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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 Waitematā Local Board:
a) confirm the minutes of its ordinary meeting, held on Tuesday, 19 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
At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

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

8 Deputations
Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Waitematā 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 Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust - Requirement for Community rooms at 192 Parnell Road, Auckland

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To discuss a requirement for community rooms at 192 Parnell Road, Auckland.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Waitematā Local Board:
   a) thank Annalee Hayward, Community Support Team Leader and Chris Gower, Northern Property Advisor for their presentation and attendance at the business meeting.

Attachments
A 20190416 Waitematā Local Board Item 8.1 Requirement for Community rooms, 192 Parnell Road, Auckland ................................................................. 167

8.2 Auckland Basketball Services Limited

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To introduce Auckland Basketball Services Limited to the local board.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Waitematā Local Board:
   a) thank Cliff Freeman, Funding Manager and Tracy Atiga, Chief Executive Officer of Auckland Basketball Services Limited for their presentation and attendance at the business meeting.

8.3 Auckland Writers' Festival 14 – 19 May 2019

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To introduce the Auckland Writers’ Festival, their community programmes and benefits.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Waitematā Local Board:
   a) thank Anne O’Brien, Festival Director and Nicola Strawbridge, Programme Manager for the presentation and attendance at the business meeting.
8.4 Graham Street - Hardinge Street Precinct Project

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present an alternative to the order in which the Graham Street-Hardinge Street Precinct Project design work is carried out.
2. The present Auckland Transport proposal places cycleway first, traffic management second. Specifically, it is requested:
   - Step 1 – AT to cease work on cycleway design until full review of Traffic Management Options is completed, including consideration of Travel Demand Management Plans already in existence with the Graham-Harding Precinct.
   - Step 2 - Traffic management and design – based on the review in Step 1, to design a comprehensive traffic management plan for Victoria Street between Nelson Street and Halsey Street including protection of the access and egress from the Graham-Harding Precinct, such layout and design to protect the safety and interests of vehicular and motor cycle traffic, e-scooter riders, pedestrians and cyclists by the incorporation of appropriate signalisation of all modes of movement.
   - Step 3 - Cycleway design as an adjunct to and not the driver of the traffic management design.
3. To request the appointment of a Waitematā Local Board member to work with a panel to provide them with guidance on the matter.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) thank David Watt and panel members for the presentation and attendance at the business meeting.

Attachments
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8.5 Request for Prime Road, Grey Lynn to be included in Residents' Parking Zone (RPZ)

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present a request from residents of Prime Road, Grey Lynn to be included in the Residents' Parking Zone (RPZ).
2. The residents in support of this request are those in the block bounded by Schofield Street to the south and Dryden Street in the west, except for 13 Prime Road which is currently a construction site.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) thank John Dymond for the presentation and attendance at the business meeting.
9 Public Forum

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

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

10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”

11 Notices of Motion

Under Standing Order 2.5.1 (LBS 3.11.1) or Standing Order 1.9.1 (LBS 3.10.17) (revoke or alter a previous resolution) a Notice of Motion has been received from <Member Names> for consideration under item 12.
Notice of Motion - Member R Thomas - Western Springs Bush Restoration Project

File No.: CP2019/05655

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

1. Member R Thomas has given notice of a motion that he wishes to propose.
2. The notice is appended as Attachment A.
3. Supporting information is appended as Attachment B.

Motion

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) receive the Notice of Motion

b) acknowledge the Hearing Commissioners view that the project must not focus on tree removal rather than protecting, enhancing and restoring the Sensitive Ecological Area (SEA)

b) provide the following direction to staff regarding the delivery of the Western Springs Native Bush Restoration Project:
   i. request council staff to commission an independent and comprehensive Ecological Management Plan for the area
   ii. that the Ecological Management Plan is informed by an independent ecologist undertaking a tree-by-tree assessment of the pines and makes a recommendation of how removal methodology has been designed to achieve the desired outcomes of protecting and enhancing the SEA
   iii. that the Ecological Management Plan include an accurate overall site plan and map of priority areas for protection
   iv. that the Ecological Management Plan provide for the reinstatement of the walking access track
   v. that the Ecological Management Plan is consulted with the community and a community reference group is established to provide further guidance before the Plan is adopted; and
   vi. that an independent ecologist is empowered through the Ecological Management Plan to direct tree removal on an as-needed basis consistent with a transition from the dominant pine canopy to native forest.
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Notice of Motion to Western Springs Native Bush Restoration Project, 859 Great North Road

In accordance with Standing Orders, please place the following Notice of Motion on the agenda for the Waitematā Local Board meeting being held on 19 March 2019:

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) receive the Notice of Motion

b) acknowledges the Hearing Commissioners view that the project must not focus on tree removal rather than protecting, enhancing and restoring the Sensitive Ecological Area (SEA)

c) provide the following direction to staff regarding the delivery of the Western Springs Native Bush Restoration Project:

i. request council staff to commission an independent and comprehensive Ecological Management Plan for the area

ii. that the Ecological Management Plan is informed by an independent ecologist undertaking a tree-by-tree assessment of the pines and makes a recommendation of how removal methodology has been designed to achieve the desired outcomes of protecting and enhancing the SEA

iii. that the Ecological Management Plan include an accurate overall site plan and map of priority areas for protection

iv. that the Ecological Management Plan provide for the reinstatement of the walking access track

v. that the Ecological Management Plan is consulted with the community and a community reference group is established to provide further guidance before the Plan is adopted; and

vi. that an independent ecologist is empowered through the Ecological Management Plan to direct tree removal on an as-needed basis consistent with a transition from the dominant pine canopy to native forest.
Horopaki Context

The local board was established in 2010. Within that first term an operational project was presented to the local board called the Western Springs Pine Stand Removal Project. At the time the project was not being championed by an elected member but was put forward by council staff with the intent to remove pine trees as officers informed us they were unsafe and coming to the end of their life.

In 2014, the Waitematā Local Board was approached by residents concerned about the clear-felling of pine trees around the south eastern edge of the stadium near the outer sports field. At the time the Waitematā Local Board was unaware of this project that had been carried out by Regional Facilities Auckland, a CCO of Auckland Council, that had informed neither elected members nor the public about these activities.

At the time elected members Vernon Tava and I, along with Auckland Council Park managers met with residents at Annette Izby’s house. We informed Council staff and CCO’s to implement a “no surprises” approach to any future works to be undertaken in the reserve.

Between 2010 and 2017 almost no works were undertaken by Auckland Council relating to the pine-stand removal project and the local board re-named the project the “Western Springs Native Bush Restoration Project.”

In 2017 with a new Auckland Council project manager, staff approached the local board pushing the project ahead once again with a request by the local board for a “no-surprises” approach to project management. A number of workshops were undertaken with the local board highlighting officers’ concerns that the pine trees in the reserve posed a risk to the public and that if the project did not progress that the park would need to be closed.

In late 2017, the Waitematā Local Board received communication from residents in the area that a permanent wooden fence had been erected at the south-western entrance of the reserve and a door prevented access through the western edge of the reserve. Auckland Council staff had not kept their promise to ensure there were no surprises in the execution of the project. Once again officers were asked to explain their actions which were a breach of their delegated responsibilities as they had not sought the land owner’s (i.e. Waitematā Local Board’s) approval.

When asked why they did not seek the local board’s permission there was no explanation. When asked why they put up a permanent fence at the entrance they said it was cheaper than a non-permanent, see-through fence. One local board member observed that, if they had been asked, they would never have permitted
Council to put up a permanent structure, especially one that residents could not see through.

In late 2018, at a local board workshop, Member Thomas requested information about insurance for the project, land stability reports, and the methodology being used to assess the trees to be felled.

The Waitematā Local Board requested that the officers submit an application to remove the remaining 200 pine trees in Western Springs Reserve. The methodology put forward by council would potentially destroy 75% of the natural bush undergrowth and, hence, the majority of the Sensitive Ecological Area (SEA).

A week prior to Christmas, Auckland Council issued evacuation notices to neighbours at the top end of the reserve using emergency powers for the urgent removal of 13 trees. Once again, I heard this through the media.

At the same time Auckland Council had received the Commissioner’s first report with recommendations indicating that the Auckland Council’s approach to the consent was not taking into consideration the importance of the SEA.

Local residents who had received the notification of evacuation and were also submitting to the resource consent hearing approached the elected members of the Local Board and Waitematā and Gulf Councillor, Mike Lee.

Councillor Lee was the first to respond saying that works for the removal of the 13 trees should stop until after the Commissioners’ report provided guidance. Further correspondence with staff found that Auckland Council had not undertaken an adequate arborist’s assessment of the 13 trees.

After a number of emails directed to the CEO’s office, residents finally met with Council staff and reached an agreement that no road would be built for the 13 trees to be removed, that only 9 needed to be section felled, and two would be trimmed. This saved 4 trees and prevented a logging road from destroying a significant amount of native growth.

On the 8 March 2019 the Independent Hearing Panel chaired by David Serjeant issued a second direction by Hearing Commissioners under section 41C of the Resource Management Act 1991 for 859 Great North Road:

“The conditions presented at the hearing appeared to be focused on tree removal rather than protecting, enhancing and restoring the SEA, consequently we consider that they should be redrafted where relevant for this approach;”

The second direction attached to this NOM has given clear direction to Council. It also confirms to the residents and many of the submitters that Auckland Council has
not adequately considered the status of the SEA in its assessment of the project. It further highlights that Council staff have failed in their duty to act independently, seek independent expert advice, and/or provide good advice to elected members, and transparency to the public.

To date Auckland Council has wasted a significant amount or ratepayers' money and caused major distress to residents.

This Notice of Motion has been developed to reflect the Hearing Commissioner’s recommendations, give voice to the concerns of local residents, and provide some direction and leadership to Council officers.
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IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Application for resource consents by Auckland Council Community Facilities for the removal of pine trees within the northern corner of Te Wai Ôrea - Western Springs Lakeside Park.

Second Direction issued by Hearing Commissioners under section 41C of the Resource Management Act 1991

1. The Commissioners thank all parties for their extensive input to the first direction dated 18 December 2018 relating to further information.

2. The full consideration of any proposal includes the mitigation offered. Such mitigation is set out in conditions of consent. We did not specifically ask for a revised set of conditions from the applicant in the first direction. However, clearly with the significant amendments to the proposal a revised set of conditions offered is very important to our understanding of how environmental effects are to be avoided and mitigated.

3. We therefore seek an amended set of conditions from the applicant relating to its revised proposal. Matters that should be considered for specific revised or additional attention in the conditions in our view are:

   • The conditions presented at the hearing appeared to be focused on tree removal rather than protecting, enhancing and restoring the SEA, consequently we consider that they should be redrafted where relevant for this approach;

   • Protecting, enhancing, and restoring the SEA and transitioning it from pine canopy to native forest should be the primary goal of the project and stated upfront in conditions particularly in relation to any management plans;

   • Many restoration projects that are of interest to the community include consent conditions with ongoing community engagement and methods by which information is disseminated in a regular and timely manner using modern communications. e.g. community liaison group and website. We consider such a condition is appropriate in this case.

   • The conditions should refer to a revised overall site plan and map of Priority Areas for Protection – including accurate mapping of the area (2.2ha);

   • The revised tree removal methodology should be clearly specified in the conditions for the different areas (Area 1; Area 2; PAPs);

   • Consistent with the above focus on the SEA, a comprehensive ecological management plan, incorporating all aspects of the environment, is needed given the revised methodology;

   • The plan should provide explicitly for the reinstatement of the access track to indigenous vegetation following tree removal;
We consider that the conditions should provide for a suitably experienced arborist and ecologist independent of the consent process to be engaged to manage the implementation of any consent granted.

In order to achieve the desired SEA outcomes, the independent ecologist should be empowered to direct tree removal and earthworks on a day-to-day onsite basis, and required to log a daily or weekly report on how removal methodologies have been designed and implemented.

Ongoing weed and pest control for the site, and monitoring of plantings to ensure transition to native forest over a long term in order for the project to meet its goal of enhancing and restoring the SEA.

4. The above list contains suggestions of the Commissioners and it is the applicant’s prerogative to provide updated conditions as it sees fit.

5. The Commissioner’s request for conditions should not be interpreted that we have reached a view on whether to grant or decline consent. As stated above, it is simply that the consideration of the revised project must be informed by a clear set of conditions.

6. We set out the following timetable for responses:
   
a) The applicant is to provide a set of revised conditions by 4pm Thursday 14 March, 2019; and

b) The Council and submitter’s are to provided any comments on the new conditions by 4pm Wednesday, 20 March 2019. No extensions will be given and the submitters are requested to confine comments to the conditions and no other matters.

7. All correspondence is to be sent to: sam.otter@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Dave Serjeant
Chair
Independent Hearing Panel

8 March 2019
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor Mike Lee with an opportunity to update the Waitematā Local Board on regional issues.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Waitematā Local Board:
a) receive the verbal update from the Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor, Mike Lee.

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Mike Lee - Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor Waitematā Local Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Waitematā Local Board on transport related matters in their area including the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report covers:
   • a summary of Auckland Transport projects and operations in the local board area
   • a summary of the board’s transport capital fund
   • a summary of general information items sent to the board.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waitematā Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport April 2019 report
b) requests Auckland Transport assist with facilitating the introduction of time restricted parking in Newmarket Park
c) allocates up to $4,000 from the boards locally driven initiatives budget to implement the time restricted parking at Newmarket Park

Horopaki
Context
3. This report updates the local board on Auckland Transport (AT) projects and operations in the local board area, it updates the local board on their advocacy and consultations and includes information on the status of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund.
4. Auckland Transport is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. We report on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in our Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within the governance of Auckland on behalf of their local communities.
5. The Local Board Transport Capital Fund 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.
6. The Community Safety Fund is a capital budget established by Auckland Transport for use by local boards to fund local road safety initiatives. The purpose of this fund is to allow elected members to address long-standing road safety issues that are not regional priorities and are therefore not being addressed by the Auckland Transport programme.
**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**  
**Analysis and advice**

**Auckland Transport projects and operations in the Waitematā local board area**

7. The table below has a general summary of projects and activities of interest to the board with their current status. Please note that all timings are indicative and are subject to change:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parnell cycleway – proposed cycleway through Parnell</td>
<td>No update this month. Previous update: The AT Executive Leadership Team (ELT) are finalising the cycleway programme priority and available budget. This will help determine the future of Parnell cycleway and subsequent funding. The project team has worked through a multi criteria assessment of concept design options and determined AT’s preferred design option. The design can be presented to the community reference group pending the ELT decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Chevalier to Westmere cycleway - A dedicated cycle route along Pt Chevalier Road and Meola Road ending near the Westmere Shops</td>
<td>No update this month. Previous update: Design and planning is progressing and a public consultation will be carried out later in 2019. Once a design is finalised, the project team will present to the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 4 of Waitematā Safer Routes. Improvements for pedestrians, people on bikes and bus users for the section of Great North Road between Crummer Road and Ponsonby Road.</td>
<td>This project has now been included in the Integrated Corridors programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Street Bus Improvement Project (formerly Midtown bus route) – Improving how city centre buses operate</td>
<td>No update this month. Previous update: The project team is gathering material to develop the Detailed Business Case ahead of future optioneering and public consultation. This includes getting the latest HOP data, traffic volumes and development plans. A new reference design is being developed and will be brought to the local board for consideration in the near future. Overall project co-ordination is being undertaken with the Victoria St Linear Park Team, the Light Rail Team and City Rail Link Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herne Bay cycling and walking improvements – proposed changes to encourage slower driving speeds and improve routes for people walking and cycling.</td>
<td>The project team has been updating the design to meet the new standards in the Traffic Design Manual. The stormwater design and the lighting design are progressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Street East-West cycleway - dedicated cycle route along Victoria Street West, from the Beaumont Street intersection to the Hobson Street intersection.</td>
<td>The project team is working to progress the detailed design to incorporate more on road safety and to minimise any rework due to other proposed projects in the area (such as Linear Park) through a coordinated design approach. For this the Victoria Street cycleway project’s scope is reduced to finish at Nelson Street as there is an existing cycleway connection on Nelson Street and Auckland Council is considering future work on Hobson Street. The detailed design is progressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Street Walking and Cycling Improvements (proposed for Federal Street linking Fanshawe Street to Victoria Street until the full Federal Street Upgrade occurs.)</td>
<td>No update this month, previous update: We are currently analysing feedback we received from consultation and will soon produce a report highlighting key themes and changes to be made to improve the safety of the design as a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Street and Union Street</td>
<td>No update this month. Previous update: The project team is in the process of applying for funding for this project. They anticipate this process will be completed in May 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Drive cycle route (Quay Street to Ngapipi Bridge)</td>
<td>The tender period for contractors starts in April and is expected to be awarded in June 2019. Construction will begin soon after and is expected to be complete July 2020. The Solent Street intersection has been separated out to have greater focus as a safety project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā Safe Routes project, the two routes open for feedback are Route 1: Surrey Crescent to Garnet Road and Route 2: Richmond Road.</td>
<td>A high-level summary of public feedback has been presented to the local board at a workshop on the 2 April 2019. Following receiving feedback from the local board the project team will finish compiling all the feedback into a public feedback and decisions report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karangahape Road Enhancements Project – streetscape upgrade</td>
<td>Final negotiations for this project are being worked through and a contractor will be appointed in the coming weeks. Construction is scheduled to begin in late April 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnell Station – installing ticket gates</td>
<td>Contract has been awarded. Expected ticket gates and canopy to be installed in June 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Downtown Infrastructure Improvement Programme –
- Quay Street Strengthening
- Quay Street Enhancement
- Britomart East
- Lower Albert
- Downtown Ferry
- Waterfront Park
- Mooring dolphin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Infrastructure Improvement Programme –</td>
<td>Utilities relocation trenching, and ducting works are complete, and service providers are feeding the services into the ducts. Installation is expected to be complete mid-April. Installation of the new water-main is also compete and connected. Stormwater works began on Saturday 30 March between Lower Hobson and Lower Albert Streets. This phase is expected to take around eight weeks to complete. The traffic layout has been stable throughout March and the majority of the longer-term barriers are in place. We do not expect any major changes to layout through April. We are continuing to monitor and manage traffic on an on-going basis. Public engagement on the Downtown Programme continues with targeted pop ups. From week commencing April 8 we will be installing a temporary public activation area in front of the Ferry Terminal building. The report from the public feedback gathered in late 2018 is being finalised and we expect to have that available for the public soon. The appeal against consent approval for the Queens Wharf to Marsden Wharf section of the Quay Street Strengthening Programme is due to go to mediation in the week commencing 8 April. If there is no resolution, a final hearing is likely to be late June. The hearings for the Princes Wharf and Ferry Basin sections of the Seawall have closed and a decision is expected on 23 April. The hearing for the Ferry Basin redevelopment has been completed and decision expected early May. The hearing for the Mooring Dolphin has been completed a decision is expected 23 April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnell residential parking zone - proposed permit scheme for residents and businesses</td>
<td>Implementation of the parking zone is underway and expected to be complete by the beginning of May 2019. The changes will be introduced progressively: Area 1, 2 and 3 are complete Area 4 and 5 expected by 6 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnell Busway - bus priority improvements on Parnell Road between Davis Crescent and St Mary's Close.</td>
<td>Construction is underway. Construction to be completed by late April. The new bus lane operating hours will be in effect once the work is complete.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Franklin Road upgrade - upgrades to improve the road quality and future-proof existing services. | Overall project completion expected by October 2019.  
Phase 1 (Victoria Street to Wellington Street roundabout) main works complete, pedestrian traffic islands, cycle lane sealing and landscaping to be completed.  
A full day road closure is expected in May for final road overlay, exact date to be confirmed.  
Phase 2 (Ponsonby Road to Wellington Street roundabout) footpath, cycle lane and berm construction underway until May 2019.  
Downhill lane closure in place until early April, uphill traffic only. Final pavement construction programmed for May 2019. |
| Wynyard Quarter street and park upgrades – central construction package | Work continues to progress well. Planning is starting for work staging on Gaunt Street, to ensure we minimise disruption for the marine businesses. We are starting to communicate with the business about staging the work, timing work to avoid their peak trading months, and maintaining access into their customer car parks. Gaunt Street will likely be one way with a detour in place for traffic traveling in the opposing direction. The detour will also have accompanying signage to direct marine business customers. |
| Grey Lynn & Arch Hills parking scheme - proposed permit scheme for residents and businesses | No update this month. Previous update: The Residential Parking zones were implemented in December 2018. Feedback so far has been positive. In line with a resolution passed by the Waitematā Local Board, we will re-assess the parking situation in the remaining streets after parking patterns have normalised. |

### Local Board Transport Capital Fund

8. Following the proposal to increase the Local Board Transport Capital Fund, the allocation to the Waitematā Local Board is now $3,073,725 in total for this electoral period.

9. From this sum the local board has approved:

   - $221,000 as additional funds for the Ponsonby Road pedestrian improvement project
   - up to $5,000 for streetscape enhancement incorporating tree planting on St Marys Road
   - $825,000 for the Greenway connection through Cox’s Bay Reserve to Wharf Road via Bayfield Park
   - $18,500 for upgrading the footpath along the western side of Bourke Street, Newmarket
   - $41,000 to install two sets of bollards in St Patricks Square.

10. The local board currently has $1,963,225 uncommitted.
11. The local board has requested Auckland Transport and the Development Programme Office to provide an updated rough order of cost for the Newmarket Laneways Plan Project 6 - Widen footpath along York Street and look to activate street edge beside multi storey parking.

12. The local board has also requested Auckland Transport develop designs and firm estimates of cost for:
   - walking and cycling connections in the Domain, and
   - a greenway connection through Sneddon Fields.

13. Auckland Transport has also sought feedback from Albert-Eden Local Board on the Motions Road assessed options for the Western Springs Greenway.

14. Auckland Transport is working with Regional Facilities Auckland and the Museum of Transport and Technology (MOTAT) to confirm the opportunity to upgrade the connection to a greenway standard between Motions Road to Meola Road as part of MOTAT’s project to develop a carpark between Meola Road and Motions Road with adjoining cycle and walkway.

Parking Restrictions at Newmarket Park

15. The WLB has signalled its intention to introduce time restricted parking in Newmarket Park. It is understood this is to ensure spaces are available for park users rather than commuters. AT is able to carry out enforcement of parking once the relevant legal process has been completed. This process involves developing a plan of the proposed changes, internal consultation with AT staff, Council staff, stakeholders and the Local Board. An external consultation of a finalised plan is required followed by preparation of a resolution report for approval by AT’s Transport Control Committee to make the changes legal and restrictions enforceable. Physical changes (eg new signage) would then be installed. The process takes 4-6 months and in this case will be managed by Council’s Parks Team and funded by the Local Board. Auckland Council’s Parks Team has sought a preliminary quote for the proposal and has advised that the cost will be in the order of $4,000.

Community Safety Fund

16. The Community Safety Fund is a capital budget established by Auckland Transport for use by local boards to fund local road safety initiatives. The purpose of this fund is to allow elected members to address long-standing road safety issues that are not regional priorities and are therefore not being addressed by the Auckland Transport programme.

17. As this fund is designed to address local road safety concerns it is allocated by local board area. It has been apportioned by a formula focused on numbers of Deaths and Serious Injuries (DSI). This is a finite fund that must be spent by 30 June 2021. Unlike the Local Board Transport Capital Fund there is no ability to carry it over into future financial years.

18. Waitematā Local Board’s allocation is $1,450,216.

19. The criteria of what qualifies for the fund is as follows: “Physical measures raised by the local community to prevent, control or mitigate identified local road and street safety hazards which expose people using any form of road and street transport to demonstrable hazards which may result in death or serious harm. Individual project cost is to be no greater than $1 million. Projects must consist of best practice components, conform to AT standards and comply with New Zealand law.”

New e-scooter trial

20. Auckland Council and Auckland Transport began a new shared e-scooter trial on Monday 1 April 2019. The previous trial ended on the 31 March 2019. The new trial will be for seven months until 31 October 2019. It has new licence conditions for improved incident and maintenance reporting by operators.
21. By mid-April Auckland Transport will be receiving the remaining trip data from the two operators that participated in the first e-scooter trial. After analysing that data, it will be possible to confirm how many scooters are the best number for the city centre and other areas of Auckland.

22. Auckland Transport believes that there is a need for a national regulatory framework for e-scooters, whether they be a shared service or privately owned, and has requested that central government develop regulations for e-scooters and new forms of micro-mobility.

23. In the meantime, Auckland Transport and Auckland Council believe the licences issued under the Street Trading Bylaw are suitable to regulate shared e-scooter services.

**Speed Bylaw consultation closes**

24. Public consultation has closed on the speed bylaw.

25. Auckland Transport received 11,007 submissions on its proposal to reduce speeds on some 700km of high-risk roads around the region.

26. Auckland is facing a road safety crisis with a 78 per cent increase in deaths and a 68 per cent rise in serious injuries since 2014. Lowering speeds and working with Police to enforce those limits is one of the easiest and most effective interventions available.

27. Submissions are currently being analysed and those who have requested will present to a Hearings Panel of AT Board members and senior executives later in April.

28. If adopted, the speed limit changes will come into effect in August this year.

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

29. The impact of the information in this report is confined to Auckland Transport and does not impact on other parts of the Council group. Any engagement with other parts of the Council group will be carried out on an individual project basis.

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

30. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no local, sub-regional or regional impacts.

**Local Board Workshops**


**General information items sent to the board:**

32. Please see below for a summary of items sent to the board for their information or feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date sent to local board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FYI: Midtown bus routes public feedback report</td>
<td>06/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYI: Temporary measures for Queen Street</td>
<td>07/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYI: City Centre on street parking price increases</td>
<td>12/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYI: K Road Arborists Report</td>
<td>12/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYI: St Stephens Ave Parking Update</td>
<td>18/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYI: Scanlan Street and Williamson Avenue</td>
<td>20/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYI: Parnell Station - Accessible Ramp</td>
<td>25/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYI: Outcome - Ayr St/Parnell Rd</td>
<td>01/04/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
33. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no impacts or opportunities for Māori. Any engagement with Māori, or consideration of impacts and opportunities, will be carried out on an individual project basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
34. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no financial implications.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
35. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no risks

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
36. Auckland Transport will provide another update report to the local board next month.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Ben Halliwell - Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon - Elected Member Relationship Team Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Authorisers                  | Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor Waitematā Local Board |
New community sublease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust, 545 Parnell Road, Parnell

File No.: CP2019/04933

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To grant a new community sublease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust at 545 Parnell Road, Parnell, also known as the Jubilee building.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Royal New Zealand Plunket Society Auckland has a community sublease of a room at 545 Parnell Road, Parnell with the former Auckland City Council. The lease for the room in the third party owned building was for a term of three years which commenced 1 February 2007 and contained two renewal terms of three years each. The lease reached its final expiry on 31 January 2016 and has been continuing on a month by month basis.

3. On 22 July 2014 the Royal New Zealand Plunket Society - Auckland Central Branch Incorporated assigned the lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Society Auckland City Area Incorporated. The assignment of lease was with the consent of Auckland Council.

4. As at 1 January 2018 all the interests of the Royal New Zealand Plunket Society – Auckland City Branch Incorporated in the sublease were vested in the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust (Plunket).

5. The land on which the leased room is located, is described as Lot 2 DP 362696, comprising 2794 m2, and contained in Record of Title 255815. It is also held in fee simple by Foundation Properties Limited.

6. Auckland Council has a building lease with the Foundation Properties Limited until 31 May 2022.

7. This report recommends the granting of a new community lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust with a final expiry date of 22 May 2022 to align with the expiry of the third-party building lease.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) grant a new community sublease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust at 545 Parnell Road, Parnell for the room measuring at approximately 48.55m2 subject to the following terms and conditions:
   i) term: commencing 1 May 2019 with expiry 22 May 2022 to align with the expiry of Council’s third-party building lease;
   ii) rent: $1.00 plus GST per annum if requested;
   iii) maintenance fee: $1,213.75 plus GST per annum (calculated at $25 per m2 lease area);
   iv) Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust Community Outcomes Plan to be negotiated and approved by the Chair and Deputy Chair of the board;
   v) all other terms and conditions to be in accordance with the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.
Horopaki

Context

8. This report considers the grant of a new community sublease to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust located at 545 Parnell Road, Parnell.

9. The Waitematā Local Board, is the allocated authority relating to local, recreation, sport and community facilities, including community leasing matters.

10. Royal New Zealand Plunket Society Auckland has a community sublease at 545 Parnell Road, Parnell with the former Auckland City Council. The lease for a room in the third party owned building was for a term of three years which commenced 1 February 2007 and contained two renewal terms of three years each. The lease reached its final expiry on 31 January 2016 and has been continuing on a month by month basis.

11. On 22 July 2014 the Royal New Zealand Plunket Society - Auckland Central Branch Incorporated assigned the lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Society Auckland City Area Incorporated. The assignment of lease was with the consent of Auckland Council.

12. As at 1 January 2018 all the interests of the Royal New Zealand Plunket Society – Auckland City Branch Incorporated in the sublease were vested in the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust (Plunket).

13. The use of the plunket rooms as Plunket Clinics are Mondays and Wednesdays.

14. Casual usage or users of the facility are the PEP (Parent Education Programme).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Land and current community sublease

15. The land on which the Royal New Zealand Plunket Room is on, is legally described as Lot 2 DP 362696, comprising 279m², and contained in Record of Title 255815. The land is held in fee simple by Foundation Properties Limited.

16. Auckland Council has a building lease with the Foundation Properties Limited until 31 May 2022.

17. Plunket has provided a copy of its financial accounts which indicate that its funds are sufficient to meets its liabilities and that it possesses adequate financial reserves.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

18. Council’s Service, Asset and Planning team have advised that a new sublease to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust until the expiry of the third-party building lease, with Foundation Properties Limited, would be appropriate.

19. The Lessor, Foundation Properties Limited, has agreed to granting a sublease to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust until the expiry of the third-party building lease.

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

Local impacts and local board views

20. During the local board workshop on 26 February 2019, the local board enquired about how a new sublease may impact on the other service provisions in the building, specifically the expansion of the library. The council’s Service, Asset and Planning team have advised that the expiry of the new sublease to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust should align to the third-party building lease. The new sublease would not have an impact on the expansion of the library because they are distinct separate areas.

22. The recommendations within this report fall within the local board’s delegated authority relating to community leases.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

23. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader legal obligations to Māori. The council recognises these responsibilities are distinct from the Crown’s Treaty obligations and fall within a local government Tāmaki Makaurau context. These commitments are articulated in the council’s key strategic planning documents the Auckland Plan, the Long-term Plan 2015-2025, the Unitary Plan and Local Board Plans.

24. Support for Maori initiatives and outcomes are detailed in Te Toa Takitini, Auckland Council’s Maori Responsiveness Framework. An aim of community leasing is to increase targeted support for Maori community development projects.

25. In this instance, engagement with mana whenua is not required on third party land.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

26. There are no direct financial implications associated with the grant of a new community sublease.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

27. If a sublease is not granted to Plunket to enable its continued occupation of the land, this will restrict Plunket’s ability to provide its services and activities to the community. Additionally this could affect the respective local board outcomes.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

28. Subject to the local board grant of a new community sublease, council staff will work with key representatives of the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust to finalise the sublease.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20190416 Waitematā Local Board Item 15 Floor Plan</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Tsz Ning Chung - Community Lease Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor Waitematā Local Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To adopt the Waitematā Grant Programme 2019/2020.

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 Waitematā Grants Programme 2019/2020 for adoption (see Attachment A).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Waitematā Local Board:
a) adopt the Waitematā 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.
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 Waitematā Grants Programme has been worked upon 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>20190416 Waitematā Local Board Item 16 Waitematā Grants Programme 2019/2020</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

| Authors                          | Marion Davies - Grant Operations Manager                                                                 |
|                                 |                                                                                                          |
| Authorisers                     | Shane King - Head of Operations Support Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor Waitematā Local Board |
Waitematā Local Board
Local Grants Programme 2019/2020

Our local grants programme aims to provide contestable grants to local communities under the activity areas of arts and culture, events, community development, environment and natural heritage, historic heritage and sports and recreation.

Our local grant programme schemes:
- Quick response grants
- Local grants (includes multi-board grants)
- Accommodation grants

Expressions of interest:
- Local Events Development Fund

Outcomes and priorities sought by the Waitematā Local Board from the local grants programme

Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the following outcomes, as outlined in our local board plan. The Waitematā Local Board welcomes grant applications for services, projects, events and activities that align with one or more of the following local board plan priorities:

1. Inclusive communities that are vibrant, healthy and connected.
   - Provide spaces and places that enable our diverse communities to connect, and feel welcome
   - Ensure all members of the community have access to shelter and warmth
   - Empower our communities by supporting community-led initiatives
   - Encourage access to and participation in local events and arts activities
   - Ensure our communities have opportunities to lead active and healthy lifestyles

2. Attractive and versatile public places that meet our communities' needs
   - Ensure our parks, open spaces and recreation facilities meet the needs of our current and future residents
   - Deliver high-quality facilities that encourage active and healthy lifestyles

3. The natural environment is valued, protected and enhanced
   - Improve air and water quality and the health of our waterways
   - Support Waitematā being a low carbon community
   - Increase the urban forest and enhance biodiversity
   - People have adopted low carbon lifestyles and live sustainably
   - Empower our communities to enhance their resilience to disasters and the impact of climate change
   - Regenerate our natural areas to enhance biodiversity

4. A high-quality, built environment that embraces our heritage
   - Identify and protect places with heritage and distinctive character
   - Reinforce neighbourhood character and improve town centres
5. An accessible, connected and safe transport network with well-designed streets
   - Improve the accessibility and connectivity of the transport network
   - Improve safety for all road users

6. An innovative, productive and resilient local economy
   - Support our business associations to drive local growth and innovation
   - Empower and support start-up businesses and social enterprises
   - Increase the prosperity of our town centres
   - A strong and healthy international education sector

Lower Priorities

We will also consider applications for other services, projects, events and activities. However, in addition to the eligibility criteria outlined in the Community grants policy, the following may be considered a lower priority:

   - catering
   - travel expenses
   - vehicle expenses
   - ticketed events
   - operational costs
   - wages and salaries, with the exception of fees for professional services
   - activities that primarily benefit communities outside the Waitematā area
   - commercial entities and promotion of commercial entities.

Specific lower priorities: Local Events Development Fund only
   - Events requesting funding below the minimum threshold

Exclusions

In addition to the eligibility criteria outlined in the Community grants policy, the Waitematā Local Board will not fund:

   - applicants who apply to Waitematā Local Board for the same project or activity more than once in a financial year
   - groups who have not completed past grant accountability requirements
   - groups requesting funding over the maximum amount set

Note: Applicants planning to conduct work or maintenance on council property, buildings or land should consult with a grants advisor before completing an application. Please contact communityfunding@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or phone 09 3010101 and ask to speak to a grants advisor.

Specific exclusions:

   - Accommodation grant
     - Organisations that are the leaseholder of an Auckland Council community lease or community occupancy agreement
     - Hireage costs of a council managed venue or externally managed council facility

   - Local Events Development Fund
     - Ticketed events
- Individual or team events, conferences, private functions or award ceremonies

Please refer to the Community grants policy: “Scope and eligibility” for general eligibility criteria:
- Ineligible applicants – Paragraph 78
- What we won’t fund – Paragraphs 84-86
- Lower priority – Paragraphs 87-88

Accountability measures (applies to all grant schemes)

Waitematā Local Board requires that all successful applicants complete an accountability report via SmartyGrants (a link will be sent to successful applicants at the time the grant payment is made).

The Waitematā Local Board requests that all successful applicants:
- extend an invitation to the activity to local board members
- recognise the local board’s support, including through the placement of the local board logo on advertising, and display of the local board branding/banners at events (evidence to be included in the accountability report).

Our grants approach

Waitematā Local Board operates three grants schemes under their local grants programme and a separate expression of interest process for the Local Events Development Fund:

- **Quick response grants** (two rounds a year)
  - Minimum amount per grant: $300
  - Maximum amount per grant: $3,000

- **Local grants** (two rounds a year)
  - Minimum amount per grant: $3,000
  - Maximum amount per grant: $7,500

- **Multiboard grants** (two rounds a year)
  - Minimum amount per grant: $3,000
  - Maximum amount per grant: $7,500

- **Accommodation grant** (one round a year)
  - Minimum amount per grant: $2,500
  - Maximum amount per grant: $20,000

- **Local Events Development Fund** (one round a year)
  - Minimum amount per grant: $5,000 (except at the at the local board’s discretion)

Grants Budget Allocation

The following table outlines the allocated budget for each of our grant schemes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants scheme</th>
<th>2019/2020 Budget allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quick response and local grants</td>
<td>$150,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation grant</td>
<td>$125,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Events Development Fund</td>
<td>$30,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*these are provisional budgets and subject to change upon approval in June 2019
Accommodation Grant

Community organisations can apply for accommodation grants to cover rental and/or lease payments, Auckland Council rates and regular, ongoing venue hire costs.

Accommodation grant criteria

- Applicants are a community organisation, as outlined in the community grants policy.
- Accommodation costs applied for are for the following financial year starting 1 July.
- Evidence of the accommodation costs is provided.
- The organisation has been operating for a full financial year prior to the application date and must provide its last full year financial statements and/or audited accounts.
- The accommodation is located in and benefits the Waitematā Local Board area.
- If the applicant is requesting a grant for a venue that has an Auckland Council community lease or community occupancy agreement, the council’s approval for the sub-lease or hireage needs to be verified by the applicant.

Expression of interest approach for Local Events Development Fund

A separate annual expression of interest approach for the Local Events Development Fund is available for events which enable partnerships with established and emerging community-led events. The fund supports these events to become a regular and celebrated part of the Waitematā event calendar.

This grant will support and develop events which:

- are locally specific and environmentally responsible
- enable partnership with established and emerging community-led events to support their development to their full potential
- enable events to be professionally run while remaining community-focused
- enable events to be financially sustainable and to become a regular and celebrated part of the Waitematā event calendar
- are smoke-free, particularly those targeting children, young people and their families
- are working towards zero waste
- ensure that local events cater for our young people, providing a range of free and safe opportunities for them to attend and perform
- are of a certain scale with minimum grants of $5,000 (at the local board’s discretion).

If your expression of interest is unsupported you may still be eligible to apply for local/quick response grants.

Grant round application dates

Grant rounds for the 2019/2020 financial year (1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020) will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quick Response Grants</th>
<th>Grant round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision Made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>23 September 2019</td>
<td>18 October 2019</td>
<td>10 December 2019</td>
<td>11 December 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>20 April 2020</td>
<td>15 May 2020</td>
<td>16 June 2020</td>
<td>1 July 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>24 June 2019</td>
<td>2 August 2019</td>
<td>17 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>17 February 2020</td>
<td>27 March 2020</td>
<td>19 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multi-board Grants

The Waitematā Local Board welcomes multi-board grant applications. However, the activity or initiative will need to clearly benefit the Waitematā community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>17 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>

### Other Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Project period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Events Development</td>
<td>29 April 2019</td>
<td>7 June 2019</td>
<td>16 July 2019</td>
<td>1 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Support</td>
<td>17 February 2020</td>
<td>27 March 2020</td>
<td>19 May 2020</td>
<td>1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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File No.: CP2019/04730

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 tabled).

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 Waitematā Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the Waitematā Local Board priorities for 2019/2020
b) recommend any new or amended business improvement district targeted rates to the Governing Body
c) recommend any new or amended local targeted rate proposals to the Governing Body
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 be tabled) to its 2019/2020 Local Board Agreement
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 Waitematā 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 (to be tabled at the 16 April business meeting) will be 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 10 in the Waitematā Local Board area. Feedback was received through written, event and social media channels.

12. Consultation feedback on the Waitematā 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 Waitematā 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.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Local financial matters for the local board agreement
13. 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
14. 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)
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. 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
18. Local boards are requested to approve any advocacy initiatives for consideration by the Governing Body and inclusion (as an appendix) 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.
19. 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
20. 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 and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers.

Regional issues in the Annual Budget 2019/2020
21. 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
     o annual waste management changes
     o food scraps targeted rate
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- Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate
- urban boundary rating
- rating of religious use properties
- regulatory fees

22. 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.

23. The feedback form contained one question relating to changes to rates and fees. Consultation feedback received from the Waitematā 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.

24. 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

25. 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.

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

27. 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
Council group impacts and views

28. 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.

29. 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

30. 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.

31. 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

32. 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.

33. 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.

34. Attachment A includes analysis of submissions made by mana whenua and mataawaka entities who have interests in the rohe/local board area.

35. 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

36. 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.

37. 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 ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

38. 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

39. Local boards will approve their local board agreements and corresponding work programmes in June.

40. 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:

<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>
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Annual Budget 2019/2020 consultation feedback report for the Waitematā Local Board

1. Purpose

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

- Feedback on the Waitematā Local Board priorities for 2019/2020
- Feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 from people and organisations based in the Waitematā local board area
- Feedback on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 from people and organisations in the Waitematā Local Board area

The feedback received will inform the Waitematā Local Board decisions on allocation of their local budgets in their Local Board Agreement for 2019/2020. It will also inform the Waitematā Local Board input and advocacy on regional budgets and proposals that will be agreed at their business meeting on 16 April 2019 and subsequently discussed with the Finance and Performance Committee on 8 May 2019.
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 submissions (including online and hard copy forms, emails and letters) and through social media.

Feedback on Waitematā Local Board priorities for 2019/2020

The local board consulted on the following priorities:

- Developing 254 Ponsonby Road as a civic space
- Activating, improving and renewing local parks, guided by Park Development Plans
- Improving the playgrounds at Western Springs Lakeside Park and Home Street Reserve, providing pathways in Basque Park and building the Grey Lynn Park changing rooms
- Continuing waterway restoration projects and seeking opportunities to implement initiatives to enhance the Western Springs-Meola-Three Kings Aquifer
- Supporting community and arts groups and local events, including the local board’s flagship events: Parnell Festival of Roses and Myers Park Medley
- Funding an arts partnership with TAPAC
- Funding increased opening hours at Grey Lynn Library and the Central City Library
- Investigating opportunities to reduce agrichemical use, including advocating to the Governing Body to take a regional approach to agrichemical-free park maintenance.

A total of 223 submissions were received for the Waitematā Local Board area; of these 148 submissions provided responses on the local board priorities for 2019/2020. The majority of these submissions either supported (45 per cent) or partially supported (43 per cent) the Waitematā Local Board’s priorities.

Feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020 from the Waitematā local board area

Out of the 5,250 written submissions received on the regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2019/2020, 223 submissions were from people living in the Waitematā Local Board area.

Changes to rates and fees

- Annual waste management changes
  - Twenty-seven responses were received on this proposal. This proposal was generally supported with 16 responses supporting the increase and three responses partially in support.
- North Shore food scraps targeted rate
  - This proposal elicited 21 responses of which 15 were in support and one partially in support.
- Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate
  - Five responses were received on this proposal. This proposal was not supported with four responses against the proposal.
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- Urban boundary rating
  Nine responses were received on this proposal. This proposal was supported by eight of these responses.

- Religious properties rating
  Of the rating and fee questions, this question received the greatest response with 77 responses. Of the responses received 48 responses did not support the proposal and six responses partially supported the proposal.

- Regulatory fees
  The majority of responses and feedback points in relation to changes to regulatory fees were not in support of increasing regulatory fees. Some of the responses were in relation to regulatory fees as a whole, while others were specific feedback points on one of the fees listed e.g. resource consents.

Draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2019/2020

The Waitematā Local Board did not receive any responses on this matter. The response rate was very low across Auckland.

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

Out of the 2,450 responses received on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers, 154 responses were from people living in the Waitematā Local Board area. Sixty-five per cent of respondents from Waitematā supported the proposal with another 19 per cent partially supporting the transfer of legal ownership of Panuku Development Auckland held land to Auckland Council.
3. Context

Auckland Council consulted on its Annual Budget 2019/2020 and a proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 between 17 February and 17 March 2019. The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 requires that the Annual Budget 2019/2020 includes a Local Board Agreement for the Waitemata Local Board which sets out local board priorities and how those priorities will be funded.

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 6,521 pieces of feedback during the consultation period on the Annual Budget and the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028. This feedback was received through:

- Written submissions – 5,250 hard copy and online forms, emails and letters
- 1,246 in person feedback points – feedback was received through 14 Have Your Say events and 51 community events.
- Social media – 25 comments were received through Facebook and Twitter.

For the purposes of this report a ‘submission’ refers to the number of written forms received including the online form, hard copy form, email or letter. Each form is one submission. A ‘response’ refers to the number of people who responded to a particular question (as not everyone submitting will answer all questions). A ‘feedback point’ refers to an individual comment on a particular topic. For example one submission might contain 10 feedback points on a topic.

The submissions will be publicly available on the Auckland Council website.
4. Feedback received on the Waitematā Local Board priorities for 2019/2020

The Waitematā Local Board consulted on the following priorities:

- Developing 254 Ponsonby Road as a civic space.
- Activating, improving and renewing local parks, guided by Park Development Plans.
- Improving the playgrounds at Western Springs Lakeside Park and Home Street Reserve, providing pathways in Basque Park and building the Grey Lynn Park changing rooms.
- Continuing waterway restoration projects and seeking opportunities to implement initiatives to enhance the Western Springs-Meda-Three Kings Aquifer.
- Supporting community and arts groups and local events, including the local board’s flagship events: Parnell Festival of Roses and Myers Park Medley.
- Funding an arts partnership with TAPAC.
- Funding increased opening hours at Grey Lynn Library and the Central City Library.
- Investigating opportunities to reduce agrichemical use, including advocating to the Governing Body to take a regional approach to agrichemical-free park maintenance.

The type of written submissions received for Waitematā is set out in the graph below.

![Graph showing types of submissions](image)

The submissions summarised in this graph does not include the Have Your Say hearing event feedback except where event attendees also made a written submission. Of the 223 submissions received 31 were received from organisations and 192 from individuals.

![Graph showing number of submissions](image)

Submissions were received from the following organisations:

- Auckland City Centre Residents Group
- Westhaven Marine Users Association Incorporated
- Herne Bay Residents Association Incorporated
- St Matthew-in-the-City
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- Heart of the City
- Orams Marine
- Auckland Methodist Central Parish
- Kelimata Community Garden Trust
- Grey Lynn Residents Association
- General Marine Services
- Grafton Residents Association
- Grey Lynn Business Association
- St Marys Bay and Hemi Bay Residents Association
- Parnell Business Association
- St Andrews First Presbyterian Church
- Friends of Gladstone Park
- Newmarket Business Association
- Property Council New Zealand
- Church of Scientology
- Congregation Christian Church Samoa Grey Lynn
- Methodist Church Samoa Grey Lynn
- Chimaera Group Events
- Alloy Yacht International Ltd
- Catholic Diocese of Auckland
- Parnell Community Trust
- 37 South Ltd on behalf of Captain Andrew Clarke
- Elim Christian Centre
- Integrated Marine Group
- Royal NZ Plunket Trust
- Reid Yacht Services
- Ports of Auckland Limited

In addition to the above list of organisations, Bike Auckland and Cruise Lines International Association did not select Waitematā Local Board as their home board, but notwithstanding included feedback points related to the Waitematā Local Board.

Submissions from iwi and Māori groups

A regional Have Your Say Hui was held on 13 March 2019. Amongst other matters Ngāti Whātua o Orākei acknowledged 'the recent development of their iwi management plan advised that they look forward to open dialogue with council regarding fresh water.'
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The Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum submitted to the Annual Budget consultation in relation to the proposed amendment to the 10-year budget and stated that it does not oppose the proposal subject to clarification around how development and consenting decisions will be made.

Many mana whenua groups committed resources to respond to the “Our Water Future” concurrent consultation.

No responses were received from iwi groups in relation to the Waitematā Local Board priorities.

**Key consultation themes**

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

- Strong support for the Waitematā Local Board priorities
- Support for proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding transfer of legal ownership of Panuku Development Auckland owned properties to Auckland Council
- Support for an increase in the waste management fee
- Opposition to increases in regulatory fees
- Opposition to not charging rates on some parts of land owned by religious organisations.

**Information on submitters**

The tables and graphs below provide a demographic breakdown of respondents who provided demographic information (either in part or in full) and relate to written submissions (either online or hard copy). Of the 181 submissions that provided demographic information, 54 per cent were received from males, 45 per cent from females and two per cent from gender diverse people.

![Gender Demographics Graph](attachment:graph.png)

A large proportion of submitters were in the 45-54 and 55-64 age groups. No submissions that included demographic information were received from people under the age of 15.
Of the 172 respondents who provided ethnicity data 74 per cent identified as Pakeha/ NZ European, five per cent identified as being Māori and 12 per cent identified as Asian. No submissions with demographic information were received from Pacific peoples. When compared to the Auckland-wide demographics this result indicates a slightly higher proportion of respondents who identify as Pakeha/ NZ European (71 per cent regionally) and a much lower proportion of residents who identify as Asian (26 per cent regionally)

Feedback received through written submissions

Respondents were provided with the local board’s priorities as set out above and asked:

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

and given the option of answering:

- yes
- no
- partially

One hundred and forty-eight responses were received on the Waitakere Local Board priorities for 2019/2020, showing that a significant proportion of respondents either supported (45 per cent) or partially supported (43 per cent) the local board’s priorities.

All respondents were then asked to comment on why they had provided this response. Around one-third of the 82 respondents who answered “partially” or “no” did not expand on their reasons for providing this answer.
In general, there were no clear or significant themes that emerged from the responses. It is noted that the local board is not proposing major changes to their existing work programme for 2019/2020 and focusing on delivering the projects identified in the 2017 Waitematā Local Board Plan.

A number of submitters supported the local board’s consistency of direction. A small number of feedback points expressly supported the agrichemical free parks, extended library hours and the development of 254 Ponsonby Road. The local board’s waterway restoration projects were also supported. The local board’s events elicited a few comments and were generally (but not exclusively) supported.

Where submitters agreed with the local board’s priorities comments included:

- It is all as expected and as previously communicated
- Good quality public projects can take considerable time in planning and execution so I’m pleased that the board is sticking with current plans and bringing projects through to completion
- There’s continuity from the previous plan and that had a commendable focus on active transport
- I really like the projects supported by the Waitemata board, they enhance the local communities
- We are supportive of the WLB’s commitment to funding increased hours at the Central Library. The library provides an important free service for the growing and diverse city centre community
- Love the WLB support and advocacy work for the whole site civic open space at 254 Ponsonby Road. We all want to see this built SOON. It has already been in Council ownership since 2006 and it’s time for the local community, residents, businesses, and visitors to Ponsonby to have this much needed and wanted facility realised
- I think for the most part they have directed their efforts towards improving the lives of the ever increasing number of people who live and work in the central city. I would like to see more money spent on and advocacy for cleaner air in the city centre, especially the areas around lower Queen St and the Port. Money spent will pay off in better health people who live and work in the area but for visitors as well…(cont.)
- Good direction, but needs more focus on creating a habitable space for people. Larger footpaths, traffic blocked instead of cycleways, footpaths when construction is present. More greening.
Similarly of the 64 responses where respondents partially agreed with the Local Board’s priorities there are no clear themes, but some general themes that emerged included:

- Requesting improvements to refuse collection practices in the city centre
- Seeking improvements to pavements and the pedestrian environment
- Supporting initiatives that enhance active transport
- Seeking improved livability for city centre residents, including improved street cleaning, green walls and green spaces
- Supporting improvements to water quality in stream, beaches and the Waitematā Harbour
- Requesting improvements to park maintenance
- Supporting more funding for homelessness initiatives

As noted not all respondents made any additional comments to explain their reasons for selecting “partial” in response to this question, however those that did included:

- They seem to be aimed at maintaining and developing public spaces, however I would like to see more aimed at promoting more environmentally friendly travel and activities. Composting collectives for example would be great
- The focus does not proportionally represent the population distribution - there is a lack of attention paid to the city centre (1010 postcode) and it's ~57000 residents. Footpaths, parks etc are all not treated as well as they are in the surrounding (more affluent, older, whiter) suburbs
- There needs to be more money allocated to sort out our sewage issues. Also, more money allocated to clean up our waterways. More trash cans around Auckland and having them emptied more often, I live off of Queen Street and the trash cans are always full and overflowing, which means that trash is everywhere, and in our windy city, it is being blown around and into our harbour...(contd)
- I live in westmere I think I am this board??? storm water needs to be prioritised even more – it needs to be number one, its so sad that the swimming is crap now on our inner city beaches. Stop spending on playgrounds there are enough good ones, but if you are going to do them then build more pump tracks but please dont use the guys who did water view - that is a waste of money total waste of money they made it too hard for the kids and the average person - no one ever uses it - the privately funded grey lynn park is a much better example - it not too hard and boy does it get used
- Restore/increase the maintenance schedule for existing parks and reserves. The current park and reserve maintenance schedule for some of our local shared spaces has seen a reduction in the frequency of maintenance in recent years. In Herne Bay, this has affected at least some of our nine walkways down to beaches...(contd)
- I am not happy with all the transport plans, in particular restricting traffic on busy arterial routes like Quay St, Hobson St and Nelson St. You need a balance between people who live in the immediate area and other Aucklanders who need to travel by car so shouldn’t make things too difficult for car users. Walking, bikes and scooters are fine for distances of a few km but cars are needed also
- Should be more efficient in dealing with homeless people in CBD. The streets are messy and smelly
- ……Looking at your list of priorities prompted me to search your demographic report card and I noted your priorities do not actually reflect the interests and views of your constituents. Your
local board plan is a bit more balanced, but I find some of your priorities strange. For example, the flagship events you discuss are more family centered and European. Your demographics reports states that the electorate is "under-represented in older and younger age groups and over-represented in age groups between 20 and 34 years". I wonder why your focus has been on these two particular events? I speculate it's because there are a number of events and activities in the area that attract demographic that I belong to, but I see a lot of that being food/drink related. I'm sure you also fund a number of the more youth-friendly events but this is not clear and your priorities seem to reflect the views of older people in the community. I personally think Myers Park Medley is the most boring event in the whole electorate but get that you want to activate that space. The date selected this year was awful - clashing with Ponsonby Festival and Lantern Festival... (cont’d)

- Waitematā is a diverse area but I would have liked an amenities plan, plan to move the cruise ships, and money for more public space in the city centre. We need some green spaces and improvements to the harsh environments the AT and Council keep leaving us with
- Storm water problems is a major issue. As also upgrade of footpaths. Very well done with walking and cycle paths
- Wriggle • R is amazing!! Highlight of our week. Would be wonderful for more play equipment on Gunson St Playground. Fences too please! On Playgrounds. 254 Ponsonby Road, great idea, need more local areas.

There were no clear themes in the 18 responses that did not support the local board priorities. Where respondents expanded on this answer, there were few consistent comments. Feedback points received included the following:

- Not supporting cost or design of cycle lanes
- Request for better tree and heritage protection and maintenance
- Concern around helicopters landing in residential areas
- More funding should be provided for homelessness
- Against the proposed superyacht anchorage fee
- St Marys Bay/ Masefield Beach stormwater project (discussed further below)

Feedback points included the following:

- Huge money poured into little used, badly designed cycle ways. Pedestrians and cyclists often share these, but there has been no cyclist courtesy awareness training to accompany this move. eg cyclists approaching from behind warning pedestrians by bell as they get near. This is basic practice in overseas countries. With some cyclists this situation is really frightening for pedestrians
- more tree and heritage protection and follow-up maintenance issues
- I am a resident of St Marys Bay and I want Auckland Council to abandon the $44 million tunnel proposed in the St Mary’s Bay/Masefield Beach water project, and instead fund the less expensive and much more effective scheme of separation of sewage and stormwater pipes... (cont’d)
- As stated more should go to homelessness & poverty. The Brisbane Common Ground project (of 126 apts) shouts how accommodation (plus wrap around services) can achieve massive savings in Police, medical, health, emergency & other services.
Feedback received through events

The Waitematā Local Board held one formal Have Your Say hearing event and nine community events, including a Facebook live event. The nine community events were held in various venues around the Waitematā Local Board area and were used to raise awareness of the consultation, provide supporting collateral and an opportunity to meet or engage with elected members. People who engaged with the elected members at these events were encouraged and assisted to submit on the Annual Budget and their responses are included in the commentary above.

A formal Have Your Say hearing event was held on 14 March 2019 at the Waitematā Local Board office. Twelve organisations and one individual presented to the Waitematā Local Board as follows:

- Grafton Residents Associations*
- St Matthews in the City*
- For the Love of Bees
- NZ Box
- Victoria Quarter / Central Bike District
- St Marys Bay Residents Association*
- Herne Bay Residents Association*
- Newmarket Business Association*
- Grey Lynn Business Association*
- Gael Baldock (who also read a submission on behalf of Wendy Gray)
- Parnell Business Association*
- Parnell Community Committee
- Auckland Central City Residents’ Group*

Feedback received at this hearing was varied. Some attendees provided comprehensive feedback on the annual budget questions and other matters important to that group and their local community. Other attendees chose to focus on single major issues affecting their communities. Matters presented to the local board included:

- A request to review the St Marys Bay/ Masefield Beach project from the Herne Bay and St Marys Bay Residents Associations
- St Matthews-in-the-City raised concerns over how the religious property rating consultation question had been presented and sought for no change to the current rating for religious properties. They also confirmed their support for the council to grant the City Mission $5m towards the HomeGround project
- The Parnell Community Committee sought improved maintenance and further planting at Point Resolution Taurarua.
- For the Love of Bees raised the importance of climate change responsiveness and urban regenerative agriculture learning practices including localised composting.
- The value and importance of localised composting solutions was also raised by NZ Box

* Denotes the eight organisations that attended the Have Your Say Event who also submitted in writing
One submission raised concerns around the effectiveness of the Super City local government model and another hearing participant raised their concerns around the current Western Springs Bush Restoration project.

Three business associations attended and identified issues of concern for Parnell, Newmarket and Grey Lynn. These included raising the need for a youth space in Newmarket and continuation of public realm improvements from the Newmarket Lanesways Plan, a request for the local board to prioritise actions from the Parnell Plan for delivery in the FY20 work programme, including Heard Park and the importance of distinguishing Grey Lynn as a village versus town centre.

The challenges and advantages of living in the city centre were set out by the City Centre Residents Group and the Victoria Quarter/Central Bike District, including issues around maintenance of the public realm, commercial rubbish collection, safety in the city centre and the need to urgently improve the Nelson Street slip lane.

A couple of presenters raised disquiet around the quality of the information provided to respondents answering the annual budget questions.

Feedback received through social media channels

Regionally feedback was received from the following social media channels:

- 12 social media feedback points from Facebook
- 13 social media feedback points from Twitter

The feedback point topics were varied and ranged from requests for free tip passes, objection to, and support for, the light rail on Queen Street, focus on essential services and support for off leash dog areas. However, the social media feedback points are considered regional and cannot be attributed to a specific local board area.

The local board held a Facebook live event on 28 February 2019.

During the event 114 people interacted with the live feed. To date the Facebook post has reached 8,865 people and received 77 reactions, comments and shares.

Feedback on other local topics

Key themes across feedback received on other local topics include:

- Approximately 20 feedback points were received which supported the proposed stormwater and wastewater separation in St Marys Bay and Herne Bay but did not support the tunnel proposed by the St Marys Bay/ Masefield Beach outflow project. These submissions were consistent with contents of the hearing submission made by the Herne Bay Residents Association and the St Marys Bay Association.
- Around 10 feedback points supported the proposed $5 million funding contribution to the City Mission HomeGround project.
- Approximately 18 feedback points were received in support of a composting network and food scrap collection being available in Waitemata.
- Around five feedback points did not support the Queen's Wharf mooring dolphin proposal or wharf extensions.
Requests for local funding

Requests for local funding included a submission from Parnell Trust requesting a grant to go towards covering losses from the inability to rent the Jubilee Hall, which is undergoing earthquake strengthening renovations, and the flow on impact to Parnell Community Centre.
5. Overview of feedback received on the Annual Budget from Waitematā Local Board area

Changes to rates and fees

The regional consultation on the proposed Annual Budget focused on changes to rates and fees. The submissions received from residents in the Waitematā Local Board area on these key issues are summarised below. Aucklanders were asked about a proposed small number of rating and fee changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These changes include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2000 properties in the North Shore former trial area to whom the service is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• phasing out the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020-2020/2021)</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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following graph sets out the responses received. The low volume of feedback associated with the Waitākere rural sewage scheme question and the urban rating boundary question may reflect the limited relevance these questions had for Waitematā residents.

Of more relevance was the increase to the annual waste management charge which had mixed support with 16 of the 28 responses in support of the proposal. Many responses in support of the proposal accepted the justification provided in the consultation document being:

- Increased recycling costs
- Inorganic service volumes exceeding demand
- A new bin service in Waitākere and North Shore
Although of limited direct relevance to Waitematā residents, there was support for extending the food scraps targeted rate in the North Shore trial area. Many of the respondents were supportive of introducing a food scrap collection within Auckland generally and some respondents asked for a trial to commence in the city centre. Comments included:

- I'm keen to see the food scraps collection expanded… (cont'd)
- Would like to see a more rapid expansion of food scraps project, especially in the city centre where composting is more difficult in apartments.
- Need food scrap collection all over Auckland
- Why trial on the North Shore when inner city Auckland can only put their food scraps in a bin as there is no room for composting
- Food scraps…we have a worm bin. Cost $398, and now we pay extra for a service we will not use

As evidenced by the graph, the question which received the highest response related to the proposal not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations. Of the 77 responses the majority (48) did not support this proposal and six partially supported the proposal. Many submissions against this proposal stated that religious organisations should be required to pay rates. Numerous feedback points in support of this proposal were received by church groups and other religious organisations. Comments included:

- Religious organisations should pay full rates on ALL their property
• I agree with all except: 1) I don’t agree with zero rates for religious organisations. Many of these hold very substantial land parcels in high value areas and represent declining and minority numbers of the population. I strongly believe that they should pay their share of rates... (contd)

• Don’t agree with not charging S0 rates for religious organisations. Rates should be applied to all NFP/Registered charities, even if at a lower rate than commercial/domestic property.

• I agree with not charging rates on land used primarily for spiritual purposes by a charity, not for profit, ie churches.

• Rates should absolutely not be charged on all land owned by religious organisations. Auckland religious organisations need all the help they can get to carry on the valuable social and spiritual input to Auckland communities that the Council is unable to provide. The Council should be providing monetary and leadership assistance for these amazing organisations - put that in your budget.

• We are concerned that the “change” to the way religious use properties are rated is being presented in the consultation documents as a new discount on rates. Up till now churches have been exempt as provided by the Local Government Act 2002. In 2018 Auckland Council tried to impose rates on some parts of religious properties and the current new policy is a result of that rather flawed process.... When the document says (p17) “we are proposing not to charge rates to the following land” it sounds like the churches are gaining a new rebate. We would emphasise that we only wish to have the status quo remain and that the Council was overreaching in trying to charge these rates in the first place.

Increase to regulatory fees

Feedback was sought on increasing regulatory fees to ensure that users, rather than ratepayers, cover the cost of these services. The online feedback form also included animal management fees which were not noted in the hard copy feedback form. Notwithstanding this, the consultation document and supporting information included a discussion on animal management fees. Due to the nature of this question, respondents could choose to respond generally about the proposed increase in regulatory fees or make specific feedback points about one or more of the listed regulatory fees i.e. resource consent fees.
Changes to regulatory fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory fees (generally)</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource consent fees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building consent fees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour master fees - Mooring fees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour master fees - Foreign vessel charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal management fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a clear theme that most respondents did not generally support increasing regulatory fees. Increases to resource consent or building consent fees was similarly not supported. There was a clear theme that many respondents felt the consenting fees were already too high, prevented people from applying and that the resource consent process needed improvement. Respondents who partially supported the proposal did so on the basis of a corresponding improvement to the service provided by Auckland Council. Comments included:

- I would be concerned if resource consent costs increased for individuals, and if this meant that only professional development companies could afford construction.
- It’s hard enough to get a resource consent currently without adding to the cost.
- If the charges for resource consent etc are insufficient to cover costs, the process needs to be streamlined as it is ridiculously expensive already and it could be argued that the price excludes a lot of people from doing this and is therefore an example of disabling people from access to opportunities.
- Don’t agree with increased resource consent fees or others likely to impact the building process - we have enough problems getting sufficient housing for low-income earners in Auckland without adding additional costs.
- All is good except for Resource consent and building control. This would be good if you supplied a good service but all projects are taking a lot longer due to the fact you are unable to provide a prompt and consistent service.
- Building control costs are also way too expensive.

The proposal to increase mooring fees and introducing anchorage fees for foreign vessels over 40 metres in length generally received a negative response, particularly from those with an interest in the marine sector and ship captains. Many feedback points against the anchorage fee proposal.
suggested it constituted a charge for no service and one that would detrimentally impact on the number of super yachts visiting Auckland. Comments included:

- Super yachts will not accept a considerable charge where no perceived service is received
- 23 NZD a day per metre for an anchorage is a huge charge for an anchorage
- Whilst charges for anchoring are uncommon, where they are in place, they must be reasonable and proportionate. The proposed fees are not.
- Mooring fees I have no problem with as that’s a leisure pursuit, not a necessity.
- Believe foreign vessel fees should be increased more as they have the money to pay and a privilege to moor in the middle of our harbour (why exactly do we let them do that?)

A number of respondents submitted that Auckland Council should look at making savings and improve efficiencies instead of increasing regulatory fees.

- Disagree with increases regulatory fees. Greater efforts should be put on cost containment rather than just increasing the amount paid by the public.
- Regulatory fees already too high. Look inside council to see how you can reduce costs.
- Sort out internal budgets before changing the rate payers.
- Regulatory fees need to be reduced through efficiency and streamline within council rather than simply allowing them to grow and be paid for by increasing costs.
- There is only one possible reason to increase regulatory fees and that is the complete inefficiency and incompetence of the regulators. Please explain what the increased COSTS ARE!!

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

No feedback was received from the Waitenatā Local Board area on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2019/2020.
6. Overview of feedback received on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers from Waitematā Local Board area

The annual budget consultation included the following question in relation to a proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028:

**Question 1:**

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $750 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?

One hundred and fifty-four responses were received from the Waitematā Local Board area on the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and showed clear support for this proposal with 65 percent of respondents in support and a further 19 percent partially in support. Where respondents partially supported the proposal and expanded on why the most common theme was a request for more detailed information or a better understanding of the tax implications mentioned. This was notwithstanding the consultation document and the supporting information did provide detail around this proposal.

A small number of respondents raised concerns around the accountability of Council Controlled Organisations in response to this question.

The graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Waitematā Local Board area.

![Pie Chart](image)

Comments in response to this proposal include:

- **So long as this transfer means that the public waterfront areas will remain and be further opened to the public and that this will happen at no extra costs.**
• Council are doing a good job of trying to open up the water front for pedestrians—good job. Make Princes Wharf car park free!
• Makes sense to minimise tax issues.
• Smart to consolidate everything under one arm
• CCO’s are not democratic organizations therefore the move of particularly strategic assets to direct Council control will enhance democratic control over those assets.
• Auckland Council not Panuku (to suggest there is a difference in ownership insults the intelligence of ratepayers) should not be in the business as a commercial landlord. Any properties held by the Council for revenue reasons should be divested to the private sector.
• Council is way too big already and can’t manage what they already oversee.
• There is no evidence that the Council (or its officers) have been able to assert ownership control over the various authorities on behalf of we ratepayers and city consumers. This is especially the case with Ports of Auckland and I would guess that the properties concerned will border on POAL properties.
Additions to the 2016-2019 Waitematā Local Board meeting schedule

File No.: CP2019/04279

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for one meeting date to be added to the 2016-2019 Waitematā Local Board meeting schedule in order to accommodate the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and proposed amendment to 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 timeframes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. At that time the specific times and dates for meetings for local board decision making in relation to the local board agreement as part of the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and proposed amendment to 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 were unknown.
4. The board is being asked to approve one meeting date as an addition to the Waitematā Local Board meeting schedule so that the Annual Budget 2019/2020 timeframes can be met.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) approve one meeting date to be added to the 2016-2019 Waitematā Local Board meeting schedule to accommodate the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and proposed amendment to 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 timeframes as follows:
   • Tuesday, 4 June 2019 at 3.30pm.

b) note the venue for this meeting will be the Waitematā Local Board office located on the ground floor at 52 Swanson Street, Auckland Central.

Horopaki
Context
5. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) have requirements regarding local board meeting schedules.
6. In summary, adopting a meeting schedule helps meet the requirements of:
   • Schedule 7, clause 19 of the LGA on general provisions for meetings, which requires the chief executive to give notice in writing to each local board member of the time and place of meetings. Such notification may be provided by the adoption of a schedule of business meetings.
   • Part 7, sections 46, 46(A) and 47 of the LGOIMA, which requires that meetings are publicly notified, agendas and reports are available at least two working days before a meeting and that local board meetings are open to the public.
7. The Waitematā Local Board adopted its business meeting schedule at its 22 November 2016 business meeting (WTM/2016/180).
8. The timeframes for local board decision making in relation to the local board agreement which is part of the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and proposed amendment to 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 were unavailable when the meeting schedule was originally adopted.

9. The board is being asked to make decisions in early June to feed into the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and proposed amendment to 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 process. This timeframe is outside the board’s normal meeting cycle.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

10. The board has two options:
   i) add the meeting as an addition to the meeting schedule.
   or
   ii) add the meeting as an extraordinary meeting.

11. For option one, statutory requirements allow enough time for this meeting to be scheduled as an addition to the meeting schedule and other topics may be considered as per any other ordinary meeting. However, there is a risk that if the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and proposed amendment to 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 timeframes change or the information is not ready for the meeting there would need to be an additional extraordinary meeting scheduled anyway.

12. For option two, only the specific topic Annual Budget 2019/2020 and proposed amendment to 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 may be considered for which the meeting is being held. There is a risk that no other policies or plans with similar timeframes or running in relation to the Annual Budget 2019/2020 and proposed amendment to 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 process could be considered at this meeting.

13. Since there is enough time to meet statutory requirements, staff recommend approving these meetings as additions to the meeting schedule as it allows more flexibility for the board to consider a range of issues.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

**Council group impacts and views**

14. There is no specific impact for the council group from this report.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

15. This report requests the board’s decision to schedule an additional meeting and consider whether to approve this as an extraordinary meeting or addition to the meeting schedule.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

16. There is no specific impact for Māori arising from this report. Local boards work with Māori on projects and initiatives of shared interest.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

17. There are no financial implications in relation to this report apart from the standard costs associated with servicing a business meeting.
Risks and mitigations
18. There are no significant risks associated with this report.

Next steps
19. Implement the processes associated with preparing for business meetings.

Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Beth Corlett - Advisor Plans and Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor Waitematā Local Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To delegate responsibility to nominated members of the Waitematā Local Board to provide formal feedback on behalf of the local board in relation to the Department of Conservation (DOC) proposal to revoke most Ministerial delegations to Territorial Authorities under the Reserves Act 1977.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. A letter dated 14 March 2019 has been received from the Department of Conservation (DOC) addressed to all Territorial Authorities seeking feedback on a proposal to revoke most Ministerial delegations currently delegated to councils under the Reserves Act 1977. A copy of the letter and relevant attachment is set out in Attachment A of this report.

3. The reason provided for much of the proposed revocation is that under the current delegation, council makes its decision as the territorial authority and then reviews that decision under ministerial delegation. This could be viewed as potentially putting council in a conflict of interest situation, as it is effectively reviewing its own decision(s).

4. The proposal has been reviewed by staff and a short assessment presentation has been prepared (Attachment B). A briefing was provided for local board members on Monday 8 April 2019 on the proposal.

5. Auckland Council is currently preparing a draft submission in response to the letter that will be circulated to local boards on 15 April 2019 for feedback by 18 April 2019. This draft submission was not available at time of agenda production and will be tabled at the board meeting. The preparation of the draft will be followed by two drop-in sessions for elected members to provide in-person feedback.

6. Local board feedback will be considered as part of the final submission and will be reported to the Environment and Community Committee meeting on 14 May 2019.

7. The final response deadline to DOC has been extended to 17 May 2019.

8. Due to the tight timeframes between the date of receiving the draft submission and the deadline for local board feedback, this report requests that responsibility for finalising the feedback for the Waitematā Local Board is delegated to nominated elected member/s.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) delegate authority to members of the Waitematā Local Board to provide formal feedback by 18 April 2019 on behalf of the local board in relation to the Department of Conservation proposal to revoke most Ministerial delegations to Territorial Authorities under the Reserves Act 1977 by 18 April 2019.
Waitematā Local Board feedback on the Department of Conservations’ proposed revocation of certain delegations to Territorial Authorities under the Reserves Act 1977

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20190416 Waitematā Local Board Item 19 Letter to Territorial Authorities - The revocation of certain delegations to Territorial Authorities under the Reserves Act 1977</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20190416 Waitematā Local Board Item 19 DOC Proposal to revoke Reserve Act delegations presentation to elected members</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Authors  Heather Skinner - Local Board Advisor Waitematā Local Board
Authorisers  Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor Waitematā Local Board
Ref: DOC 5730277

14 March 2019

Attn: Chief Executive
All Territorial Authorities

Tēnā koe

Subject: The revocation of certain delegations to Territorial Authorities under the Reserves Act 1977

In June 2013, the Minister of Conservation delegated certain powers under the Reserves Act 1977 (the 2013 delegations) to Territorial Authorities. Over the past year or so there have been instances where Territorial Authorities have relied on the delegations to exercise the prior consent role of the Minister in circumstances where they have also made the initial decision to grant the instrument or activity applied for.

In a recent Court of Appeal decision, (Opua Coastal Preservation Inc v Far North District Council)\(^1\) the Court considered a delegation of the Minister’s prior consent role under s 48 of the Reserves Act 1977 to be “highly unusual”. The Court commented that it could be argued that it replaced a two-step process involving two separate decision makers (the Council and the Minister) with a single-step process and a single decision maker. The Court noted that the effect of the delegation was that the Council made both decisions contemplated by s 48(1)(f) of the Reserves Act and observed that “[I]t might be thought that in these circumstances any difference of view between the two decision makers is unlikely”. The Court did not rule on the legality of the delegation because the Appellant had not pursued the matter. Nevertheless, it seems that had the lawfulness of the delegation been in issue the Court would have ruled it to be unlawful.

In light of the above, we have undertaken a review of the 2013 delegations was undertaken, it would appear some are potentially unlawful and would put Councils in a position of conflict of interest, for example;

a) Those where a Council makes its own decision and then acts under delegation to exercise the prior consent role of the Minister;

b) Those where the Minister’s power to carry out certain actions has been delegated to Councils, including a requirement for the Minister to consult with a Council before exercising the power. In this situation, a Council would end up consulting with itself.

---

\(^1\) Opua Coastal Preservation Incorporated v Far North District Council & Others [2018] NZCA 262 20 July 2018

Department of Conservation Te Papa Atawhai
Where Kaupapa Atawhai / Conservation House
PO Box 10426, Wellington 6143,
www.doc.govt.nz
In view of the above, the Minister of Conservation is considering a proposal whether to 
revoke certain delegations and has requested that the Department seek your comments 
before the Minister makes a decision. Attachment 1 to this letter sets out the delegations 
proposed to be revoked and contains a column for you to insert your comments/views.

We also take this opportunity to invite you to identify any new delegation proposals that 
you believe would improve efficiencies for Councils and that you would like the Minister 
to consider. We ask that you use Attachment 2 for this purpose.

A table of the sections, the power delegated and the reasoning for the revocation is 
attached, along with a table for any new items you may want considered.

Please forward your responses no later than 26 April 2019 to Sheryll Johnson, 
sjohnson@doc.govt.nz. All comments will be collated and forwarded to the Minister for a 
final decision.

Nāku non, nā

Marie Long
Director, Planning, Permissions and Land

Department of Conservation Te Papa Atawhai
Whare Kaupapa Atawhai / Conservation House
PO Box 10420, Wellington 6143,
www.doc.govt.nz
## Attachment 1 – Proposed Delegations for Revocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Heading</th>
<th>Power Delegated</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 14 Local authority may declare land vested</td>
<td>Section 14(4) Minister must consider resolution and cause it to be gazetted or</td>
<td>The Council would be double dipping – i.e. making a resolution and</td>
<td>This delegation is not necessary as s15(3) already authorises the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in it to be a reserve for certain purposes</td>
<td>refuse to do so</td>
<td>then considering it again in the shoes of the Minister</td>
<td>administrative body to do these things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 15 Minister may authorise exchange of reserves</td>
<td>Section 15(1) Minister may authorise exchange provided that Minister not</td>
<td>The delegation enables the Council to control the outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for other land</td>
<td>exercise power in respect of a reserve vested in an administering body except</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pursuant to a resolution of that body requesting exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 15(3) The Minister or the administering body, as the case may require,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may do all things necessary to effect any exchange, including the payment of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 24 Change of classification or purpose or</td>
<td>Section 24(1) If Minister considers the change of classification or purpose</td>
<td>The delegation enables the local authority to make the resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revocation of reserve</td>
<td>advisable or if the local authority notifies Commissioner that pursuant to a</td>
<td>seeking the changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resolution of the local authority of proposed changes, Minister may make</td>
<td>It also enables it to exercise the Minister’s powers to agree to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changes</td>
<td>changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 24(2)(a) Before classification or purpose is changed or reservation</td>
<td>The delegation to a Council is inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>revoked, the Minister must consider proposal and, in the case of objections</td>
<td>It would be exercising the Minister’s powers to consider objections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>made to an administering body, the administering body’s resolution</td>
<td>made to the administering body’s own resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 41 Management Plans</td>
<td>Section 41(1) Administering body must prepare and submit to Minister a</td>
<td>The delegation seems inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management for approval</td>
<td>The administering body ends up preparing the plan and approving it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The intention is that there be a separation of powers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 42 Preservation of trees and bush</td>
<td>Section 42(1) The destruction of trees and bush on any historic, scenic,</td>
<td>As noted below it would not be appropriate to delegate to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nature or scientific reserve may not occur without a permit granted under s</td>
<td>administering bodies the Minister’s power under s 48A(3) to impose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48A or with the express consent of the Minister</td>
<td>conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 45</th>
<th>Erection of shelters, cabins and lodges</th>
<th>Section 45(1) The administering body may with the Minister’s prior consent approve certain things</th>
<th>The delegation is inappropriate The administering body makes both the initial decision and Minster’s decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 48</td>
<td>Grants of rights of way and other easements</td>
<td>Section 48(1) Where reserve vested in administering body, it may with the consent of the Minister grant rights of ways and easements</td>
<td>The delegation is inappropriate The administering body makes both the initial decision and Minster’s decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 48A</td>
<td>Use of reserve for communication station</td>
<td>Section 48A(1) The administering body of a reserve vested in it acting with the consent of the Minister may grant licence for certain things</td>
<td>The delegation is inappropriate The administering body can give itself consent by exercising the delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 48A(3) A licence issued under s 48A(1) must be subject to such terms and conditions as the administering body imposes with the approval of the Minister</td>
<td>The delegation is inappropriate The administering body makes the initial decision on terms and conditions and can then ratify it by exercising the delegated power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 51</td>
<td>Introduction of flora and fauna</td>
<td>Section 51(1) For the purpose of restoring, promoting or developing certain reserves, the Minister may authorise the administering body to introduce flora or fauna</td>
<td>The delegation is inappropriate In exercising the power of the Minister, the administering body is able to act in its own interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 53</td>
<td>Powers (other than leasing) in respect of recreation reserves</td>
<td>Section 53(1)(d) The administering body may prescribe not more than 40 days in any year that the public shall not be entitled to have admission to reserve unless on payment of charges provided that with the Minister’s prior consent the number of days may be increased</td>
<td>The delegation is inappropriate The administering body is able to increase the maximum number of days to exclude the public from a reserve unless they pay money, and then confirm the decision by exercising the delegated power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 53(1)(e) The administering body may grant exclusive use of reserve but not for more than 6 consecutive days, with power for licensor to charge admission fees provided that the Minister may consent to an increase in the number of consecutive days</td>
<td>The delegation is inappropriate The administering body makes the initial decision on closure and can then increase the period by exercising the Minister’s powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 54</td>
<td>Leasing powers in respect of recreation reserves (except farming, grazing, or afforestation leases)</td>
<td>Section 54(1) With the prior consent of the Minister the administering body in which a reserve is vested may lease parts of a reserve to a third party</td>
<td>The delegation is inappropriate The administering body makes an initial decision to lease and then exercises the Minister’s powers to grant prior consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 55</td>
<td>Powers (other than leasing) in respect of reserves</td>
<td>Section 55(2)(a) The administering body of a scenic reserve may,</td>
<td>The delegation is inappropriate The administering body makes both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Waitematā Local Board feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56(1)</td>
<td>With prior consent of the Minister, the administering body in the case of a scenic reserve may grant leases or licences</td>
<td>The administering body makes both the initial decision and the Minister’s decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56(2)</td>
<td>Before granting a lease, the administering body must give public notice</td>
<td>This delegation is not necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58(b)</td>
<td>With prior consent of the Minister, the administering body may set apart and use part of an historic reserve for residences for officers and staff</td>
<td>The administering body makes both the initial decision and the Minister’s decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58A(1)</td>
<td>With prior consent of the Minister, the administering body of an historic reserve may grant leases or licences</td>
<td>The administering body makes both the initial decision and the Minister’s decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 59A</td>
<td>Granting of concessions on reserves administered by Crown</td>
<td>Section 59A(1)</td>
<td>The administering body may grant concessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 67</td>
<td>Leasing</td>
<td>Section 67(1)(b)</td>
<td>With prior consent of the Minister, the administering body may lease a recreation reserve set apart for racecourse purposes to a racing club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 72</td>
<td>Farming by another person or body</td>
<td>Section 72(1)</td>
<td>Where a recreation reserve or local purpose reserve is not required for purposes of classification the administering body may enter into an agreement or lease with the Minister to provide for a third party to carry out farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 73</td>
<td>Leasing of recreation reserves for purposes of farming, grazing, afforestation or other purposes</td>
<td>Section 73(1)</td>
<td>Where recreation reserve not currently required for purposes of its classification, the administering body may with the prior consent of the Minister lease in the administering body; grant a lease, otherwise only Minister can grant leases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 73(2)</td>
<td>Likewise for afforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 73(3)</td>
<td>Leases of recreation reserves where inadvisable or inexpedient to revoke reservation of recreation reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 73(5)</td>
<td>Prior consent of Minister before any member of administering body becomes the lessee of land under control of administering body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 73(6)</td>
<td>Any lease under s 73 may with approval of administering body be surrendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 74</td>
<td>Licences to occupy reserves temporarily</td>
<td>Section 74(1)(b)(i) Licences may be granted in the case of any reserve except a nature reserve by the Commissioner</td>
<td>This delegation is misconceived. This power relates to Crown vested reserves managed by the Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75</td>
<td>Afforestation by administering body</td>
<td>Section 75(1) With prior consent of the Minister an administering body of a recreation reserve may afforest it. Section 75(2) Minister may refuse to give consent</td>
<td>The administering body makes both the initial decision and the Minister's decision. The administering body makes both the initial decision and the Minister's decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 16</td>
<td>Classification of reserves</td>
<td>Section 16(1) Minister must by GN classify reserves according to their primary purpose provided that where reserves are controlled or managed by a Council the Minister must not classify without consulting it Section 16(4) Before classifying a reserve, the Minister must give public notice</td>
<td>The delegation effectively means the Council consults with itself. If the previous delegation is revoked this will need to be revoked as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 18</td>
<td>Historic reserves</td>
<td>Section 18(2)(a) Except where the Minister otherwise determines, the indigenous flora and fauna and natural environment of an historic reserve shall as far as possible be preserved</td>
<td>The Minister may wish to maintain control of these decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 19</td>
<td>Scenic reserves</td>
<td>Section 19(2)(a) Except where the Minister otherwise determines, the indigenous flora and fauna and natural environment of a scenic reserve classified for its scenic values shall as far as possible be preserved and exotic fauna and flora shall be eradicated. Section 19(3)(a) Except where the Minister otherwise determines, the flora and fauna, ecological associations and natural environment and beauty of a scenic reserve classified for the purpose of providing suitable areas to develop for purposes of generating scenic beauty or interest, shall as far as possible be preserved</td>
<td>The Minister may wish to maintain control of these decisions. The Minister may wish to maintain control of these decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 24</td>
<td>Change of classification or purpose or revocation of reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 24(3)</td>
<td>No change of classification or purpose of a scenic, nature or scientific reserve to a recreation, historic, government purpose or local purpose should be made except where the Minister considers the purpose etc no longer appropriate because of destruction of bush or natural features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 24(5)</td>
<td>Minister may change the classification or purpose or revoke the reservation of an historic reserve by reason of destruction of historic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Minister may wish to maintain control of these decisions given the importance of the type of reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 42</th>
<th>Preservation of trees and bush</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 42(1)</td>
<td>Minister must consent to cutting or destruction of bush on any historic, scenic, nature or scientific reserve except in accordance with a permit under s 48A or with the express consent of the Minister and subject to any terms and conditions the Minister chooses to impose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The section 48A permit issue has been dealt with in the table above. The Minister may wish to maintain control over the circumstances of providing express consent to destroying or cutting down bush.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 50</th>
<th>Taking or killing of fauna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 50(1)</td>
<td>The Minister in the case of a scenic, historic, nature or scientific reserve and the administering body of any recreation, government purpose or local purpose reserve may grant any qualified person authorisation to take and kill any specified type of fauna and authorise the use of firearms etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Minister may wish to maintain control over authorisations on the killing etc of fauna on scenic, historic, nature and scientific reserves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waitematā Local Board feedback on the Department of Conservation's proposed revocation of certain delegations to Territorial Authorities under the Reserves Act 1977
DOC proposal to revoke Reserves Act delegations

Kim Bellingham, Legal Services
Purpose

• To brief elected members on DOC proposal to revoke most Ministerial delegations to local authorities under the Reserves Act
  – In order to obtain feedback for 26 April deadline, pending confirmation from DOC of an extension to 17 May
  – Draft submission circulated 15 April
  – Feedback required from you by 18 April
The DOC proposal

- Letter to all local authorities proposing to revoke 44 of the 50 Reserves Act delegated Ministerial powers and seeking comment
  - Reasoning less than clear
  - Letter refers to comments on the delegations made by Court of Appeal in its July 2018 decision *Opua Coastal Preservation Inc v Far North District Council*, recently appealed to the Supreme Court
  - DOC view on lawfulness inferred from *Opua*
  - Different reasoning in table, eg re management planning; desire to retain control of decisions on “important” types of reserves
Reserves Act s 10 provides for delegation of Ministerial powers to local authorities – to better enable local authorities to make decisions affecting reserves: “conservation with communities” Delegations primarily exercised by Governing Body, sub-delegated to staff Many reserve decisions require both administering body (ie local board) decision and Ministerial decision Approx 80% reserves owned by Auckland Council Approx 20% Crown reserves administered by council
Key decisions proposed to be revoked:

- Classification (e.g., recreation, scenic, historic, local purpose)
- Reclassification
- Exchanges
- Management plans
- Easements
- Leases and licences
- Concessions for Crown-owned reserves administered by council
- Vegetation/flora and fauna decisions
Implications

• Impact on local governance of local reserves
  – Reserve decisions currently made within the Auckland Council dual governance structure would need to be approved by DOC officers in Hamilton or Wellington
  – Cuts across intent of better enabling local authorities to make decisions affecting local reserves
  – Implications for local park management planning (omnibus plan) process underway
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications contd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treaty breach re settlement commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eg Tūpuna Maunga Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on evidence of current timing of DOC (eg 1 year not unusual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on volume of decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC cost-recoveries (based on recent examples could be $2000-$3000 per decision)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

• Draft submission circulated 15 April for elected member feedback by 18 April
• Feedback incorporated into Auckland Council submission to DOC for 26 April deadline
• Retrospective approval by Environment and Community Committee 14 May
• Participation in LGNZ-led submission
• Consideration of options, should the proposal to revoke the delegations proceed
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present the Regional Facilities Auckland (RFA) report for the quarter ended 31 December 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Regional Facilities Auckland’s (RFA) purpose is to enrich life in Auckland by engaging people in the arts, environment, sports and events. RFA work in partnership with key stakeholders to present exciting, engaging and accessible experiences to those who live in and visit the city.

3. Key highlights for Quarter 2 include:
   - The appointment of Gregory Burke as the Director of the Auckland Art Gallery in April.
   - Multiple large-scale events were hosted by Auckland Live venues including, Taste Auckland at Queens Wharf, Diwali Cuisine Good Food Awards and the New Zealand Television Awards at the Civic.
   - Mt Smart Stadium hosted two major events: Taylor Swift’s Bad Behaviour tour and the Monster Energy SX Open.

4. 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.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
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a) receive the Regional Facilities Auckland 2018/2019 Second Quarter Report
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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.

### Key performance indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key performance indicators</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 2</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience RFA’s arts, environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td>886,700</td>
<td>816,606</td>
<td>914,373</td>
<td>Not met</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>
<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>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>

### Financial (smillion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial</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>

### 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 that 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.

---

Regional Facilities Auckland Second Quarter Performance Report for the quarter ending 31 December 2018.
Strategic focus area – Stadia

Key highlights and risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights</th>
<th>Strategic context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highlight 1:</strong> 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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highlight 2:</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highlight 3:</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

---

### Key programme of works

<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 focus area – Zoo development

#### Key highlights and risks

**Highlights**
- **Highlight 1:** Renewal of the Old Elephant House to improve visitor amenities has been completed
- **Highlight 2:** The development of a South East Asian Precinct is underway, and has completed its first year of construction

**Risks**
- **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.

#### 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

Highlights
- **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-tightness) has commenced and will continue into the next financial year.
- **Highlight 3:** Development of an Aotea Precinct master plan has commenced
- **Highlight 4:** Installation of an outdoor screen, the “Digital Stage” on Aotea Square, to provide live and enhanced digital experience visitors to the Aotea Arts Precinct.

Risks
- **Risk 1:** Changing consenting requirements in relation to “Grenfell” is causing programme delays on the exterior for up to 6 to 9 months. This will result in additional costs due to extension of time claims and rework of plans in order to meet revised consenting requirements. Additional funding will be sought for the additional costs as part of the Annual Plan 2019/20 budget refresh process.
- **Risk 2:** Unfavourable revenue impact from delays to completion.
- **Risk 3:** Potential negative impact on the customer experience caused by on-going construction works.

Strategic context
With the refurbishment and further proposed development and expansion of the Aotea Centre, RFA aims to create a vibrant Aotea Arts Quarter. This will include a significantly upgraded and expanded Aotea Centre and integrated Aotea Square, providing a home for the development and presentation of performing arts in Auckland.

A proposal for the funding for the development and expansion of the Aotea Centre will be tabled to Council as part of future LTPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Refurbishment</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>The first significant refurbishment of the 30 year old Centre, aiming to upgrade foyer and functions spaces and address long-standing weather-tightness issues</td>
<td>Compliance with Council’s evolving consent requirements around façade and weather-tightening works continues to cause delays to this project. Additional funding will be sought through the Council project risk fund or the Annual Plan 2019/20 budget refresh. This project is progressing with input with a broad group of stakeholders and is intended to help guide future investment proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Square master plan</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>A precinct planning approach to the development of the square and its surrounds to ensure the precinct meets its potential as a key lively and active space for Aucklanders</td>
<td>This project is in its early stages – it is envisaged that a funding proposal for the development will be sought in future LTPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Centre expansion</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Developing concept plans for expanding the current Aotea Centre to provide a home for performing arts organisations and fostering the work of performing arts groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Māori Weddings 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 holistically sustainable experience.
- Auckland Stadums launched a new sustainability initiative for concerts in October. The reusable Globelet Cups help Auckland Stadums 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 reusable tote bags distributed at trade shows and client meetings, along with a reusable 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 Taonga. 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 Māori 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 Tāmaki Makaurau.
- New Zealand Maritime Museum successfully trialled a wāke programme for kura kaupapa Māori with a kura from Waitakere. This programme is being developed in collaboration with Te Toki Voyaging Trust, as the kaitiaki of matarangi 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 meet with Tūpuna o Tāmaki 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 Stadums, visited Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Manurewa-Otahuhu Local Boards to discuss sporting facilities, including clarification of the roles of RFA and Auckland Council. The Director, Auckland Stadums, met twice with Upper Harbour Local Board to maintain effective communications regarding ORE Stadium, and also visited Waitākere Local Board regarding 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.
# Regional Facilities Auckland Q2 Financials

## Direct Operating Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18 Actual</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 2 Actual</th>
<th>FY 19 Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Direct Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; User Charges</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants and Subsidies</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Revenue</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Contributions &amp; Sponsorship</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Expenditure</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Key Operating Lines

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 $720k 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 charges 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 recharge 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 going 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 VEC was leased to Team NZ during the quarter. This re-purpose of the facility has had a negative impact on the overall visitor numbers. It is unlikely this target will be met by year end.</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 Construction has negatively impacted overall visitor numbers and revenue. The impact of this is being mitigated partly by a pricing review. It is likely this target will not be met by the end of the financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to Auckland Art Gallery</td>
<td>110,052</td>
<td>94,009</td>
<td>125,933</td>
<td>Not met While visitor numbers are expected to increase over the summer months the year-end target will not be met due to a lower number of paid exhibitions and potentially also due to the introduction of the international visitor charge.</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 Comment with mitigation/outlook</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 Comment with mitigation/outlook</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 The forecast shows that revenue targets will not be met this year resulting in a potential unfavourable variance of approximately $1.5m by the end of this year. Focus remains on seeking additional revenue and reduction/deferral in variable costs to reduce this variance.</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 Comment with mitigation/outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Māori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Met Comment with mitigation/outlook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw Statement of Proposal resolution from Governing Body

File No.: CP2019/03731

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
Recommendation/s

That the Waitematā 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>20190416 Waitematā Local Board Item 21 - 28 February 2019 Governing Body report</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Statement of Proposal Auckland Council’s new policy on dogs and dog management bylaw <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></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>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor Waitematā Local Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw Statement of Proposal referred from the Regulatory Committee

File No.: CP2019/01471

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To receive the recommendation from the Regulatory Committee and adopt the statement of proposal.

Whakarāpopotanga 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 tūtohunga
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 to the Regulatory Committee</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Amended Statement of Proposal with changes highlighted</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Samdra O'Toole - Team Leader Governance Advisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Stephen Town - Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair’s Report

File No.: CP2018/18683

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update on projects, meetings and other initiatives relevant to the local board’s interests.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Waitematā Local Board:
a) receive the Chair’s report for the period April 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>20190416 Waitematā Local Board Item 22 Chairs Report</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Pippa Coom – Chair Waitematā Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor Waitematā Local Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair’s monthly report

This report covers the period 13 March until 9 April 2019. It is on the agenda for the local board business meeting held on 16 April.

The last few weeks have, of course, been dominated by the terror attacks in Christchurch and the community response to the massacre of 50 innocent people.

Christchurch Mosque Massacre

At our board meeting on 19 March, just days after the horrific events that have changed our country for ever, I led us in a minute’s silence and we gave the following acknowledgment:

“Waitematā Local Board acknowledges the victims of the Christchurch terror attack. We send our deepest condolences to the families and friends directly affected by the shocking, tragic and devastating mass shooting carried out at two Mosques. We acknowledge, love and support the Muslim community in Waitematā and across Aotearoa as we come together to stand united with the community in grief and solidarity.

We commit to promoting tolerance, empathy and mutual understanding for people of all ethnicities and religious beliefs. We value the diversity of Waitematā and wish for all people to feel safe and welcomed. The board’s Ellen Melville Centre (photo right) is one of the Auckland Council community centres with a condolence book to give Aucklanders the opportunity to express their messages of support for the victims, their families and their community.”

At the Vigil in Aotea Square on 16 March (photo right), a defiant and passionate Mayor Phil Goff spoke about his determination more than ever to give nothing to racism, and to ensure the world knows that Auckland and New Zealand is wonderfully diverse, where people of all ethnicities and faiths are welcome.
The Waitematā Local Board joins with the Mayor in taking a strong stand prohibiting speakers wishing to use our community venues to incite intolerance and hate. In addition, we support Auckland as a City of Peace and the development of a regional policy that prohibits the promotion, marketing and sales of weapons of war in council facilities. I reported on our acknowledgement in the April Ponsonby News (Attachment 1).

On 22 March I was in Wellington for a National Council meeting and joined LGNZ staff for the two minutes silence observed across New Zealand. Auckland Council staff assisted in providing support to Ponsonby Mosque who were overwhelmed by the numbers who attended NZ Stand Together for Friday prayers and the evening gathering on one week commemoration (photo right).

The Neighbours day event hosted by City Centre Residents Group on 23 March provided an opportunity to come together for a shared lunch at Ellen Melville Centre. It was especially significant to hear from Imam Wajahat Khan as the centre hosts the Muslim community every Friday for prayers. Local Board member Richard Northey and I were both invited to speak (in the photo right: Auckland Street Choir singing at this event).

Love Aotearoa Hate Racism hosted Kia Kaha: Stand Against Racism in Victoria Park on 24 March and on 29 March I attended Kotahitanga Together - Auckland’s Remembrance for Christchurch at Eden Park with around 2,000 Aucklanders in remembrance of those who lost their lives in the Christchurch mosques attack.

The afternoon’s line-up included Dave Dobbyn, Lizzie Marveilly and children from Islamic schools across Auckland singing the national anthem, and a haka and waiata from children of Kowhai Intermediate.

The Mayor, FIANZ President Br. Mustafa Farouk and Sonny Bill Williams, were among the guest speakers, and the event MC was broadcaster Miriama Kamo (photo right).
Climate Change Symposium

“On Friday morning (15 March) we heard the global call from 1.5 million young people to act to save our planet. By Friday afternoon, New Zealand quickly realised that we needed to act to save ourselves – from discrimination, intolerance and racism. Today as we gather to discuss action on climate change, I call on you all to use this same sentiment to act for good in every aspect of our society. To be resolute to act to create a better future for our children, for Auckland and New Zealand.” – Cr Penny Hulse opening the Auckland Climate Symposium on 18 March organised by Chief Sustainability Officer John Mauro and team.

The day started with Otene Reweti’s poignant miwhakau providing an opportunity to reflect on the words of the national anthem.

The symposium brought people and sectors together to build cross-sector momentum on climate action and feed directly into the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan.

As summed up by MC Rod Oram the first imperative is to give expression to who we are as the fourth most diverse city in the world. The response to climate change must be about a wider purpose of addressing social justice, structural inequality and poverty.

There were a lot of really great presentations and panel discussions on the day I attended with the resounding takeaway that we know what we need to do, we just need to get on with it - with urgency. Ngairimu Blair stepped aside from his presentation to allow the rangatahi of Para Kore ki Tamaki Makaurau to speak (Photo credit David Galler). They powerfully reminded decision makers and us all that we have a duty to youth, those inheriting this world. “We are generation now. Our voices will be heard.”

Annual Budget 19/20 consultation

Council’s annual budget consultation finished on 17 March. The local board ended our engagement with a formal hearing on 14 March. We heard 13 presentations in total from a range of groups and individuals.

Thanks to everyone who has given feedback. We are listening and always keen to seek out the views of the community.

In the photo Adam Parkinson is presenting to board members at the hearing on behalf of the Auckland City Centre Residents’ Group - CCRG.
Good Citizen Awards

Nominations for the Waitematā Local Board Good Citizens’ Awards opened on 18 March. We immensely value community-led work and our Good Citizens’ Awards is one of the ways we celebrate and give recognition to those who make Waitematā a great place to live. We are seeking nominations for individuals or community-led organisations working within the Waitematā Local Board area until 14 April (Our Auckland Attachment 2).

Western Springs Lakeside Park update

I have been providing updates on Western Springs following complaints about the water quality of the lake and maintenance of the park.

I received the following update from Community Facilities on 1 April.

There has been a significant amount of work going on at Western Springs lately.

Treescape have been through and done a lot of tidying up from last year’s storms as well as taking out some significant additional dead or dying trees. The bins and handrails are all newly painted and the playground toilets are up and running including a minor revamp to the electrical equipment. The water quality is being closely monitored by Healthy Waters and they are regularly removing rubbish and tree branches from the lake and clearing out the weirs weekly, a recent bathymetric survey was undertaken with sediment levels measured and lake depth mapped.

Any deterioration of the park assets such as paths and playground will be addressed by the Western Springs Lakeside Park Development Plan (coming to the board’s May business meeting).

The park is audited weekly and complying with contract specs, apart from the goose poo on one section of path, which I believe is what people are perceiving as a lack of maintenance. I have asked the contractors to increase the level of cleaning of the section of path on the northern side that is bombarded by geese, which will be waterblasted daily if required.

Wildlands have been asked to prepare a report on our options for Geese management for discussion with the local board.

In other park news, the Meola Reef Reserve Te Tokaroa Development Plan which provides a 10-20year holistic vision for the area is now online.
Black Carbon Levels – Queen Street

As I reported in my February report, pedestrians and workers in Queen Street are being exposed to high levels of “black carbon” associated with a number of health problems. This was one of the findings from Auckland Council Research and Evaluation Unit, RIMU's report published in December 2018 “The impacts of transport emissions on air quality in Auckland’s city centre”. The report states “Policy decisions that promote safer streets, climate action, active and public transportation modes as well as congestion mitigation strategies have multiple and interdependent benefits. These include increased economic activity, vibrant social spaces and a cleaner, more sustainable environment, including cleaner air”.

I was one of the signatories to a letter to AT’s CEO on 17 December asking for “immediate action to alleviate the risk of more premature deaths, contributed to by atrocious air quality on our busiest street”. AT’s response dated 21 March is attached (Attachment 3).

Meetings and workshops: 13 March until 9 April

- Transport portfolio meeting on 13 March
- Leys Institute Library drop-in on for the Annual Budget consultation on 13 March
- Briefing on the Walking and Cycling work programme by Auckland Transport’s CEO on 13 March
- Communications meeting on 13 March
- Ponsonby Business Association monthly board meeting on 14 March
- Annual Budget 19/20 local board hearing on 14 March
- Meeting on 14 March to discuss Auckland Transport’s safety review of car transporters on Great North Road with John Strawbridge, Group Manager Parking services and compliance and Melanie Alexander, Traffic Operations Manager
- Attended the Climate Change Symposium on 18 March at GRID AKL (photo right one of the panel discussions)
- Waitematā Local Board business meeting on 19 March
- Attended the Albert-Eden Local Board workshop on 20 March to discuss possibility of jointly delivering a Greenway on Meola Road
- Speed Limit consultation drop-in organised by Auckland Transport in the Atrium, Britomart
- Meeting with Taj Pabari, Founder & Chief Executive Officer / Fiftysix Creations (Business Camp Academy)
- Meeting with representatives of Westfield to discuss a Newmarket wayfinding project
- Auckland Climate Change Symposium closing session on 20 March (photo right Cr Penny Hulse closing the conference)
• Ports of Auckland Community Reference Group meeting on 20 March
• LGNZ National Council meeting in Wellington on 22 March
• Weekly chairs catch-up held on 25 March, 1 April and 8 April
• Auckland Transport quarterly briefing on 25 March
• Waitematā Local Board workshops on 26 March, 2 and 9 April
• TRAFINZ executive meeting on 27 March
• Wynyard Quarter Neighbour Forum and America’s Cup 38 Community Liaison meeting held at ASB on 28 March
• Supported board member Vemon Tava presentation on 28 March to the Hearing Commissioners considering Auckland Transport’s application to construct six new ferry berths on Queens Wharf. We raised concerns about: the lack of integrated planning, the impact on public space on the “people’s wharf”, the adequacy of the infrastructure for passengers and objected to plans for buses to circulate on the wharf. We also confirmed our opposition to the Dolphin mooring extension
• Meeting with Kelimana Gardens Trustees on 28 March
• Site visit on 29 March at the Auckland Domain to discuss the location of footpaths to be funded by the Local Board (the photo right highlights how poor the walking environment is in the Domain with parked cars dominating the entrance to Auckland Museum)
• Meeting with businesses impacted by CRL construction on 3 April at the invite of Sunny Kaushal (owner of the Shakespeare Hotel). It was very concerning to hear about their very stressful situations. I’ve been following up with CRL to find out what has happened to the development response that was meant to have been put in place as well as activation of the street to encourage more foot traffic.
• Auckland City Centre Advisory Board workshop at AUT on 4 April
• Local Board Chairs Forum on 8 April

Events and functions: 13 March until 8 April

• Spoke at the Parnell Business Association monthly networking event on 13 March regarding the Annual Budget 19/20
• Launch of the Writers Festival on 13 March at Aotea Centre
• Auckland Arts Festival performance Silk Road at the Auckland Town Hall at the invitation of the University of Auckland on 14 March
• Climate Strike in Aotea Square on 15 March
• Safe Speeds Panel discussion organised by Auckland Transport on 15 March
• Backbone performed at Aotea Centre at the invitation of Auckland Arts Festival Trust
Vigil for the victims of the Christchurch Mosque Massacre in Aotea Square on 16 March
Toku Reo Waiata at the Auckland Town Hall on 16 March at the invitation of Auckland Arts Festival Trust
Astroman opening night at Q Theatre at the invitation of Auckland Theatre Company on 17 March
BFM radio interview on 15 and 29 March
Neighbours Day at Ellen Melville Centre on 23 March organised by City Centre Residents Association (photo above cutting the Love Your Neighbour cake)
Splice Neighbours Day event “Check it out” Human library on Lorne Street
Dog Day Afternoon at Silo Park on 23 March
Kia kaha Aotearoa: Stand against racism rally on 24 March
Presented at the Citizenship ceremony on 25 March at the Auckland Town Hall. The Citizenship ceremony took on extra special significance. One of the commitments of citizenship is to foster and support the close relationships between New Zealanders of all ethnicities and faiths. It was an honour to preside and welcome over 400 new New Zealanders from 49 countries along with Kaumatua Bob Hawke, local board members David Wong, Rosalind Rundie, Bob Upchurch and Cr Josephine Bartley. (Photo credit: Paul Victor Pu’u’a)
Kai at Merge afternoon tea at the invite of Lifewise
Kotahitanga Together - Auckland’s Remembrance for Christchurch at Eden Park on 29 March
Aloha Night at Grey Lynn School on 29 March
Opening of Korean Day festival on 30 March (photo below)
Red Alert radio interview on 4 April
Announcement of the National Erebus Memorial design – Te Paerangi Ataata- Sky Song- by the Prime Minister and Mayor on 5 April with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei in Sir Dove Myer Robinson Park. I attended with Deputy Chair Shale Chambers. Kathryn Carter (photo right) spoke beautifully about the significance of the design. She was one of two family representatives on the selection panel who chose the design for the way it touches the land lightly leading into the sky (with many thoughtful features). Importantly all the victims are acknowledged as well as the responders and Justice Mahon who found the truth about what happened.
• Relationship Agreement Signing Ceremony Waikato-Tainui and Auckland Council at the Kelingitanga Exhibition - Auckland War Memorial Museum on 8 April

Attachments
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<th>Ponsonby News update: April 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Our Auckland: Waitematā Local Board seeks nominations for Good Citizens’ Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Auckland Transport’s response on Black Carbon Levels – Queen St dated 21 March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waitematā Local Board
16 April 2019

Chair’s Report

Attachment A

Item 22

The Waitematā Local Board stands with Christchurch and the Muslim community across New Zealand. At our first board meeting just days after the horrific events that have changed our country for ever, I led us in a minute’s silence and gave the following acknowledgment:

“Waitematā Local Board acknowledges the victims of the Christchurch terror attack. We extend our deepest condolences to the families and friends directly affected by the shocking, tragic and deplorable mass shooting carried out with malicious intent. We acknowledge and support the Muslim community in Waitematā and across Aotearoa as we come together to stand united with the community in grief and solidarity.

We commit to promoting tolerance, empathy and mutual understanding for people of all ethnicities and religious beliefs. We value the diversity of Waitematā and wish for all people to feel safe and welcomed. The board’s Elam Mākau Centre is one of the Auckland Council community centres with a confidence block to give Aucklanders the opportunity to express their messages of support to the victims, their families and their community.”

Board members have joined the many thousands paying their respects at vigils and events held in response including at the Al Noor Mosque in Christchurch where an amazing sea of flowers has been laid by locals. We will join together for the broadcast of the National Remembrance Service planned for Friday 22 March in Christchurch.

In speaking at the vigil in Aotea Square on 18 March, a defiant and passionate Mayor, Phil Goff, spoke about his determination more than ever to give nothing to racism, and to ensure the world knows that Auckland and New Zealand is a wonderful diverse place where people of all ethnicities and faiths are welcome. The local board joins with the Mayor in taking a strong stand prohibiting speakers wishing to use our community venues to incite intolerance and hate. In addition, we support Auckland as a city of peace and have prohibited the promotion and sales of weapons of war in our council facilities.

Through the sadness we also come together to celebrate the best of our community and strengthen neighbourhood connections that make us more resilient. Last month (31 March), the Grey Lynn Community Centre is hosting the Jam on Toast Festival. This annual event showcases some of the diverse and amazing classes run in and around our community. Throughout the day there will be fantastic entertainment, live art and graffiti demonstrations, street food and refreshments and something for the whole family. Visit Grey Lynn Community Centre’s Facebook page to find out more.

Our local board also immensely values community-led work and our Good Citizens Awards is one of the ways we celebrate and give recognition to those who make Waitematā a great place to live. We are seeking nominations for individuals or community-led organisations working within the Waitematā Local Board area until 14 April. (Pippa Com) *(PC)*

Find out more and make your nomination at our website:
www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/waitemata

Contact: Pippa Com, Chair of Waitematā Local Board, pippa.com@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz , www.facebook.com/waitemata

Contact: Pippa Com, Chair of Waitematā Local Board, pippa.com@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz , www.facebook.com/waitemata

PUBLISHED FIRST FRIDAY EACH MONTH *(except January)*
Waitematā Local Board seeks nominations for Good Citizens’ Awards

Our Auckland Published: 21 March 2019

Waitematā Local Board is seeking nominations from the community to help recognise people and groups, who go above and beyond to contribute towards making Waitematā a great place to live.

The local board introduced its Good Citizens’ Awards in 2011 and have run the event biennially since then.

Waitematā Local Board Chair Pippa Coom says sometimes the work recognised reaches further than just the Waitematā Local Board area.

“At our last Good Citizens’ Awards ceremony in 2017, Community Group Awards’ went to the Outreach Therapy Pets Programme and Rainbow Youth whose work covers the Auckland region.

“Our local board immensely values community-led work and our Good Citizens’ Awards is one of the ways we celebrate this good work. We encourage people to make nominations,” she said.

You can nominate a person or group based within the Waitematā Local Board area by using the online nomination form.

Nominations are open from Monday 18 March, closing Sunday 14 April 2019.
The successful nominees will be recognised at the Waitematā Local Board Good Citizens' Awards ceremony, which will be held at the Auckland Town Hall on Thursday 16 May 2019.

Award Categories

Individual Award
Recognising individuals who give their time for the community's benefit.

Children and Young People Award
Recognising children and young people under 24 who give their time to make a positive difference in the community.

Community Group Award
Recognising not-for-profit organisations that do outstanding work for the community, directly or indirectly, and that provide a platform for people to volunteer their time.
21 March 2019

Chairs and Deputy Chairs of the Planning and Environment & Community Committees of Auckland Council, and Waitematā Local Board
Chris Darby@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Penny Hulse@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Pippa Coom@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Richard Hills@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Alf Filipaina@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Dear Councillors Chris Darby, Penny Hulse, Pippa Coom, Richard Hills, and Alf Filipaina

Black Carbon Levels – Queen St

Thank you for your correspondence on 17 December in relation to carbon levels on Queen Street. Like you, AT is concerned at the high concentration of Elevated Black Carbon on Queen Street and is considering a number of initiatives to reduce these.

Recently, the AT Board of Directors reviewed our Sustainability Programme and also considered the issue of sustainability through the Statement of Intent.

The clear message from our Board to management is to be more ambitious in this space.

AT is committed to delivering on Auckland’s Climate Change targets and working together to make tangible progress. Climate change and CO₂ emissions are one of the greatest challenges that AT has sought to address in the recently developed Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). The RLTP was consulted on, prior to being approved the AT Board, and we received 18,000 submissions from across the region. There was overwhelming agreement on these challenges and the program of interventions to address them.

A key initiative is the (draft) Low Emissions Bus Roadmap (“Roadmap”) endorsed by the AT Board which sets out our plan to undertake trials of zero emission vehicles to meet the aspirations of Auckland Council. We appreciate your general support of our key milestones and acknowledge the desire to advance the timelines of the Roadmap. This tactical roadmap will be further developed and regularly reviewed as more information becomes available from the market, incorporating technology updates and learnings from these trials and learnings from further afield in New Zealand and across the globe.

AT had considered the immediate steps articulated in your letter. Some investigations are already under way to assess feasibility and financial implications:

1. Reduce diesel buses - transition to E-buses faster

Currently, the large number of buses on Queen Street is partly due to construction of the CRL which is limiting traffic access to Albert Street. As a result, some services will need to run on Queen Street until the CRL project is completed around 2023/4. There are, unfortunately, no practical alternatives to this.

The fleet used under current bus contracts includes 30% of older, diesel-powered models (Euro III to Euro IV). However, some of that fleet is being replaced with Euro VI buses, and from March 2019 the proportion of lower emission diesel buses will increase.

Throughout this year we will be reviewing our contracts with bus operators and we will negotiate contract variations to prescribe fleet type by route and Euro standard to minimise the number of Euro III and IV buses on routes using Queen Street and Downtown.
AT is participating in a forum led by the New Zealand Transport Agency ("NZTA") to review Requirements for Urban Buses ("RUB") and Vehicle Quality Standards (VQS) and make appropriate changes that may support and enable changes to bus operators fleets.

AT is also assessing the compatibility of the current fleet with technology to enable the suggested automatic stop/start function, and the potential implications on performance of the bus fleet in service. Key concerns include the impact on air-conditioning and quality of air in the cabin due to current fleet’s reliance on engine running for the air-conditioning to work and, the impact on maintenance costs due to more frequent component replacements that may affect operating costs.

We are also investigating the option of facilitating the use of renewable diesel by bus operators to further reduce emissions from Euro V and Euro VI diesel buses during transition to zero emission fleet. There are over 900 such buses in the fleet and they will be operating until they are replaced by a zero-emission fleet.

AT is planning to prescribe battery electric buses for City Link service to commence in November 2020 at the commencement of new contract. Further acceleration of transition to e-buses will be assessed and updated in the next iteration of the Roadmap.

2. Disincentivise private vehicles on Queen Street

Private vehicles are expected to be removed from Queen Street following the introduction of light rail from the mid-2020s and the major pedestrian transformation ("A4E") of Queen Street. All general traffic would be expected to be removed with restricted access for servicing and loading of businesses being permitted. The increased amenity for pedestrians will contribute to the fulfilment of the Mayor’s C40 declaration ensuring a major area of the city centre is zero emission by 2030.

We are currently working with the Auckland Design Office to design trials for early implementation of elements of this future pedestrianisation of Queen Street.

In addition, our Travel Demand team are working with businesses, commuters and students to reduce single occupant vehicles coming into the city. This includes behavioural change programmes and campaigns highlighting alternatives to the car.

While the primary focus of our Speed Limit Bylaw proposal currently subject to consultation is improving survivability for vulnerable road users in the city centre we anticipate that the indirect consequences of this will be to create broader health benefits for pedestrians.

3. Reduce rat running in and around Queen Street

As part of working with Auckland Council on A4E trials, AT will consider the proposal to use right-hand turn bans to restrict unnecessary traffic access to Queen Street. Bus services have been prioritised along Queen Street with the introduction of bus lanes and pedestrians are prioritised at the crossing locations. As noted above the trials for Queen Street are being investigated and seek to increase the people space for sections of the road corridor.

4. Reallocation of road space from parking

Following the introduction of LRT and removal of all private vehicles from Queen Street, and with completion of other Long-Term Plan (LTP) funded projects and conversion of traffic lanes to public transport, more space will be available for pedestrians and cyclists.

In the meantime, a servicing and delivery plan is currently in development for the city centre to manage the business and residential needs. This considers the changing nature of the city centre and reduction in parking areas. In addition, Auckland Transport’s Parking Strategy sets out ways of managing the utilisation of parking to optimise availability. As you may be aware, just this week we increased on-street parking charges.
Within months we are hoping to trial an e-bike “hub” for courier companies at the Strand. In effect this will be a deliver depot for pick-up of parcels which will reduce the number of courier vehicles circulating in the CBD.

Finally, we are following up on a suggestion from Cr Darby that will see (in a trial) 15 minute parking spaces on Queen St reallocated for other uses—most likely for e-scooter or bike-hire parking.

Further to the suggested steps and quick wins, AT will continue to investigate other options to bring notable improvement in air quality in Queen Street. The timeline of completion number of transport and building projects will also reduce construction truck movements and machinery that contribute to the lower air quality in Downtown Auckland.

Again, AT is committed to working together to make tangible progress in the long term and implement some of the quick wins in the short-term to reduce the risk of respiratory related illnesses, and to create more sustainable environment.

Yours sincerely

Shane Ellison
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
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Board Member Richard Northey’s Report to 16 April 2019 Waitematā Local Board Meeting

Events Portfolio Activities

21 March Official Launch of the Helen Clark Foundation.

Events Applied for or Occurring During This Period

16 March Filming a TV Commercial for BNZ in O’Connell Street.

20, 21 and 24 March Filming of TV programme Power Rangers in Mahuhu Crescent, Mahuhu Ki e Rangi Reserve, and Tapora Crescent.

22 March La Longue Table Orange du Chef dinner and drinks for 100 people in Upper Vulcan Lane. This event has now been postponed indefinitely.

22 March Filming for Feature Film “Take Home Pay” in Victoria Park. Apparently, Grafton Cricket are okay with it.

23 March Rose wine tasting and lifestyle all day event in Albert Park.

23 March Garmin Active Kids Boot Camp activities in the passive area of Western Park.

23-24 March Pasifika Festival, Western Springs Lakeside Park, Western Springs Stadium Fields, Bullock Track and Stadium Road. This was cancelled in the light of the mosque attacks.

24 March Rainbow Youth musical celebration of their 30th Birthday in Western Springs Park.

24 March Filming for TV Programme Power Rangers on Faraday Street and Wall Street off St. Georges Bay Road.

24, 26 and 27 March Filming of the NZ Comedy Feature Film “Take Home Pay” in Lower Hobson Street, High Street, Freyberg Place, Fort Lane, Jean Batten Place, Silo Park, North Wharf, Wynyard Quarter, Westhaven Boardwalk; Federal Street, Wyndham Street, Te Wero, Karana Plaza, Takutai Square, Wakefield Street, Queen Street, Canada Street, Galway Street, Gore Street and Te Ara e Whiti - The Lightpath.

26 March Rebel Sports Mailer Photoshoot, “To be disturbed in New Zealand” in the Auckland Domain

26 March Filming of NZ Feature Film “Baby Done” in Fort Street, Emily Place, Crummer Road and Arika Street.

28 March Filming TV Programme The Block Challenge by drones over Western Park and Western Springs Lakeside Park.
28 March Same Same But Different Film Festival at the Civic Theatre and on the adjoining footpath in Queen Street.

28-31 March Under 17 Football Tournament in the Seddon Fields. This has been cancelled.

29 March Filming of a TV Commercial for Trelegy bicycles for the US Market in Western Springs Lakeside Park. This filming was cancelled.

30 March Motor Scooter Picnic to train riders and promote motor scooter safety organised by Auckland Transport, held in Point Erin Reserve.

31 March Filming of a Tuk Tuk scene for the feature film “Baby Done” on North Wharf.

1 and 2 April Filming for TV Programme Power Rangers in Mahuhu Crescent.

2 April Filming for New Zealand feature film “Baby Done” in the Lower Domain Drive, Auckland Domain.

4 April Photoshoot and filming for Easter themed Rebel Sport TV Commercial in Western Springs Lakeside Park.

5 April Premiere of the New Zealand documentary, Soldiers Without Guns, for the red carpet and crowds on the footpath outside the Civic Theatre.

5 April Photoshoot promotion for Subaru in the Auckland Domain - Lovers Lane and carpark, band rotunda, The Crescent, Football Road and Museum Circuit.

6 April Swim the Bridge based at Curran Street and Park.

6 April Ponsonby Market Day in Ponsonby Road and the eastern end of Jervois Road.

7 April Cure Kids PureGo sponsored fundraising walk on Tamaki Drive, Quay Street, Beach Road, Customs Street, Fanshawe Street and Victoria Park.

7 April Unite’s Mercy Hospice Fundraising Walk in the Domain with associated road closures.

7 April Chapman Tripp staff office picnic in Point Erin Park.

7 April Plunket Buggy Fundraising Fun Run on Western Springs Lakeside Park. Annalee has advised the Western Springs Buggy Run was postponed until the 5th of May 2019 out of respect for our Muslim and wider communities in Christchurch as Plunket did not want to hold fund-raisers during this time.

7 April Filming of Power Rangers TV Programme in St. Paul Street, Chancery Street, O’Connell Street, Bacons Lane and Courthouse Lane

7-14 April Filming of feature film “Ablaze” in Mahuhu Crescent and Te Taou Crescent and in Western Springs Lakeside Park.
9 April Central West Cluster of Schools Tag Rugby Tournament at Cox’s Bay Reserve.

9-11 April Filming of corporate documentary promotion for ARA Security on Lighter Quay Walkway, Halsey Street; Albert Park and Bowen Ave; and Fred Ambler Lookout.

10 April UNITEC Autumn Graduation Procession from Albert Park, Princess Street to Aotea Square. This was cancelled in the light of the Christchurch massacre.

10 April Filming of Short Film “We Love Trees” with Hinemoa Elder in Lovers Lane, Domain Drive and The Crescent in the Auckland Domain.

10-30 April ANZAC Memorial Field of 171 white crosses set out below the Cenotaph in the Domain.

12 April Huawei Launch of their P30 phone product Federal Street Music Festival with closure of the shared space block of Federal Street.

13 April Vertical Pursuit Pole Vaulting Exhibition Event in Federal Street.

14 April Auckland Half Marathon on Tamaki Drive.

15 April Photoshoot for promotion of Biz Corporates Catalogue in Kitchener Street and Te Ha o Hine Place.

15 April Photoshoot for Icebreaker Clothes at Silo Park

16-22 April Water World Inflatable Waterpark on Judges Bay.

18-26 April Anzac 19: Bledisloe Lane poppies decorations made from waste materials to commemorate Anzac 2019 in Bledisloe Lane.

19 April Stations of the Cross Catholic Church Walk from Albert Park through Princess Street, Old Government House grounds, Symonds Street, Alfred Street, Wellesley Street, Kitchener Street, Lorne Street, Rutland Street, Aotea Square, Queen Street, Darby Street, Elliot Street, Victoria Street, Federal Street, and Wyndham Street to St. Patrick’s Cathedral.

25 April Grey Lynn RSC march and service with approval of $4650 funding from the Waitakorika Local Board. The march has been cancelled in light of the high security situation.

25 April ANZAC Day Commemoration Events, Dawn and Civic services, with road closures in Auckland Domain.

25 April Newmarket Anzac Day Parade from Teed St, through Osborne Street and Broadway to Olympic Park. This has been cancelled as a result of the High Security situation.
29 April and 1 and 3 May Auckland University graduation processions from Princes Waitematā, through Bowen, Victoria and Queen Streets to Aotea Square. This is being reviewed in the light of the High Security situation.

30 April Gucci’s in store and on Queen Street footpath launch cocktail party event for their customers, 48 Queen Street.

4 May J Day in Albert Park, music and workshops.

4 May Laura, Sam and Toni’s Boot camp organised by The Hits Station Breakfast Show, held in the passive area of Victoria Park.

4 May Private Bright Nights music and performance event at Te Wero.

5 May Dutch War Memorial Service, Dove-Myer Robinson Park.

5 May Plunket Society Buggy Fun Run Fundraiser in Western Springs Reserve near the quarry and the Zoo.

8-12 May Public Bright Nights music and performance events on Eastern Viaduct marina, Market Square, Waitematā Plaza, and Te Wero. I am concerned that there is no transport plan and no additional public transport to be provided when about 50,000 people are expected there. I have been assured there will not be high noise levels.

10 May F-45 Track Boot Camp in Albert Park.

12 May Annual Run Auckland Series in Western Springs Lakeside Park.

12 May Why Women Run 5 and 10 km Run on Grandstand Road South in the Domain.

19 May, 9 June, 7 July, 11 August and 15 Sept Sri Chinmoy “Self-Transcendence” Auckland Series runs in the Domain.

29 May to 19 June Auckland Festival of Photography light box Installations on Te Wero Island and in Freyberg Place / Ellen Melville Centre.

22 June to 14 July Busting Moves - the emerging Māori Design Movement for Tāmaki Makaurau- Lightbox Installations of Māori designers and their works in Freyberg Place.

30 June to 1 August Winter Festival Static Art installation in Lumsden Green.

5, 12, 19 and 26 July Light Installations and performances at Heard Park as part of ATEED’s Winter Festival Event-Elements of Parnell occurring throughout July.

12 July Te Korakora, SkyCity’s Matariki Festival with Māori performers, music and food stalls in Federal Street from Victoria Street to Wellesley Street.

25-28 July ATEED Winter Festival with elements including interactive light pieces, performing groups and food stalls in Albert Park. I raised concerns about noise levels arising from nearby residents’ negative experiences of the Laneways Festival.
5 Oct F45 Boot Camp in Albert Park.

6 Oct Pink Ribbon Ride, annual motorcycle charity ride to raise funds for breast cancer from the Mt Wellington Netball centre to Western Springs Stadium.

17 Nov Parnell Festival of Roses in Dove Myer Robinson Reserve.

23 Nov Grey Lynn Festival, Grey Lynn Park – I raised concerns about inadequate waste management.

**Arts and Culture Portfolio**

14 March Opening Night of Stephen Sinclair’s Play “The Bach”.

15 March Enjoyed the Backbone Circus courtesy of the Auckland Arts Festival.

16 March Went to the Artists in Eden event with Peter Haynes, artists creating art works on the Essex Reserve; with Robyn to the Arts Festival musical from Africa, A Man of Good Hope; and, courtesy of the Auckland Arts Festival to Toku Reo Waiata, a festival of songs in Te Reo.

17 March Watched the opening performance of the New Zealand play “Astroman” courtesy of the Auckland Theatre Company.

21 March Auckland Art Gallery Members’ Tour of the Melanie Roger, Mokopopaki, Starkwhite and Tim Melville Galleries and their current exhibitions: Henrietta Harris’ “Hidden People”; Billy Apple: “2 Gallery Abstract”; Cook Island Artist, Ani O’Neill with her massive Tivaevae and other artistic styles; and Joel Dwyer’s “Dreams of a Chrlave”; and Arts Festival Music and Planetarium Show “A Synthesised Universe” at the Stardome.

22 March Auckland Arts Festival Dance Drama from Shanghai “The Dreamer” courtesy of the Arts Festival.

23 March Arts Festival Performance of Messiaen’s massive orchestral work ‘Turangaliia’ by the APO at the Town Hall.

24 March Arts Festival Play “Ulster American” at the Waterfront Theatre; there was no sign of the Rainbow Youth 30th Anniversary Celebration in Western Park I was invited to.

4 April APO Concert “Landscapes”.

5 April Event to Reopen the Gus Fisher Art Gallery and exhibitions; Premiere of the Documentary Film “Soldiers Without Guns” at the Civic Theatre with Phil Goff.

6 April View exhibitions at Studio One.

7 April Attended the art installation and performance event “Between Tides” at Westmere Beach and spoke with organiser Juliet Laird.
8 April Showing at the Film Society of the notable Bulgarian Film “Western”.

**Community Portfolio Activities**


14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 March and 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12 April fitness workouts at Pitt St YMCA.

17 March and 7 April Grey Lynn Farmers Market.

19 March Auckland Central Labour Electorate Committee Annual Meeting.

20 March City Vision Meeting.

21 March Karangahape Road Business Association Meeting.

23 March With Pippa Coom spoke at the Neighbours’ Day Lunch organised by the Central City Residents Group at the Ellen Melville Centre (speech and photos attached).

25 March Ponsonby Community Centre Committee Meeting.

27 March Auckland Central City Labour Branch Meeting; Meeting to hear and select City Vision candidates for the Auckland District Health Board.

28 March Central City Network Meeting at the Ellen Melville Centre. Only nine there. Ateesh talked of events coming up at Ellen Melville, Kathy Ross about the speed limits consultation and Emergency Management; I about the Good Citizens Awards; all of us about long-term impacts on New Zealanders of the mosque attacks.

1 April Central City Residents’ Group Meeting; teleconference to organise Labour’s Auckland Regional Policy Conference.

3 April Housing Call to Action Meeting.

5 April Jim Foote, leading JASMAX architect’s, funeral.

6 April Ponsonby Road Market Day; Central City Labour Branch Meeting.

8 April Blessing of Hauora Rehina at Griffiths Gardens.
10 April Professor Mai Chen Lecture at the University; Asian Family Services Board Meeting.

11 April Central City Residents Group Red Hat Dinner at The Kimchi Project in Lorne Street.

12 April BFM Concert and Climate Change Ready Urban Adventures presentation at Ellen Melville centre.

**Waitematā Local Board General Activities**

13 March With Pippa and Adriana took part in engagement on the Council and Waitematā Local Board Budget and Work Programme at the Leys Institute library; Met Deborah Manning and other West View and Old Mill Road residents on the site regarding the Western Springs pines issues.

14 March The Waitematā Local Board Formal Hearing event on the Annual Budget consultation.

19 March Waitematā Local Board Monthly meeting.

20 March Waitematā Local Board Community Portfolio Meeting.

26 March Waitematā Local Board Workshop.

2 April Waitematā Local Board Workshop.

9 April Waitematā Local Board Workshop.

10 April Auckland Conversation on “Future Proofing Auckland”.

12 April Meeting with Arts Advisers concerning their forthcoming report to our may meeting on their visual arts facilities stocktake and the future of 3 Ponsonby Road.

**Auckland Council and National Activities**

13 March Led in presenting and making the response for the Auckland Council submission to the Local Government Commission on the representation review of the Auckland Council Ward Boundaries.

14 March Made a presentation to a workshop of the Governing Body regarding the proposed Code of Conduct. For a variety of reasons, it is probable too many Councillors are opposed to it to proceed.

18 March Council’s Local Boards Cluster Workshop dealing with more effective reporting of complaints and requests for service; the Navigation Safety Bylaw regarding life jacket wearing and the like and the Animal Control Bylaw regarding owned cats and other creatures.
19 March Attended and spoke to Auckland Transport staff at their consultation on reduced speeds in the Speed Limits Bylaw, held at the Atrium on Takutai Street, Britomart; Labour Policy Council teleconference.

20 March Internal Affairs Department consultation on the Charities Act and Charity Services; Problem Gambling Foundation of NZ Executive Meeting; Address by Professor Ramesh Thakur about reforming the UN and the Security Council.

22 March With Penny Hulse and Laurie Ross spoke to welcome blind Norwegian cyclist Tore Naerland and his group on a cycling journey around the world to promote nuclear disarmament, tolerance and peaceful dispute resolution (my speech and Tore’s itinerary attached).

26 March Governing Body Planning Committee Workshop City Centre Masterplan Refresh on the Access for Everyone Proposed Programme including pedestrian priority for High Street and for Queen Street starting from the area from Shortland Street north. Open Day for the Albert Street part of the CRL held at the Connectus Office under the AMP with lots of complaints about loss of car access from residents of apartments on Albert Street.

27 March Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Meeting.

28 March Participated in a meeting of the Karangahape Road Community Liaison Group for the Central Rail Link.

30 March New Zealand Labour Policy Council Meeting at Parliament.


8 April Chaired the Teleconference of the International Affairs and Disarmament Committee of the Peace Foundation. There was considerable discussion of the mosque attacks, gun control and what local government can do to ban arms bazaars and hate speech from speakers in its facilities; discussion at local boards forum on DOC proposal for them having more say over local parks.

9 April Teleconference of Labour’s Policy Council.

10 April Pasifika Advisory Board of the PGF Group; Teleconference of Labour’s Housing Policy Subcommittee.

11 April Celebration of the 25th Anniversary of the Formation of the Problem Gambling Foundation of New Zealand (my speech is attached); Chaired a meeting of the PGF Group Board.
Richard Northey Speech at Neighbours Day Event 23 March at Ellen Melville Centre.

Tena Kotou Katoa

I want to give my thanks to Leesa and Ateesh at the Ellen Melville Centre and to Kathy Ross, Alan Parkinson and the wonderful City Centre Residents Group for organising this great event.

Today more than ever we need to reach out to, and come to know and appreciate, our neighbours, in all their diversity. The amazing love, empathy and generosity of both Muslim and non-Muslim New Zealanders has been vital for us all.

There are still some who believe a country and a society is happiest and safest if it is largely homogeneous, particularly in its ethnicity, religion and culture. That used to be our heritage as New Zealanders. In 1986 David Lange did me the honour, as a new Member of Parliament, to chair a review of our immigration policy. It was then very much a White New Zealand policy, with only those exceptionally well qualified or with very close family connections, permitted to come here from outside what were called “Traditional Source” countries. These were all in Northern Europe, so people from Iceland and Finland were strongly favoured over those from India and China, even though people from those countries had helped build our society and horticultural and retail economy.

Helen Clark, Kerry Burke and I, and the other MPs on the Committee, quickly decided that this was grossly discriminatory and was selling New Zealand short by missing out on the skills, talents and the cultural richness from people all around the world. We removed national or ethnic origin entirely as a criterion for immigration. Since the 1987 Immigration Act, New Zealand, and particularly Auckland, have totally changed. We are now the world’s fifth most diverse city. And our lives are so much the better and the richer for it. Our political and community leadership, of both left and right have helped ensure that this huge change has been accomplished with little of the stress and anguish found in some other countries. And it has enabled us to come together and be strengthened by the Christchurch events.

Yesterday I had the privilege of welcoming to Auckland blind Norwegian cyclist Tore Naerland, who has spent the last 45 years leading others in biking around the world for world peace and tolerance. Norway, similarly unexpectedly, suffered a white supremacist massacre eight years
ago so he had a lot of empathy for us. His persistence and passionate commitment to advancing world peace and mutual understanding is an inspiration to all of us.

Those of us who live in inner city apartments face new challenges in promoting neighbourliness. When I was first elected to the City Council there were just 237 people living in the inner city. Now there are 300 times as many. We have no back or front fence to chat to our neighbours over but instead often have locked gates that are impregnable to those not living there. Many of us are new to this country and city and often bewildered by it. Neighbourliness needs to be built by events like this, where we can find and meet new friends. Thank you again to Ellen Melville and to the City Centre Residents Group for making this Neighbours Day event happen.
Speech to Welcome Tore Naerland and other Members of Bike for Peace Around the World, Aotea Square, 22 March 2019

Tena Kotou Katoa

I am Richard Northey, an Elected Member of the Waitematā Local Board, the local government unit for this area, and Chair of the International Affairs and disarmament Committee of the Aotearoa / New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies. On behalf Councillor Penny Hulse here, who is Chair of the Environment and Community Committee of the Auckland Council, representing the Council, of the Waitematā Local Board, and of the people of Auckland I welcome you, Tore, and your colleagues, to Auckland.

We admire and support you, Tore, for in spite of your blindness, setting up and participating in Biking for Peace and 47 years of pedalling through the world’s centres of violence, oppression and environmental degradation. We support your current project where you and your colleagues’ are circumnavigating the world promoting nuclear disarmament, the prevention of hatred sand war, climate protection, promotion of cycling and renewable energies, protection of the oceans including from plastic waste, full inclusion of the disabled in society and cutting military spending to fund the UN’s sustainable development goals. This dedication and persistence sets a huge example for achieving a better, safer, more peaceful, just and sustainable world.

New Zealand has a proud history of promoting nuclear disarmament. It was bottom up action by New Zealanders in declaring their schools, organisations, workplaces and local authorities nuclear free that led to the New Zealand government enacting the New Zealand Nuclear Free Zone Act that I was proud to be in Parliament to speak and vote for. The threat of nuclear war remains as real as ever and we must advocate strongly to the nuclear weapon states to carry out their obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty to reduce and eliminate their own nuclear weapons under a verifiable Nuclear Weapons Convention.

You, Tore, know from Norway’s experience from eight years ago how a white supremacist can try to create fear and division through mass slaughter. Norway’s people came together and were stronger in their commitment to tolerance and justice. New Zealanders are clearly and thankfully doing the same but it is a very tough time for all of us and we are grateful for actions of the Muslim community here in helping us through this.

Our Waitematā Local Board is fully in support of the Auckland Council having made Auckland a City for Peace. We have gone further by specifically banning activities that promote or sell weapons of war in our halls and community centres. We have established and give strong support to a community-led Low Carbon Network. We give great support to cycling, creating Greenways and cycle lanes. We know we must be as persistent and determined over the long haul as you have so admirably demonstrated in order to stop climate change and help create a tolerant, inclusive, just and peaceful world.

You are all flying on to the United States tonight to spread your vital message in the United States.

We wish you well.
Tore Næerland and his group on a cycling journey around the world to promote nuclear disarmament, tolerance and peaceful dispute resolution.

**TURER 2019-2020**

11-19 mai Puschintur-Russland
1-6 juni Trheim- Oslo
15-23 juni Moskva-St Petersburg
5-14 juli Bosnia
01.08-09 08 Islamabad Lahore Amritsar Delhi
28 august- 8 sept
San Diego- El Centro- Phoenix, USA.
11-18 sept Wales-England Wye Valley etc.
19-23 sept Newcastle-Manchester via York Leeds Sheffield.
26 okt 4 nov Addis-Asmara
26 fly to Addis
27-28 meetings and bike in Addis
29 fly to Mekelle
30 bike Adigrat and Senafe
31 Dekemhare Asmara
1 meeting with leaders
2 sightseeing
3 fly home
17-20 October IPB conference in London.
6-19 November Mexico City og San Miguel De Allende i Guanajuato, med fem dagers sykling.
14-28 November Vietnam på sykkel/ Cuba

**Maraton:**
Almaty Maraton 17-22 April 2019
Belfast Maraton 2-7 mai 2019
Kiev Maraton 9-13 mai 2019 Sofia Marathon 10-15 October 2019

**2020**
18-25 mai Hereford- Cardiff- Gloucester city
2020 W DC-NYC 21-26 April

**New world tour 2021!**
25 Jan 2021 Norway Singapore
26 Singapore- biking in S. and Malaysia.
1-6 of February Bali
6 Auckland (via Melbourne)
6-11 New Zealand, north.
11- 16 Tahiti
16-21 Eastar Island
21-26 Santiago, Chile
26-3 March Mendoza, Argentina
3- 7 Buenos Aires, Brasil
W DC, USA
Home
Richard Northey’s Speech to Celebrate the Anniversary of the Compulsive Gambling Society/
Problem Gambling Foundation 11 April 2019

Tena kotou, tena kotou, tena kotou katoa

I want to express my admiration and gratitude to those who had the vision and the grit to found our predecessor organisation, the Compulsive Gambling Society, including Dr Fraser MacDonald, Ralph Gerdelan and Dr Sean Sullivan. Ralph Gerdelan, this is his photo, led the organisation for a great many years with imagination passion and determination and set the foundation not only for our organisation but for effective services for problem gamblers and advocacy for them throughout New Zealand. We were fortunate not only for the work of Ralph, but also for the huge contributions of his successors as PGF’s Chief Executive: Susan Macken, John Stansfield, Graeme Ramsey and now Paula Snowden. Many dedicated, passionate, empathetic, effective and creative staff also have built this organisation and its awesome achievements. Our Problem Gambling Foundation Board Members have provided their time, knowledge and sage advice including their chairs Fraser MacDonald, Max Abbot, Peter Adams, Rod Perkins and myself for 13 years. Political leaders as diverse as Graham Lee and Jim Anderton have played a major role in supporting the development of adequately resourced problem gambling services including those provided by the Problem Gambling Foundation.

Throughout most of its history the Problem Gambling Foundation and its predecessor the Compulsive Gambling Society have embodied four major understandings and commitments: a public health approach; client-centred professional quality; cultural appropriateness and diversity; and fearless advocacy for social change.

The public health approach has helped change our understanding of problem gambling as being a product of vulnerable people, families and communities being exposed to dangerous gambling products. The response needs to be more resilient and empowered communities and effective regulation of gambling provision.

Responding appropriately and effectively to individuals, families and communities harmed by gambling needs high standards of skill, professionalism, dedication, innovation, empathy and responsiveness and over the years our staff have repeatedly embodied that quality.

Gambling disproportionately harms those on lower incomes, Māori, Pasifika and those of East and South Asian origin. The Problem Gambling Foundation over the years has taken the lead in prioritising working effectively and culturally appropriately with these communities. We have endeavoured to work biculturally in a mana enhancing way throughout the organisation. Asian Family Services and Mapu Maia have carved out and developed pathways and achievements with their communities that are truly admirable and remarkable.

The neoliberal revolution of the late 1980s and 1990s saw a vast expansion of inadequately regulated legalised gambling opportunities and of gambling-related harm. Our organisation’s educational, consciousness-raising and advocacy activities helped bring in some appropriate restraints in the 2002 Gambling Act. However technological development and sections of the gambling industry never sleep, unnecessary harm continues and new sources of harm are developed and our evidence-based advocacy on behalf of our clients and our communities remains as central and vital to our purpose as ever.
Report to the Local Board of Member Vernon Tava
April 2019

Purpose
This report covers my Waitematā Local Board Activities in mid-March to mid-April 2019 as Lead of the Planning and Heritage portfolio; co-holder of the Transport portfolio; Local Board representative on the Parnell Business Association; and, member of the Auckland Domain Committee.

Executive Summary
- I submitted in person to the Hearings Panel for the Ferry Terminal and Queens Wharf resource consent on behalf of the Local Board on 28 March. Further details below in the Heritage & Planning portfolio report
- A project manager has been appointed for the installation of the bollards by Saint Patrick’s Square
- The liquor licence renewal for Plush Karaoke bar at 59 Upper Queen Street has been declined by a panel of commissioners
- I keep track of resource consent applications as they are received by Council, requesting further information, plans and Assessments of Environmental Effects for applications of interest. Significant applications are referred to the relevant residents’ associations for their input which I then relay to planners as part of the Local Board’s input. Reporting of resource consent applications, planning portfolio input, hearings and decisions in the Local Board area for this month is detailed in the Heritage, Urban Design and Planning section of this report under the headings ‘Planning’: ‘Resource Consents’
Recommendation
That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) Receive the Monthly Report of Member Tava

Portfolio Report: Transport
Saint Patrick’s Square Bollards Re-Installation
Demolition work has begun on the building at the Eastern end of the Cathedral.
A project manager has been appointed and they have asked Council CAD designers to check how tracking curves for a fire truck may impact on the plan to install the bollards at the rear of the cathedral. The current tracking design shows that they can re-install the bollards at their original locations. They are uncertain, however, on spacing. The original design shows 6 or more bollards at each location. That is more than necessary if the need for a removable bollard is included at each location. The current proposal works with four bollards at each of the locations; this includes one removable bollard for each location. This would provide a 3.5 metre space/gap if the removable bollard has been used. This uneven spacing may be a concern for our urban designers, so the team have decided to visit the site again on 12 April to discuss this matter and others such as how the placement will match the paving pattern. Once they have decided on the locations of the bollards, they will check if any additional paperwork is required and then install the bollards.

Portfolio Report: Heritage and Planning
Portfolio Responsibilities
Heritage, Urban Design and Planning covers a mix of regulatory and non-regulatory activities including city planning and growth, heritage protection, urban design requirements, Local Board resource consent application input, and bylaw development, including advocacy to achieve local priorities relating to heritage preservation, good urban design and spatial planning. Regulatory and policy oversight of local liquor licensing, signs & billboards, and brothels.

Submission at Hearing for Queens Wharf and Ferry Terminal Modifications: 28 March 2019
BUN60327622 (CST60327623, DIS60327717). 85-89 Quay Street, Queens Wharf and water space of the Waitematā Harbour adjacent to the western side of Queens Wharf. To construct, operate and maintain six new ferry berths within the Downtown Ferry Basin (Piers A-F), undertake modifications to the existing ferry terminal building and historic shelter on
Pier 1, modify existing areas of outdoor public space to the south and east of the Pier 1 terminal building, undertake modification to the Pier 2 terminal building, and remove existing Piers 3 and 4. The construction, establishment, operation and maintenance of Piers A-F will require the installation of a concrete piled breakwater located immediately adjacent to the west of Queens Wharf, the installation of reverse saw-tooth shaped pontoons, three gangways, three fixed shelter structures, piles, pile guard markers and fenders. Street furniture will be installed along Queens Wharf to demarcate pedestrian-only and vehicle zones between the western edge of Queens Wharf and the Cloud. Overall, the proposal is a discretionary activity.

**The Local Board’s written submission on 17 December 2018 was as follows:-**

Auckland Transport Notified Resource Consent application for 85-89 Quay Street, Queens Wharf and water space of the Waitematā Harbour adjacent to the western side of Queens Wharf. The views of the full Local Board have been sought of this feedback.

**Positive Aspects**
- Spatial efficiency for anticipated increased customer patronage
- Shelter from rain and sun
- Lighting, particularly natural light
- Connections to Queens wharf and city
- Removal of the gates to the facilities
- Improved wayfinding

We support the recommendations for conditions of consent in AEE report noting the need for smoothing the project to avoid disruption as much as possible.

**Exposure to Elements**
The Cloud is consented until 2022. This is a concern because if we are looking for cover and a traveller system for the elderly, frail, those with limited mobility and those laden with luggage and/or dependents then the Cloud does need to be in the frame as an interim existing structure. There is weather-proofing to embark and disembark all ferries but no cover from the elements from the ferry to the terminal. The estimated distance is 400 metres from the last ferry to the edge of Quay Street. That same walkway is deemed sufficient for the two-way foot traffic but for no other operational support for people to cover that 400 metres is the first haul into the downtown termini (it is expected that other walks will be of similar distance to reach connections). Patients and hospital visitors have to travel between
the ferry and the bus service to the ADHB hospital bus and Greenlane outpatient centre. The Local Board is concerned that a possible lack of stability of the pontoons in rough weather will make it difficult for people with mobility challenges to negotiate the distance between their ferry and the wharf. We would like to see this dealt with in the approved consent. We understand that the ferry terminal will be one of five disaggregated transport centres: two bus termini, the train station, the airport light rail terminus, and the ferry terminal. None of these will be co-located. We won’t want the RC approved unless the applicant can first demonstrate that this will create seamless connectivity – if it goes ahead without that assurance the capital works may preclude the best operational plan being delivered to our ferry users and vice versa. For those with smaller less frequent ferry services then there will be much further to walk than currently. That’s no issue for most people but it’s a major impediment to the journey for the elderly, frail, disabled and those over-burdened with luggage and/or dependents. We would like to see, as part of the consent conditions, AT-guaranteed ways to move these people and their luggage between the five termini.

Heritage
This Heritage Impact Assessment identifies that the proposed works will affect Queens Wharf, which is a Category B Scheduled historic heritage place in the Auckland Unitary Plan. The relocation works will also take place adjacent to and within the extent of place of the Auckland Harbour Board Fence, which is a Category A scheduled historic heritage place. We request that the heritage aspects be vigorously protected; especially the following scheduled items:

- Queens Wharf
- The Ferry Shelter
- The Ferry Building
- The Public Shelters
- The Auckland Harbour Board ‘Blue Fence’ and historic ‘Red Fence’

We support the retention of the double set of rail lines fixed into the proposed walkway for the full length of the adjacent wharf/ walkway access for ferry passengers but ask that their potential as a trip hazard be minimised.

Environmental
The Local Board are concerned about the impact of the piling and mooring dolphins including contaminants discharged into the Coastal Marine Area and request conditions to minimise these impacts.
I said the following at the hearing:

Our starting point is the impact of this and any other projects in this area on Queens Wharf and its surrounds.

This land, the "People’s Wharf", was hard-won as a public space and forms a significant and valued part of the inner city’s open space. It is essential that this be kept as open and welcoming to people on foot as possible. It is not just a part of the city’s infrastructure, it is also the ‘front yard’ for many of our city centre residents.

We are concerned overall that there are numerous large projects on the same piece of real estate with little coordination between them.

We understand that the operation of ferries in the basin need to be streamlined - and that there is nowhere else for them to go outside the basin - but are concerned at the congestion of the surrounding environment and impacts on movement which have been raised with us by numerous constituents.

The Local Board have opposed the mooring dolphin at the north end of Queens Wharf due to its likely impacts on the use, pedestrian flow, and enclosure of public space. The Local Board particularly opposes the provision for cruise buses to drive around the full length of Queens Wharf, and while we are – of course – aware that this is part of another consent, this consent needs to be designed around that potential use.

While provision of adequate shelter is important it needs to be carefully balanced with heritage protection of the historic heritage place: any structures need to be sympathetic in the broader context and we would specifically like to see the protection of the double set of rail lines fixed into the proposed walkway for the full length of the wharf but also ask that their potential as a trip hazard be minimised.

There will be five disaggregated terminals (two bus termini, the train station, the light rail terminus and the ferry terminal): appears that the work will be done before there is an operational plan. We would like to see, as part of the consent conditions, AT-guaranteed ways to move these people and their luggage between the five termini.

Liquor Licensing Applications

New Off-Licence: Units 4-5/2-8 Anzac Avenue, Auckland Central (accessed from Beach Road) – Application Withdrawn
We objected to the application on the following grounds: This is near Spark Arena, Countdown supermarket, several bars and nightclubs, and many other very close-by bottle shops. Given the high density of bottle shops in the area, it is reasonable to assume that these contribute to the amount of alcohol-related violence in the vicinity. It is clear from the volume of alcohol containers left in the area – including significant amounts of broken glass and damage to parked cars – that the CBD alcohol consumption ban is routinely flouted. It is the view of the Local Board that the effects on amenity and good order are more than minor (s 105(1)(h) Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 ("the Act")). However, the concentration of bottle shops is not yet so high that the committee could reasonably find that, as per s 105(1)(i) of the Act, that the area is so badly affected already by existing outlets that the area would not be affected by another.

The Local Board has received numerous complaints from local residents about the negative effects on amenity and public order in recent times and they are generally opposed to new licences being granted to bottle shops in the area.

This application has been withdrawn.

‘Plush’ Licence Renewal Declined

59 Upper Queen Street, Newton. After years of objections led by the Newton ResidentsBusiness (NRB) group, the liquor licence renewal for the Plush karaoke bar has been declined for renewal. The Local Board was happy to offer its support to the NRB being recognised as a community group with standing in the matter and with assisting them in clarifying the interaction of legislative and bylaw regimes with respect to liquor outlets and the behaviour of patrons outside them.

Resource Consents

The portfolio request information on resource consent applications of interest as a matter of course. The Local Board can have input into the decision on public notification of a resource consent application and can also comment on the substantive matters of the application. The input of the Local Board is not binding on the commissioner or hearings panel making the decision but we are able to appear at notified hearings to speak on behalf of the Local Board. This is not treated as a submission for the purposes of the Resource Management Act but it is given weight by a hearings panel or commissioner according to the merit of the arguments made.
Significant Resource Consent Matters

Seismic Strengthening and Tree Removal at University of Auckland Student Union Building
LUC60336361, LUC60336362. Land use consent for stage 2 of seismic strengthening to the Category B-scheduled Student Union Building, internal & external modifications to a scheduled historic heritage extent of place, and associated comprehensive development signage. The application involves removal of building B312B which is an annex to building B312A, forming a part of the original Student Union complex and associated modifications to B312A which is located within a scheduled historic heritage extent of place. The application also includes the removal of six trees (two being street trees in Princes Street). Discretionary activity consent overall is required for modifications to a building located within a heritage extent of place for seismic strengthening; and additions/alterations to a building in the Learning Precinct not otherwise provided for; and the removal of trees within the heritage extent of place overlay. I’ve reviewed the plans and AEE (assessment of environmental effects) and – given the need for the seismic strengthening, the quality of the design work (including its consistency with the original design), and the poor condition and placement of the trees to be removed – don’t see the need for Local Board input on this application.

New 11-Storey, 190-Room Hotel on Corner of Hobson and Nelson Streets
161-169 Hobson Street, City. LUC60335778. Demolition of two existing commercial office and retail buildings occupying the site and redevelopment for hotel use and retail activity. The proposal consists of an 11-storey hotel building with 190 rooms distributed over 10 levels plus a ground level with restaurant/bar, kitchen, reception, meeting room lounge and other ancillary hotel facilities over a single basement providing 4 carparks, 14 bicycle parks and further ancillary hotel facilities. The proposal exceeds the maximum allowable gross floor area of 4,883m² by a factor of 1.07:1 which is approximately 871m². Overall resource consent is required for a non-complying activity. No input offered by the Local Board for this application.

New 11-storey Student Accommodation Building Fronting onto Upper Queen Street and Backing onto the Symonds Street Cemetery
6-8 Upper Queen Street, Newton. LUC60335579, DIS60335580. Resource consent is sought to construct a new 11-storey student accommodation building which fronts onto Upper Queen Street and backs onto the Symonds Street Cemetery. The building complies with the site’s maximum height limit of 32.6m and will have a total gross floor area of
8161.41m² and floor area ratio (FAR) of 6.94:1. It is also noted that the subject site is a non-contributing site located within the Karangahape Road Historic Heritage Area. Consent is sought for the demolition of the existing building within the site; the construction of a new building; the exceedance of the basic FAR of the site (4:1) where the bonus features provided do not meet the site’s maximum total FAR (6:1); infringements to the site’s maximum total FAR (6:1); infringement to the minimum floor to floor height; infringement to the maximum 14m building frontage height; earthworks within the Historic Heritage Overlay, and earthworks associated with contaminated land and on a site subject to the NESCS. The proposal requires non-complying activity resource consent. No input offered by the Local Board for this application.

Container/Bar in Aotea Square
Aotea Square, 299 Queen Street, Auckland Central. LUC60333892. Application for the container café/bar that has been consented temporarily in the Square, while the Aotea Centre is being refurbished, to be consented on a permanent basis. Given the significance of this space in the context of the city centre, its centrality to the civic and cultural life of the city, and the clearly expressed concerns of the public that commercialisation and/or enclosure of this space is to be kept to a minimum, the Waitematā Local Board submitted to the Commissioner deciding notification that this application is of high public interest and should be publicly notified.

The special circumstances are:

- the significance of the space: Aotea Square is the only large plaza space in the central city; it is the premier civic space and the site of any significant protest, rally, etc. held in the city
- the fact the proposal closes off a part of this significant space
- the Local Board have heard time and again from the public that they want public space to be maximised and not impinged upon by additional installations or structures unless they are seasonal, temporary and make a contribution to the space, e.g. the Spiegellent
- the Local Board are also concerned with commercialisation of public space and generally resist this unless a strong case can be made that the commercial aspect will make a positive contribution to the space by enhancing the public’s enjoyment.

Other Consents

- 15A Ayr Street, Parnell. LUC60334577. New dwelling in SCA. Earthworks and landscaping. Application for a new (contemporary) dwelling on land already
subdivided behind 15 Ayr Street utilising an existing vehicle crossing and access. Reasons for consent relate to a new building within a special character area overlay, height in relation to boundary, building coverage and yard setbacks, earthworks, parking and stormwater. AEE and plans forwarded to Parnell Community Committee for their input.

- 35 Surrey Crescent, Grey Lynn. LUC60334955. Removal of existing dwelling, replacement with a 3-storey building to house 4 apartments. Infringements to HIRB and AHIRB, yards and building coverage (over by 1%). The application and plans have been forwarded to the Grey Lynn Residents’ Association for their input: no objections were raised except on the grounds of aesthetic considerations. The Local Board had no further input.

- 85-89 Quay Street, Auckland Central. CST60335784, DIS60335785, LUC60335786, WAT60335787, ‘Quay Street Enhancements’ project, comprising streetscape upgrades between Lower Hobson Street and Commerce Street and re-alignment of the Tangihua St Intersection. The proposed streetscape works will reduce general traffic lanes along Quay Street to two (one in an eastern and one in a westerly direction). Two bus lanes will be provided between Lower Hobson Street and Lower Albert Streets (providing a total of four traffic lanes through this section block). A bi-directional cycle lane will be provided along the northern side of Quay Street. A continuous pedestrian promenade will be provided along the northern edge of Quay Street. This will comprise areas for pedestrian movement, as well as planting/trees, outdoor dining and occupation and street furniture. Likewise, a multiuse pedestrian zone will be provided on the southern side of Quay Street, comprising areas for pedestrian movement, as well as planting/trees, areas for outdoor dining and occupation. Lighting and street furniture will be provided throughout. Lighting will comprise both in ground lighting and street lighting (11m and 12m high poles) with 9m high traffic poles proposed at intersections. Street furniture will comprise a range of bespoke and modular street furniture, including fixed and moveable seats, bike racks, bollards, rubbish bins and way finding signage (among others). Extensive planting will be provided throughout, with planting to incorporate the relocation of existing street trees. New paving will also be laid throughout.

- 5-7 Albert Street, Auckland Central. LUC60335900. Demolish the existing building. The proposal involves the demolition of the existing three level commercial building on the site comprising ground floor retail, and commercial parking for up to 118 vehicles (with access from Federal Street). The building was altered some years ago
to accommodate the vehicle parking and this resulted in a two storey vehicle access ramp being constructed that overhangs the podium level of the adjacent West Plaza building to the north, located at 3 Albert Street. The vehicle access ramp is supported by structural steel beams that are connected to the podium level of the West Plaza building. This building is a Category B-scheduled historic heritage place. As the building is currently subject to a lease, a specific date for demolition has not been determined. Resource consents are required for the demolition of building and modifications of a scheduled historic heritage place. Overall resource consent is required for a restricted discretionary activity. The Local Board did not have input into this consent.

- 58 Albert Street, Auckland Central. TRE60335848. Removal of three street trees. Consent is ongoing, awaiting asset owner approval. May require a s127 variation of consent as the trees are subject to conditions of consent relating to the adjacent development (LUC60312611). Negotiation between applicant and landowner is ongoing, once resolved will be forwarded to the DC for a decision. Officer support depends largely on the outcome of the landowner consent deliberations so this is a watching brief.

- 89 Saint Marys Road, Ponsonby. TRE60335782. Removal of a mature Pohutukawa tree located within 150 metres of mean high water springs to provide adequate daylight for existing dwelling and future developments. I do not support consent for the removal of this tree, but have yet to determine the best way to proceed. They Council planners do not have delegation to refuse consent. The Local Board has submitted for public notification of this consent.

- 43 Cook Street, Auckland Central. LUC60335778. Demolition of existing building and construction of a new hotel.

- 44-58 Liverpool Street, Auckland Central. LUC60336006. Two new dwellings. The application is for two additional residential units within a currently vacant ground floor space – a one bedroom unit with a floor area of 42m² and a two bedroom unit with a floor area of 61m². The overall design of the building will be maintained with only minor alterations to the windows for each unit, the existing ranch sliders will be replaced by a window. The existing access, parking areas and other levels of the building will remain unchanged. No car park spaces will be allocated to the units.

- 4 Brown Street, Ponsonby. LUC60336086. Proposed alteration to existing building, amendments to carpark building. This application has two parts, first a new consent to insert a window into the existing building fronting Brown Street. This requires
restricted discretionary consent as an external change to a building in a special character area – business. The second part is a variation to the original consent for this building for internal layout changes as well as external changes, including a balcony along the alleyway between the existing and new building. The building otherwise keeps the same footprint. This requires discretionary consent as a variation. The Local Board did not have input into this application.

- St Patrick’s Square, Auckland Central. TRE60336185. Removal of one pear tree (over 4m tall). This seven year-old tree stands in front of the development site for the Indigo development at 51-53 Albert Street. The applicant will plant a 5 year-old replacement tree of the same time and undertake its care and maintenance. I have informed Cathedral management and the head of the two local residents’ groups and sought their input. They have responded with the suggestion that the tree be relocated elsewhere in the square and that the new tree be planted in the same spot from which the older one has been moved. I have passed this feedback on to the planner.

**Signatory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Tava</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waitematā Local Board Workshop Records

File No.: CP2018/18709

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. The purpose of this report is to present the Waitematā Local Board workshop records to the board. Attached are copies of the proceeding records taken from the workshops held on:
   - 26 March 2019
   - 2 April 2019
   - 9 April 2019

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
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Waitematā Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Waitematā Local Board held in the Waitematā Local Board Office, 52 Swanson Street, Auckland Central on **Tuesday 26 March 2019**, commencing at 9.43am.

**PRESENT**

Chairperson: Pippa Coom  
Deputy Chairperson: Shane Chambers  
Members: Adriana Avendaño Christie, Richard Northey, Denise Roche, Vernon Tava, Rob Thomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks and Recreation Policy – Open Space Network Plan</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To discuss and finalise the key moves for the Waitematā Local Board Open Space Network Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATEED - Local Economic Development Budget Allocation</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To discuss a possible change in the scope of the project to create a city fringe identity for use by all city fringe business associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks, Sport and Recreation - Ecological Volunteer and Environmental Programme 2018/2019</strong></td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific decisions</td>
<td>To provide an update on the Ecological Volunteer and Environmental Programme (Local Parks) 2018/2019 and to discuss the upcoming Arbor Day event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Infrastructure and Environmental Services – Healthy Waters Projects Update** | Local initiatives and specific decisions             | To provide an update on three major regional Healthy Waters projects being St Mary’s Bay, Picton Street and Daldy Street.  
Finalise SafeSwim sign placement. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Facilities Auckland – RFA Quarterly Report and Auckland Live Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>To present the RFA Quarter Two Report for the period ended 31 December 2018 and to provide an update about Auckland Live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>To provide an update on Cox’s Bay to Wharf Road – Shared Path and to inform the local board of progress with their Community Facilities work programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Waitematā Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Waitematā Local Board held in the Waitematā Local Board Office, 52 Swanson Street, Auckland Central on **Tuesday 2 April 2019**, commencing at 9.40am.

### PRESENT
- **Chairperson:** Pippa Coom
- **Deputy Chairperson:** Shale Chambers
- **Members:** Adriana Avendaño Christie, Richard Northey, Denise Roche, Vernon Tava
- **Apology:** Rob Thomas

### Workshop Item | Governance role | Summary of Discussions
--- | --- | ---
**Local Board Services** – the process to develop regional policy | Input into regional decision-making, policies, plans and strategies | Seek feedback from the local board on a discussion paper that considers how the process to develop regional policy could be improved to ensure effective local board input.

**Auckland Transport – Waitematā Safe Routes (1 and 2)** | Oversight and monitoring | To provide an update on the consultation process for Waitematā Safe Routes (WSR) – routes 1 and 2.

**Auckland Transport – Wellesley Street to Sale Street** | Local initiatives and specific decisions | To inform members of a proposed interim solution to improve pedestrian safety when crossing Sale Street.

**Auckland Transport – Community Safety Fund** | Setting direction, priorities and budget | To develop a prioritised list of projects for the Community Safety Fund.

**Development Programme Office – DPO update** | Keeping informed | To present a new structured approach to reporting on city centre programmes and initiatives.

**Development Programme Office – America’s Cup AC36** | Keeping informed | To provide an update on America’s Cup 36 Programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities</strong> – Grey Lynn changing rooms</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To provide an update on Grey Lynn changing rooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage</strong> – Carlile House</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To provide an update on Carlile House, Grey Lynn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waitematā Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Waitematā Local Board held in the Waitematā Local Board Office, 52 Swanson Street, Auckland Central on **Tuesday 9 April 2019**, commencing at 9.40am.

**PRESENT**
- **Chairperson:** Pippa Coom
- **Deputy Chairperson:** Shaile Chambers
- **Members:**
  - Adriana Avendaño Christie
  - Richard Northey
  - Denise Roche
  - Vernon Tava
  - Rob Thomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Watercare</strong> – Central Interceptor and Western Isthmus Programme Update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>To present updates on the Central Interceptor project and Western Isthmus Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Events</strong> – monthly update</td>
<td>Local initiatives, specific decisions</td>
<td>To provide an update on events since previous workshop held 12 March 2019 and to review permitted or facilitated events in Waitematā in April to June 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts</strong> – Update on Public Art: Launch, Renewals, Future Planned Works</td>
<td>Local initiatives, specific decisions</td>
<td>To provide an update around public art in the Waitematā Local Board area and to seek feedback on the proposed Victoria Park Digital Art Wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Design Office</strong> – Shortland Street Tactical Urbanism: Stage 2</td>
<td>Local Initiatives, Specific Decisions</td>
<td>To present the proposed approach for Shortland Street Tactical Urbanism: Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panuku</strong> – Westhaven and Wynyard Projects</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>To provide an update on Westhaven and Wynyard Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panuku – Wynyard Crossing Bridge</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>To provide an update on progress with the Wynyard Crossing Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panuku – 200 Victoria Street West</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To inform and seek input to the potential disposal of 200 Victoria Street West, Central Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board Services – Local Board Agreement – consultation feedback, advocacy, fees and charges and KPI’s</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>To discuss consultation feedback from Annual Budget 2019/2020, consultation feedback on proposed amendments to the 10-Year Budget 2018-2028, local board input/advocacy, fees and charges and performance measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
1. Attached is a copy of the governance forward work calendar for the Waitematā Local Board which is a schedule of items that will come before the board at business meetings.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Waitematā Local Board:
a) receive the governance forward work calendar April 2019 attached to the agenda.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20190416 Waitematā Local Board Item 25 Governance Forward Work Calendar April 2019</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories
Authors  Liz Clemm - Democracy Advisor - Waitematā Local Board
Authorisers Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor Waitematā Local Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>Homelessness Review</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific decisions</td>
<td>Arts and Creative Spaces Stocktake</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities, budget</td>
<td>Western Springs Lakeside Te Wai Orea Development Plan</td>
<td>Define local board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>Draft Golf Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td>Define local board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
<td>Grey Lynn Changing Rooms</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>City Centre Masterplan Refresh</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>Auckland Climate Action Plan (previously Low Carbon Auckland)</td>
<td>Define local board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June 2019</td>
<td>Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>Draft Resilient Recovery Strategy</td>
<td>Define local board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June 2019</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities, budget</td>
<td>Signage Bylaw 2015</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June 2019</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities, budget</td>
<td>Adopt Local Board Work Programmes FY20</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June 2019</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities, budget</td>
<td>Adopt Local Board Agreement</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 July 2019</td>
<td>Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>Animal Management Bylaw</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 July 2019</td>
<td>Input into regional decision making</td>
<td>Open Space Management Framework</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Requirement for Community rooms, 192 Parnell Road, Auckland

April 2019

Background:
We understand Auckland City Council is doing a strategic assessment for the ongoing need of a community facility at 192 Parnell Road, Parnell, Auckland. In response we would like to provide the following information to support the current and future use of this important community facility at 192 Parnell Road. While the majority of current use is through groups affiliated with Plunket, there is always the opportunity for other groups to use the community rooms. We would like to support any improvements and planning for this site.

Current community requirement:
- Provides a space for parents and caregivers with their babies/children to meet and have a support network in the community.
- Positive social environment for local families to get to know each other.
- Non-costly, non-threatening, safe environment.
- Central location with all-weather indoor/outdoor play space (important with housing intensification in area).

Current use:
- **70 families registered with Plunket that regularly attend the following weekly sessions:**
  - **Wednesday:** 10am – 12noon: Brazilian Playgroup
  - **Thursday:** 10.30am – 12noon: New Parent Playgroup
  - **Friday:** 10am – 12noon: General Playgroup
- **Other** Until recently Plunket also had a Chinese playgroup running on a weekly basis and we have had enquiries to start these again.

Ad-hoc:
- Saturday / Sunday bookings by local parents to host children’s parties
- Plunket Group meetings

Alternative local child-friendly options:
There is no Play Centre available in Parnell and the only other local child-friendly environments available are:
- Parnell library, Gladstone Park, Auckland Museum, Mainly Music once a week at the Holy Trinity Cathedral
- Privately owned day cares, kindergarten or travelling out of the area (costly alternatives)

Future use:
If the rooms were improved to a sufficient standard the potential for other groups to use the building would be higher, for example:

- *Hired out for Parties/Functions
- *Cubs/scouts/brownies/guides etc
- *Ante natal classes
- *Coffee Groups
- *Book Clubs
- *Meetings
- *Yoga/Pilates/tai chi classes etc
- *Plunket Education classes
- *ESOL Groups
Vision for renovation
The main component of any renovation work is to combine the old unused toilet and storage area into one unit. This would allow for the kitchenette to be shifted and improved. Currently it no more that a bench and jug. The other areas would be to improve the environment with the windows being older louvre style and no insulation. The roof is need of some maintenance to ensure the run off from the neighbour is better controlled.

Plunket contribution
Plunket would like to invest in the playground area and provide heating plus soft furnishings to make the place more comfortable and usable.

We look forward to seeing any plans or scope that would help us to envisage what the site may look like in the future.

Kind Regards

Annalee Hayward          Community Service Co-Ordinator
Chris Gower               Northern Property Advisor

Royal NZ Plunket Trust
Supplementary Information on the Communications Consolidation within the Precinct.

**Background.**

1. The Precinct has been a powerful commercial hub from over 117 years ago.

   In its earlier days it saw the historic activities of Kauri Timber cutting timber on what is now Fanshawe Street and loading this up an elevator to a nib of land at 27 Graham street. The nib remains in place today but the Kauri Timber Building has been tastefully refurbished with Sherson Willis having naming rights on the extension.

   There are a number of associated aged features (the old seawall for example) that do not appear to have historic protections.

   The facades of 147 Victoria Street West and 1 Graham Street do have protection and Safari Group are incorporating these into a pleasant design as part of the Ramada Inn and Apartments.

2. The precinct went into a period of decline which started to turn around when NZ Post / Kiwibank building was constructed and then The Galleries Apartments in 2005.

   In 2010 Mansons TCLM constructed the 4 Spark Towers in an innovative and modern age transport mode.

   - Telecom / Spark shed 60% of its carparks in consolidating into the precinct
   - It provides 200 bicycle racks for staff
   - It provides 13 mens’ and 13 womens’ showers, plus laundry and changing facilities
   - Mansons developed and implemented a Travelwise Traffic Demand Management Plan which is believed to unique in its day and included an strong commitment to the use of the Green Bus Service

3. The decline was totally reversed when Mansons constructed Building A and Building B in an innovative design that draws both buildings plus the public accessways into a cohesive whole.

4. The flavour of the precinct then changed in a significant manner when NZME became a key tenant in Building A and Building B. To achieve this tenancy, Mansons’ had to apply in March 2015 for a Resource Consent for the installation of the telecommunications equipment required to enable NZME to consolidate into one location. **Please see an extract from this at Attachment 9.**
5. The key points from attachment 9 are as marked in the Attachment:
   o Page 3 last section, reasons for NZME consolidation and need for telecoms
   o Page 4 first paragraph – stresses the importance of leveraging presence of Spark and TV NZ and especially the last phrase "... and outwardly engages the local community as a destination hub for media and entertainment business in the city."
   o Page 4 site content confirms that the site contains most of the block
6. In regard to entertainment, ATEED have now moved into one of the Spark Towers as a tenant, adding to the entertainment factor in the precinct
7. Other large entities now in the precinct include Maersk, Kotahi Logistic, Meredith Connell, BDO, and a number of smaller businesses such as Carpet Court.
8. Mansons’ family interests retain ownership of the Walkers Building at 30 Graham Street

FUTURE AND CURRENT DEVELOPMENT.
1. Safari at 147 Victoria Street are the most obvious and advanced development in the precinct
2. Mansons’ new commercial site at 136-142 Fanshawe Street has a direct link into the precinct with a wide flowing set of steps linking the new development with the media and communications hubs.
3. Auckland City has placed 35 Graham Street on the market and this is most likely going to draw another major construction into the precinct.

THE OUTCOME.

This precinct is now the most powerful media centre and communications centre in New Zealand and deserves to be treated as such in the ability of its operations to quickly and safely enter and exit the precinct whether by foot, cycle car, truck or e-scooter.

In addition Oracle for some years has been working with Auckland Transport to have Hardinge signalised, to no avail.

THE RISK.

That Auckland Transport by throttling the traffic flow into and out of the precinct will create an extremely unfortunate unintended consequence for the precinct.

THE PLEA.

That Auckland Transport lift its head above a simple cycleway design and put its collective wisdom into first completing a major redesign of the traffic flows

David Watt
8th April 2019
4 April 2019

Mr David Watt
david.watt@xtra.co.nz

Dear Mr Watt

CAS-1010533-C020Z6 – Victoria Street Cycleway Project

We refer to your email dated Thursday 21 March 2019 addressed to Mayor Phil Goff regarding the impact of the Victoria Street Cycleway project on traffic exiting from Graham Street and Hardinge Street.

We acknowledge your concerns around the potential impact of the cycleway on access to the Hardinge and Graham Street precinct. We want to reassure you that the proposed improvements to the intersections of Hardinge Street and Graham Street with Victoria Street are not going to change any of the current permitted movements. The proposed changes are consistent with providing safer intersections for all users.

We are improving safety in the area by putting in three new side street raised tables (Dock Street, Hardinge Street and Graham Street) as part of the cycleway project. This will help to slow the entering and exiting speeds on these side roads which is consistent with slowing of speeds city wide and ties in with creating a 30km/hr speed zone. Victoria Street West, Hardinge Street and Graham Street are identified in Schedule 2 of Speed Limits Bylaw 2019 document which is part of the Auckland Transport’s proposal for Safe Speed Programme. (https://at.govt.nz/speed)

As a part of our investigation, we have reviewed the Transportation Assessment that was done for the Ramada Inn Resource consent. This document states that that the difference in intersection performance is not greatly affected by the proposed development. The evening peak is the more critical case where the delay for turn movements out of Graham Street increases by 2.3 seconds from 24.5s to 26.8s and the average delay for the intersection increases by 0.4 seconds. The existing traffic users of the intersection are unlikely to notice the difference caused by the additional traffic generated. The impact of this development will be no more than minor. The performance of the intersection is in the “good to satisfactory range” for a busy urban environment.

In addition to the above, during the detailed design phase, we have had to consider all modes of travel, pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, public transport (buses) and heavy vehicles and the safety of the area. Our design philosophy for the proposed design is influenced by the existing usage of the area as well as envisaged future use.

The Hardinge/Victoria Street intersection is crossed by a significant number of pedestrians, as well as reasonable levels of vehicles. (as shown by the numbers in the table below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Through</th>
<th>LT into</th>
<th>From Hardinge</th>
<th>RT into</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ped crossing Hardinge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM (700 to 930)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter (1130 to 1300)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM (1630 to 1830)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 Data from August 2018, Hardinge St/Victoria St Intersection*
Due to the existing geometry and speed limits of the side road and Victoria Street, turning speeds of vehicles in and out can be significant which creates collision risks for pedestrians and cyclists.

- A kerb build-out is proposed to lower turning speeds and reduce risk for cyclists and pedestrians (including vehicles). This will shorten the distance that pedestrians must cross, will make their decision making easier and does not impact on the existing movements permitted for vehicles. In the current situation the pedestrians cross in a two-stage movement as shown in the pictures below.

![Image of pedestrians crossing](image1.png)

*Figure 1: PRESENT - Top Harding St. - Victoria St. during Inner peak, Bottom - Graham St. - Victoria St.*

In our proposed design, vehicles are able to track through the intersection and perform all the permitted movements as they in the present scenario. The existing median island at Harding Street will be removed.

See snips form latest concept plans below:
To improve safety in the area we are proposing three new side street raised tables at the entrances of Dock Street, Hardinge Street and Graham Street. The proposed raised speed tables will slow entering and exiting speeds into these side streets.

This design will be more appropriate for this busy highly pedestrian-focused location and should help resolve risk associated with conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. These additional speed tables are recommended by safety auditors to further improve the safety in this area.

Traffic Impact assessment on Ramada Inn reflects that in the present scenario at most times of the day the Level of Service (LOS) – a measure provides a quantitative stratification of the operational performance of traffic on a given roadway, measured on an A to F scale where A to D is acceptable E is on the point of failure and F is unreasonable LOS. On the Graham Street, Victoria Street intersection is A for all the movements there except in the PM when the right turn out from Graham St. is LOS is C.
Table 2 - Victoria Street West/Graham Street SiDRA results - Transportation assessment Ramada Victoria Street West
(Top AM, Bottom PM)

This level of service is acceptable in this environment.

We aim to have the detailed design completed and plans on the project website by early May 2019. This will provide further reference material for additional consultation with the affected properties and residents prior to construction. We are anticipating starting construction in October or early November of 2019.

You can view information related to the project on the AT website via the following link:

The project team intends to update this page on a quarterly basis.

For any more information on this project please contact the project team via Projects@at.govt.nz

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

David Nelson
Portfolio Delivery Director (Projects)
Integrated Networks

Incl: SOP – Speed Limits Bylaw 2019 PDF
Mr David Nelson  
Portfolio Delivery Director (Projects)  
Integrated Networks  
Auckland Transport  

Dear David,

Thank you for your comprehensive, detailed and thoughtful response to my 21st March email. There has been a lot of research and thought gone into your reply and this is much appreciated, thank you.

However, not being qualified in any form to make sensible comments on your findings and recommendations, I will stay with the principles involved.

Local businesses.

Taking information directly from the Travel Development Management Plan ("TDMP") as filed with AC as part of the Resource Consent process as an example, the Manions’ Telecom Development in 2010 provides some interesting insights.

The TDMP was a comprehensive thoughtful document that included incentivisation of staff to wean themselves of own vehicle transport, encouragement of car-pooling, and wider use of public transport – the Green Bus service was core part of the public transport offering. In consolidating onto one site from I believe 4 previous sites, they eliminated 60% of their previous carparks, a reduction of around 438 carparks. The Travelwise Plan was adopted, and it is understood that Resource Consent Condition 35 reflects this.

The TMDP includes staff facilities such as 200 secure bicycle parks, near to 13 male and 13 female Showers, lockers, hair dryers, irons and ironing boards – in brief, provision of facilities to encourage bicycle use. These facilities are now required under UP E27 Transport (14) pages 6 and 7.

Approximately 97 parks are not available for individual staff use, but are for visitors use.

As tenants in their leases are required to commit to compliance with the Resource Consent provisions, the provisions of the Consent remain applicable today.

This site reflects what would appear to be a model development of what Auckland Council and Auckland Transport are trying to achieve in the redevelopment of the inner city.

It seems in principle that in restricting the size of exit points from the Graham – Hardinge precinct, AT is potentially not holding up its end of that two-way arrangement.


On page 319 of the plan for Auckland’s Transport that was applicable at the time of the main developments in the precinct, it is worthy to note what the requirements were for serving the local community in local centres. The Graham – Hardinge precinct is such a centre.
**BOX 13.1**

The principles involved that are relevant to Graham – Hardinge precinct are:

2. Use traffic demand management techniques
3. Achieve appropriate balance between movement and place
4. Ensure long term land use and activities drive long-term transport functionality
5. Optimise existing and proposed transport investment
6. Establish corridor management plans that account for place-shaping
7. Recognise existing community investment and the need to enable connectivity between and within communities
8. Align community expectations in urban areas with urban levels of service, particularly with realistic expectations around levels of congestion.

**The issues with your proposed changes to Graham and Hardinge Street exits.**

1. The precinct is subject to significant bottlenecks on exiting as changes were made previously to the road layout that served to REDUCE the size of the exits BUT did not address the earlier requests from Oracle and subsequently from The Galleries for the signalisation of Hardinge Street.
2. INSTEAD, reductions were made to the exit sizes and pedestrian lights were installed outside Les Mills.
3. The proposed further changes to entry and exit sizes will serve to make large vehicle ingress more difficult, and will further restrict the flow of traffic from the precinct. Vehicles will be held further back from the intersection severely restricting line of sight into Victoria Street. Cyclists and e-scooters will take the elevated path as having right of way over vehicles and hence there will be more danger to those road users, not less.

We believe that by addressing what is in front of you, rather than what the principles are that should be considered as shown in Directive 13.1, your proposal is flawed.

**Signalisation of Hardinge Street.**

While this is our preferred option, and not being traffic engineers, we can only note that a signal-controlled exit from Hardinge would control all forms of transport and pedestrians (including cycles and e-scooters) AND would double the number of vehicles exiting the precinct on each light activation because of the controlled left and right turns then possible from the precinct.

**The view of the Community.**

There is large support for the position that has been referred to the Waitemata Local Board ("WLB") and will be presented by a Deputation on 16 April. An important request of this deputation is the order of design, rather than being an attack on the cycleway design itself – it is simply a question of timing and order of design.

Based on a submission to WLB, the community proposal is:

- Cycleway design (May 2019) and intended construction (October 2019) to be deferred
- A comprehensive traffic management plan to be developed, based on the principles of Directive 13.1
- A cycleway to then be designed that integrates completely with the traffic management plan
- WLB to nominate a member to work with AT and owners and occupiers in ensuring that Directive 13.1 is compiled with by AT

WLB will be provided a list of those supporting the proposal.

**The way ahead.**

It is recommended that AT please consider carefully what the precinct community is telling you. The CV of buildings affected is in excess of $700 million with market value probably around $1 billion, the community is modern and largely will be compliant with the requirements of the Travelwise program, and is deserving of support in ensuring that entry to, and exit from, the precinct for their vehicles is achieved with a minimum of conflict between transport modes. It goes without saying that safety for pedestrians, cyclists and e-scooters is paramount once the traffic management issues are sorted out.
My recommendation is that AT seriously consider the proposal and consult with the interested parties, not on the cycleway design itself, but to ensure that the appropriate design objectives are agreed for development of a major traffic management plan. And that signalisation of Hardinge St is one of the options considered please.

30 kph speed limit.
The Galleries community had suggested to AT that the precinct be added to the original trial streets for the 30kph trial, but this was not taken up by AT. So in principle, from The Galleries viewpoint adoption of this within the precinct sits ok with us. Given the congestion in the precinct, this may also to be acceptable to other owners and occupiers but I have no authority to speak for them on this.

Yours sincerely,

David Watt
BC Chair, The Galleries, BC347480.

CC Precinct Panel and Interested Parties.
CC Waitemata Local Board
Deputation to Waitemata Local Board
16 April 2019

Traffic Management in Victoria Street West, between Nelson and Halsey Streets

Key objective – to have traffic management design placed ahead of cycleway design

What do we want?

- Cycleway design (May 2019) and intended construction (October 2019) to be deferred
- A comprehensive traffic management plan to be developed, based on the principle of Directive 13.1
- A cycleway to then be designed that integrates completely with the traffic management plan
- Waitemata Board to nominate a member to work with AT and owners and occupiers in ensuring that Directive 13.1 is complied with by AT
Specifics in Directive 13.1 NOT MET in the cycleway plan

2. Use traffic demand management techniques
3. Achieve appropriate balance between movement and place
4. Ensure long-term land uses and activities drive long-term transport functionality
5. Optimise existing and proposed transport investment
6. Establish corridor management plans that account for place-shaping
7. Recognise existing community investment and the need to enable connectivity between and within communities
8. Align community expectations in urban areas with urban levels of service, particularly with realistic expectations around levels of congestion

Supporting papers follow
Unitary Plan Chapter 13
Auckland Transport

AUCKLAND EXPECTS SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENTS IN ITS TRANSPORT SYSTEM SO THAT IT WORKS WELL FOR BUSINESS, RESIDENTS AND VISITORS, SUPPORTS AUCKLAND’S DEVELOPMENT, AND CONTRIBUTES TO THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF ITS PEOPLE AND THE CHARACTER OF ITS PLACES.

DIRECTIVE 13.1

Specifics in Directive 13.1

2. Use traffic demand management techniques
3. Achieve appropriate balance between movement and place
4. Ensure long term land use and activities drive long-term transport functionality
5. Optimise existing and proposed transport investment
6. Establish corridor management plans that account for place-shaping
7. Recognise existing community investment and the need to enable connectivity between and within communities
8. Align community expectations in urban areas with urban levels of service, particularly with realistic expectations around levels of congestion
What is our concern?

- AT decided against further consultation with owners and occupiers of Graham – Hardinge precinct on traffic management issues on Victoria Street West (between Nelson and Halsey Streets)
- Submissions from owners and occupiers ongoing for over 4 years (Oracle and The Galleries)
- AT have abandoned any intent to resolve the issue of ingress and egress from the precinct, including inclusion of Oracle site into a signalisation project
- Instead of signalisation, we are told we will get a cycleway and a layout that will further significantly reduce ability of traffic to move in the vicinity

Panel introduction and framework

- Two speakers: David Watt BC347480  Rob Neil MD Safari Group
- One support (one from Oracle, Bayleys A & B, Kiwibank / NZ Post or CBRE)
- Public support (3 from above, plus The Galleries)
Hi Jo,
I thought you might want to see some supporting data to back up our concerns.

You will see the numbers quoted below are quite accurate, the number of parks may be slightly over-stated but still will be around 900 + on-street parking. So close to 1,000 car-parks. Car-park data comes from AC records including titles, Resource and Building Consents etc so this is quite accurate as to the 900 odd.

Occupancy numbers appear to remain on track to exceed 5,000.

It is important that you note some key differences in roadway width:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway width (kurb to kurb)</th>
<th>metres</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Metres taken by lanes</th>
<th>Metres left after lanes &amp; parking</th>
<th>Metres parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardingie</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham (east - west)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham (north - south)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lanes each way = 1

You will see from this that our area of immediate concern (Graham St north-south) does not even meet AT’s own standards as to lane and parking width.

We do not support one-side only parking only on Graham St north-south as our residents and visitors would be significantly disadvantaged on weekends, but the use of a loading zone outside NZME would go a long way to avoiding a major problem during the week.

I hope this extra data is useful for you and your team?

Kind regards,

David Watt
021 280 7240

Hi Jo,
I see you’ve been thrown the curved ball !!!!
Just to clarify, this is not a complaint – our letters (and especially the recent one) have all been aimed at making sure that Graham Street / Hardinge Street is properly served with transport planning and kerbside marking / parking.

A few facts first:
1. Graham Street and Hardinge Street are in effect a crescent, there is only one lane from Victoria Street West into each of Graham St and Hardinge Streets. And only one lane out of each of them.
2. the precinct has cornerstone businesses of:
   a. Spark (including Geni etc), NZ’s largest communications company.
   b. NZME
   c. Kiwibank, Courier Post, NZ Post
   d. Les Mills Head Office
   e. Auckland City Planning Centre (with high visitor numbers, Terry Monaghan can give you some ideas about this level, but we observe this on a daily basis by the turnover in the 23 / 25 Graham Street AT Carpark)
3. there will be:
   a. a fully operational population of around 5,000 people (mixed business and residential) within the precinct
   b. over 1,000 car parks within the precinct, virtually all of these exiting onto Hardinge or Graham St
   c. a high level of visitors already apparent at Spark and for which conflicts already occur at most time in the use of the traffic lanes.
   d. A new level of staff and visitors at NZME (NZ’s largest media organisation)

A further complicating factor which has occurred since 18th October has been the introduction of bus only lanes on Victoria Street West – these have significantly reduced the flow of traffic exiting Graham Street onto Victoria Street. **UNLESS something is done to protect the flow of traffic in Graham Street, you [AT] will see absolute chaos within a few days on the street.**

This is a NOW issue, not a planning question that has a timeframe of weeks or months – it needs addressing URGENTLY please. We are now relying on you Jo to help us here please.

Our requests are set around protection of traffic flow and pedestrians.

We have set out the issues we see around the Spark / Kiwibank area and the footpath protection and wish to have these addressed sometime soon please.

**BUT the most critical matter for this week please is for a drop zone for visitors to be placed outside the NZME entry on Graham Street. Please note that Graham Street is far narrower than Hardinge Street.**

The AT code of Practice gives us some guidance on this matter.

We look forward to your prompt action and advice please.

Kind regards,

David Watt
Chair BC347480, 23 Graham street
021 280 7240

Extracts from AT Code of Practice 2013 (page 5 or page 309)

- Signed or marked parking restrictions put in place by Auckland Transport can include:
  - restrictions on the times of day when parking can occur
  - restrictions on the class/classes of vehicles that can park in a particular location
  - restrictions on the users of parking in a particular location (mobility parking, residents only parking)
1 March 2016

David Watt
David.watt@xtra.co.nz

Dear David,

Auckland Transport - CAS-182991-W4S5D3 – Traffic/Pedestrian concerns

Thank you for your detailed submission regarding the proposed changes to parking as well as your comments and suggestions to date around traffic and pedestrian safety on Graham and Hardinge Street. Auckland Transport (AT) very much welcomes your feedback and our response to each point you have raised is set out below.

1. Change the designation of the small section of parking (2 spaces) between 5 and 21 Graham Street to a P5 Loading Zone Monday to Friday.

AT did consider proposing a change to this parking space as at 9m it is not really of a sufficient length to accommodate two vehicles. While 9m is a suitable length for a loading zone, its location between two vehicle entrances is not. At other locations where such an arrangement exists AT has many complaints regarding the obstruction of the adjacent vehicle entrances caused either by its use by vehicles longer than 9m or two smaller vehicles trying to use the restriction at the same time.

It is our opinion that if we were to adopt your suggestion, the level of complaints regarding obstructed vehicle entrances would increase and that our enforcement resources would not be able to respond effectively.

2. Change the designation of a section on the western side of Graham St immediately outside NZME to a P5 Loading Zone Monday to Friday.

Graham Street and Hardinge Street are within the Monday to Saturday part of the City centre parking zone. It is therefore essential that any loading zone restriction at the very least, has the same operational hours. Experience in Central Auckland and Newmarket has shown that if the hours of the loading zone are less than the paid parking zone, customers see the loading zone as unrestricted parking outside of its operation hours. This is not the case and customers are then liable to be issued an infringement notice. If the hours of the loading zone are at least aligned to the parking zone then there is no room for confusion. Due to the high demand for a loading zone in this area, AT decided to propose a Monday to Sunday loading zone thereby ensuring that the cafes in the area always have access to a loading zone.

AT prefers to propose loading zones at the end of restrictions as it is easier for larger vehicles to access. Moving the loading zone to outside NZME would place it in between other restrictions and make it difficult to access. AT is of the opinion that as the proposed loading zone is only 50m from the entrance to NZME that changes to the proposal are not required.

aucklandtransport.govt.nz
3. Extend westward the no parking (including buses) lines west on Victoria St West so that visibility in that direction is improved for drivers wishing to exit Graham St.

The bus stop on Victoria Street West between Hardinge Street and Graham Street has temporarily been shortened and replaced with broken yellow lines due to construction works. Consequently, visibility for drivers exiting Graham Street has temporarily been improved.

We have assessed operation of the permanent bus stop and reviewed visibility for drivers exiting Graham Street. We can advise that when the permanent bus stop is reinstalled, we will be providing a short length of additional broken yellow lines to retain visibility at the intersection.

4. Re-highlight the Keep Clear section in Victoria St West at the Graham St entry/exit.

Our Engineers have inspected the site and have re-marked the worn black markings. The remaining road markings are in an acceptable condition.

5. Create a two lane exit from Graham St onto Victoria St West by removing the two southernmost car parks on the eastern side of Graham St thus allowing concurrent left and right exiting onto Victoria St West.

AND

6. Creation of a two lane exit (one left and one right) from Hardinge St onto Victoria St West by a combination of:

a. Reduction in the width or relocation of the central pedestrian safety zone in the middle of the junction, and

b. Utilisation of a small portion of the eastern footpath.

AND

Graham Street Right Turn Ban

The Hardinge Street intersection with Victoria Street West was deliberately designed to allow only single lane exit operation. It was designed this way for two reasons:

• dual lane exits generally experience a higher number of crashes due to left turning and right turning drivers obscuring each other’s vision, and

• Narrowing the exit to a single lane means that there is enough width remaining to accommodate a pedestrian refuge island between the entry and exit lanes.

Therefore, for safety reasons, we do not intend to change the intersection to allow for dual lane exits. Likewise, for safety reasons we will not be providing dual lane exits at the Graham Street intersection with Victoria Street West. However, we will look into the possibility of signalising the Hardinge St exit, which then could operate safely with two lanes. We expect to be able to provide you with the outcome of our findings by the end of May.

The question of banning the right-turn from Graham Street is problematic as there tends to be a high level of non-compliance with these types of bans. When Victoria Street West is not so busy drivers wanting to turn right would find it hard to understand the reason for the ban. Also, banning turning movements can result in increased congestion, if there is no suitable alternative route. In this case, as we are not planning to widen the exit from Hardinge Street onto Victoria Street, this intersection could be adversely affected by a ban at the Graham Street intersection. Therefore, we will not be making
any changes to the Graham Street intersection whilst we look at the possibility of moving the traffic signals to Hardinge Street.

7. Install a pedestrian crossing outside NZMA including ramping to enable mobility aid users to cross safely over Graham St.

This part of your request will be considered in conjunction with our investigation to assess Hardinge Street for signalisation. The feasibility of installing a pedestrian crossing outside NZMA will be included in the outcome of our findings to be relayed to you by the end of May.

8. Create the Graham St/Hardinge St precinct as a 30km speed zone

You may be aware that central government is leading substantial change in relation to speed management and associated speed limits.

A new draft speed management framework is being developed. Supporting its development is a demonstration project to test a new approach to speed management using this new framework. The Waikato region has been selected to demonstrate the new draft guide over the coming year at a number of yet to be determined locations in the region.

The guide intends to offer a toolbox of different ways to manage speeds on roads. The aim is to reduce deaths and serious injuries, while supporting overall economic productivity. Both the framework and demonstration of the guide align with the Government’s Safer Journeys Strategy. The aim is to develop a nationally consistent approach to speed management.

This will better enable Auckland Transport to be in a position to provide a more holistic response to speed management and consider this in the wider context of the aspirations for Auckland that includes consideration of appropriate speed management of the Auckland CBD and town centres across Auckland.

For this reason, there are no immediate plans for a speed limit reduction on Graham Street or Hardinge Street however we will look at these roads as part of wider speed management planning in 2017.

In addition, as a first step, we are currently working on a pilot project for a 30km/h zone in the Wynyard/Viaduct area north of Fanshawe Street as part of this national demonstration project. The outcomes of this project will help to guide future proposals for reduced speed limits across the wider CBD and town centres within the region.

9. As an alternative to 5 above, but conditional on completion of 6, creation of a no-right turn (no exit only) from Graham St onto Victoria St West but not unless in conjunction with:

A two lane east-bound exit from Graham St onto Victoria St West being created by removing the southern most two car parks on the eastern side of Graham St thus allowing two concurrent left turn only lanes to enable a separate turn to each of the kerbside and outer lanes going east on Victoria St West. These lanes are on either side of the central bus lane. This will reduce some of the congestion currently being experienced as traffic intending to turn left into Nelson Street will not be inhibited by traffic trying to cross the bus lane into the outer lane.

We have reviewed your requests to widen the Graham Street and Hardinge Street exits to two lanes, as well as the suggestion to ban the right turn out of Graham Street. Our initial response to these suggestions has been relayed above, and you will see that we are not proposing to make any changes at this time. However, we hadn’t previously considered your recent suggestion of moving the signalised pedestrian crossing and combining it with a signalised intersection at Hardinge Street, and
these issues are all linked. An initial review of the suggestion to signalise Hardinge Street indicates that this has merit, and we are now planning to assess the impacts of this in more detail. We will update you at the end of May to advise you of the outcome to this investigation.

We trust the above has provided you with a satisfactory update to your concerns.

Yours sincerely

Jo Maylor
Customer Liaison Team Leader

Cc: Terry Monaghan
    Andrea McKenzie
Hi Jo,

There was a serious harm accident yesterday afternoon with a pedestrian run over we believe by a vehicle right turning from Graham Street on to Victoria St West (to travel west on Victoria St West).

Last evening our Body Corporate Committee expressed concern on the lack of progress on addressing the traffic issues and refer to our submissions in December 2015 in response to parking and traffic matters. In that submission we not only made parking / kerbside designation recommendations but also addressed the issues of entry and exiting of traffic from Graham St and Hardinge Street.

**With the incident yesterday, we seek your support please in getting an acceleration of the addressing of these issues.**

Our BC Committee met last evening and our owner representatives were very concerned on behalf of our owners at the mounting level of street danger in our locale.

Rather than just criticize, we want to make what we see as constructive suggestions / recommendations based on many years of experience of driving in the locality, and observing the rapid change in traffic density in the Graham / Hardinge precinct – these recommendations are a package which we believe would relieve a lot of the present issues and yet to escalate issues (as Mansons Building becomes fully occupied):

1. better control the flow of traffic on Victoria Street West by moving the pedestrian lights from outside Les Mills to be part of a new set of traffic lights controlling the vehicle flow into and out of Hardinge Street. Controlling the intersection with lights would enable the concrete island taking up a part of Hardinge Street exit to be removed and allow two exit lanes (one left turn and one right turn) from Hardinge onto Victoria Street.

2. **conditional on 1, create two left turn lanes from Graham onto Victoria Street West, both being left turns, in effect straddling the central bus lane on Victoria St.** That is, two lanes turning left exiting Graham St, with **no right turn ex Graham Street** BUT still retaining the right turn from Victoria Street West into Graham St.

3. the area in front of Graham St on Victoria Street West to be yellow diagonal painted to ensure that the intersection is left clear.

**So in a few words:**
- control the Hardinge / Victoria St West intersection with lights, and move / merge the pedestrian lights from outside Les Mills into this intersection.
- Stop right turns ex Graham St onto Victoria St West
- Create two left turns from Graham St into Victoria St West
- Highlight the clearway in Victoria St West in front of Graham St.

We wish this matter to be addressed with urgency please before we have fatalities occurring.

David Watt
BC347480, Chair
23 Graham Street
Hi Jo and Branavan,

The Consultation Plans for the Victoria West cycleway have been just brought to our attention at The Galleries at 23 Graham Street. We will be following the consultation process but this issue is so major in the context that we need to seek common ground on this matter before your consultation goes too far.

A revised plan with the pedestrian lights moved to Hardinge Street would no doubt require consultation also.

To put this on the table bluntly:

1. If the Hardinge St intersection were to be lighted and encapsulated the present pedestrian crossing outside Les Mills:
   a. safety concerns for both pedestrians and cyclists would be captured as part of that process –
      motorists would also have a better entry / exit opportunity.
   b. further reduction of the usable exit from Hardinge Street would be avoided, and in fact vehicular
      exit and entry to Hardinge Street would be enhanced, not reduced.
   c. Further increase in traffic congestion in Hardinge Street would be avoided.

2. The cycleway plan does not capture previous commitments to consider the relocation of pedestrian lights to Hardinge Street
   a. Jo, your commitment of 1st March 2016 for consideration of signalling of Hardinge Street has not
      been picked up by the cycleway designers.
   b. Branahan, we had discussed the moving of the lights and you had said to us that AC/AT were in
      favour of the concept but did not have budgetary support at that time (February 2017)

3. Adoption of the proposed cycleway design would significantly prejudice the rights of over 3,000 people
   living and working in the precinct (Hardinge / Graham St) and over 1,000 vehicle users who live and work in
   the precinct.

I have two questions for the moment:

**QUESTION A:**
With whom do we discuss as a Body Corporate on behalf of our residents the wider traffic implications of the non-inclusion of the Hardinge Street lights in the overall traffic management plan?

**QUESTION B:**
With whom do we discuss the detail of the proposed cycleway design for which we have a number of specific issues
related to the further closedown of usable roadway at both Graham St and Hardinge St.

We have a BC meeting on 26th May and we would appreciate please your advice as to whom our correct contact
points would be much appreciated please.

We are not seeking with this email for you to address the issues, just to tell us to whom we should be talking so this
 can be quietly resolved without a major public airing of the matter.

Kind regards,
David Watt

From: David Watt <david.watt@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Sunday, 10 June 2018 4:14 PM
To: 'Info (AT)'
Cc: 'lkpope@xtra.co.nz'
Subject: RE: Auckland Transport - CAS-780165-5629P4 - Hardinge Street
Attachments: img171.pdf

Importance: High

Thank you Shyamala for your response.

Just to clarify our proposal which has been on the table with AC/AT for about 2 or 3 years, we have been talking with AC/AT about a combination of inter-linked solutions to resolve the ongoing traffic issues in the Hardinge / Graham St precinct:

1. To move the pedestrian lights from outside Les Mills to the Hardinge St Inter-section
2. To open up the Hardinge St exit lanes to two (one left and one right turn) instead of closing this off even further from the present restricted exiting
3. To consider ONLY IN CONJUNCTION WITH BOTH THE ABOVE the removal of the right turn on exit from Graham St on to Victoria St West.

This is NOT A NEW PROPOSAL and needs to be carefully considered BEFORE the cycleway designs and construction commence please.

Our BC Committee initially would appreciate a chance to discuss this urgently as we need to get clarity on this please.

Can someone please brief me on the proposed timeline for the cycleway design completion and construction?

Thanks and regards,

David Watt
021 280 7240

From: Info (AT) <-info@aucklandtransport.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 7 June 2018 2:55 PM
To: david.watt@xtra.co.nz
Subject: Auckland Transport - CAS-780165-5629P4 - Hardinge Street

Dear David,

Thank you for contacting Auckland Transport in regards to the issue at Graham and Hardinge Street.

Your case reference number is CAS-780165-5629P4

We have forwarded your enquiry to the appropriate team for further investigation and response.

If necessary, you may be contacted for further clarification.

Thank you for your patience as we will endeavour to respond to you within a timely manner.
Attachment A

Item 8.4

1. OPEN UP NOT CLOSE DOWN TO FROM HARDINGE ST.

3. CONSIDER OPTIONS FOR HARDINGE ST. NO RIGHT TURN OR EXIT.
Dear Mr Watt

Further to your meeting with Graeme Bean from Major Projects and Ally Holden from our Customer Insights team on Friday 6 July, we would like to summarise our discussion in relation to your request for AT to consider signalising the Hardinge Street/Victoria Street intersection.

- We are currently completing an urban design review of Victoria Street cycleway, and have requested that the potential signalisation of the Hardinge Street/Victoria Street intersection be considered in that process.
- If the Hardinge Street/Victoria Street intersection was signalised then the mid-block crossing outside Les Mills would be removed.
- The above elements need to be considered from a network operation point of view and AT is reviewing those aspects along the road corridor. This would include, amongst other things, working with our Metro team to ensure that bus services could operate satisfactorily.
- Based on results of above the investigations, AT will update the Council’s design office and seek their support on our findings.
- If the above can be achieved we would then seek approval to consider the signalisation of the Hardinge Street/Victoria Street intersection as part of the cycleway project and seek additional funding to cover the extra cost.
- The above processes will take about 6 to 8 weeks after which time we provide you an update.

Kind Regards

Sandy Webb
Project Coordinator
Major Projects
6 Henderson Valley Road, Henderson, Auckland 0812
Private Bag 92250, Auckland 1142
Ph: 09 335 3553
www.at.govt.nz | MajorProjects@at.govt.nz

Important notice: The contents of this email and any attachments may be confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments; any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is prohibited. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Auckland Transport.
David Watt

From: Major Projects (AT) <MajorProjects@at.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 7 September 2018 12:03 PM
To: david.watt@xtra.co.nz
Subject: CAS-78016S-S6Z9P4 - Hardinge Street
Attachments: CAS-182991-W455D3 - Response.pdf

Dear Mr Watt

Ally has notified us you have been in touch regarding an update on this case. My apologies, I thought I had sent you this update last week but it appears I failed to send it.

We had previously advised an investigation into the Hardinge Street / Victoria Street intersection would take from 6 to 8 weeks and we will provide you with a further update at that time.

Our project team are still working on the points outlined in our previous email below, we are unable to provide an update at this time except to let you know we are working through these points and hope to have a response for you shortly.

Kind Regards

Sandy Webb
Project Coordinator
Major Projects
Integrated Networks
Private Bag 92250, Auckland 1142
Ph: 09 447 4671
www.at.govt.nz | MajorProjects@at.govt.nz

---

From: David Watt <david.watt@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 12 July 2018 12:52 p.m.
To: Major Projects (AT) <MajorProjects@at.govt.nz>
Cc: Ally Holden (AT) <Ally.Holden@at.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: CAS-78016S-S6Z9P4 - Hardinge Street

Thank you Sandy, much obliged.

I must compliment Ally in particular for her handling of my ‘walk-in’ visit on Friday, and especially facilitating the discussion with Graeme on the cyceway / Hardinge St design.

And thank you for your prompt response and assurances below – after several years of asking for Hardinge to be signalised, it is very comforting that we have at last got our thoughts to the people who have the potential to make this to happen, not just for our benefit of the over 6,000 people who work and live in the Graham-Hardinge Precinct but in particular for the benefit of the users of the 1,000 odd car-parks for which the only exit from the precinct are Graham Street and Hardinge Street.

It may be useful for your considerations to refer back to your Case CAS-182991-W455D3 – Traffic Pedestrian Concerns. The AT report of 1st March 2016 concluded that the signalising of Hardinge St had merit and was going to be further considered.
And with Ramada Inn developing rapidly, there is the prospect of a significant shift in traffic flows from the 55 serviced apartments and the 48 residential units (entry at 147 Victoria St West) and the additional 73 car-parks which access from and exit onto Graham St (I think at number 3).

As access and exiting from Ramada Inn (hotel and apartments) are likely to be affected by the cycleway and will add to the precinct traffic density, perhaps you could contact Stephen Taylor who may have some comments regarding the positive effects of the moving of the lights to Hardinge Street, and possible comments on the cycleway if he hasn’t already done so.

Thanks for your help, and we look forward to hearing from you in late August.

Kind regards,

David Watt
BC Chair, The Galleries, 23 Graham St

From: Major Projects [AT] <MajorProjects@at.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 12 July 2018 9:12 AM
To: david.watt@xtra.co.nz
Subject: CAS-780165-5625P4 - Hardinge Street

Dear Mr Watt

Further to your meeting with Graeme Bean from Major Projects and Ally Holden from our Customer Insights team on Friday 6 July, we would like to summarise our discussion in relation to your request for AT to consider signalising the Hardinge Street/Victoria Street intersection.

- We are currently completing an urban design review of Victoria Street cycleway, and have requested that the potential signalisation of the Hardinge Street/Victoria Street intersection be considered in that process.
- If the Hardinge Street/Victoria Street intersection was signalised then the mid-block crossing outside Les Mills would be removed.
- The above elements need to be considered from a network operation point of view and AT is reviewing those aspects along the road corridor. This would include, amongst other things, working with our Metro team to ensure that bus services could operate satisfactorily.
- Based on results of above the investigations, AT will update the Council’s design office and seek their support on our findings.
- If the above can be achieved we would then seek approval to consider the signalisation of the Hardinge Street/Victoria Street intersection as part of the cycleway project and seek additional funding to cover the extra cost.
- The above processes will take about 6 to 8 weeks after which time we provide you an update.

Kind Regards

Sandy Webb
Project Coordinator
Major Projects
6 Henderson Valley Road, Henderson, Auckland 0612
Private Bag 92250, Auckland 1142
Dear David

Ally advised our team that you had been in the office seeking an update on this project.

We are pleased to be able to provide a further update to your query on the possibility of signalising Hardinge Street.

We have progressed with our investigation on signalising Hardinge Street intersection. In our investigation we have had to consider all modes of travel, pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, public transport (buses) and heavy vehicles and the safety of the area. The current property access has two high volume driveways (Oracle and Les Mills) incorporating the entrances into the signals requires catering for both incoming and outgoing movements from both driveways. The only way that this can be managed through signalisation is to have a five leg intersection. This will be most inefficient and will lead to congestion, long delays and the resulting frustration will likely lead to unsafe usage.

In our current conversations with Les Mills there are future plans to close this driveway entrance in their future development plans and Auckland Transport will be keen to take another look at the signalising for this intersection then. There is also likely to be further development when the Victoria Linear Park is progressed.

In the interim, to improve safety we are proposing three new side street raised tables at the entrances of Dock Street, Hardinge Street and Graham Street. The proposed raised speed tables will slow entering and exiting speeds into these side streets. This design will be more appropriate for this busy highly pedestrian-focused location and should help resolve risk associated with conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

We aim to have the detailed design completed and plans on the project website by early May 2019. This will provide further reference material for additional consultation with the affected properties and residents prior to construction. We are anticipating starting construction in October or early November 2019.

Please see the project website page here. This page will be updated on a quarterly basis.

Please feel free to email the project team directly via MajorProjects@at.govt.nz for any further updates or information.

Kind Regards

Sandy Webb
Project Interface Business Support
Portfolio Delivery, Projects
Integrated Networks
Private Bag 92250, Auckland 1142
Ph: 09 447 4671
www.at.govt.nz | MajorProjects@at.govt.nz

Important notice: The contents of this email and any attachments may be confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments; any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is prohibited. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Auckland Transport.
Mansons TCLM
Installation of Telecommunication Equipment
151 Queen Street West, Auckland CBD
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### THE APPLICANT AND PROPERTY DETAILS

| **To:** | Auckland Council |
| **Site Address:** | 151 Victoria Street West and 2 Graham Street, Auckland CBD |
| **Applicant’s Name:** | Masons TCLM Ltd |
| **Site Owner:** | Masons TCLM Ltd |
| **Site Occupier:** | Under construction/Vacant at this stage |
| **Address for Service:** | Barker & Associates Ltd |
| | PO Box 1986 |
| | Shortland Street |
| | Auckland 1140 |
| | Attention: Kathryn Akouz |
| **Legal Description:** | Lot 1 DP 468475 |
| **Site Area:** | 4861m² |
| **Operative District Plan:** | Auckland Council District Plan – Operative Central Area Section |
| **Strategic Management Area:** | Strategic Management Area 3 (Western SMA) |
| **Precinct:** | Victoria Quarter |
| **Activity Area:** | Pedestrian Orientated Activity Area & Less-Pedestrian Orientated Activity Area |
| **Site Intensity:** | BFAR 3:1 MTFAR 4:1 (Bonus Area 6) |
| **Special Height Control:** | E10 Mt Eden View Protection Plane (not affected) |
| **Designations/Limitations:** | None |
| **Road Classification:** | Victoria Street West is a District Arterial Road |
| | Graham Street is a Local Road |
| | Hardinge Street is a Local Road |

---

Masons TCLM 151 Victoria Street West
Telephone Equipment
Assessment of Environmental Effects

B&A Ref: 14130 Issue 3
Prepared by Kathryn Akouz
Reviewed by Karl Cook
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B&amp;A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Road Type:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Street West is a Type 2 Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Street is a Type 4 Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardinge Street is a Type 4 Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace Restriction Designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of Volcanic Viewsheds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of proposal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of telecommunications equipment on the rooftop of a building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of reasons for consent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height and dimensions of equipment on the roof of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relevant consents required:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dispensation under Part 27 (Signs) of the Auckland City Consolidate Bylaw is required for the installation of signage associated with the occupation of the building by NZME. This application is being sought concurrently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 OVERVIEW

This report has been prepared in support of a resource consent application by Mansons TCLM Limited for the installation of telecommunication equipment on the rooftop of the building being constructed located at 151 Victoria Street West, Auckland CBD.

This Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Section 88 and Schedule 4 to the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act) and is intended to provide the information necessary for a full understanding of the activity for which consent is sought and any actual or potential effects the proposal may have on the environment.

2.2 BACKGROUND

Mansons TCLM Limited were granted resource consent (ref. R/LUC/2013/1553, Permit 41694 and Permit 41695) in July 2013 for the development and use of a multi-level commercial development involving two, six-storey buildings with connecting two-level basement parking area, retail units, public through site links and a publicly accessible plaza.
The applicant has obtained consent to vary the conditions of the original consent in accordance with s127 of the RMA on three occasions:

- R/VCC/2013/1553/1 was approved in August 2013 and provided for an increase in height, the addition of an atrium and other minor amendments to the internal configuration of the buildings.

- R/VCC/2013/1553/2 was approved in September 2014 and provided for the addition of ten pedestrian 'bridges' to connect Buildings A and B with the atrium.

- R/VCC/2013/1553/3 was approved in February 2015 and provided for the addition of a coffee kiosk located on the western side of the development in the approximately the centre of the podium area.

This application involves the installation of telecommunication equipment on the rooftop of the building for a prospective tenant of the building. This is considered to be different to the existing consent and subsequent variations provided for and therefore resource consent for the installation of the telecommunication equipment is sought.

Discussions with New Zealand Media Entertainment (NZME) as a prospective tenant of the building has resulted in additional signage requirements which are subject to a separate application for a dispensation under the Bylaw No. 27 - Signs 2007 and which are being sought concurrently with this consent application.

### 2.3 INTRODUCTION TO NZME.

NZME, is New Zealand's premier integrated media company with a portfolio of market-leading newspaper, radio, digital and magazine titles that 3.1 million Kiwis engage with.

Due to a confluence of events, the availability of the building at 151 Victoria Street is a one-off opportunity for NZME to consolidate most of its Auckland business operations into one building within the CBD. Such opportunity is unlikely to occur again within the foreseeable future. However the opportunity for NZME to lease the majority of space at 151 Victoria Street is conditional on obtaining resource consent to allow the telecommunication equipment to be located on the rooftop of the building (subject to this application) and a dispensation under the signs bylaw to allow the proposed signage regime (subject to a separate application), and on terms and within a timeframe acceptable to NZME.
Due to the size of NZME’s operations in Auckland, it has the ability to influence the business uses of other tenants that may want to work in close proximity to NZME. NZME is passionate about media and entertainment, and the location of the building at 151 Victoria has the potential to leverage the existing presence of other media and entertainment industry participants such as Television New Zealand and Spark. It is critical to NZME. that its work environment portrays how it wishes to engage with its customers and staff. The consolidation of existing newspaper, radio, digital and magazine titles is only possible at this site if the building itself provides a functional platform for the operation of core infrastructure, and outwardly engages the local community as a destination hub for media and entertainment business in the city.

Obtaining the required consents for the installation, operation and use of all of the rooftop equipment and the signs (including digital display signs) of the size, location and operation is essential to NZME.’s required use and essential to NZME. satisfying the only condition for NZME. to move to 151 Victoria Street.

3.0 SITE CONTEXT

3.1 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The subject site has an area of 4,861m² and is located within the block formed by Graham Street, Hardinge Street and Victoria Street West. The site comprises almost the entire block, the exception being the area occupied by the Walker Building on the northwest corner at the intersection of Graham Street and Hardinge Street and the CPH building on the southwest corner which was given separate title in 2013 via R/SJR/2013/1822. The site generally slopes from southeast to northwest.

The site was previously occupied by Courier Post, New Zealand Post and Kiwibank - which now occupy a multi-storey building (known as the Courier Post Building) located in the southwest corner of the site at the intersection of Hardinge Street and Victoria Street West - and P&K Automotive in a single-level workshop building in the northeast corner of the site. Tournament Parking also operated paid public parking from at grade sealed surface parking spaces on the site.

The development of the site (approved by R/LUC/2013/1553) involved the demolition of the existing single-storey annex to the six-storey Courier Post building and the demolition of the workshop building occupied by P&K Automotive. The existing six-storey building in the southeast corner of the site was retained, together with the existing 11 parking spaces in front of that building on Hardinge Street which were subdivided from the balance of the site in 2013.
The construction of a multi-level commercial office development on the site has commenced and is largely completed. The site now comprises two, six-storey buildings with connecting two-level basement parking area, retail units, public through site links and a publicly accessible plaza.

3.2 SURROUNDING LOCALITY

The surrounding area is characterised by various commercial, retail and office buildings. Immediately opposite the subject site on the western side of Hardinge Street is the recently constructed six-storey Spark City buildings, providing a mix of retail at the ground floor and office uses. Immediately opposite the site on Victoria Street West is another recently constructed five-storey office building with provision for ground floor retail at 162 Victoria Street West. The four-storey Walker Building located in the north is currently occupied as offices for Les Mills. The Auckland Council occupy the three-storey building at 35 Graham Street. There is also a mix of one and two storey retail and office buildings to the eastern side of Graham Street.

4.0 PROPOSAL

The proposal involves the installation of telecommunications equipment on the rooftop of Building A and to the west of the existing rooftop plant. The telecommunications equipment is required in conjunction with the proposed occupation of the building by NZME, and to facilitate broadcasting from the site and to enable communications in emergency situations.

The proposed telecommunication equipment is illustrated on the plans in Appendix 3. In summary this comprises:

- Three communication dishes will be installed to the west of the existing rooftop plant area on a singular base structural support which also provides access for maintenance works. The dimensions of the dishes will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dish</th>
<th>Diameter (m)</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUBMISSION TO WAITEMATA LOCAL BOARD MEETING 16 APRIL 2019

Proposal.

1. To stop the current cycleway design work for Victoria Street West until a comprehensive traffic management plan is developed for Victoria Street from Nelson to Halsey Streets, including management of traffic, cycles and pedestrians safely into and out of the Graham – Hardinge Precinct.
   a. For AT to include the existing Travel Management Plans that are in place in the precinct in conjunction with their assessment of the needs of the development of the linear park on Victoria Street. But at least, to consider these in a wider evaluation of the local demand for signalisation of Hardinge Street. Travel Management or Traffic Management Plans are in place with the Spark building (292 carparks, 2,800 staff), with Buildings A and B on Graham Street (251 carparks, 2,100 staff, and Kiwibank – NZ Post (90 carparks, estimated 300 staff).
   b. For AT to provide to the Local Board the outcomes of the required monitoring of the Traffic Management Plans lodged in relation to the Precinct since 2014.
   c. AT with its ownership and use of the Fanshawe Street carpark has approximately 135 carparks that directly discharge into Graham Street, having an extremely high level of visitor traffic from its Consenting Functions, and has a high staff level. Although AC will be moving soon, the replacement tenants will simply take over from AC, so a Traffic Management Plan for this property should also be required, and incorporated into the comprehensive traffic management plan as noted in 1 above.
   d. Ramada Inn and Apartments in development at 147 Victoria Street with 73 carparks, will have visitors (taxis, shuttles) as well as residential traffic and many arrivals and departures to manage. This will be a busy site, and sits squarely on the Graham Street intersection. It requires a Travel Demand Management Plan and this should be integrated into AT planning.

Deputation panel.

As discussions on this vexed matter are ongoing, the persons and organisations that will represent the local view on this matter is not yet able to be determined.

Presentation.

A brief overhead presentation summarising the key matters will be provided.
Background:

Body Corporate BC347480 “The Galleries” was formed in 2005 and through our properties being “joined at the hip”, has a very special relationship with AC/AT. AC/AT own the bottom carpark level in our building and we share driveways, have service easements and there many areas in which we co-operate. At an operational level, while we have tried to treat each other as neighbours, owners in The Galleries have always respected the AC/AT role as the regulatory body.

On 9th November 2015 The Galleries wrote to AT with our message “aimed at making sure that Graham Street / Hardinge Street is properly served with transport planning and kerbside marking / parking”. This message included a prediction of traffic chaos based on the same or similar data that we now have available today. [Attachment 1 – page 2]

On 2nd December 2015 AT sought feedback from precinct owners on proposed changes to parking in the precinct. The Galleries prepared a formal submission to AT and shared this with other precinct owners / occupants. The response from AT on 1st March 2016 [Attachment 2 – last para, pages 3/4] is significant as it concluded:

“However, we hadn’t previously considered your recent suggestion of moving the signalised pedestrian crossing and combining it with a signalised intersection at Hardinge Street, and these issues are all linked. An initial review of the suggestion to signalise Hardinge Street indicates that this has merit, and we are now planning to assess the impacts of this in more detail.”

On 23rd February 2016 we reported to AT a serious harm accident at Graham / Victoria St intersection, and further reinforced our views regarding the signalisation of Hardinge Street. [Attachment 3]

On 2nd December 2016 we wrote again to AT regarding the precinct (ahead of Ramada Inn construction commencing) and sought a further update on the signalisation of Hardinge Street.

We were advised that “budgetary constraints” prevented this from occurring. We acknowledged on 9th February 2017 that AT had a budgetary constraint preventing further consideration of the Hardinge signalisation.

Then came 17 May 2018 when the AT Cycleway Consultation was brought to our attention – we wrote to AT on that date expressing our concerns that the proposed did not include signalisation of Hardinge Street. [Attachment 4]

On 7th June 2018 AT acknowledged a submission that Galleries had made to AT [CAS-780165-S6Z9PA – Hardinge St] and we responded on 10th June 2018 reinforcing our views on Hardinge signalisation. [Attachment 5]
On 6th July 2018 I personally met with the design team at AT, as per AT email 12th July 2018. [Attachment 6]

On 7th September 2018 AT advised that a response would take 6 to 8 weeks. [Attachment 7]

Then the letter from AT that took away all the effort at working with AT on this very important matter – AT 18 March 2019 [Attachment 8].

This is not only local precinct issue, but would set in concrete a cycleway infrastructure that would not only create further traffic havoc, escalate danger for pedestrians and cyclists in the precinct BUT would frustrate the future development of a sensible traffic management plan covering Victoria Street West from Nelson to Halsey Streets.

What is proposed by AT Cycleway Team.

AT have now advised that the Hardinge signalisation project has been abandoned and that instead a further development of the Victoria Street cycleway is now being designed (output expected in May 2019, construction October 2019) which will:

- Further close down the width of the exits of both Graham and Hardinge Streets
- Install a raised cycleway across the face of Dock Street, Hardinge Street and Graham Street
- Set back traffic exiting further from the intersection thus removing visibility into Victoria Street.

Traffic situation:

Exit from the precinct is extremely difficult and dangerous as AT do not control in any way the flow of traffic through Victoria Street West with drivers stopping across both Graham and Hardinge Streets on Victoria Street, resulting in gridlock within the precinct. The proposed changes will further exacerbate this problem.

Urgency of Timing:

AT have advised that they will have plans completed by early May based on parameters above. It is simply unacceptable that such a valuable and active commercial heart of the new City will be crippled by an ill-conceived design of a cycleway – the project to manage traffic in this area of Victoria Street West needs a significant input from top level design by AT, and that input must be sought from the interested parties.

Hence the request for a deputation to the Board from interested parties.
Parties affected:

- Mansons as property owners, the Spark buildings at 167 Victoria Street West (their carpark exit discharges into Hardinge Street), the Oracle Building at 162 Victoria Street West (whose carpark discharges into the Hardinge / Victoria Street inter-section) and NZME Central at 2-4 Graham Street. CV of these properties is in excess of $400 million
- NZME as key tenants in 2-4 Graham Street
- Auckland Council Planning Building at 35 Graham Street
- Ministry of Housing and Development as tenants in Spark complex
- Meredith Connell as a major tenant in 2-4 Graham Street
- Safari Developments (developer of Ramada Inn hotel and apartments at 147 Victoria Street West)
- Les Mills are a key player not only as the present pedestrian lights outside their main gym are subject to change if the lights were signalised, but their carpark exit discharges into the Hardinge / Victoria Street intersection, and their HQ is based in the Walker Building at 30 Graham Street.
- NZ Post and Kiwibank carparks discharge into Hardinge Street
- BC347480 is the quiet residential 28 boutique apartment building at 23 Graham Street in which I live.
- There are many small businesses

Traffic Management Plans, Ignored by AT?

As an integral part of each Resource Consent, there is a requirement for major developments to have Travel Demand Management Plans.

It is unclear as to what monitoring activity has been occurring, otherwise the gridlock issue should have surfaced through these reviews.

Value of the property involved.

The AC valuation of the property involved is in excess of $700 million, market value approaching $1 billion.

The Precinct.

The precinct is an extremely busy commercial, local body, Government and media area, with a large number of visitors and a high traffic flow from the incoming visitors.
The proposed changes to Hardinge Street (left) and Graham Street (right) exits.

It should be noted that in the proposed Hardinge intersection layout, that traffic wishing to exit will be held back behind a white line to the extent that visibility of traffic on Victoria street will be totally obscured. A similar effect is planned for the Graham Street exit.

This paper has been prepared on behalf of the owners of 23 Graham Street (59 carparks, 85 residents).

David Watt 4 / 23 Graham Street Auckland Central 1010

5th April 2019
PARKING REGULATIONS
PRIME ROAD, GREY LYNN, 2019

[Map showing parking regulations for Prime Road, Grey Lynn, 2019]
2018 Parking Proposal; Auckland Transport

RPZ MAP
Neighbour circular
Auckland Transport Letter to Peter Allen Prime Road
If you live in one of the following streets:
ALL of Allen Rd, Baldon Rd, Browning St, Castle St, Edwards Rd, Firth Rd, Fisherton St, Prime Rd, Selbourne St, and PARTS of Cockburn St, Dryden St, Elgin St, Francis St, Hakanoa St, Sackville St, Schofield St, Tutukakai St, Warrock St, Westmoreland St East, Wilton St

This is very important news about changes that Auckland Transport (AT) is making to parking in your street.

Auckland Transport (AT) has decided to introduce **TIME-RESTRICTED PARKING** in your street from January 2019 or possibly earlier. On one side of your street there will be a two hour limit (P120) between the hours of 8am and 6pm, Monday to Friday. On the other side of the street, there will be NO parking restrictions.

This is NOT the Residential Parking Zone that AT consulted residents about and there will be no permits or exemptions for anyone. Other parts of Grey Lynn/Arch Hill will become Residential Parking Zones as proposed (as in Freemans Bay and Ponsonby). For more information and a zone map visit: [https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/grey-lynn-and-arch-hill-residential-parking-zones/](https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/grey-lynn-and-arch-hill-residential-parking-zones/)

**Problem:**

Many residents will not be able to park in front of their house for more than 2 hours at a time on weekdays. The side of the street with unrestricted parking is likely to be full during the day with residents' cars, avoiding the two-hour limit, commuters' cars and tradespeople.

**Solutions being proposed for which your support is encouraged:**

1) All of Grey Lynn should be a Residential Parking Zone with residents able to purchase a parking permit for the area, as per the consultation.

**OR**

2) The time-restricted parking area should not be instituted at the same time as the Residential Parking Zone in the surrounding areas. This would allow AT to monitor the effects and respond appropriately.

**Please act now and have your say by emailing:**

Email:
Auckland Transport: ATEngagement@at.govt.nz
Grey Lynn Residents Association: hello@GreyLynnResidents.org.nz
Your local board chair: pippa.com@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Your ward councillor: mike.lee@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Or write to local media.
And please spread the message through your social media networks.
6 September 2018

Pete Allen
petera@pl.net

Dear Mr Allen

Auckland Transport – CAS-850700-Y0S8T1 – Parking in Grey Lynn

We refer to your correspondence dated 28 August 2018 regarding Grey Lynn parking.

Your correspondence was provided to me as Group Manager of Parking Services and Compliance. I note your concerns about the P120 time restrictions proposed for Prime Road. I would like to take this opportunity to respond to the issues you have raised and provide you with an explanation of why the time restrictions were suggested.

Update

We have listened to the feedback (including yours) that we have received since we published our proposal and we have had further engagement with the Waitemata Local Board and Grey Lynn Residents Association. We have decided to postpone the implementation of the P120 time restrictions.

The Residential Parking Zone (RPZ) will be implemented as indicated. We will reassess the parking situation in the remaining streets (including Prime Road) after parking patterns have normalised. Depending on the results of future parking occupancy surveys, we could consider a number of different options, including possibly expanding the RPZ, implementing some form of time restriction, or not implementing any restrictions. We will work further with the Local Board, Grey Lynn Residents Association and Grey Lynn Business Association to produce a sustainable outcome for the community.

Reason why P120 time restriction was proposed

As a result of our public consultation AT received a high level of feedback from residents and local business. AT listened to all feedback about not wanting an RPZ in their area and, as a result of this feedback, an amended proposal was developed. As you are aware this amended proposal included the introduction of the P120 time restrictions on one side of some roads, including Prime Road.

Time restrictions were proposed because, from our experience of introducing RPZs and Paid Parking Zones (PPZ) in other suburbs of Auckland, displacement of commuters takes place quickly after the introduction of these types of schemes and streets and roads outside of an RPZ or PPZ become very busy. We have noted your comments and observations of the flow-on effects of this parking, on your street.

P120 time restricted parking would provide parking for short-term visitors (who are struggling at present, including visitors to local residents and businesses), with the unrestricted parking available for longer-term parkers, including residents.
With regard to your concerns about the number of vehicles in your area, as advised earlier, we will closely monitor the capacity on your road and surrounding roads and take appropriate action.

Finding parking solutions for inner city fringe suburbs in Auckland is complex due to the mixture of residential and commercial premises, the proximity to the city (meaning a high number of people either want to park in these areas and commute into the city) and the consideration of local business and their employees. This demand puts heavy pressure on parking capacity.

**Information regarding parking on Prime Road**

Prime Road has approximately 65 on-street parking spaces. In May 2017 and March 2018, AT undertook parking surveys to assess the occupancy in Prime Road. This showed that although the average parking occupancy was 50% in May 2017 and 40% in 2018, the section of Prime Road from Surrey Crescent to Dryden Street was 87% in 2017.

**Effects of other RPZs**

As you have observed and pointed out, the increase in the number of people parking in your street to may be attributed to an increase of local businesses staff or commuters parking in the area. As you are aware, the RPZ and the PPZ were introduced late last year. The introduction of these two schemes may be a reason for the increased parking on Prime Road because there will have been a displacement of parking from those areas. We have seen displacement of commuters in all areas where we have introduced RPZ’s and our experience is that the surrounding areas receive displacement quite early on after the introduction of RPZs and PPZs. There is likely to be a similar effect with the introduction of the RPZ in Grey Lynn & Arch Hill.

We understand and appreciate that any change we implement is unlikely to satisfy everyone. However, as the Road Controlling Authority we have a responsibility to look at the large picture, to balance the conflicting needs of many different road users and to look to the future. Congestion in Auckland is at an all-time high and the introduction of RPZs in inner suburbs will encourage people to move away from using driving as their preferred choice of transport.

We trust the above has clarified the issue raised, however if you have any further queries, please contact Auckland Transport at customerliaison@at.govt.nz or on 09 355 3553.

Yours sincerely

John Strawbridge
Group Manager, Parking Services & Compliance

Cc Jacinda Arden
2019 John Dymond Letter to Auckland Transport

. AT Response
06 January 2019

John Strawbridge
Group Manager, Parking Services & Compliance
Auckland Transport
20 Viaduct Harbour Avenue, Auckland 1010
Private Bag 92250, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

Dear John,

**Re Parking Regulations, Prime Road Grey Lynn**

This letter is to register my objection to current parking regulations, which came into effect late 2018, which have imposed 2 hour parking for non-residents in tributary streets to Prime Road, while allowing unrestricted parking in Prime Road (refer appendix).

The net effect of these parking regulations is that Prime Road has become a parking lot of choice for commuters, who take advantage of the unrestricted parking regulations to park their cars for the day and take other modes of transport such as fold up cycles and scooters to their place of work.

This is to the disadvantage of residents of Prime Road and to visitors to residents of Prime Road.

This morning at 08:10am all available parking spots have been filled and there are no available parking spots available to me within a one block perimeter. This now is a regular occurrence. (Refer panoramic photographs attached – all digitally date stamped).

I request that Auckland Transport immediately institute the same rights to Resident parking, with 2 hour restrictions to others that are available to residents of Schofield, Dryden and Elgin Streets.

If you require any further information in this regard, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

John Dymond
16 Prime Road
Grey Lynn 1021,
021 177 9712

cc. Pippa Coom / Waitematā Local Board
Appendix 1

**THIS SECTION OF PRIME ROAD**

**Please note**
This letter and accompanying photographs relate to the section of Prime Road between Dryden and Schofield Streets.
Appendix 2

Panoramic photographs of Prime Road block, between Dryden and Schofield Streets

29 January 2019 south side Prime Road / 100%

29 January 2019 north side Prime Road / 100%
Attachment A

Item 8.5

30 January 2019 south side Prime Road / 100%
01 February 2019, south side Prime Road /100%

01 February 2019, north side Prime Road /100%
05 February 2019, south side Prime Road / 100%

05 February 2019, north side Prime Road / 100%
04 February 2019, north side Prime Road /100%
Residents’ Letter To Auckland Transport

AT Response
RESIDENTS LETTER  
Parking Regulations, Prime Road Grey Lynn

27 February 2019

John Strawbridge
Group Manager, Parking Services & Compliance
Auckland Transport
20 Viaduct Harbour Avenue, Auckland 1010
Private Bag 92250, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

Dear John,

Re: RESIDENTS LETTER  
Parking Regulations, Prime Road Grey Lynn

This letter is to register our objection to current unrestricted parking in Prime Road following the implementation of Restricted Parking Zones (RPZ) in late 2018.

The parking situation has become untenable for residents of Prime Road, with daytime occupancy now at full capacity.

We the undersigned request that Auckland Transport immediately institute the Restricted Parking Zone to Prime Road.

Yours sincerely,

Signed By:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SELLA DIGNA</td>
<td>16 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john@dignam.com.au">john@dignam.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellee Chilwell</td>
<td>23 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elle.chilwell@gmail.com">elle.chilwell@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALLY BEARD</td>
<td>22 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sally.beard@holmail.co.uk">sally.beard@holmail.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Walker</td>
<td>20 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul@freycoaching.com">paul@freycoaching.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Konrad Schubert</td>
<td>2a Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:konrad.schubert@ipo.com">konrad.schubert@ipo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catherine Byrne</td>
<td>19 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:catherine@byrnefamily.co.nz">catherine@byrnefamily.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Byrne</td>
<td>19 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael@byrnefamily.co.nz">michael@byrnefamily.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Huntington</td>
<td>17 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard@hlts.co.nz">richard@hlts.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Stimpson</td>
<td>16 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew@hlts.co.nz">andrew@hlts.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESIDENTS LETTER
Parking Regulations, Prime Road Grey Lynn

27 February 2019

John Strawbridge
Group Manager, Parking Services & Compliance
Auckland Transport
20 Viaduct Harbour Avenue, Auckland 1010
Private Bag 92250, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

Dear John,

Re: RESIDENTS LETTER
Parking Regulations, Prime Road Grey Lynn

This letter is to register our objection to current unrestricted parking in Prime Road following the implementation of Restricted Parking Zones (RPZ) in late 2018.

The parking situation has become untenable for residents of Prime Road, with daytime occupancy now at full capacity.

We the undersigned request that Auckland Transport immediately institute the Restricted Parking Zone to Prime Road.

Yours sincerely,

Signed By:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Allen</td>
<td>14 Prime Rd, Grey Lynn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:petera@pl.net">petera@pl.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Smith</td>
<td>14 Prime Rd, Grey Lynn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:prsmith@pl.net">prsmith@pl.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Skinner</td>
<td>12 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.skinner@tvz.co.nz">jane.skinner@tvz.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miri Soich</td>
<td>12 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sumich@yahoo.co.nz">sumich@yahoo.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luca Mongaio</td>
<td>12 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luca@1600ede.travel">luca@1600ede.travel</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nela Maw</td>
<td>2 Prime Road</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nela.maw@gmail.com">nela.maw@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hannah Romay</td>
<td>2 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:handyromay@gmail.com">handyromay@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagan</td>
<td>MCNAMARA</td>
<td>12B Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JMcNamara@gmail.com">JMcNamara@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janet McLan</td>
<td>16 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Janet.McLan@gmail.com">Janet.McLan@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cc. Pippa Coom / Waitematā Local Board
25 March 2019

John Dymond
john@dymondmclain.co.nz

Dear Mr Dymond

Auckland Transport – CAS-979757-RSG3F8 - Extension on the Grey Lynn RPZ

We refer to your correspondence regarding an extension on the Grey Lynn Residential Parking Zone (RPZ) to include Prime Road.

I appreciate the effort you have put together to gather these signatures from your surrounding neighbours.

Unfortunately, at this stage, Auckland Transport (AT) will not be extending the Grey Lynn RPZ. An extension of this sort would require a lengthy process.

I understand that my Parking Design Manager, Scott Ebbett, responded to your email in February explaining that we are prepared to install P120 parking restriction on one side of Prime Road. However, these will be general parking restriction and will not include parking permits. If this is the approach that you wish to take, please let us know.

In regards to the extension of the Grey Lynn RPZ, which will include parking permits for residents, my team is considering this as part of the work programme for next financial year. However, there are no firm timelines are available at this stage.

We trust the above has clarified the issue raised, however if you have any further queries, please contact Auckland Transport at customerliaison@at.govt.nz or on 09 355 3553.

Yours sincerely

John Strawbridge
Group Manager, Parking Services & Compliance
27 February 2019

John Strawbridge
Group Manager, Parking Services & Compliance
Auckland Transport
20 Viaduct Harbour Avenue, Auckland 1010
Private Bag 92250, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

Dear John,

Re: RESIDENTS’ LETTER
Parking Regulations, Prime Road Grey Lynn

This letter is to register our objection to current unrestricted parking in Prime Road following the implementation of Restricted Parking Zones (RPZ) in late 2018.

The parking situation has become untenable for residents of Prime Road, with daytime occupancy now at full capacity.

We the undersigned request that Auckland Transport immediately institute The Restricted Parking Zone to Prime Road.

Yours sincerely,

Signed By:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>30 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tanyappaduk@gmail.com">tanyappaduk@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DeMarco</td>
<td>28 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elwhile@gmail.com">elwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda下来</td>
<td>10 Prime Rd</td>
<td>mandagil.christakwad@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christakwad</td>
<td>8 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:samcossey@gmail.com">samcossey@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Cossey</td>
<td>3 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheryl.cayce@gmail.com">sheryl.cayce@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgina</td>
<td>5 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:g.w.martin@gmail.com">g.w.martin@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montague</td>
<td>9 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frithley@yahoo.com">frithley@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>11 Prime Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smallangaze@gmail.com">smallangaze@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEFORE & AFTER RPZ

22
BEFORE

2016
BEFORE

2017

Attachment A
BEFORE

2018
AFTER RPZ
2019
14 February 2:42pm 100% south side Prime Road

14 February 2:42pm 100% north side Prime Road

14 February 2:42pm west side Dryden 20%

14 February 2:42pm west side Dryden 50%

Waitematā Local Board
16 April 2019