classification be reviewed after a 12-month period if:
   (a) the owner provides evidence of completing a dog obedience course, at the owner’s expense; and
   (b) the owner has not obtained any infringements in relation to the dog within the preceding 12-month period.

(2) Removing the classification of the dog is at the council’s discretion.

Part 3
Enforcement, offences, penalties

18 Enforcement

(1) The council may use its powers under the Dog Control Act 1996 and the Local Government Act 2002 to enforce this Bylaw.

19 Offences and penalties

(1) Every person who breaches this Bylaw commits an offence.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under this Bylaw is liable to a penalty under the Dog Control Act 1996 and the Local Government Act 2002.
Part 4
Savings, transitional provisions

20  Exemption where multiple dog licence not previously required

(1)  This clause applies to any owner to which clause 12 applies, who immediately prior to the date of commencement of this Bylaw, was not required to hold a licence to keep multiple dogs in Auckland.

(2)  Where subclause (1) applies, an application under clause 12(2)(b) is not required unless –
   (a)  the owner changes address; or
   (b)  the number of dogs over 3 months of age (other than a working dog) kept on the premises increases for more than 14 consecutive days.

21  Certain applications to be dealt with under former bylaw

(1)  This clause applies to any application submitted for multiple dogs in Auckland under the Dog Management Bylaw 2012.

(2)  An application to which subclause (1) applies to any valid multiple dog ownership licence held prior to the date of commencement of this Bylaw must be dealt with by the council —
   (a)  under the relevant bylaw in subclause (1) as if it was still in force; and
   (b)  as if this Bylaw had not been made.

22  Existing approvals to continue in force

(1)  Every licence continues in force as if it is a licence of that kind issued pursuant to clause 12(2) of this Bylaw.

(2)  Every licence to which subclause (1) applies expires —
   (a)  if any owner to which the licence applies changes address;
   (b)  if the number of dogs kept on the premises for more than 14 days exceeds the number permitted by the licence;
   (c)  if the number of dogs kept on the premises for a continuous period of more than 12 months is fewer than the number permitted by the licence; and
   (d)  for any reason specified in the licence.

(3)  Unless otherwise stated in the conditions of the licence granted under subclause clause 13(1), the licence will remain valid as long as the circumstances described in the licence remain unchanged.

(4)  The licence cannot be transferred to another person or another premise.
Additional Information to
Dog Management Bylaw 2012

This document contains matters for information purposes only and does not form part of any bylaw. It includes matters made pursuant to a bylaw and other matters to assist in the ease of understanding, use and maintenance of a bylaw. The information contained in this document may be updated at any time.
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### Section 1
#### History of Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date of Decision</th>
<th>Decision Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make</td>
<td>Following dog control bylaws in force on 31 Oct 2010 deemed to have been made by Auckland Council • Rodney District Council, Chapter 15 Dog Control • North Shore City Council, Part 23 Dog Control • Waitakere City Council, Bylaw No 29 Dog Control • Auckland City Council, Bylaw No 12 Dog Control 2009 • Manukau City Council, Chapter 6 Dog Control • Papakura District Council, Dog Control Bylaw 2004 • Franklin District Council, Dog Control Bylaw 2010</td>
<td>01 Nov 2010</td>
<td>Section 63 Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010</td>
<td>01 Nov 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revoke and Replace</td>
<td>Review of dog control bylaws resulted in replacing the seven existing bylaws with a single bylaw – the Dog Management Bylaw 2012.</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Minor edits or amendments</td>
<td>22 Nov - 1 Jul 2013</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Time and season dog access rules amended in Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Area to implement decision of the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board on 23 Sep 2013 (Resolution HB/2013/222).</td>
<td>23 Sep 2013</td>
<td>GB/2013/106</td>
<td>26 Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Various dog access rules amended in the Albert-Eden local board area plus minor edits or amendments</td>
<td>26 Nov 2015</td>
<td>GB/2015/120 GB/2012/157</td>
<td>29 Mar 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Action Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date of Decision</th>
<th>Decision Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Various dog access rules amended in Great Barrier, Puketapapa Papakura, and Whau local board areas plus minor amendments in the Waiheke local board area</td>
<td>29 Sept 2016</td>
<td>GB/2016/225</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2
Related Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Description of Document</th>
<th>Location of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Various, related to Hibiscus and Bays Local Board decisions | Hibiscus and Bays Local Board decisions related to amendments to time and season dog access rules in Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Area | - Bylaw amended: Agenda and minutes of Governing Body meeting on 26 Sep 2013  
- Policy amended: Agenda and minutes of Hibiscus and Bays Local Board meeting on 23 Sep 2013  
- Hearing / Decision Report: Agenda and minutes of Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Hearing Panel hearing and deliberations on 19 and 20 Sep 2013  
- Statement of Proposal: Agenda and minutes of Hibiscus and Bays Local Board on 7 Aug 2013 |
| Policy on Dogs                                         | Provides broad approach to dog management in Auckland                                   | [www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) |
| Decision Minutes and Agenda                            | Background to policy and bylaw on dogs (Decisions on submissions to Statement of Proposal including final policy and bylaw on dogs) | Agenda and minutes of Governing Body meeting on 22 Nov 2012 |
| Hearing Report                                         | Background to policy and bylaw on dogs (Summary of submissions to Statement of Proposal) | Deliberations Report to Hearing Panel meeting on 8 and 20 Oct 2012  
Background Report to Hearing Panel meeting on 17, 24, 27, 29, 30, and 31 Aug and 7, 10 and 14 Sep 2012 |
<p>| Statement of Proposal                                  | Background to policy and bylaw on dogs (Proposals in relation to review of policies and bylaws on dogs publicly notified for submissions) | Agenda and minutes of Governing Body meeting on 22 November 2012 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Description of Document</th>
<th>Location of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bylaws Act 1910</td>
<td>Provides for certain matters related to the validity of bylaws</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legislation.govt.nz">www.legislation.govt.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretations Act 2009</td>
<td>Provides for certain matters related to the interpretation of bylaws</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legislation.govt.nz">www.legislation.govt.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on Dog Policy and Practices</td>
<td>Provides annual report on dog policy and practices, including statistical information</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 3
Delegations for matters contained in Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Function, Duty, Power to be Delegated</th>
<th>Delegated Authority</th>
<th>Date of Delegation Decision</th>
<th>Decision Reference</th>
<th>Commencement of Delegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>All powers, duties and functions.</td>
<td>Licensing and Regulatory Compliance (Tier 6)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(2)</td>
<td>To impose reasonable conditions on the entry and presence of working dogs in prohibited areas</td>
<td>Licensing and Regulatory Compliance (Tier 6)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Environmental Services (Tier 5)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks, Sports and Recreation (Tier 5, 6)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Temporary Changes to Dog Access Rules (Schedules)</td>
<td>Community Empowerment (Tier 6)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Environmental Services (Tier 5)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>Function, Duty, Power to be Delegated</td>
<td>Delegated Authority</td>
<td>Date of Delegation Decision</td>
<td>Decision Reference</td>
<td>Commencement of Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Controls for licence for multiple dogs</td>
<td>Licensing and Regulatory Compliance (Tier 4)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Requirement to Neuter Uncontrolled Dog</td>
<td>Licensing and Regulatory Compliance (Tier 3)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch 1</td>
<td>To grant permission and impose reasonable conditions on the entry and presence of dogs in places with restricted access</td>
<td>Community Empowerment (Tier 6)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries and Information (Tier 4)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks, Sports and Recreation (Tier 5)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch 1</td>
<td>To grant permission and impose reasonable conditions on the entry and presence of dogs in cemeteries</td>
<td>Parks Mangers (Tier 5)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch 1</td>
<td>To grant permission and impose reasonable conditions</td>
<td>Parks Managers/ Team Leader (Tier 6)</td>
<td>22 Nov 2012</td>
<td>GB/2012/157</td>
<td>01 Jul 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: A responsibility, duty or power delegated to an officer/committee holding a named position is also delegated to any officer/committee who performs or exercises the same or a substantially similar role or function, whatever the name of his or her position.

Section 4
Register of controls for matters contained in bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date of Decision</th>
<th>Decision Reference</th>
<th>Commencement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* None attached at this time. Refer to delegated authorities in section 3.

Section 5
Licence process for matters contained in bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date of Decision</th>
<th>Decision Reference</th>
<th>Commencement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* None attached at this time. Refer to delegated authorities in section 3.

Section 6
Enforcement powers for matters contained in bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Provision</th>
<th>Description of Legislative Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 162 Local Government Act 2002 (s20(5A) Dog Control Act 1996)</td>
<td>District Court may issue injunction restraining a person from committing a breach of a bylaw.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7
Offences and penalties for matters contained in bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Description of Offence</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Infringement Fee</th>
<th>Other Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cl 18(2)</td>
<td>Breach of bylaw</td>
<td>Max. $20,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 8
Monitoring and review for matters contained in bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Measured By</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* None attached at this time. Refer to Report on Dog Policy and Practices in section 2.
Section 8
Delegated authority template

Memo
(Type date here)
To: (Type recipient/s name here) Manager Policies and Bylaws
cc: (Type name/s here. Delete this line if not required)
From: (Type sender/s name and position who has delegated authority here)

Subject: (Type subject here e.g. Delegated Authority Control / Licence Process pursuant to Clause # of the XZY Bylaw)

That-
(1) pursuant to the delegation from the Governing Body of the (Type “Auckland Council” or “Auckland Transport” here)
(2) to the (Type delegated authority position here)
(3) under (Type standing order reference here)
(4) in relation to (Type the control, or licence process here)
(5) under clause (Type clause here) of the (Type bylaw title here)

The following (Type “control”, or “licence process” here) is (Type “made”, “amended”, “revoked”, “replaced” here) as follows:

(Insert matters here)

Signature: (Appears at the end of document, delete if not required)
(Type name here)
(Type position here)

Enc [attach any attachments, e.g. maps]
Local board resolution responses and information report

File No.: CP2019/04490

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. This report provides a summary of resolution responses and information reports for circulation to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board.

Information reports for the local board:
2. A memo regarding the land owner approval application to place a container on Imrie Park, Mangere for three months was sent to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on 27 March 2019 is Attachment A to this report. This initiative is part of the board’s ‘Out and About’ park activation programme, 2018/2019.
3. A memo regarding the refurbishment of Māngere Town Centre Library, in response to the resolution number MO/2018/150 was sent to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on 3 April 2019 is Attachment B to this report.
4. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback to Auckland Transport on the Speed Limits Bylaw 2019 is Attachment C to this report.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
a) note the memo on the land owner approval application to place a container on Imrie Park, Māngere for three months.
b) note the memo on the refurbishment of Māngere Town Centre Library.
c) note the board feedback on the Speed Limits Bylaw 2019, sent to Auckland Transport.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Memo on the land owner approval application to place a container on</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imrie Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Memo on the refurbishment of Mangere Town Centre Library</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mangere-Ōtahuhu Local Board feedback on the Auckland Transport Speed</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limits Bylaw 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

Authors          Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor
Authorisers      Rina Tagore - Relationship Manager Mangere-Ōtahuhu & Otara-Papatoetoe
Memorandum

27 March 2019

To: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

Subject: Land owner approval application to place a container on Imrie Park, Mangere for three months

From: Alayna Fiatau, Land Use Advisor

Purpose
1. To request feedback on the land owner approval application to place a container on Imrie Park, Mangere for three months from the applicant, Peter Caccioppoli, Senior Activation Advisor in Parks Sport and Recreation.

2. To request feedback from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on this proposal in accordance with the following:
   - the authority to grant land owner consent is delegated to council staff as per the Officer Delegations Register [schedule two – scope of delegated functions, powers, and duties for the Community Facilities Department, Property - power to approve works on, over or under Council land]. The local board’s delegation protocols require that staff consult with the nominated local board members before exercising this delegation.

Context/background
3. Parks Sport and Recreation are requesting to place a container on Imirie park for three months. The container will support locally led activations such as fitness challenges and youth-led games and activities.

Discussion

Proposal
4. The container will be located between the existing basketball halfcourt and playground (shown in Figures 1 and 2).

5. The container is part of the ‘Out and About’ park activation programme.

6. Parks Sport and Recreation attended a workshop with the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board. Please refer attachment 1, Memo from Peter Caccioppoli.

Site details
7. Lot 74 DP 54457 is held in fee simple by the Auckland Council as a classified recreation reserve and subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977.

Planning context
8. The application is consistent with and supports the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan 2017 outcome “A place where everyone thrives and belongs”. It promotes active, healthy living and will increase opportunities for community involvement and connectedness.
Figure 1: Aerial view Imrie Park, Mangere showing approximate location of the container

Figure 2: Photo of proposed container location (photo taken 1/03/2019)

Figure 3: Photos of an identical container (provided by applicant)
Land use and specialists comments/consultation

9. Auckland Council’s maintenance delivery coordinator reviewed and supports the proposal.

10. Overall, the applicant’s proposal is considered to be acceptable to the Community Facilities because:
    • it supports residents becoming more active in parks and open spaces
    • it will allow increased access and visibility to park based activations
    • it will not affect the long term use of the reserve
    • the area will be fully reinstated upon removal of the container.

Options

11. If the board confirms that they support the application, staff can exercise the delegation to provide land owner approval. This will enable the applicant to proceed with placing the container.

12. If the board rejects the application, this will not allow the applicant to place the container.

Next steps/implementation

13. If the local board supports the application, the applicant will be able to proceed with placing the container.

14. Conditions will be placed on any land owner approval regarding but not limited to:
    • the container to be removed three months from the time of placement
    • reinstatement of any damage
    • health and safety conditions.

Attachments

15. Memo from Peter Caccioppoli to Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board dated 27 February 2019, subject Out and About – Community led container activations, Imrie Park.

Recommendation

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board have been consulted and confirm that it supports the Manager Land Advisory Services exercising the staff delegation to provide landowner approval to Peter Caccioppoli on behalf of Parks Sport and Recreation, Community Services, Auckland Council for the placement of a container.
Attachment 1: Memo from Peter Caccioppoli
Memo

To: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

From: Peter Caccioppoli, Senior Activation Advisor, Active Recreation

CC: Debra Langton, PSR Portfolio Manager; Liz Muliaga, Strategic Broker, Community Empowerment

Date: 27 February 2019

Subject: Out and About – Community led container activations, Imrie Park

1. Purpose

To provide information on how Active Recreation are supporting new ways to enable local led delivery through the temporary placement of a container at Imrie Park.

2. Introduction

Active Recreation have identified a local group (Do Good Feel Good) who plan to deliver some activations at Imrie Park from March – May.

3. Details

Active Recreation, in FY 17/18 piloted container- based group fitness activations in Howick, Otara, and Manurewa local board areas, which took place over a weekend for a period of 2 – 3 weeks.

The pilots were successful enough to extend them in FY18/19 through the deployment of a set of containers across multiple local board areas at the same time with each container being placed for a minimum of 12 weeks.

The ‘Do Good Feel Good’ group have developed an activation schedule including an 8 week fitness challenge; youth- led games and activities, One Love Mama’s gatherings, to be delivered in the period of March - May 2019 at Imrie Park.

4. Discussion and Officers Comments

Active Recreation is seeking land owner approval to put the container on Imrie Park and are waiting for this process to be completed. The container and equipment are ready to deploy and the plan is to action this as soon as practically possible. Active Recreation will also provide $800 from the out & about LDI funding (work programme #526), to the Do Good Feel Good group to be used to fund instructors to facilitate the 8 week fitness challenge.

5. Next Steps

Active Recreation will provide a copy of the finalised delivery schedule so that the local board can attend some of the Imrie Park activations, quarterly attendance figures, and a summary report before the end of FY18/19.
7. Container initiative Moana Nui a Kiwa

Officers will discuss initiative as part of the 19/20 PSR work programme and will draw on the learnings and outcomes of the community led container activations.
Memorandum

To: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board members
cc Rina Tagore, Acting Relationship Manager, Local Board Services
Subject: Refurbishment of Māngere Town Centre Library
From: Andrew Hollis, Senior Project Manager, Community Facilities
Gill Pannell, Auckland Libraries

Purpose

1. To respond to board resolution at its September 2018 business meeting request, requesting community facility and library officers to inform the board of closing dates, including the reopening of the library and arrangements. (Resolution number MO/2018/150).

2. To inform the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board of the impending closure of Māngere Town Centre Library to allow a comprehensive renewal to take place.

Summary

- Closure of the Māngere Town Centre Library from Monday 6 May until Monday 15 July.
- Some services will be maintained - outreach to kōhanga reo and schools.
- Mobile Library present on Saturdays from 10 am to 3 pm
- “Pop up” library events are being explored

Context/Background

Māngere Town Centre Library is scheduled for a comprehensive renewal of the interior spaces this financial year. Closure of the library for 10 weeks is to allow for the safe renewal of lighting and electrical services upgrade, new floor coverings, new counter space, new furniture and painting.

At a workshop on 11 April 2018 the local board were supportive of the proposed design with minor improvements suggested including Koru shapes in the decorative motifs for the pillars now included in the design. The current timeline is now for the works to be undertaken Monday 6 May until Monday 15 July. The library will be closed for this period.

To mitigate the effect of the closure:

- all outreach services to schools and kōhanga reo will continue, and library staff will offer visits to other groups as requested
- the Mobile Library will be present on Saturdays from 10 am until 3 pm for the duration of the works
- books will still be able to be returned through the afterhours book slot
- items customers have requested will be sent to Māngere East Library (or another library of the customer’s choice) for collection
- options for some “Pop-up” events are being explored in conjunction with the Māngere Arts Centre
- items borrowed from Māngere Town Centre Library will not fall due during the closure
The communication plan includes:

- Signage about the closure in all the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board libraries
- Fliers included when books are issued from Māngere Town Centre Library
- Local schools and regular groups to be informed about the closure
- Auckland Libraries’ website update regarding the closure
- Library Connect to update i-Know
The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board presents the following submission to Auckland Transport’s Speed Limits Bylaw 2019 (draft Bylaw)

30 March 2019

Introduction

1. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is focused on safety to the local area’s transport network. Auckland Transport recently reported that Māngere Central ranks 4th out 275 Auckland communities for fatal and serious crashes. 26% of all crashes in the area involve pedestrians. The social costs of these incidents in Māngere Central is around $18.2m.

2. This is not acceptable and urges Auckland Transport and the New Zealand Transport Agency to reduce these statistics and improve the safety of the local transport network.

3. The local board supports the draft Bylaw’s commitment to a holistic, data-driven and inclusive approach to speed management, as these principles reflects the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s Local Board Plan’s outcomes:

   - **Outcome 4:** A well-connected area: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is well connected by public transport, cycleways and walkways, making it easy for everyone to get around.

   - **Outcome 6:** A place where everyone thrives and belongs Our communities have safe and healthy neighbourhoods. Our actions ensure positive prospects for the future of children and young people. We come together to celebrate our cultures. We are active and involved in local matters.

Purpose

4. The purpose of the draft Auckland Transport Speed Limits Bylaw 2019 is to make our roads safer by reducing speeds on the local transport networks through setting new speed limits across the transport network. Auckland Transport’s consultation material specifically ask for feedback on:

   I. The detail of the bylaw that are being introduced, and

   II. The specific roads where the speed limits are to be reduced
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board response

5. The local board support the draft Bylaw to introduce new speed limits across the Auckland region’s road network as detailed in the draft Bylaw consultation material, as the local board remains committed towards making the local board area’s transport network safer.

6. The local board proposes the speed limit is changed to 50km/h to the following roads specific to the local area (table below). This is a change from the recommendation noted in the memorandum dated 18 February 2019 from AT to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Existing Speed Limit</th>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creamery Road</td>
<td>Mangere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>full length</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Road</td>
<td>Mangere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>full length</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukaki Road</td>
<td>Mangere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>between 375m south of Cyclamen Road and southern end of Pukaki Road</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submission comments and recommendations

Regional Fuel Tax

7. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board also acknowledges that the draft Bylaw is part of Auckland Transport’s Regional Fuel Tax-funded (RFT) programme that became operative in 1 July 2018. Projects approved to be funded from this revenue includes, Road Safety (Project 8).

8. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s resolution in May 2018 supported the RFT proposal and requested for more safety programmes, streetscape upgrades, and safer active modes of transport to be delivered in the local area. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board now calls Auckland Transport to deliver these initiatives in the local area in parallel with the draft Bylaw to reduce speed and make our transport network safer. There are roads in Mangere-Ōtāhuhu that require the existing speed limit to be further reduced. The roads in paragraph 6 should be set at 50 km/h.
Demographics

9. In addition to the local board’s Local Board Plan outcome 4, its focus is to make the local transport network safe for the most vulnerable. Mangere has a significant residential development for Auckland through central government’s Auckland Housing Programme (AHP) which will replace approximately 2,700 state houses with up to 10,000 new healthy homes over the next 10-15 years. This will include around 3000 new state houses, as well as 3500 affordable homes and 3500 new market homes.

10. The board urge Auckland Transport that the occupants of these dwellings must be front of mind and require the draft Bylaw to include proper safety activation initiatives for this target group.

11. The local board request that Auckland Transport plan’s effective delivery of local safety projects for the local area with a deliberate strategy of ensuring pedestrian walkways and cycleways are clearly marked and enable controlled signalisation in busy connector roads to ensure pedestrian safety to cater to all ages (school children to mobile elderly citizens).

12. Making the local transport network safer in built up areas such as the local area, supports the delivery of local board’s Local Board Plan outcome 6. By improving the road network through better road design like raised pedestrian crossings, widened footpaths, the installation of dedicated cycle lanes, upgraded well designed bus shelters and clearly marked bus stops and bus seats, not only helps to reduce speed but this also encourages other benefits like more public transport usage.

13. The local board also request effective controlled signals where required, better signage strategically placed in the local area (specifically placed on council or transport land not on residential properties on berms outside residential properties, well managed planting and street improvements that are maintained regularly in the community trail as this will encourage people to walk or bike around their neighbourhood. This will also provide better health and wellbeing outcomes to the communities in the local area.
Town centres

14. Mangere-Ōtāhuhu local board area has two major town centres in Mangere and Ōtāhuhu and two minor shopping areas in Mangere East and Mangere Bridge. The local board agree to the 30km speed restrictions in these shopping areas. Clear strategically placed signage needs to alert or remind drivers to slow down in these designated precinct localities.

15. In addition to the speed restriction draft Bylaw, two projects in the local area are examples (noted below) of a holistic approach to road safety, the local board now request more safety projects in the local area.

   a. Te Ara Mua - Future Streets project makes it safer and easier to walk and cycle in the Māngere Central area, which includes the Mangere town centre, for improving streets, pathways, crossings, and better safer access to these town centre areas and the local schools nearby.

   b. The Ōtāhuhu Streetscape project - The Ōtāhuhu town centre upgrade aims to transform the streets and public open spaces, making changes to roads and connections to provide better infrastructure for walking and cycling initiatives.

16. The local board request that these types of projects are fully funded and delivered to the local area, but to minimise disruptions to business operations, their customers, and project areas. If the rollout programme does have disruptions it is important the local board is kept well informed prior to the delivery. The local board also request clear signage is placed with well-marked alternative routes.

17. The local board accepts that potentially minimal delays will occur traveling through its town centres but believes saving lives outweighs such implications. The board request that this restriction is implemented to town centres region wide for consistency and to minimise confusion.

18. The local board agree that traffic speed is one of the factors that people perceive as making roads unsafe. The perception of unsafe roads is a barrier to people visiting local town centres to shop, meet and work. Unsafe speed levels also limit's people from traveling by cycle, walking, and social interaction, with slower traffic speeds, roads are perceived to be safer.

19. The local board request Auckland Transport to rethink local busy pedestrian routes and shared spaces in suburban roads and to think about introducing the colouring of specific road surfaces so that vehicles etc can slow down or drive to a speed of 30 km/hour. This could help influence a driver behaviour
change to help drivers understand they are now entering a frequent pedestrian shared space area and encourage drivers to slow down.

20. In addition to the above roads the board recommend the following roads for speed limits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Existing Speed Limit</th>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favona Road</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahunga Drive</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie Road</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmsley Road</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Roads</td>
<td>Mangere Otahuhu</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the local board chair and Transport Portfolio alternate lead welcome the opportunity to speak to the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board Submission direct to the Auckland Transport Board on the Auckland Transport Speed Limits Bylaw 2019.

Kind Regards,

Lemauga Lydia Sosene
Chair
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board with its updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.

3. The governance forward work calendars were introduced in 2016 as part of Auckland Council’s quality advice programme and aim to support local boards’ governance role by:
   - ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   - clarifying what advice is expected and when
   - clarifying the rationale for reports.

4. The calendar also aims to provide guidance for staff supporting local boards and greater transparency for the public.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
a) notes the Governance Forward Work Calendar.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Governance Forward Plan Work Calendar</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rina Tagore - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu &amp; Otara-Papatoetoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting (workshop or business meeting)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>April/May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>May/June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>1 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>5 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>12 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>May/June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Early May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Early June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>May/June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>June/July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Attached are the notes from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board workshops held on 6, 13 and 27 March 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
  a) receive the workshop notes from the workshops held on 6, 13 and 27 March 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6 March Workshop Notes</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13 March Workshop Notes</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>27 March Workshop Notes</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rina Tagore - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu &amp; Otara-Papatoetoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Workshop record of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board held in the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board Office, Wednesday 6 March 2019, commencing at 1.00pm**

**PRESENT**  
Chairperson: Lemauga Lydia Sosene  
Members:  
Nick Bakulich  
Carrol Elliott  
Makaila Kolo  
Christine O’Brien  
Absent: Walter Togiamua and Tafafuna’i Tasi Lauese for absence.  
Also present: Rina Tagore, Janette McKain, Daniel Poe, Riya Seth, Shoma Prasad, Liz Muliaga  

Chair Lemauga Lydia Sosene opened the workshop in prayer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where Koa – Mangere Community House 2019/20 work programme</td>
<td>Jacqueline Puna-Teaukura, Fatima Vaaga, Rosetta Mamea</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>The board discussed the Where Koa work programme and gave feedback. This will be reported at the quarterly work programme updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out and About community led container activations</td>
<td>Peter Cacciopoli, Liz Muliaga</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The board discussed the plan around the opportunity for community led Out &amp; About activations at Imrie Avenue and gave direction to officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Assets Management Programme</td>
<td>Tanya Sorrel</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring</td>
<td>The board were introduced to council’s Strategic Heritage Asset Management document, summarise the funding in the LTP (heritage building fund) and had an update on next steps for council’s heritage buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Improving the process to develop regional policy | Liz Civil                                      | Oversight and Monitoring                | The board had a powerpoint presentation and gave feedback on a discussion paper that considers how the process to develop regional policy could be improved to ensure effective local board input.  
**Action:** Feedback to officers by the end of April. |
| Relationship Manager & Information Update  | Rina Tagore                                    | Keeping Informed                        | The board were updated on any upcoming issues.                                                                                       |
**Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Workshop Notes**

**Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Workshop Notes**

17 April 2019

**Workshop record of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board held in the Mangere-Ōtahuhu Local Board Office, Wednesday 13 March 2019, commencing at 1.00pm**

**PRESENT**

Chairperson: Lemauga Lydia Sosene  
Members: Nick Bakulich  
           Tafafuniai Tasi Lauese  
           Makalita Kolo  
           Christine O’Brien

Absent: Carrol Elliott and Walter Togiamua for absence.  
Also present: Rina Tagore, Janette McKain, Riya Seth, Shoma Prasad, Liz Muliaga

Member Lauese opened the workshop in prayer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeslot</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.00 - 1.30pm | ACAB – CAB funding | Riya Seth, Paul Prestige | Feedback | The board had a presentation and gave feedback on the preferred model for allocating funding to CABs, including:  
- The basis of funding allocation, including the population estimates and deprivation index.  
- Bureau areas served (e.g. alignment with local board boundaries).  
- Other local funding considerations. |
| 1.30 - 2.00pm | Grant Programme Review 2019/2020 | Marion Davies, Fran Hayton, Helen Taimarangai, George Makapatama, Winnie Hauraki | Setting direction, priorities and budgets | The board reviewed the grant programme for the 2019/2020 financial year and decided on the content of the grants programme including criteria, exclusions, lower priorities and grant round dates. |
| 2.00 - 4.00pm | Local Board Work Programme Development | Audrey Gan Libraries - Gill Pannell  
               ATEED - John Norman  
               I&ES - Mara Bebich  
               ACE - Liz Muliaga, Stephen Johnson  
               PSR - Debra Langton  
               CF - Nichola Painter, Ian Milne, Marcus Tali, Marc Dendale | Setting direction, priorities and budgets | The board had discussion on the draft work programmes by activity and gave feedback on the following work programmes:  
- Libraries  
- ATEED – Local Economic Development  
- Infrastructure and Environmental Services  
- Arts, Community and Events  
- Parks, Sport and Recreation  
- Community Facilities |
Workshop record of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board held in the Mangere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Office, Wednesday 27 March 2019, commencing at 1.00pm

**PRESENT**

Chairperson: Lemauga Lydia Sosene  
Members: Nick Bakulich, Carrol Elliott, Makalita Kolo, Christine O’Brien  
Absent: Tafafuna'i Tasi Lauose and Walter Togiamua for absence.  
Also present: Rina Tagore, Janette McKain, Riya Seth, Shoma Prasad, Liz Muliaga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeslot</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.00 - 2.00pm | Community Facilities  
- Operational management and maintenance;  
- Project Delivery  
- Community Leases | Greg Hannah, Dominic Stanley, Tai Stirling, Raymond Tan, Tony Child, Susan Quinn | Oversight and Monitoring | The board had a presentation on 19 Hall Avenue, Ōtāhuhu and gave feedback on the following options:  
Option 1: to do nothing  
Option 2: to carry out recommended works  
Option 3: to rationalise the property site to maximize the potential for future use  
Action: A report will come to a business meeting recommending Option 2 for 19 Hall Avenue.  
The board discussed the Mahi Tahi and maintenance delivery. |
| 2.00 – 2.45pm | Community Services  
Arts, Community & Events (ACE)  
- Arts Broker Update  
- Update on Youth Scholarships, Youth Hackathon and Youth Strategy | Liz Muliaga, Sarah Edwards, Renee Tanner, Daylyn Braganza | Oversight and Monitoring | The board had a presentation on the projects supported and funded by through the community arts broker work programme.  
Update on Youth Scholarships, Youth Hackathon and Youth Strategy.  
Action: A report will come to the board to in April/May reallocate funding to Youth Strategy. |
| 2.45 – 3.30pm | Community Services  
Parks, Sport & Recreation  
- Priority Playground Development Projects | Debra Langton, Steve Owens, Marcus Tali, Greg Hannah | Oversight and Monitoring | The board had a presentation and discussed the next steps in priority playground development.  
Priority Playgrounds:  
1. David Lange Park  
2. Kiwi Esplanade Reserve  
3. Cyclamen Park  
4. Boggust Park |
| 3.30 – 4.00pm | Relationship Manager  
& Information Update  
- Land Owner approval for Imrie Park | Rina Tagore | Keeping Informed | To update the board on upcoming issues.  
Summary of information memos that have been sent to the board members. |
ATTACHMENTS
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Respite Care Facility
-Te Manawa -
Business Plan for Mangere

Puti & Doug Wilson
The Need for Respite

- Few venues for respite care & day stay facilities for young adults in the South Auckland region
- Especially for High to Very High (H-VH) needs (ORS funding)
- 19% in Auckland ~269,000
- Counties Manukau DHB (CMDHB) ~100,000 disabled
- Estimated H-VH needs in CMDHB~ 5600
- 15-44yr olds in CMDHB H-VH ~ 2400 people
- Where are the centres in the CM Community for respite?
Respite Centres

- Wilson Home Trust - Takapuna - excellent example
- For children up to 18yrs – respite care & rehabilitation
- Special Education Schools caters for up to 21yrs
- Little available for post school age other than residential care
- Needs are hidden especially in M&P communities
Community Wellbeing

- Govt has recognised the need to improve community wellbeing in the Mangere area
- Maori and Pacific communities fair poorly in many indicators
- How can this need be translated into improved outcomes:
  - Requires a Maori / Pacific kaupapa approach
  - Needs to be community led and operated
  - Requires access to community based facilities
  - Integration of services (MoH, MSD, Housing, Transport, NGOs)
  - Develop community ownership / stewardship.
### Attachment A

#### Item 8.2

**161R Robertson Rd**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>CT Number</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Site (Property)</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Property Area</th>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Council Property ID</th>
<th>Council Rate Account Key</th>
<th>Valuation Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Agencies support

We are in discussions with and/or have general support from:

- Ministers Twyford and Sepuloni

- Office of Disability Commission (Brian Coffey)

- Auckland Council / Panuku / Local Board

- Papatūānuku Kōkiri Marae

- Auckland University Planning & Architecture Dept

- HLC (Nicola McAtrie)