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Hibiscus and Bays Local Board
Community Grants Programme 2019/2020

Purpose
Grants help groups and organisations to provide activities, projects, programmes, initiatives and events that make a positive contribution to the community within the local board area.

The local board would like to see applicants demonstrate that they are working collaboratively with other community groups and have identified alternative funding partnerships. It is important for groups and organisations to be sustainable and deliver good community outcomes.

Important Advice for Applicants
Applicants are encouraged to read the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Plan before submitting an application.

You will be asked to identify how your project aligns with one or more of the local board plan priorities and how the project will benefit the community.

Ensure that you clearly outline the contribution you are making to the project within the local board area.

The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board plan can be found on the Hibiscus and Bays Community page.

Priorities
The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board has confirmed the following priorities for its contestable community grants. In your application identify how your events/projects/activity will contribute to one or more of the following:

- Place-shaping which includes adding value or making improvements to our community spaces
- Promote economic benefits locally
- Leisure or sporting opportunities that encourage the community to be more active
- Improving and enhancing access and amenity in parks, reserves and coastal areas
- Youth activities including leadership, education and training
- Inter-generational and “age-friendly” activities that support participation
- Artistic and creative opportunities for people and our community
- Education on pollution prevention, stream care or stream enhancement projects
- Restoration and environmental projects including pest free and waste minimisation initiatives
- Acknowledge New Zealand history and showcase our local heritage.

Other important factors (where appropriate to a proposed event/project or activity):
The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board will also take into account whether the applicant:

- is making a contribution to the event or project (financial, volunteer time etc.)
- has identified collaboration and working with other groups to deliver an event/activity and seek funding collaboratively
- is utilising and supporting volunteer groups through the delivery of an event or project
- will get the community involved early on, by working collaboratively and creating opportunities to meet new people and share experiences
- is part of the sun-smart programme (for outdoor activities)
- has considered health and safety in the design of their event or project
- provides promotes Smoke Free programmes as part of their event or project.
Lower Priorities
The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board has identified the following as lower priorities:
- Wages and salaries, with the exception of fees for professional and specialised services
- Ongoing operational costs
- Churches and Educational Institutions, except where these groups can demonstrate the wider community benefit

Limitations
Applicants are generally ineligible to apply for the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board contestable grants if they have had two successful grant applications within the current financial year.

General Exclusions
The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board will not consider grants for financial assistance for:
- Activities that do not relate to one or more of the local board plan outcomes and priorities
- Activities or projects where the funding responsibility lies with another organisation or central government
- Prizes for sports and other events (except trophies)
- Commercial business enterprises and educational institutions in accordance with the Council’s Community Grants Policy (Scope and Eligibility, Page 20)
- Internal applicants to fund projects, programmes or facilities run by Auckland Council or its employees
- Auckland Council CCO's or organisations who receive funding from the Auckland Regional Amenities Fund.
- Applications for activities or projects outside of the local board area*
- Commitment to ongoing funding or financial support
- Applications to subsidise rentals, reduce debt or payment of rates
- Applications for the purchase or subsidy of alcohol or costs associated with staging after-match functions
- Grants for the sole purpose of an individual
- Family reunions
- Debt servicing
- Legal expenses
- Activities that promote religious or political purposes
- Medical expenses.

*With the exception of multi-local board applications where a benefit to the local board area can be shown

Contestable Grant Amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of grant</th>
<th>Local board's proposed figures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Response Grants</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Grants</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant Round Application Dates
Quick Response grant rounds for 2019/2020 will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round:</th>
<th>Open date</th>
<th>Close date</th>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Projects to occur after:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>9 September 2019</td>
<td>4 October 2019</td>
<td>11 December 2019</td>
<td>12 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>6 April 2020</td>
<td>1 May 2020</td>
<td>17 June 2020</td>
<td>1 July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: there will not be a third quick response round due to the local government elections in 2019.

Local Grant rounds for 2019/2020 will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round:</th>
<th>Open date</th>
<th>Close date</th>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Projects to occur after:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>12 July 2019</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>3 February 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>20 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-board funding

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board will also consider funding multi-board grant applications in collaboration with other local boards. Applicants will need to clearly demonstrate how their intended project, event or activities will specifically benefit people and communities in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-board grant round:</th>
<th>Open date</th>
<th>Close date</th>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Projects to occur after:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>20 January 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>20 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obligations if you receive funding

In order to ensure that the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board grant achieves positive results, recipients will be obligated to provide evidence that the assistance has been used for the agreed purpose and the stated outcomes have been achieved. Obligations will be outlined in a funding agreement that the applicant will be required to enter into.

The following accountability measures are required:

- The completion and submission of accountability forms (including receipts), proving that grants have been used for the right purpose
- Any grant money that is unspent and not used for the project must be returned to the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board
- Recognition of the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board’s support of your initiative (e.g. using the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board logo on promotional material).
Report to the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board 15th May 2019
Outcome: Communities are strong, safe, supported and well connected.

**Whangaparaoa Community Hub Activation**

- Create a sense of belonging, a welcoming place in the main town center and community gathering place
- Encouraging space for community lead responses to identified needs
- Community activator connecting and working with other local facilities – e.g. Library to collectively activate spaces and places

- In total 2000 people came through the Hubs doors in a seven month period
- There are 1000+ facebook followers and this continues to grow
Outcome: Communities are strong, safe, supported and well connected.

Community Activation Events

- **A Very Coastie Christmas** - a free community event collaborating with Whangaparaoa Library & Coast Plaza; family activities, live music etc
- **A Very Special Coastie Christmas** - for children with special needs/disabilities and their families; a collaboration between Parent to Parent, Relax Kids, FW Trust & Chambers & Co
- **Movies in the Park** – fun photo event
Outcome: Everyone cares about wellbeing, works together and young people are valued and supported.

**Whangaparaoa Wellbeing Network**

- Space for community lead responses to identify needs, share and promote, and work together
- Local capacity building workshops on different topics – (including supporting attendance at Te Ao Māori workshop)
- Youth leadership project – supporting CYC to develop youth engagement and leadership

- Meetings of the wellbeing network held bi-monthly and are well attended 30 – 40 people, engaging in discussion, speakers and collaborative projects
- FW umbrellaing Wellbeing Network Youth Project
Outcome: Local economies are strong and business is innovative and thriving.

Business Whangaparaoa

- Seed, support and umbrella the development of a local business network and business association
- Business Activator to support local business initiatives and hub activate activation
- Series of networking and business related events
- Job training and employment support research

Launch of membership model:

- Attendance 83
Now:
- 37 Members
- 30 Full Members
- 7 Associate Members
Next Steps – 2019 - 2020

Future Whangaparāoa

Four Signature Community Events
• Collaborating with others to run a series of events across the Whangaparāoa Peninsula

Whangaparāoa Community Hub
• Key partner in community hub providing development and activation support

Whangaparāoa Wellbeing Network
• Connecting, capability building and working to meet need
• Supporting youth project
• Developing Wellbeing Toolbox
• Supporting intergeneration and age friendly projects

Collaboration
• Working with other organisations to activate communities and spaces
3 Manuwai Rd Subdivision and Development (Lot 19 DP 34441)
Re: Resource Consent No: BUN60311259, LUC60311261 SUB 60311230

The main concerns that we have with this development are as follows.

1. Due to the number of dwellings of this development and the large number of restricted discretionary activities, all boundary neighbours expected that they should have been notified.
2. Subdivision lot sizes are not in keeping with the Mixed Housing Suburban Zone of 400m².
3. The development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.
4. More than 2-3 dwellings on this site was based on a court decision for a retirement home not a residential area.
5. The total area of all proposed lot sizes is 24m² more than the available 997m² site.
6. There is a major overland flow path through this site, no documentation for retention tanks.
7. The major overland flow path is stated to be diverted around the proposed development, this will cause erosion and flooding.
8. The maximum impervious area is greater than 60% in a major overland flow path that already causes flooding.
9. Contaminated soil washed around the site has a potential to affect the very sensitive wetlands and detention ponds that contain native eels and Imangas.
10. The estimated earthworks are understated, due to the soft ground at the lower end of the property.
11. The number of carparks per dwelling for a 4-bedroom home are less than the current recommendations of two parks for a two to three bedroom home.
12. Based on 4 bedroom homes, there will be a substantial extra number of cars parked on the road that is only 6m kerb to kerb – this will block emergency service access.
13. The car manoeuvring areas into the single carparks will require three-point turns to access, it is stated “that residents will get used to it”.
14. Due to the size and number of properties, all adjacent properties will lose their privacy and have increased noise, due to the number of people (20) accessing and living in these dwellings.
15. Outlook spaces are not in keeping with the current requirements.
16. There are a large number of restricted discretionary activities, based on attempting to squeeze too many dwellings onto a site that does not accommodate these.
17. Request for an internal audit and a review of the resource consent.
18. Request for a meeting with Auckland Council.

1. Due to the number of dwellings of this development and the large number of restricted discretionary activities, all boundary neighbours expected that they should have been notified.

We have recently had a meeting with all local neighbours who have highlighted concerns about this development and as to why none of the boundary neighbours who notified and therefore not allowed to offer their thoughts and concerns overall.

We are aware of a number of planning issues concerning this property that I would have thought in other circumstances would have required this development as proposed go through a notifiable procedure.

In this case where there are four or more dwellings of which there are a large number of discretionary activities including heights in relation to boundaries, a major overland flow path, soil contamination, reduced number of carparks, yard sizes, outlook spaces to name a few – this implies that this development is not of a usual standard of development – and should have required notification to all boundary property owners.

2. Subdivision lot sizes are not in keeping with the Mixed Housing Suburban Zone of 400m².

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board
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If the above minimum subdivision size was followed, then the maximum number of dwellings that could be established on the 997m² site would be two dwellings within the minimum size of 400m² per site.

Based on the Unitary Plan H.4.1 - Zone description, it is stated as follows:

“Up to two dwellings are permitted as of right subject to compliance with the standards. This is to ensure a quality outcome for adjoining sites and the neighbourhood, as well as residents within the development site”

Having a 250% increase on the above standard, goes far beyond ensuring a quality outcome for our adjoining sites and the neighbourhood, which are predominantly one to two dwellings on a full site as seen in the following image representing the immediate neighbouring area.

3. The development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Proposed dwellings compared to surrounding properties

The objectives of zoning are defined as:

- achieve the planned suburban built character of the zone;
- achieve attractive and safe streets and public open spaces;
- manage the effects of development on neighbouring sites, including visual amenity, privacy and access to daylight and sunlight, and
- achieve high quality on-site living environments.

Also

Achieve the planned suburban built character of predominantly two storey buildings, in a variety of forms by:

- limiting the height, bulk and form of development;
- managing the design and appearance of multiple-unit residential development;
- and requiring sufficient setbacks and landscaped areas.

and

“Require the height, bulk and location of development to maintain a reasonable standard of sunlight access and privacy and to minimise visual dominance effects to adjoining sites.”

If the 5 dwellings are to proceed then this will not meet the above definitions and will affect the bordering properties privacy, natural sunlight as well as increased noise due to the amount of car traffic on the driveway.

As these properties are also small in size they do not offer a high quality on-site living environment expected with a four bedroom home and due to the issues of parking required this does not ensure attractive and safe streets – only adds to the problem.
4. More than 2-3 dwellings on this site was based on a court decision for a retirement home not a residential area.

In the application to get approval for more than the standard two dwellings, there has been a clear direction pointing to a previous Environment Court Decision which was based on allowing a retirement home to have more dwellings than the rule and zoning states – it was not based on standard residential properties.


So, this is very misleading information and should not be considered as applicable in this case, retirement dwellings after normally smaller in size to accommodate one to two people per dwelling and they also include additional parking spaces and facilities that assist in supporting these additional dwellings.

5. The total area of all proposed lot sizes is $24m^2$ more than the available $997m^2$ site.

All sites as indicated on the notification are less than the defined subdivision size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Lot Number</th>
<th>Dwelling Reference</th>
<th>Gross Site Area</th>
<th>Net Site Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>206m$^2$</td>
<td>148m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>191m$^2$</td>
<td>141m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>191.4m$^2$</td>
<td>145m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>216m$^2$</td>
<td>145m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>217m$^2$</td>
<td>209m$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the total size (the sum) of the above Gross Site Area for all properties above and as indicated on the plans comes to $1,021.4m^2$, while the total lot size is $997m^2$ being a discrepancy of $24m^2$. This clearly indicates that a thorough application process and approval has not been completed.

6. There is a major overland flow path through this site, no documentation for retention tanks.

A major concern we all have with the proposed development is the control of the overland flooding that does occur on a regular basis, where the current property at 3 Manuwai Road experiences a torrent of water running under and through the basement.

This is a significant major flow which can be metres wide in places and knee deep. Reviewing the drawings, we have real concerns that the alteration of the existing ground levels to accommodate the proposed dwellings and drive will now direct all that overland flow onto my and neighbouring properties and cause additional flooding.
All storm water collected from this property will flow directly into the newly constructed very sensitive wetlands and detention ponds that are already under stress during high rainfall events. There is absolutely nothing indicated on the plans to demonstrate how the applicant intends to mitigate the significant change in runoff from this site. One would have expected at least an indication of detention tanks but there seems no room left on the site to accommodate these.

Insufficient information with regard to the levels provided and the cross sections drawn have been provided to Council for it to properly consider the effects on my and neighbouring properties. No ground profile information extends outside 3 Manuwai Road property boundaries except for the road boundary. In this regard I feel that Council has been remiss in not requesting and analysing the effects of the development on my or adjacent properties with regard to surface flooding and retaining.

7. The major overland flow path is stated to be diverted around the proposed development, this will cause erosion and flooding.

In the decision document made by Auckland Council, there is special note as follows:

“There is a major overland flow path that runs through the middle of the site, south to north which will be diverted around the proposed development without affecting the exit or entry points.”

This statement is very concerning as it implies that the natural overland flow path will be directed around the development rather than finding a solution that ensures it will not have a negative effect on neighbouring properties. As there will now be five dwellings, extensive earthworks, ground level changes, fences, retaining walls and additional impervious areas caused by this development, it will mean an increased flow of water going around and exiting this site in a location where flooding already occurs – this will only add to the problem if a solution is not found and undertaken.

“Earthworks (including filling) within overland flow paths must maintain the same entry and exit point at the boundaries of a site and not result in any adverse changes in flood hazards beyond the site, unless such a change is authorised by an existing resource consent”

8. The maximum impervious area is greater than 60% in a major overland flow path that already causes flooding.

We are also surprised that Consent was granted with the proposed amount of impervious surfaces.


“Restrict the maximum impervious area on a site in order to manage the amount of stormwater runoff generated by a development and ensure that adverse effects on water quality, quantity and amenity values are avoided or mitigated”

The standard states a "Maximum Impervious Area" of 60% of the site, I do not believe that this is the case, when taking the driveway into consideration as a non-impervious area per site.

9. Contaminated soil washed around the site has a potential to affect the very sensitive wetlands and detention ponds that contain native eels and Inanga.

Based on the report for contaminated soil and the amount of earthworks to be undertaken, there are concerns that this significant change in runoff of contaminated soil in the additional overland flow path due to the increased impervious spaces, will put undue stress on the wildlife and below Glenvar Road. What plans will be put in place to ensure that there are no negative effects to the newly constructed very sensitive wetlands and detention ponds.

10. The estimated earthworks are understated, due to the soft ground at the lower end of the property.

What tests are proposed and how do we ensure that the estimated earthworks indicated in the request for resource consent will stay within these estimates of 272m3.

The ground at the lower end of this site is very soft and we believe that to reach a solid ground there will be a larger amount of earthworks required than currently estimated. This would therefore require extra retaining walls and ground support to ensure there is no instability of the adjacent properties.

11. The number of carparks per dwelling for a 4-bedroom home are less than the current recommendations of two parks for a two to three bedroom home.

The other concern that all neighbours raised was that five dwellings each with four bedrooms will require more than one parking space per dwelling as indicated on the plans.
Looking at the council's own unitary plan and the minimum parking requirements it is suggested that "three or more bedrooms: 2 per dwelling".

See Mixed Housing Suburban Zone: https://www.greaterauckland.org.nz/2014/02/25/unitary-plan-and-minimum-parking-requirements/

12. Based on 4 bedroom homes, there will be a substantial extra number of cars parked on the road that is only 6m kerb to kerb – this will block emergency service access.

A four bedroom home will consist of either a family of two adults, or if rented it can contain more than 4 adults per dwelling. This means that each dwelling would have approximately two to four cars that require available parking space. So a total of ten to twenty additional cars – where only one parking space is available per dwelling, leaving five to fifteen cars to park on the road.

Manuwai and surrounding roads are already under stress where larger vehicles cannot fit between the parked cars due to the width of the road being 6 metres from kerb to kerb, as well as causing an issue for the existing neighbours no longer having road parking spaces.

This will also not allow emergency services like ambulance and fire to attend properties on Manuwai Road, as there will be no room to fit between the extra cars parked on either side of the road.

13. The car manoeuvring areas into the single carparks will require three-point turns to access, it is stated "that residents will get used to it".

Due to the restricted size of the sites, this means that the accessway within the body of the site after the bend is non-compliant with a manoeuvring gradient being 1.6 outside unit 1 and 1.5 outside units 2 and 3.

Due to this reduction it will mean that the cars will have to do a three point turn to access and exit the single garages for each dwelling – this alone will cause additional noise, which will be unacceptable to neighbouring properties.

The comment on the resource approval was also noted as:

"The non-compliance with the manoeuvring area gradient outside units 2 and 3 is not considered to be a significant issue for the owners and occupiers of the proposed units as drivers will generally be residents and therefore regular users who will become familiar with the layout of the access."

This is not an acceptable comment, as it states that they will "become familiar" with an issue of access that would be avoided if the regulations were being correctly met. No decision should be made based on becoming familiar with an issue, that these rules are there to avoid.

14. Due to the size and number of properties, all adjacent properties will lose their privacy and have increased noise, due to the number of people (20) accessing and living in these dwellings.

With five dwellings, this will mean an increase in the number of people visiting and leaving these dwellings on an ongoing basis. Also due to the reduced parking and manoeuvring spaces it also means that these people will take longer to enter and exist the single carparks – creating more noise than is acceptable to neighbouring properties.

Due to the increased number of dwellings all being of a very small size, this will mean that there are more possible breaches of privacy due to the total number of occupants (20) compared to the zoned number of allowed dwellings. This is a concern in an area where children can currently play in their backyards without worrying about who is watching them.
15. Outlook spaces are not in keeping with the current requirements.

The proposed outlook space is defined as being in failure to meet the rule H4.6.10 of 40% landscaping, in the request for resource consent it is noted as:

“Although the development is able to accommodate the outlook space, adjacent to the principal living room of each unit, they fail to meet Rule H4.6.11 (4) which requires the width of the outlook space to be measured from the centre point of the largest window on the building face it applies to.”

This is purposely misleading as there is no way that they could accommodate the outlook space within the requirements as they have indicated, being adjacent to the principal living room. So, in this fact, an approval has been made on miss leading information that makes it appear as if they choose to not meet the requirements based on a design, rather than not being able to meet requirement overall.

The following images demonstrates how the outlook spaces should be defined based on figure H4.6.11.1 and what has currently been proposed within the development.

16. There are a large number of restricted discretionary activities, based on attempting to squeeze too many dwellings onto a site that does not accommodate these.

It seems as if every rule that could be pushed to its limit has been to squeeze the five properties into a site that does not support it, the overall total number of issues should have caused this request to be looked at thoroughly, to ensure it was suitable for the surrounding neighbours and area that it is zoned for.

We can understand that these discretionary activities are acceptable when they only effect a certain aspect of a development, in this case it has gone beyond the extreme when it effects so may:

- Earthworks
- Manoeuvring Area
- Four or more dwellings
- Height in relation to boundary
- Combined heights of fences and walls
- Landscaped areas
- Yards
- Outlook Space
- Overland flow path
This clearly indicates that the dwellings are being developed in a restricted space, do not allow sufficient outdoor areas or enough manoeuvring for easy access to the single carpark – let alone the extra pressure these four bedroom dwellings will have on road parking and number of people in close proximity causing a loss of privacy.

17. Request for an internal audit and a review of the resource consent.

Due to the overall concerns of this development, we have gathered signatures from our local neighbourhood who have all indicated objection for this resource consent being issued and ask that Auckland Council review as part of an in-house audit of this particular consent in its entirety and tests each and every restricted discretionary activity granted.

This audit should be conducted by senior staff that had no prior dealings with this approval. In addition, checks should be made on the information provided by the Developers Professional Advisers to see if the reports Auckland Council has relied on do contain all the information that should be provided.

After reviewing the plans and reading the decision we all feel that this consent has been issued based on incorrect information, oversight and consideration for the local neighbourhood.

While we understand that resource consent has already been issued, at no time were we as a neighbourhood, able to be included during that process, this is not acceptable.

17. Request for a meeting with Auckland Council.

We would like to request a meeting with Auckland Council (on site) to discuss and work through our concerns, we would like to extend the invite to Erica Stanford and Wayne Walker, who we have already been in discussion with about this matter as it not only effects this site, but also the greater Auckland Area.

On behalf of the residents of Manuwai, Watea and Glenwar Roads, Torbay, Auckland.

Sincerely

Dave and Jenny Williams
5 Manuwai Road, Torbay, Auckland 0630
Phone: 021 797313
Email: davejw@gmail.com