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CELEBRATING LITERATURE & IDEAS SINCE 1999

IN THE WAIHEKE LOCAL BOARD AREA

Presentation by Anne O’Brien, Festival Director
AUCKLAND WRITERS FESTIVAL
SIX DAYS EVERY MAY AT THE AOPEA CENTRE

230+ Writers incl. 40+ International Writers
200+ Events – 70% Ticketed, 30% Free Admission
Three days of dedicated schools’ programming

Conversations, Presentations, Interviews, Lectures, Panel Discussions, Performances, Workshops, Catered Events and more
AUCKLAND WRITERS FESTIVAL 2018

ATTENDANCE OF 75,000+

Incl. 6800 Students & Teachers (upper North Island)
1000+ at free Family Day
TURNOVER: 2 MILLION

STAFF: 5 PERMANENT POSITIONS
SMALL CONTRACT TEAM FEB-MAY
110 VOLUNTEERS
SUCCESSES

- Reputation for excellence, locally & internationally
- Able to attract major writers from around the world
- Largest presenter of New Zealand writers in the world
- Largest attendance figures of any Australasian Book Festival
- 98% of audience satisfied+; 100% recommend to others
- Contributor to inclusive, vibrant, connected communities
CHALLENGES

- Raising two thirds of Festival budget annually - 1.3 million
- Reduced grants funding
- Tightening sponsorship market
- Limited internal capacity to sustain current growth
- Increasing artistic, production and travel costs
- ROI to Council on venue costs alone is 4 times amount received from Council
## Funding Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Festivals 2017</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>City/ State funding</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Writers Festival</td>
<td>72,500</td>
<td>$2m</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Writers Festival</td>
<td>80,000 (includes out of season)</td>
<td>$4.8m</td>
<td>$865,400</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Writers Festival</td>
<td>54,994</td>
<td>$2m</td>
<td>$501,100</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUCKLAND CITY DELIVERABLES

Cultural Benefit:
A major international event in the Waitāmatā Local Board area which welcomes celebrates and connects Aotearoa’s diverse communities

Economic Benefit:
• Intensive use of Auckland Council venues – hireage valued at 150K+plus; high F&B spend in-venue; inside ticketing charges
• More than 400 direct hotel bed nights valued at 100K+
• 20% out-of-Auckland attendance - 10,370 visitor nights & $1.4 million spend
• Surrounding city spend including parking and hospitality
• Contribution to regional GDP of $1.1 million
WHAT WE NEED

A robust and supportive partnership with key stakeholders at Auckland Council, sustaining this world-class event in Waitematā.

SUPPORT US TO THRIVE AND DELIVER
### Schedule of Support for The Galleries Presentation re Graham-Harding Precinct Traffic Management

Schedule completed at 3:45 pm 15th April 2019 by David Watt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive:</th>
<th>Dated</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Galleries</td>
<td>5-Apr-19</td>
<td>BC Owners Committee</td>
<td>23 Graham Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safari Group</td>
<td>2-Apr-19</td>
<td>Rob Noll, Director</td>
<td>147 Victoria Street West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle</td>
<td>3-Apr-19</td>
<td>Andrew Pitar, Head of Property</td>
<td>162 Victoria Street West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Post</td>
<td>2-Apr-19</td>
<td>Ash Patel, Property Manager</td>
<td>151 Victoria Street West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings A and B</td>
<td>2-Apr-19</td>
<td>Hamish Mackereth, Building Manager</td>
<td>2 - 4 Graham Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings A and B</td>
<td>2-Apr-19</td>
<td>Ben Harding, Augusta Capital, funder</td>
<td>2 - 4 Graham Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Corporation</td>
<td>12-Apr-19</td>
<td>Stephanie Rogers, Property Manager</td>
<td>151 Victoria Street West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpet Court</td>
<td>3-Apr-19</td>
<td>Jayne Skinner, National Admin Manager</td>
<td>5 Graham Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch Bakers</td>
<td>25-Mar-19</td>
<td>Jonny McKessar, principal owner</td>
<td>5 Graham Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Against:

There have been no votes against the submission from other owners and occupiers approached.

In total over 24 local owners and occupiers have been approached for letters of support.

There have been no advice of a contrary view received. There have however been a number of abstentions based on concern over relationship issues with AG/AT, or other reasons. These abstentions are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Reason for Abstention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penguin</td>
<td>1-Apr-19</td>
<td>Gilligan Shephard, NZ Agent</td>
<td>Overseas owner, relationship concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implied</td>
<td>35 Graham Street, AC Consents Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATEED</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implied</td>
<td>167 Victoria Street West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maersk</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-Apr-19</td>
<td>Bruce Jamieson, Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansons</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-Apr-19</td>
<td>Senior managers decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-Apr-19</td>
<td>Building Manager Spark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major developer with ongoing dealings with AG and AT, believed to be relations related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email traffic was lost in CBRE rep personal spam email and not found until 13th April. Only possible vote was to abstain, as Property Manager not available until 17th April.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmatives received</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstentions</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No responses</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support sought</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graham – Hardinge Traffic Management Deputation – additional papers.

The Deputation has considered the WHAT of this project, that is the order of completing Traffic Management design before undertaking cycle-way design.

The deputation is focussed on the WHAT, not the HOW?

In the course of research for the Deputation, it has been found that there are probable grounds to consider that AT is acting ultra vires its delegated authority, and that this matter needs to be escalated beyond AT for a resolution.

The papers attached address this aspect which is the HOW rather than the WHAT.

Only a few of the deputation members are aware of the HOW proposition and hence no claim is made that the support provided for the WHAT proposition covers the HOW Proposition.

Attached are:

- Schedule of Support for the WHAT proposition 1 page
- Schematic of the HOW proposition 1 page
- Encumberance 9508255.1 7 pages

David Watt 15 April 2019

Prepared by David Watt 15th April 2019, on the basis of providing a non-professional but simple way of describing the findings of research on public documents and in no way is intended for direct use by any party and in no way liability is accepted, given or implied in the provision of this information. Anyone wishing to check or use the information must do so independently of this summary and at their own risk.
### Tracing the potential for Ultra Vires Action by AT

**15-Apr-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared by David Watt 15th April 2019, on the basis of providing a non-professional but simple way of describing the findings of research on public documents and in no way is intended for direct use by any party and in no way liability is accepted, given as implied in the provision of this information. Anyone wishing to check or use the information must do so independently of this summary at their own risk.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Attachment C**

**Item 8.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDMP developed under ARTA Travelwise terms and conditions by Mansons (final version dated January 2010) was endorsed by AC by approval of Resource Consent in January 2010.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travelwise agreement as developed by Mansons and ARTA was endorsed by ARTA - please refer to ARTA Annual Report 2009/10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travelwise / TDMP required ARTA to place priority Encumbrance on to land title of 167 Victoria Street West.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition from ARTA to AT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The required Encumbrance on the Land Title of 167 Victoria Street West was filed by AT on 14 October 2013 under LT 9508288.1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This is a Land Transaction and cannot be undone by AT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This means that AT have recognised their obligations under the Legacy ARTA agreements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It appears that AT may therefore be bound by Legacy Arrangements which will prevent AT proceeding as it has planned with Cycleway First.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**If AT proceeds as it has planned, they are most likely to be acting ultra vires.**

**The solution is to stop work now and escalate the matter to AT Board and to AC.**
Attorney for the Encumbrance Certificate:

I certify that I have the authority to act for the Encumbrancee and that the party has the legal capacity to authorise me to lodge this instrument.

I certify that I have taken reasonable steps to confirm the identity of the person who gave me authority to lodge this instrument.

I certify that any statutory provisions specified by the Registrar for this class of instrument have been complied with or do not apply.

I certify that I hold evidence showing the truth of the certifications I have given and will retain that evidence for the prescribed period.

Signature:
Signed by [Name] as [Title] on [Date] at [Time].

End of Report
**Form E**

**Encumbrance Instrument**

*(Section 101 Land Transfer Act 1952)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected instrument identifier and type (if applicable)</th>
<th>Allpart</th>
<th>Area/Description of part or stratum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N461B/759</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Encumbrancer**

Mansons Properties (151 Victoria) Limited

**Encumbrantee**

Auckland Transport

**Estate or interest to be encumbered**

*Insert e.g. Fee simple; Leasehold in Lease No. etc.*

Fee Simple

**Encumbrance Memorandum Number**

N/A

**Nature of security**

State whether sum of money, annuity or rent charge and amount

Rent charge of $1.00 per annum

**Encumbrance**

*Delete words in () as appropriate*

The Encumbrance/encumbrances for the benefit of the Encumbrancer the land in the above computer register(s) with the above sum of money, annuity or rent charge, to be raised and paid in accordance with the terms set out in this Encumbrance Instrument and [above Encumbrance Memorandum] (Annexure Schedule[s]) and so as to incorporate in this Encumbrance the terms and other provisions set out in this Encumbrance Instrument and the [above Encumbrance Memorandum] [and] [Annexure Schedule[s]] for the better securing to the Encumbrancer the payment(s) secured by this Encumbrance, and complies by the Encumbrance with the terms of this encumbrance.
Form E continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Length of term – 999 years from the date of this encumbrance instrument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Payment date(s) – 1 June in each year if demanded prior to that date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rate(s) of interest - Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Event(s) in which the sum, annuity or rent charge becomes payable – if demanded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Event(s) in which the sum, annuity or rent charge ceases to be payable – Refer Annexure Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governants and conditions

Refer Annexure Schedule

Modification of statutory provisions

(Continue in Annexure Schedule(s), if required)
### Form L

#### Annexure Schedule

**Insert Instrument type:**

**Encumbrance Instrument**

**Page 1 of 4 Pages**

---

**1. DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATION**

**1.1 Definitions:** In this instrument, unless the context indicates otherwise:

- **Authorised Work** means the soil anchors as more particularly described in the Lease;

- **Encumbrancer** means the person named as the Encumbrancer in this instrument and includes the person for the time being registered as proprietor of the Land but only as long as he or she has an interest in the Land;

- **Land** means the Encumbrancer's land being Lot 1 Deposited Plan 47832 comprised in computer Trustees register NA07B/759 (North Auckland Registry);

- **Lease** means the lease between the Encumbrances as lessee and the Encumbrancer as lessee dated 5 September 2013, being a lease of subsoil below legal road adjacent to the Land; and

- **Transport** means Auckland Transport established under section 38 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 and its successors and, where appropriate, its officers and agents.

**1.2 Interpretation:** In this instrument, unless the context indicates otherwise:

(a) **Defined Expressions:** expressions defined in the main body of this instrument have the defined meaning throughout this instrument, including the background;

(b) **Headings:** clause and other headings are for ease of reference only and will not affect this instrument's interpretation;

(c) **Parties:** references to any party include that party's executors, administrators, successors and permitted assigns;

(d) **Persons:** references to a person include an individual, company, corporation, partnership, firm, joint venture, association, trust, unincorporated body of persons, government or other regulatory body, authority or entity, in each case whether or not having a separate legal identity;

(e) **Plural and Singular:** references to the singular include the plural and vice versa;
Annexure Schedule

Form L

Annexure Schedule

Insert instrument type

Encumbrance Instrument

Clause/Schedules/Attachments: references to clauses, schedules and attachments are to clauses in, and the schedules and attachments to, this instrument. Each such schedule and attachment forms part of this instrument;

Statutory Provisions: references to any statutory provision are to statutory provisions in force in New Zealand and include any statutory provision which amends or replaces it, and any by-law, regulation, order, statutory instrument, determination or subordinate legislation made under it; and

Negative Obligations: any obligation not to do anything includes an obligation not to suffer, permit or cause that thing to be done.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The Encumbrancer is registered as proprietor of the Land.

2.2 The Encumbrancer applied to Transport to occupy the subsoil below the road adjacent to the Land to enable it to construct the Authorised Work. Transport granted the Lease on condition that the Encumbrancer enter into and register this encumbrance as a first charge against the Land.

2.3 The Encumbrancer acknowledges and confirms the matters set out in this clause 2.

3. COVENANTS

The Encumbrancer covenants with Transport to perform the obligations in the schedule.

4. DISCHARGE

Transport will discharge this encumbrance on termination of the Lease and the satisfaction of the lessee’s obligations under the Lease or upon the subdivision of the Land in accordance with clause 22.3 of the Lease.
Form L
Annexure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument type</th>
<th>Encumbrance Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Continue in additional Annexure Schedule, if required.

5. **COSTS**
   
   The Encumbrancer will pay all legal costs directly or indirectly attributable to the preparation, registration, enforcement and discharge of this encumbrance.

6. **FIRST CHARGE**
   
   This encumbrance will rank as a first charge in respect of the Land.

7. **CONSENT OF ENCUMBRANCEE**
   
   Transport's consent will not be required to the registration of any instrument against the Land which has priority behind this instrument.

8. **IMPLIED TERMS**
   
   8.1 Sections 203, 204 and 265 of the Property Law Act 2007 apply to this encumbrance but otherwise (and without prejudice to Transport's rights of action at common law as a rent chargee or encumbrancer);

   8.2 Transport is entitled to none of the powers and remedies of encumbrances by the Land Transfer Act 1952 and the Property Law Act 2007; and

   8.3 no covenants by the Encumbrancer or his or her successors in title are implied in this encumbrance other than the covenants for further assurance implied by section 154 of the Land Transfer Act 1952.
Form L  

Annexure Schedule  

Inward Instrument Type  

Encumbrance Instrument

---

SCHEDULE  
(Covenants)

1. The Encumbrancer will at all times hold a copy of the Lease and observe and perform the covenants and conditions on the part of the lessee contained in the Lease.

2. The Encumbrancer may not:
   2.1 assign the lease, or  
   2.2 transfer the freehold estate in the Land,  
   except as anticipated by the Lease upon the subdivision of the Land.

3. Any breach of this clause will be deemed to be a breach of an essential term of the Lease entitling Transport to terminate the Lease immediately on notice in writing to the Encumbrancer.

---

23456789_1.docx
## Appendix:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>R Bidgood, AT</td>
<td>7-Feb-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Reply to R Bidgood</td>
<td>7-Feb-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>S. Ebbett</td>
<td>19-Feb-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Reply to S Ebbett</td>
<td>27-Feb-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Customer Liaison, AT</td>
<td>29-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Reply to Customer Liaison, AT</td>
<td>29-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Customer Liaison, AT</td>
<td>9-Apr-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Reply to Customer Liaison, AT</td>
<td>9-Apr-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Planning Map Prime Road Precinct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good afternoon Mr Dymond,

I am in receipt of your correspondence. As with any change to on road provisioning, we are required to consult. The consultation for the Grey Lynn / Arch Hill residents parking zone was extensive. We received a large amount of feedback from residents, associated stakeholders and the Local Board. From this a way forward was approved by AT.

Alok Vashista from the Parking Design Team, is formulating a response to you based on the combined feedback and recommendations made. He will have the information back to me by end of business Friday 08 February, from which Paige Kaimoana will prepare a response for you.

You can expect a response by end of day Monday, February 11, 2019.

Kind regards,

Rick

Rick Bidgood | Acting Group Manager Parking Services and Compliance
20 Viaduct Harbour, Auckland 1010
P 09 355 3553 | DDI 09 4475096 | M 0272770020
www.at.govt.nz

---

Hi Rick,

As advised by John Strawbridge’s auto reply email, please find attached letter re parking regulations in Prime Road Grey Lynn for your review.

Please confirm receipt of email and indicated time of for your response.

If you require any further information, please call me on 021 177 9712.
Best regards,

John D

John Dymond  
Registered Architect  
B Arch.[Unitec]  

JOHN DYMOND PROJECTS

From: John Strawbridge (AT) [mailto:John.Strawbridge@at.govt.nz]  
Sent: Tuesday, 5 February 2019 4:32 p.m.  
To: John Dymond  
Subject: Automatic reply: Parking Regulations Prime Road Grey Lynn

Thank you for your email. I am away from the office till 25 Feb 2019. Rick Bidgood will be in my management position. Rick can be contacted at:

Rick Bidgood | Parking Compliance Manager  
Parking Compliance Parking Services  
20 Viaduct Harbour, Auckland 1010  
P 09 355 3553 | DDI 09 4475096 | M 0272770020  
rick.bidgood@at.govt.nz

Paige Kaimoana will cover the administrative side of the business.  
Paige Kaimoana | Business Support Specialist  
20 Viaduct Harbour, Auckland 1010  
Private Bag 92250, Auckland 1142  
DDI 09 447 4055 | M 021 968 568  
www.at.govt.nz | pkoa.kaimoana@at.govt.nz

Thank you

John

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.

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.
John Dymond

From: John Dymond <john@dymondmcbain.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 7 February 2019 2:16 p.m.
To: ‘Rick Bidgood (AT)’
Cc: ‘Pippa Coom (Waitemata Local Board)’; ‘Paige Kalmoana (AT)’; ‘John Strawbridge (AT)’
Subject: RE: Automatic reply: Parking Regulations Prime Road Grey Lynn

Hi Rick,

Thanks for your prompt response.

I understand that Auckland Transport (AT) consulted widely in this, however in this instance I ‘missed the memo’ until current plans were in place.

Also I understand that AT are monitoring the knock-on effect of recent changes. I will continue to document the parking situation in our street as well.

Please note that I support AT’s initiatives around reducing car congestion in the Central Business District including promoting public transport and commuter bicycling. I simply do not believe that residential streets should be used as all-day parking stations by commuters.

I look forward to hearing from Paige.

Best regards,

John D

John Dymond
Registered Architect
BArch [Unitec]

From: Rick Bidgood (AT) [mailto:Rick.Bidgood@at.govt.nz]
Sent: Thursday, 7 February 2019 1:08 p.m.
To: John Dymond
Cc: Pippa Coom (Waitemata Local Board); Paige Kalmoana (AT); John Strawbridge (AT)
Subject: RE: Automatic reply: Parking Regulations Prime Road Grey Lynn

Good afternoon Mr Dymond,

I am in receipt of your correspondence.
As with any change to on road provisioning, we are required to consult.
The consultation for the Grey Lynn / Arch Hill residents parking zone was extensive.
We received a large amount of feedback from residents, associated stakeholders and the Local Board.
From this a way forward was approved by AT.
Alok Vashista from the Parking Design Team, is formulating a response to you based on the combined feedback and recommendations made. He will have the information back to me by end of business Friday 08 February, from which Pake Kamoana will prepare a response for you.

You can expect a response by end of day Monday, February 11, 2019.

Kind regards,

Rick

Rick Bidgood | Acting Group Manager Parking Services and Compliance
20 Viaduct Harbour, Auckland 1010
P 09 355 3553 | DDI 09 4475096 | M 0272770020
www.at.govt.nz

Auckland Transport

From: John Dymond <john@dymondmcbean.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 7 February 2019 9:26 a.m.
To: Rick Bidgood (AT) <Rick.Bidgood@at.govt.nz>
Cc: Pippa Coom (Waitemata Local Board) <Pippa.Coom@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Automatic reply: Parking Regulations Prime Road Grey Lynn

Hi Rick,

As advised by John Strawbridge’s auto reply email, please find attached letter re parking regulations in Prime Road Grey Lynn for your review.

Please confirm receipt of email and indicated time of for your response.

If you require any further Information, please call me on 021 177 9712.

Best regards,

John D

John Dymond
Registered Architect
B A rch . [U nitec]

From: John Strawbridge (AT) [mailto:John.Strawbridge@at.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 5 February 2019 4:32 p.m.
Hi John,

John and Rick asked me to respond to you. I also understand you have had a conversation with Jennifer in my team who was the project manager for the Grey Lynn residential parking zone.

Residential Parking Zones (RPZ) are effective at managing the parking issues in residential streets as we have seen with the Grey Lynn zone. Unfortunately each zone has a boundary and with all of our RPZ implementations we have seen parking issues on the adjacent streets outside the zone. I went for a drive around Grey Lynn last week and noticed that the parking issues are concentrated around sections of Egin, Dryden Street and Prime Road as you mentioned.

After consideration of the feedback received in the Grey Lynn Parking consultation with residents last year we suggested implementing the RPZ, monitoring the impact on surrounding streets, then applying sections of P120 to the streets outside the Residential Parking Zone where problems exist. These P120 restrictions would not cover the whole street and we would not issue parking permits to residents but it would create some space on the street for visitors.

We are draughting up a plan that we can discuss with the Grey Lynn Residents Association before sending this to residents. Please let me know if you have any comments.

Thanks

Scott Ebbett | Parking Design Manager
Parking Services
20 Viaduct Harbour, Auckland 1010
P 09 355 3553 | M 027 2894993
www.at.govt.nz

---

From: John Dymond <john@dymondmcbean.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 7 February 2019 9:26 a.m.
To: Rick Bidgood (AT) <rick.bidgood@at.govt.nz>
Cc: Pippa Coom (Waitemata Local Board) <pippa.coom@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Automatic reply: Parking Regulations Prime Road Grey Lynn

Hi Rick,
As advised by John Strawbridge’s auto reply email, please find attached letter re parking regulations in Prime Road, Grey Lynn for your review.

Please confirm receipt of email and indicated time of for your response.

If you require any further information, please call me on 021 177 9712.

Best regards,

John D

John Dymond
Registered Architect
B Arch. [Unitec]

John Dymond Projects

From: John Strawbridge (AT) [mailto:John.Strawbridge@at.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 5 February 2019 4:32 p.m.
To: John Dymond
Subject: Automatic reply: Parking Regulations Prime Road Grey Lynn

Thank you for your email. I am away from the office till 25 Feb 2019. Rick Bidgood will be in my management position. Rick can be contacted at:

Rick Bidgood | Parking Compliance Manager
Parking Compliance Parking Services
20 Viaduct Harbour, Auckland 1010
P 09 355 3533 | DDI 09 4475096 | M 0272770020
rick.bidgood@at.govt.nz

Paige Kaimoana will cover the administrative side of the business.

Paige Kaimoana | Business Support Specialist
20 Viaduct Harbour, Auckland 1010
Private Bag 92250, Auckland 1142
DDI 09 447 4685 | M 021 928 096
www.at.govt.nz | paige.kaimoana@at.govt.nz

Thank you

John

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.

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.
Hi Scott,

Thanks for your letter and for acknowledging that the current parking situation in Prime Road, which is untenable for residents.

Please note that my view is that a partial 120 minute restricted zone, with no resident’s permit is not a viable scheme.

This scheme will potentially see residents being ticketed for parking violations while parking outside of their own home.

As can be seen from attached photographs, Prime Road is currently at full parking capacity during business hours, while adjoining streets with RPZ have reduced the occupancy to half capacity.

Please implement Restricted Parking Zone (RPZ) to Prime Road as soon as practically possible.

Best regards,

John D

CC Pippa Coom

John Dymond
Registered Architect
BArch, [Unitec]

JOHN DYMOND PROJECTS

From: Scott Ebbett (AT) [mailto:Scott.Ebbett@at.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 19 February 2019 4:59 p.m.
To: john@dymondmcbain.co.nz
Cc: John Strawbridge (AT); Jennifer Fraser (AT)
Subject: RE: Automatic reply: Parking Regulations Prime Road Grey Lynn

Hi John,

John and Rick asked me to respond to you. I also understand you have had a conversation with Jennifer in my team who was the project manager for the Grey Lynn residential parking zone.

Residential Parking Zones (RPZ) are effective at managing the parking issues in residential streets as we have seen with the Grey Lynn zone. Unfortunately each zone has a boundary and with all of our RPZ implementations we have seen parking Issues on the adjacent streets outside the zone. I went for a drive around Grey Lynn last week and
noticed that the parking issues are concentrated around sections of Elgin, Dryden Street and Prime Road as you mentioned.

After consideration of the feedback received in the Grey Lynn Parking consultation with residents last year we suggested implementing the RPZ, monitoring the impact on surrounding streets, then applying sections of P120 to the streets outside the Residential Parking Zone where problems exist. These P120 restrictions would not cover the whole street and we would not issue parking permits to residents but it would create some space on the street for visitors.

We are drafting up a plan that we can discuss with the Grey Lynn Residents Association before sending this to residents. Please let me know if you have any comments.

Thanks

Scott Ebbett | Parking Design Manager
Parking Services
20 Vladuct Harbour, Auckland 1010
P 09 355 3553 | M 027 2894893
www.at.govt.nz

From: John Dymond <John@dymondmcbain.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 7 February 2019 9:26 a.m.
To: Rick Bidgood (AT) <Rick.Bidgood@at.govt.nz>
Cc: Pippa Coom (Waitemata Local Board) <Pippa.Coom@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Automatic reply: Parking Regulations Prime Road Grey Lynn

Hi Rick,

As advised by John Strawbridge's auto reply email, please find attached letter re parking regulations in Prime Road Grey Lynn for your review.

Please confirm receipt of email and indicated time of for your response.

If you require any further information, please call me on 021 177 9712.

Best regards,

John D

John Dymond
Registered Architect
B Arch. [Unitec]
John Dymond

From: CustomerLiaison (AT) <CustomerLiaison@at.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 25 March 2019 12:27 p.m.
To: john@dymondmcbain.co.nz
Cc: Pippa Coom (Waitemata Local Board)
Subject: Auckland Transport – CAS-979757-R5G3F8 - Extension on the Grey Lynn RPZ
Attachments: Auckland Transport – CAS-979757-R5G3F8 - Extension on the Grey Lynn RPZ.pdf

Dear Mr Dymond,

Thank you for your correspondence with Auckland Transport on 5 March 2019 regarding an extension on the Grey Lynn Residential Parking Zone (RPZ) to include Prime Road. We apologise for the delay in responding to you and thank you for your patience while we looked into it.

Please find attached a response from Group Manager, Parking Services & Compliance, John Strawbridge for your reference and consideration.

I trust that this information is of use to you.

Kind regards

Shilpi | Customer Liaison Advisor
Customer Liaison Team
20 Viaduct Harbour Ave, Auckland 1142
E customerliaison@at.govt.nz

Working together to create an awesome journey — first time, every time

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.
Dear Shilpi,

Thank you for your email of 25 March 2019 with attached letter from John Strawbridge, Group Manager, Parking Services & Compliance.

Please find attached letter of response to John Strawbridge, along with updated Residents’ Letter for reference and files of Auckland Transport.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

If you require any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Best regards,
John Dymond

For and on behalf of Residents of Prime Road

Cc  John Strawbridge
     Pippa Coom, Waitakere Local Board

John Dymond
Registered Architect
B Arch. [Unitec]

JOHN DYMOND PROJECTS

From: CustomerLiaison (AT) [mailto:CustomerLiaison@at.govt.nz]
Sent: Monday, 25 March 2019 12:27 p.m.
To: john@dymondmcbean.co.nz
Cc: Pippa Coom (Waitakere Local Board)
Subject: Auckland Transport – CAS-979757-RSG3F8 - Extension on the Grey Lynn RPZ

Dear Mr Dymond,

Thank you for your correspondence with Auckland Transport on 5 March 2019 regarding an extension on the Grey Lynn Residential Parking Zone (RPZ) to include Prime Road. We apologise for the delay in responding to you and thank you for your patience while we looked into it.
John Dymond

From: CustomerLiaison (AT) <CustomerLiaison@at.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 8 April 2019 8:57 a.m.
To: John Dymond
Cc: Pippa Coom (Waitemata Local Board)
Subject: RE: Auckland Transport – CAS-979757-R5G3FB - Extension on the Grey Lynn RPZ

Dear John,

Thank you for your email. We acknowledge receipt of it and appreciate the effort you have put together to gather additional signatures from your surrounding neighbours.

As advised in our previous communication, AT will not be extending the Grey Lynn RPZ at this stage as an extension of this sort would require a lengthy process.

However, as communicated to you by our Parking Design Manager, Scott Ebbett in February, 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.

Please note that in regards to the extension of the Grey Lynn RPZ, while John’s team is considering this as part of the work programme for next financial year, there are no firm timelines available at this stage.

I hope this helps.

Kind regards

Shipli | Customer Liaison Advisor
Customer Liaison Team
20 Viaduct Harbour Ave, Auckland 1142
E customerliaison@at.govt.nz

Working together to create an awesome journey – first time, every time

From: John Dymond <john@dymondmcbain.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 29 March 2019 11:03 a.m.
To: CustomerLiaison (AT) <CustomerLiaison@at.govt.nz>; John Strawbridge (AT) <john.strawbridge@at.govt.nz>
Cc: Pippa Coom (Waitemata Local Board) <pippa.coom@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Auckland Transport – CAS-979757-R5G3FB - Extension on the Grey Lynn RPZ

Dear Shipli,

Thank you for your email of 25 March 2019 with attached letter from John Strawbridge, Group Manager, Parking Services & Compliance.
Dear Shilpi,

Thanks for your email,

Best regards,

John D

John Dymond
Registered Architect
B Arch [Unitec]

From: CustomerLiaison (AT) [mailto:CustomerLiaison@at.govt.nz]
Sent: Monday, 8 April 2019 8:57 a.m.
Cc: Pippa Coom (Waitemata Local Board)
Subject: RE: Auckland Transport – CAS-979757-R5G3F8 - Extension on the Grey Lynn RPZ

Dear John,

Thank you for your email. We acknowledge receipt of it and appreciate the effort you have put together to gather additional signatures from your surrounding neighbours.

As advised in our previous communication, AT will not be extending the Grey Lynn RPZ at this stage as an extension of this sort would require a lengthy process.

However, as communicated to you by our Parking Design Manager, Scott Ebbett in February, 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.

Please note that in regards to the extension of the Grey Lynn RPZ, while John’s team is considering this as part of the work programme for next financial year, there are no firm timelines available at this stage.

I hope this helps.

Kind regards
Wendy Gray - Waitemata Local Board submissions in support of Notice of Motion of Local Board member Rob Thomas WLB meeting Tuesday 16 April 2019

I am here to speak in support of the Notice of Motion of Rob Thomas and to educate and raise your awareness about the information that was missing from Community Facilities’ proposal when they obtained your support for their deeply flawed scheme to clearfell the Western Springs Pines.

I have brought along a document today that I found in Auckland Council Archives very recently. It is directly pertinent to Community Facilities’ proposal.

It was produced by the NZ Ministry of Forestry in December 1988 and it considers the very questions that you have been asked to consider by Community Facilities. It comes to a very different conclusion.

A conclusion motivated by knowledge of clearfelling practices and experience of pines and pine forest management. Something that has never been in evidence in any of the expert documents produced in support of this flawed plan nor apparent in the qualifications or experience of the persons charged with the management of this fragile, unique, forest Significant Ecological Area.

One difference with Local Board and Council motivation is the priority in this report given to an overall objective to preserve and “perpetuate the forest and maintain its natural and aesthetic values”.

It considers the conflict between the retention of the forest, the public safety issues and the destructive nature of logging.

The original Council Facilities plan was for logging and the current plan is a mish mash and not fully thought through, we don’t really know what they intend to do now.

The current plan adds complications especially with regard to the replanting proposals. It is the worst of all worlds especially regarding soil and erosion pollution of Motions stream, no consideration has been given to its effect on the “at risk declining” long-fin eel. Neither have they adequately addressed the long term stability of the slope. The possible issues for residents of the fragile double brick houses on top of the slope and long term erosion issues, given NIWA reports of more heavy rainfall events, have never been addressed.

Turning to the document please refer to pages 17,18 and 19.

At page 17 it describes the management options, as relevant today as they were in 1988. Retaining the Status Quo, Clearfelling the stand, and 2 types of Thinning concluding at page 19 that “Clearfelling would result in a total loss of the aesthetic and natural values for at least the next 10 years while the forest regrows and then it would take a further 10 -20 years to mature before the forest structure that exists at present begins to reform.”
We have now had another 30 years of understorey and biodiversity development since 1988 so add another 30 years to that assessment. We are now looking at 50 to 60 years before the forest structure that currently exists begins to reform on current conservation practices.

At page 19 paragraph 5 the report recommends "Removal of the obviously unstable trees and a sign warning people of the dangers of being in the forest, especially in high winds is considered adequate protection for the public."

This has always been the community solution and we continue to recommend it to You as the way forward.

It would also serve to educate the public about trees and help them to develop a "tree sense". Today people are very removed from nature, they are not tree or nature sensitive. They love to be surrounded by landscaping, see the Ponsonby Park proposals, but have no understanding whatsoever about biodiversity, trees and how nature works. Most importantly, why trees are necessary to continuing life on this earth. Like everything in life there is a risk and our children need to understand this and not try to shelter under a tree in a storm. This forest is a unique educational environment to teach our children how to live in co-creation and co-operation 'with' nature.

"The forest is a dynamic and changing environment" we are told at page 19 paragraph 6. "The pine trees are dying and will continue to do so over the next 20-50 years. As they die and light enters the forest floor more canopy regeneration will occur." This has happened. The report recommends that following health thinning the forest be underplanted with suitable canopy species.

Whilst we live in an age where it is fashionable to hate pine trees, those of us who are interested in the facts are aware that our native biodiversity are not so influenced by 'fashion or political correctness' as we are. Native plants have always grown under pine trees plus our native biodiversity likes pines too. As Ngai Tahu have just discovered to their embarrassment in the South Island where they knowing destroyed an endemic native beetle by clearfelling and for good measure, chipping, the only pine forest habitat where it existed.

This report argues that the "pines are the focal point of the forest and as such should be perpetuated. Therefore it is recommended that a variety of trees such as rimu, totara, miro, kauri, tawa and radiata pine be planted to ensure and encourage the perpetuation of this valuable urban forest." Given that our native bat likes pine perhaps consideration of planting pine should be given?

The very fact that we are having to make all these submissions to you about this deeply flawed proposal at a time when forests are considered the best way to manage climate change is scandalous.
I submit Community Facilities’ plans regarding this forest are deeply flawed and should not proceed any further. I support the Notice of Motion of Board Member Rob Thomas.
8 December 1988

Mr G J Bradbourne
Director of Parks
Auckland City Council

Dear Sir

Please find attached 3 copies of the report on Western Springs pine forest. I trust all is self explanatory and am looking forward to your comment upon its content.

If satisfactory I intend to use a similar approach for the subsequent stands. I will contact you on Dec 15th or 16th regarding the remaining work.

Yours sincerely

P H Langston
Consultant
Western Springs Pine Forest Management
Auckland City Council

Mr P W Langston
Ministry of Forestry
CPO Box 39
Auckland

Ph: (09) 33-269
Fax: (09) 32-558
Summary

The Auckland City Council owns a 3 hectare woodlot of pine trees within the Western Springs greenbelt. The trees are approximately 60 years old and showing signs of senescence and instability. The forest is an important ecological and cultural asset. The management objectives in order of priority are:

1. To retain the forest's intrinsic values.
2. To provide an environment that is safe for public use.
3. To manage the resource in such a way as to perpetuate its life.
4. To utilise the wood where possible.

Forest Description:

The two most important features of the forest are its ecological structure and its adjacent landusers. Underneath the pine canopy a forest community has developed, from the buildup of an organic litter through to sub-canopy shrubs. There were no major canopy species regenerating that would provide a natural succession to the pines.

The forest is surrounded by the Western Springs Stadium, the Auckland Zoological Gardens, the Lakeside Park and a group of residential neighbours. All of these groups have a significant level of interaction with the forest.

Forest Users:

The forest has a high number of uses because of its location within an urban environment.

1. The forest is a prominent landmark and is visually dominant.
2. The area has developed into an "urban forest" that is an important ecological habitat.
3. The forest provides a recreational source that ranges from passive to that of an informal adventure playground.
4. The forest is an integral part of the historic development of the area and at 60 years of age is one of New Zealand's oldest stands of radiata pine.
5. The tall trees act as a shelter to the immediate neighbours from the wind.
6. The forest acts as a buffer for the zoo and neighbours against noise generated within the nearby stadium.
7. The forest reduces water runoff onto the animal compounds directly adjacent.

Health and Stability:

The pine trees are 55 to 60 years old and showing typical signs of senescence. The trees are in good overall health with no signs of nutrient or moisture stress. Pathogens are attacking an estimated 28% of the trees, as a result of previous structural damage. 60 to 80 percent of the trees are considered stable and healthy while only 9 to 15 percent are considered immediately unstable.
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Brief

The Auckland City Council own a woodlot of pine trees within the area known as the western springs greenbelt. The pine trees are some 60 years old and showing signs of senescence and instability. The purpose of this study was to assess the physical condition of the stand and its current uses, discuss future management options possible and finally recommend a suitable management strategy. The report will be used as a brief of intention to the relevant community interest groups.

Management Objectives and Policy

In determining the management policy and objectives for the Western Springs Pine Forest, the issue of different landuse conflicts need to be resolved. The area is zoned Recreation B (Passive Recreation) within the Auckland City Council district scheme.

"Land zoned Recreation B will be retained principally as open space for passive and informal recreation. Provision is made for pleasure areas, play facilities, riding and boat launching ...." (Section 3 Page 33, City of Auckland District Scheme 1981).

Such zoning is consistent with the Auckland City Council’s recreation strategy of providing for present and future recreational needs.

- recreation land is a finite valuable and scarce resource.
- zoning provides for a wide range of recreational activities.
- recreation zoning is a positive means of conserving and protecting areas of aesthetic, ecological, scientific or natural importance.

Conflicting with this zoning, is the need to protect the public from an unsafe environment. The pine trees are showing signs of senescence and instability that poses a potential danger to public safety. Under the district scheme the Auckland City Council has the right to remove trees where they are judged to be dangerous because of disease or damage or if the loss of the tree is offset by the greater community benefit. (Section 4, Page 4, City of Auckland District Scheme).

A follow-on from the removal of trees for public safety, would be to remove the trees in such a way that the maximum revenue possible is guaranteed. Such a removal operation would be subject to the following conditions.

- the extent and method of removal will give priority to preserving and protecting the remaining trees and the understorey.
- any removal must include a replanting plan.

Finally, before any management decision is made, the public must be fully advised and consulted.
Barring catastrophe this stand of pine trees will live for a further 20 to 60 years. During this time there will be a gradually increasing mortality rate.

**Timber Volume and Value:**

The forest contains an estimated 2000 cubic metres of merchantable wood at a value of some thirty to forty thousand dollars. Both volume and value are declining as mortality exceeds growth rate and wood degrade occurs with fungal and insect attack.

To harvest the wood will be complex and expensive given, the forests location in an urban area and the high level of skill required to operate in a manner that is environmentally acceptable.

**Management Recommendation:**

It is recommended that all trees considered immediately unstable and a threat to public safety be removed. This can be done on an “as required” routine basis or as a periodic operation. The trees to be felled are not considered to have any significant commercial value.

It is recommended that the area be underplanted with suitable canopy species. This will ensure the forest is perpetuated beyond the pines future life expectancy of 20 to 60 years. A variety of species will be required to suit the variety of micro environments that occur.

Production thinning was not considered an acceptable option. The trees provide a high degree of mutual support. Removal of some of the trees would render those remaining highly unstable. Furthermore production thinning would cause an unacceptably high level of damage to the forests intrinsic value.

Clearfelling was not considered a suitable option because of the unacceptable level of damage to the forests intrinsic values that would be sustained while the level of instability and public danger does not warrant such extreme action.
Purpose Of The Report

Based upon the management objectives discussed above, this report has the following purposes:

1. To assess the physical character of the forest.
2. To determine the current and potential uses of the forest resource.
3. To assess and describe the health and stability of the pine trees.
4. To assess wood volume and value of the pine trees and the feasibility of harvesting the forest.
5. To identify and assess the management options possible.
6. To recommend a suitable management strategy that takes full regard of the Auckland City Councils management objectives and the conflict of issues involved.
7. To make the report available to the relevant community committee and general public for comment.

Methodology

The study was carried out in five stages.

1. Assessment Of Use Of The Woodlot:

The existing and potential uses of the forest were assessed by physical inspection and a series of interviews with Mr Graham Bradbourne, the Director of Parks for the Auckland City Council, Mr Hans Hewles, the Manager of the Western Springs Stadium who is responsible for the management of the woodlot and Mr Mick Sibley, the Curator of the Auckland Zoological gardens.

2. Assessment Of The Pine Trees Health And Stability:

The stands overall health, condition and stability was assessed by general observation and a full assessment of a sample of individual trees for stem and root stability and overall health.

3. Assessment Of The Pine Trees Commercial Timber Volume, Quality And Value:

Three plots were located and the pine trees stocking, size and merchantable volume and type were estimated. This sample estimate was then used to derive the total stand volume and value.

4. Based on the above assessments, a series of broad management options were identified and their feasibility in terms of management practicability and conflict of interests discussed.

5. Given the Auckland City Councils priority of management objectives the best overall management option was recommended.

Description Of Property

Location:

The Western Springs Pine Forest is situated within the area known as the Western Springs greenbelt that incorporates the Auckland Zoo, the Western Springs Stadium and the Western Spring Lakeside Park (refer Map 1).
Area:
The total area of the forest as shown on Map 2 is approximately 3.3 hectares. The actual stocked area (i.e. containing pine trees) is approximately 2.3 hectares.

Terrain:
The forest lies on a hillside facing predominantly to the southwest. There are two major gullies and three major ridges running down the hillside. This results in a terrain that is predominantly easy to rolling but also contains some short steep slopes, that would limit internal access by heavy machinery.

Access To The Forest:
There are three access points to the forest as marked on Map 2. Access point A is through the Stadium maintenance area. Photograph 1 shows access point A. Vehicle width would be limited to approximately 4 metres and there is no turning area beyond the photograph for a large truck.

Access point B is through a now unused gate that has been overgrown. There is no vehicle access beyond the gate.

Access point C, for pedestrians only, is across a concrete pipe/bridge. This was not built as a bridge but is used as such.

Internal access within the forest is limited at present to a series of foot tracks that extensively cover the forest.

Construction of vehicle access within the forest would require side cuts and topsoil removal.

Soils:
Photograph 2 taken at the bottom of the forest near the stadium gate, shows a view of the soil profile. Topsoil is skeletal although within the forest there has been a deep buildup (10 cm plus) of humus.

There were no obvious signs of soil erosion, where earth cuts have occurred in the past. However any logging and machinery activity will remove much of the light organic layer and topsoil that has built up over the years.

Flora:
Pinus radiata are the only canopy trees within the forest. There are some willows scattered along the creek banks on the south west boundary.
There is now a dense understorey of sub-canopy species regenerating. The regenerating pattern is that of a typical forest mosaic reflecting the different micro environments and site conditions. Appendix 1 gives a list of the different species observed, this list is by no means exhaustive. Photograph 3 and 4 are typical views within the forest. The undergrowth ranges in vigor and type from; bare needle litter where the pine canopy is dense to clumps of tree ferns on the more moist and steep faces, through a variety of successional species (1 to 8 metres in height) to the hard ridge tops where pioneering species such as gorse are growing under the light filled canopy gaps.

No canopy species (native or exotic) were observed regenerating within the forest. This could be caused by a number of factors. The most likely being the lack of an available seed source or the mechanism necessary for introducing seed.

Fauna:

As with the flora no attempt was made to quantify the levels of fauna present. However by urban standards the area carries a diverse and large amount of wildlife covering the whole range from insects such as the native termite through to rodents, cats and a variety of birds that use the site as either a permanent or temporary home.

History and Age:

No historical records were found about the trees. It is generally considered that the pine trees were planted in the depression years between 1928 to 1933 by relief workers. This suggests that the trees are 55 to 60 year of age.

Boundary Interface:

Broadly, there are four boundary interfaces that need to be considered.

1. Residential:

The north eastern boundary of the forest interfaces directly with nine private residential properties on West View Road. The boundary is fenced.

2. Zoological Gardens:

The northern end of the south western boundary interface with the zoological gardens. The northwest boundary backs directly onto some animal compounds. Refer Photograph 7. The entire boundary is well fenced.

3. Western Springs Lakeside Park:

Most of the south western boundary is adjacent to the Western Springs Lakeside Park. Access to the forest is restricted by a creek that runs along the boundary. The only dry access for pedestrians is across a concrete pipe/bridge marked on Map 2 as access point C.

4. Western Springs Stadium:

The eastern boundary of the forest interfaces with the Western Springs Stadium. A 4 to 5 metre high concrete block wall topped with barbed wire runs the entire length of the boundary. The forest has been clearfelled the length of the boundary between 20 and 40 metres away from the wall as shown on Map 2.
Forest Uses:

The forest is used both actively and passively in a variety of ways. While these uses are generally interrelated they can be broadly summarised as follows.

1. Soil And Water Protection:

The trees cover a small area of what is an intensively developed catchment and has little apparent impact on control of water runoff. However at the north west boundary the forest adjoins the zoo directly above animal compounds. Removal of disturbance of the forest would increase the flow of surface water through the animal compounds.

The soil is a clay with a thin and poorly developed topsoil that has accumulated a dense organic layer within the forest. Any machinery working within the forest will remove much of the organic buildup that has occurred.

Structurally there is no evidence of soil erosion or earth flows. The soil is not known to be prone to erosion problems should the forest be disturbed.

2. Ecological Habitat:

The area has developed over the years into an urban forest that is an important ecological habitat. There has been a gradual buildup to the point where the forest is now home to or used by a wide variety of fauna and flora.

While no mammals were seen, it would be reasonable to assume the forest is home to a number of 'city mammals' such as cats, rats, hedgehogs and possibly possums. A variety of birds use the forest, rosellas and parakeets are common, apparently they favour the soft pine wood for pecking. Blue herons have been seen roosting in the trees from time to time. (Mick Sibley pers comm). A colony of shags that use the nearby lake roost in one of the edge trees. Other birds observed included grey warblers, fantails, blackbirds, pigeons and minaws, no doubt there are others.

Insects were observed within the organic ground layer and the decomposing limbs of the trees and shrubs (termites and bhuu grubs) while signs of leaf chewers were readily obvious.

3. Landscape:

The forest is a prominent landmark within the Western Springs greenbelt and is visually dominant.

- As a distant view from the motorway,
- As an important backdrop to the zoological gardens (refer Photos 7 & 8).
- As a major backdrop to the vista from within the lakeside park (refer Photos 9, 10 & 11)
- As a backdrop to the residents of West View Road.
- As a forest setting for the internal recreational users (refer Photos 4, 5, & 6)

To disturb the forest would disturb its impact as a vista.
4. Recreation:

Recreational use of the forest is predominantly passive, as a backdrop to the adjacent activities of people visiting the zoo and lakeside park.

Internal recreational use appears limited to casual walking and an informal childrens play area. There is an intensive network of tracks (refer Photograph 3) and huts throughout the forest. Interestingly no evidence was observed of either camping or fires. The forest is an interesting and unusual environment within the city for people to explore and play in.

5. Historical:

Although there are no historical records available regarding the area, the stand is some 60 years old and as such can be considered an integral part of the history of Auckland and in particular the development of the Western Springs greenbelt.

Radiata pine is normally clearfelled well before it reaches the age of 50. To the authors knowledge this stand is one of the eldest in New Zealand and as such could be of national historical significance.

6. Shelter:

A tall forest canopy such as this (32-40 metres high) provides an important buffer from the wind. It provides shelter for the West View Road residents from the south westerly winds. To a lesser extent it provides some shelter to the zoo from the north easterly wind especially for the animal compounds directly adjacent.

7. Noise Buffer:

A forest is a natural absorption buffer against noise. The Western Springs Stadium is often a venue for high noise activities such as rock concerts, speedway events and fireworks displays. While it would be difficult to quantify, the forest will reduce the levels of noise heard by the zoo animals and to a lesser extent the local residents.

8. Timber:

Radiata pine is the most important source of commercial timber in New Zealand. This stand contains 500 to 700 large merchantable trees that will produce approximately 2000 cubic metres of roundwood with a residual value (i.e. less the cost of logging and transport) of some thirty to sixty thousand dollars ($30,000 - $60,000).

The forest is used by 4 groups of uses for a variety of different uses. In looking at management options it is necessary to consider both present and potential uses. A summary of these uses is given in Table 1.
### Table 1: Summary Of Forest Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Users</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
<th>Potential Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public &amp; Lakeland Park</td>
<td>Visual backdrop - motorway.  - Lakeland Park.</td>
<td>Develop walking and interpretative tracks, and possibly a managed adventure area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>Recreation - walking tracks. - exploration &amp; play.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoological Gardens</td>
<td>Visual backdrop. Source of branches, cones and insects</td>
<td>Integrate as part of the zoo, includes possible use as animal compounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the animal compounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing wildlife it carries, is a complimentary habitat to the zoo proper Protection for the animals from wind and noise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of water runoff for the animal compounds adjacent to the north western boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Utilisation</td>
<td>None at present.</td>
<td>Timber extraction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree Health And Stability:

Assessment Method.

Thirty six trees (approximately 5% of the total population) were individually assessed with respect to stem stability, root stability, stem form, lean and overall tree health. Selection was made within the sample plots.

Each of these characteristics was given a visual rating as a method of quantifying the results.

1. **Tree Lean**: The degree of lean of the stem from the perpendicular;
   - 0  - 0 - 5 degrees
   - 1  - 6 - 15 degrees
   - 2  - 16° and over.

2. **Stem Form**: The shape of the stem;
   - S - Straight of form.
   - K - Stem kinked, containing a potential structural defect.
   - C - Stem growing in a curve and under tension.

3. **Stem Stability**: The observed stem stability;
   - 0 - Stem stable.
   - 1 - Stem contains defects (such as ramicorn branches, multileaders and mechanical damage) that will eventually cause instability.
   - 2 - Stem is structurally unstable.

4. **Root Stability**: The observed stability of the tree with respect to root structure;
   - 0 - Good root system and tree stability.
   - 1 - Root system contains faults that could lead to tree instability.
   - 2 - Root system unsound and tree unstable.

5. **Tree Health**: An assessment of the tree health with respect to nutrient or moisture stress and attack by pathogens;
   - H - Healthy tree.
   - I - Tree under stress or attached by pathogens.

Results:

The results of the assessment are summarised below. The individual tree results are given in Appendix 2.
Table 2: Summary of Assessment of individual tree health and stability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number of Trees</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stem Form</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinked</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curved</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Lean</td>
<td>&lt; 5°</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 15°</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 15°</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem Stability</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially unstable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Stability</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially unstable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Health</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infected</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Stand Condition:

The trees are 55 to 60 years old and 32-40 metres in height and are showing typical signs of senescence; thin crowns, heavy cone production and early needle loss. Growth increment is likely to be minimal and total merchantable volume is declining as the level of heart rot and tree mortality exceeds actual growth.

However, the stand is still in a relatively sound state as the summary in table 2 shows. The foliage was generally in good condition displaying a lush green colour and good needle elongation. Approximately 28% of the trees are under attack by pathogens as a result of previous structural damage (stems and large branches splitting or tops breaking). All of the trees were attacked by native termites, however their boring appeared to be limited to the dead branch stubs and some minor penetration of the trunk.

Of primary concern to the Auckland City Council is the stand’s stability and safety to the general public. The sample evaluation and general observation suggest that most of the trees are healthy and stable (60-80%).
The stand condition can be summarised:

72% of the trees were healthy, of the infected trees none were showing signs of nutrient and moisture stress, infection appeared to be a result of mechanical damage and inherent instability.

9 to 15% of the estimated 700 trees were considered immediately unstable. In all cases this instability was due to either poor root form and or the tree growing on a severe lean. There were no obvious signs of likely stem breakage, although there was ample evidence throughout the forest of tops having broken out. Many of those unstable trees occur predominantly along the eastern boundary where previous clearfelling has occurred.

A further 33% of the trees have defects that will lead to future problems of tree instability and stem breakage. While it is difficult to put an actual value upon this statement, 10 to 20 years is a reasonable time frame to expect. A management thinning would exacerbate this potential instability because the trees rely upon each other for mutual support.

Overall the stand is in a healthy and stable state. Mortality is at present low (based upon the number of dead and topped trees) and the immediate danger to the public is considered low although it would be wise to discourage access in periods of high winds. How rapidly this level of stability will decline, is largely unknown.

In its natural environment, radiata pine is considered a short lived tree with a life expectancy of 60 to 100 years though it may persist for longer (Mirov 1976). In an artificial environment such as this it may live longer for reasons such as better growing conditions and a lack of natural pathogens. To speculate is dangerous, but based upon actual observation this stand can be expected to live a further twenty to sixty years, with a steady rate of tree mortality and stem breakage occurring.

Assessment Of Timber Value And Volume:

Radiata pine is New Zealand's most important and versatile source of commercial timber. An assessment of the quantity, quality and value of the timber within the Western Springs stand was made. A sample of three 400 metre square plots was used. Individual plot data is given in Appendix 2 while the results are summarised in Table 3 below.
Table 2: Summary of Plot Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot No.</th>
<th>Plot Stocking</th>
<th>Stems Per Hectare</th>
<th>DBHOB (cm)</th>
<th>Mean Merch Height (m)</th>
<th>Volume (m³/ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 (2 dead)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Limit</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wood Volumes:

Based upon the above plot data:

- merchantable volume per hectare @ 900 cubic metres
- stocked area (refer Map 2) @ 2.3 hectares
- Total merchantable volume @ 2000 cubic metres

Cost Of Logging

Given the small area, its isolation relative to suitable equipment and the need to avoid soil disturbance on the site, a cost to log and load in the vicinity of $20.00 per cubic metre is realistic.

Value Of Wood

Based upon current local market values, the value of these trees would be approximately $40.00 per cubic metre on truck with a range of $30 - $50 depending upon market conditions at time of sale.

This gives a residual stumpage value (revenue to the tree owner less logging and transport costs) of approximately $20.00 per cubic metre.
Table 4: Estimated Wood Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wood value on truck ($/m$^3$)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood value on stump ($/m$^3$)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total volume (m$^3$)</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value ($)</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>57,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of the wood lies between $30,000 and $60,000 dollars, a realistic value at this stage is $40,000. Should the decision be made to clearfell the stand a more precise assessment of volume, value and cost of logging should be made.

Management Options:

A number of management options were considered, they are by no means exhaustive and no doubt there are others. However the options discussed and considered below account for the issues that are considered of major importance for future management decision making.

1. Status Quo:

The first option to consider is that of retaining the status quo. The advantage of such an approach would be retention of the intrinsic values essential for the woodlots existing use. Such an option however does not remedy the problem of public safety. The survey of tree health and stability suggests that some 9% of the trees are at the stage where they will topple or break within the near future while a further 6% are unstable dead stems.

2. Clearfell:

Clearfelling of the stand is a feasible option that will solve the problem of public safety and as well provide a revenue to the council of some thirty to forty thousand dollars. Unfortunately clearfelling will eradicate the existing environment and its associated landuses which are considered of priority importance.

Any harvesting activities will result in significant damage if not complete destruction of the understorey and existing topsoil.

3. Production Thin:

An intermediate option would be to production thin the stand, selecting a final crop stocking of approximately 100 stems per hectare. Selection of trees to be removed would leave the strongest and most stable trees only. The theoretical advantage of such a method would be to reduce public danger and generate some revenue ($10,000 - $20,000) without totally compromising the other land uses.
However this option is considered unrealistic for the following reasons;

- The stability of the trees is dependant upon their mutual support. To remove two thirds of the trees will remove this support for the remaining crop, accelerating their level of instability.

- Production thinning is a difficult operation. There would be a high level of disturbance to the soil and understory. To keep this damage to an acceptable level will require a very skilled and experienced operator and specialised equipment, neither of which appears readily available in the Auckland vicinity. The resource is not of sufficient size to economically justify the development of a suitable operation procedure.

There are a variety of production thinning alternatives that could be considered such as; thinning out the biggest and best trees, or removing the trees in clumps, or leaving a fewer or greater number of final crop trees. However in all of these cases as with the one discussed, production thinning is not justified because of the level of disruption to the forests natural and aesthetic values and the instability that will result.

4. Health Thin:

A fourth option is to remove the currently unstable and dangerous trees. The total volume of merchantable wood will be approximately 200 cubic metres.

Approximately 10-15% of the trees would be felled. There are three options for utilising the fallen trees.

1. Leave them to rot and recycle (Photo 6).
2. Extract for timber value.
3. Extract for firewood.

The value of the wood will be low because the trees are defected, and subject to pathogen attack and often growing under tension. Furthermore any extraction to a level that is environmentally acceptable will be very expensive for such a low volume.

Discussion And Recommendation:

The overall objective of any management recommendations for this woodlot is to preserve the natural and aesthetic values that it provides. In preserving these values, care must be taken to ensure that the publics safety is protected given the pine trees present level of instability. A complication to this overall objective is provided by the desire to perpetuate the forest and maintain its natural and aesthetic values, given that radiata pine is considered old at 60 to 80 years of age. A further complication to the primary objective is the desire to utilise the timber from the stand that will otherwise be lost as the stand declines in quality and volume.

Four management options were considered, they highlight the basic conflict that exists in trying to retain the natural and aesthetic values while at the same time actively managing for timber, public safety and longevity. The greatest conflict is between the retention of the forest value and logging given the destructive nature of logging.
To recoup wood revenue by clearfelling or production thinning is not considered a realistic option. Clearfelling would result in a total loss of the aesthetic and natural values for at least the next ten years while the forest regrows and then it would take a further ten to twenty years to mature before the forest structure that exists at present begins to reform.

Production thinning will result in a revenue from wood production, in the vicinity of some twenty thousand dollars (1000 cubic metres at $20.00 per cubic metre residual value). However it will leave a forest that has had its aesthetic and natural values reduced, by major disturbance to its soil, understorey and visual appearance. Furthermore removal of two thirds of the pine trees will remove the mutual support the trees currently have and it is highly probable that the remaining trees would rapidly become unstable.

The 'do nothing' option does not correct the problems of public safety nor of perpetuating the forest.

The Auckland City Council has a responsibility to ensure the public's safety within the vicinity of the forest. Present internal use of the forest at present is low. Removal of the trees or exclusion of people would guarantee public safety, however this is an extreme option to take. Removal of the obviously unstable trees and a sign warning people of the dangers of being in the forest, especially in high winds is considered adequate protection for the public.

It is recommended that thinning of the unstable trees be undertaken within the stand to a level that ensures public safety and encourages further understory regeneration. The thinning could be carried out on an as required basis as a routine annual operation or as a specific one-off operation.

The forest is a dynamic and changing environment. The pine trees are dying and will continue to do so over the next 20 to 50 years. As they die and light enters the forest floor more canopy regeneration will occur. At present there are no canopy trees occurring within the forest suggesting, an unsuitable growing environment for the light demanding pines to regenerate, and a lack of seed source or dispersed mechanism for the indigenous canopy trees that could be expected. It is difficult to state categorically that no successional canopy will occur naturally but there is a risk in assuming otherwise. It is recommended that following the health thinning, the forest be underplanted with suitable canopy species. The choice of species is likely to be mixed given the mosaic of sites that exists within the forest.

The choice of species to underplant will depend largely upon the management objectives. The previously clearfelled area has been replanted with a variety of native shrubs and trees indicating a desire to attain a more indigenous environment. It could be argued that the pines are the focal point of the forest and as such should be perpetuated. Therefore it is recommended that a variety of trees such as rimu, tohara, micro, kauri, tawa and radiata pine be planted to ensure and encourage the perpetuation of this valuable urban forest.

The utilisation of the wood produced from the health thinning is likely to be in the vicinity of 200 cubic metres of low grade timber that will be difficult and commercially unviable to extract. Therefore it is recommended that the trees be felled and left to decompose (an important stage of the forest cycle). It is possible a small enterprise could extract the fallen trees for firewood. If extraction is undertaken, care must be taken to ensure that the soil and understorey are protected.
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Appendix 1:

Plant Species Present in Understorey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pittosporum eussifolium</th>
<th>Karo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittosporum tenuifolium/eugeniodes</td>
<td>Tarata, Lemonwood, Hohuha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudopanax arbores</td>
<td>S finger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coprosma species</td>
<td>Mahoe, Whiteywood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melicytus ramiflorus</td>
<td>Matipo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrsine australis</td>
<td>Hangehange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geniostoma ligustrifolium</td>
<td>Houhere, Lacock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoheria populnea</td>
<td>Cabbage tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordyline australis</td>
<td>Ponga, Silver fern,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyathea dealbata</td>
<td>Tree fern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuricoria species</td>
<td>Solarum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solium maritannum</td>
<td>Gorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulex europaeus</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus monogyna</td>
<td>Queensland coral tree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also present was a ground layer of ferns, grasses, herbs and annuals.
Appendix 2:

Plot Data

Plot 1 Area 0.04 ha (100m x 4m)

Observations: 100m x 4m transect running approximately NWW from the NE boundary. All trees have termite infection on branch occlusion. The leaning trees are unstable only at stand edge where they are leaning away from the stand, otherwise they have mutual support. Vigorous understorey but no canopy trees observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>D.B.H. O.B. (cm)</th>
<th>Merch Height (m)</th>
<th>Merch Vol (m$^3$)</th>
<th>Merch Grade</th>
<th>Stem Stab</th>
<th>Root Stab</th>
<th>Tree Health</th>
<th>Stem Form</th>
<th>Tree Lean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Diplodia

Plot Summary

Stems per hectare 325
Mean D.B.H. O.B. (cm) 60.4
Merchantable volume (m$^3$) 37.3
Appendix 2:

Plot Data

Plot 2 Area 0.04 ha (100m x 4m)

Observations: 100m x 4m transect running approximately NWW in stand centre.
All trees have termite infection.
Lush undergrowth of lemonwoods and tree ferns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>D.B.H. O.B. (cm)</th>
<th>Merch Height (m)</th>
<th>Merch Vol (m$^3$)</th>
<th>Merch Grade</th>
<th>Stem Stab</th>
<th>Root Stab</th>
<th>Tree Health</th>
<th>Stem Form</th>
<th>Tree Lean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plot Summary:

Stems per hectare - 300
Mean DBH OB (cm) - 60.4
Merch. vol (m$^3$) - 36.5
Appendix 2:

Plot Data

Plot 3 Area 0.04 ha (100m x 4m)

Observations: 100m x 4m transect running S to SE from the northern boundary. Crowns 5 to 10 metres deep and narrow. Heavy coning. Average height 35 metres, range 32-38 metres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>D.B.H. O.B. (cm)</th>
<th>Merch Height (m)</th>
<th>Merch Vol (m³)</th>
<th>Merch Grade</th>
<th>Stem Stab</th>
<th>Root Stab</th>
<th>Tree Health</th>
<th>Stem Form</th>
<th>Tree Lean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plot Summary:

Stems per hectare - 325
Mean DBH (cm) - 60.4
Merch Vol (m³) - 38.7
PHOTOGRAPHS

1. Access at point A. Maximum width of 4 metres

2. Soil profile at forest edge

3. Inside the forest, vigorous regeneration, walking tracks and leaning trees.
4. Inside the forest, vigorous but open regeneration.

6. The forest edge adjacent to Lakeside park

5. Decaying logs are an important part of the forest cycle.
Item 9.1

7. A view from the Zoo showing adjacent animal compounds and the forest backdrop.

8. The forest backdrop from within the Zoo.
The forest backdrop from various points within the Lakeside park.
I want to talk about the impact that some of the decisions the Boards are making or not making have upon our city.

The current decision to remove all non indigenous trees from Mangere Maunga has split that community and has stirred up hatred. For that to happen in the light of Christchurch was disgusting. The weeks of helicopters made it feel like a war zone. We went there but we’re too late to save the trees and to have input from all the knowledge that we have gained from Western Springs and how the ONLY solution is succession planting.

Sadly the short minded decision was made the Resource Consent wasn’t publicly Notified. That doesn't make sense as there are view shafts from far afield of the Maunga and we as a city are highly impacted by such a decision.

Mt Eden is our closest Maunga and is clearly seen from all of Waitemata.
Do we have input on the trees on Mt Eden? The decision of removal of any exotic tree on Mt Eden or any of these Maunga highly affects all Aucklanders. The Domain and Albert Park are other volcanoes, is there a plan to remove all exotic trees off the Domain too?

I'm just trying to show you how silly the decision is. Views of volcanoes define Auckland and we don't want them to be bald.

The only acceptable method of replacing trees with indigenous trees is by succession planting so the exotic canopy can protect the seedlings. Exactly as we have suggested in Western Springs. Then wait 30 years to decide whether the exotic trees stay or go. Hopefully in 30 years the decision makers will be more evolved than the current ones and will make the wise decision to keep all trees and not view exotics as "Pest Plants".
The birds don’t give a flying fig whether their homes are indigenous or not.  
Phil Goff’s one million trees weigh far less than one of the 150 year old macrocarpa that was murdered on Mangere. We need to bring back Tree Protection as he promised me.

Jacinda said that Climate Change is this generation’s "Nuclear Free" moment. How can you think that cyclelanes and creating congestion by blocking off streets and lowering speeds is the way to stop climate change while you're ripping of these carbonsinks, oxygen creators and city coolers? Shame on you!

I've just returned from New Plymouth and seen the great care they take of Pukekura Park. This too is a manmade lake and a planted park. Looking at it from the perspective of your plans for Western Springs Park and again I say "Shame on you"

Gael Baldock
Appendix A: Advocacy initiatives

A key role of the local board is to advocate for initiatives that the local board may not have decision-making responsibilities or funding for this annual plan but recognise the value it will add to the local community. Key advocacy areas for this local board include:

1. The following is the priority capital project for the local board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy position</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advocating to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ponsonby Park at 254 Ponsonby Road</td>
<td>Secure funding, resource and support to deliver the community’s agreed vision and chosen design for Ponsonby Park 254 Ponsonby Road as soon as practicable. Stage 1 – To deliver a civic and green space, repurpose the existing canopy structure for markets and events and develop public toilet facilities. Stage 2 – to repurpose the existing building and improve the adjoining streetscape. Potential funding options for stage 2 include the local boards Auckland Transport capex fund and other alternative funding sources.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The following are priority advocacy areas for the local board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy position</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advocating to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Auckland Council should be actively building or enabling others to be providing affordable and fully accessible housing meeting universal design criteria on its own land, including building more intensified affordable housing on its existing and new pensioner housing complexes. Council should also prioritise, support and partner affordable housing to be provided by iwi and by community housing associations and providers through advice, bonds, guaranteeing loans, and resource and building consents.</td>
<td>Governing Body, Panuku Development Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing solution for homeless people</td>
<td>The Governing Body to partner with the Waitematā Local Board to enhance provision of city centre public amenities such as toilets, showers and lockers. The Governing Body to financially support the development of the Auckland City Mission’s HomeGround development. The Governing Body to increase funding to support Housing First Auckland.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work towards eliminating agrichemical use</td>
<td>The Governing Body needs to allocate funds on a regionally consistent basis to reduce the use of agrichemicals, support non-chemical weed control techniques and to increase the overall maintenance budget for parks, open spaces and the road corridor to enable the elimination of agrichemicals.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce wastewater flows into waterways and the Waitematā Harbour</td>
<td>Our harbours, beaches and streams are being polluted by overflows from ageing sewerage and stormwater systems that can’t cope with heavy rainfall and from contaminants washed into natural waterways. We support accelerating the water quality programme to deliver the required infrastructure</td>
<td>Governing Body, Healthy Waters Watercare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the delivery of localised solutions for all four catchments (Maorea Reef, Grey Lynn, City Centre and Parnell/ Newmarket) to provide a major and early reduction in the volume and frequency of wastewater overflows and contaminants entering waterways and the Waitematā Harbour. This includes the agreed separation of the combined stormwater and wastewater systems in St Marys Bay and Herne Bay in the shortest practicable timeframe and a review of the requirement for a stormwater tunnel for the St Marys Bay & Masefield Beach Improvement Project.

Auckland Domain Capital Improvements Budget
Allocate adequate capital funds to progress concepts set out in the Auckland Domain Master Plan, including for improved pedestrian and cycling circulation, vehicle circulation and vegetation management.

The following are other advocacy areas for Waitematā Local Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy Position</th>
<th>Advocating to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts, Community and Events</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure Auckland’s regional arts and cultural institutions and programmes are financially sustainable</strong> - to secure appropriate funding to ensure the financial sustainability of projects, facilities, venues and events including the delivery of the free entertainment programme currently delivered by Regional Facilities Auckland</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pt Erin Pool Redevelopment Initiative</strong> - Prioritise Pt Erin Pool for redevelopment according to the recommendations endorsed by the Waitematā Local Board in 2013 in relation to two potential development concepts.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland is an age friendly city</strong> - The Board advocates for a city where the voices, needs, priorities and rights of all ages are an integral part of public policies, programmes and decisions. An age friendly city can help build social and economic conditions for strong families and connected communities and help achieve a city that is fit for all.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Peace</strong> - to support the development of a regional policy that prohibits the marketing and sales of weapons of war and prohibits speakers who promote intolerance and hate speech using council facilities including facilities managed by Council Controlled Organisations.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ponisby Road Arts Precinct</strong> - support the creation of an arts precinct at 1-3 Ponisby Road through transferring 3 Ponisby Road from a commercial lease to a community arts facility, subject to the outcome of a business case.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Council Living Wage</strong> - ensure that there is budget provision of a ‘living wage’ for council employees and extend to contract employees.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Policy</strong> - follow a policy of social and environmentally responsible investment.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speedway at Western Springs</strong> – support the relocation of Speedway from Western Springs Stadium once an appropriate alternative site has been identified and developed</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Community Recycling Centre</strong> - Deliver the centre supported by Waitematā, Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa local boards at the site identified on Great North Road. This facility is a critical part of council’s adopted Waste Management and Minimisation Plan forward work programme and the resource recovery network which underpins part of this work.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air quality improvements</strong> – support measures that improve air quality in the city centre.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governing Body**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 17</th>
<th>Governing Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Tree Protection – Auckland Council to advocate for changes to the Resource Management Act 1991 to enable councils to reintroduce general tree protection rules to maintain and increase the urban forest.</td>
<td>inating Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO Low Carbon Targets - advocate to the Governing Body for CCOs to include low carbon targets in their Statements of Intent.</td>
<td>Governing Body, CCOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Use Plastic - support mechanisms to eliminate single use disposable plastic items.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container deposit scheme – support the introduction of a container deposit scheme to reduce litter, increase recycling streams and provide a source of community funds.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised food waste collection and composting scheme – support the decentralisation of food waste collection to support individuals composting at home and local urban food farming. With the objective of providing education, behaviour changes and creating local employment, providing local healthy food production, reducing transport carbon miles, creating a long-term sustainable model and reducing cost to ratepayers.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management levy – to advocate to central government for an increase in the waste levy to $140 per tonne.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Controlled Organisations - Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) to support Waitāmatā Local Board Plan priorities including:</td>
<td>All Council Controlled Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support the introduction of low impact storm water solutions in the local board area;</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support delivery of green walls, roofs and community gardens on CCO assets such as car parking buildings;</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• implementation of the Waitāmatā Local board’s Low Carbon Action Plan.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Heritage</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Quarter – take action to progress the City Centre Master Plan objectives for the Victoria Quarter area to deliver a quality urban neighbourhood that enhances the area’s historic character where the safety of pedestrians is prioritised.</td>
<td>NZTA, Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlile House - ensure the restoration and protection of Carlile House and consider acquisition if necessary.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration and protection of the St James Theatre – Auckland Council to provide support to the restoration and protection of St James Theatre.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnell Station – Parnell Station opened in early 2017 to limited services. The local board wants to ensure Parnell Train Station is operational to full services and accessible to all users at the earliest opportunity including installation of appropriate wayfinding signs, tenantry the station building and installation of ticket gates.</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnell Train Station Pedestrian and Cycling Connections - Provide accessible pedestrian and cycling connections to Parnell Station. Open the Greenways route from the Strand through the old Parnell rail tunnel and create accessible pedestrian connections from Parnell Station to the Domain, the Strand and Parnell Town Centre.</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Cycle Network - The completion of the Auckland cycling network will provide improved cycle infrastructure through safe, connected, dedicated cycle ways.</td>
<td>Auckland Transport, NZTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Station Square Access - improve access between Broadway and Station Square in Newmarket and link to the Newmarket Laneways Plan</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety Broadway – work with Auckland Transport to implement solutions which improve pedestrian safety on Broadway including the pedestrian desire line between Station Square and Tedd Street in Newmarket.</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail – deliver light rail City Centre to Mangere route as soon as practicable</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Streets - Auckland Transport to adopt a target of zero serious injuries or deaths on our roads as part of a comprehensive safe systems approach to road safety including safe road design, enforcement, safer speeds and driver education.</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Safe and appropriate speeds
Support slower speeds that are safe and appropriate in residential areas, through our villages, town centres and in the city centre. 
- Auckland Transport

### Maximise Renewal and Maintenance Opportunities
Consider how every renewal and maintenance project can be leveraged to improve the road design for all users including layouts that include bus lanes, greenways, and cycle lanes, remove cycle pinch points and add better pedestrian crossings.
- Auckland Transport

### Improved Safety and Amenity for Pedestrians
- Auckland Transport to improve intersections with substantial foot traffic for pedestrians and developing solutions to improve safety and amenity for pedestrians. This includes: all intersections with left-slip lanes and no pedestrian facility; intersections with long pedestrian crossing delays undertaking route optimisation for pedestrians in the city centre including automatic pedestrian phases on one-way streets.
- Auckland Transport

### Change Give Way Rule
- Auckland Transport to advocate for a change of the give way rule requiring motorists to give way to pedestrians crossing parallel to the priority (main) road at intersections.
- Auckland Transport

### Residential and Town Centre Parking Schemes
- Auckland Transport to continue implementing residential parking schemes to manage commuter parking in central Auckland suburbs following consultation with residents.
- Auckland Transport

### Consultation on the Footpath Renewal Plan
- Auckland Transport to develop the 2019/2020 footpath renewal programme in consultation with the Waitematā Local Board.
- Auckland Transport

### Greenways Prioritised Routes
- Auckland Transport to work with Auckland Council to deliver the Waitematā Local Board Greenways prioritised routes.
- Auckland Transport

### Street trees and greenery
- Auckland Transport to provide opportunities for greenery in every streetscape improvement and renewal and Auckland Council to meet the consequential operational expenditure for maintenance.
- Governing Body
- Auckland Transport

### Additional Waitematā Harbour Crossing
- Ensure that the design of the additional harbour crossing prioritises rapid public transport
- Auckland Transport
- NZTA

### Deliver the Parnell Plan Transport Projects
- work with Auckland Transport to plan and deliver the transport projects set out on the Parnell Plan such as the Parnell Greenway and streetscape upgrades of St Georges Bay Road.
- Auckland Transport

### Development Response
- budgets for all major infrastructure projects to include adequate funding for effective Development Response to ensure businesses impacted by the works can be supported.
- CRLL
- Auckland Transport
- Governing Body

### Wayfinding signs
- work with Auckland Transport to plan and deliver wayfinding signage in the City Centre, on No Exit streets with pedestrian accessways, paths leading to reserves and parks and providing direction to cycleways
- Auckland Transport

### Other matters

#### Cruise ships on Captain Cook Wharf
- support the relocation of cruise ships to Captain Cook Wharf to reduce the impact of the Cruise Ship industry on the important public open space on Queens Wharf
- Governing Body

#### Full Council ownership of Ports of Auckland
- ensure Ports of Auckland Ltd remains in full accountable council ownership.
- Governing Body