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Background

- Children are unable to choose where they live, yet are profoundly impacted by their neighbourhood
  - Exposure to alcohol advertising, marketing, and promotion is a key driver of consumption
  - Little regulation of alcohol advertising content, almost no control of exposure
    - Advertising Standards Authority Code for Advertising and Promotion of Alcohol
    - Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 - S237 – Irresponsible promotion of alcohol
  - Alcohol advertising more prominent that other retail signage
  - Restricting advertising one of the three ‘best buys’ to reduce harm
Background

Submissions of Local Boards to Signage Bylaw 2015
• (see Ōtara-Papatoetoe minutes 14 September 2014)

Ministerial Forum Alcohol Advertising and Sponsorship
• Recommendation 11 called for licence conditions whereby not more than 50% of windows or buildings should be covered with alcohol advertising
• Recommendation 8 called for a ban on any alcohol advertising where 10% or more of the audience is <18 years of age

District Licensing Conditions
• Section 117 of Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 allows discretionary conditions to be imposed

• Signage Bylaw controls signs by type and by Unitary Plan zone
• Not controlled by content (e.g. alcohol/gambling/unhealthy food and beverage)
New Zealand research

- University of Otago Kids’Cam study – Tim Chambers PhD project
  - Locations outside of the home accounted for 52% of all alcohol marketing exposures; occurring at
    - on-licence retailers (19%)
    - off-licence shop fronts (16%)
  - Of all types of advertising
    - shop fronts, not including sandwich boards, were the delivery medium for 30% (1.4 per day) of all alcohol marketing exposures
    - alcohol signs (billboards, sandwich boards, posters, etc.) accounted for almost 10% of all exposures

New Zealand research

- Adjusted models showed that
  - boys (5.8 exposures/day) were ~2x as likely to be exposed than girls (3.3 exposures/day)
  - Māori were 5 times (10.5 exposures/day) and Pacific children 3x (6.7 exposures/day) more likely to be exposed than NZ European children (2.5 exposures/per day).
  - Children living in high dep neighbourhoods were >2x more exposed (10.5 exposures/day) than children living in neighbourhoods with low deprivation (3.4 exposures/day) = NS

- Off-licence proximity in children’s neighbourhoods and off-licence density in school neighbourhoods was associated with increased exposure to alcohol marketing

ambers, T., et al. 2018 https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agy053
Item 9.1

Exploratory audit of off-licence alcohol signage

Attachment A
Audit

- Funding from Albert-Eden Local Board

- Assessed compliance with:
  - Signage Bylaw
  - s.237 Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (Irresponsible promotion)
    - No clear issues
  - Advertising Standards Authority Code for Alcohol Advertising and Sponsorship
    - No clear issues
### Results

31 bottle stores visited in Albert-Eden Local Board area

#### Compliance with sections 14-21 of Signage Bylaw (n=31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premises with at least 1 identified breach</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises with at least 2 identified breaches</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises with 3 or more identified breaches</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Signage type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free standing signage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable signage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veranda signage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall mounted signage</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window signage</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: although every effort was taken to be objective and accurate in estimating the dimensions of the signs, it must be noted that the compliance outcomes are indicative and preliminary until they are followed up with investigation by the relevant authority.
# Results

31 bottle stores visited in Albert-Eden Local Board area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features present</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol brand signage visible</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol products visually depicted</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol product categories named</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking occasions/participants depicted or implied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premise branding visible</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premise branding/colour scheme dominant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price information displayed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: although every effort was taken to be objective and accurate in estimating the dimensions of the signs, it must be noted that the compliance outcomes are indicative and preliminary until they are followed up with investigation by the relevant authority.
Opportunity – a better bylaw

• Review of the Auckland Council/Auckland Transport Signage Bylaw 2015
  • Portable signage (s14)
  • Stencil signage (s15)
  • Free standing signage (s16)
  • Poster signage (s17)
  • Banners (s18)
  • Veranda signage (s19)
  • Wall mounted signage (s20)
  • Window signage (s21)

• Once reviewed, another 10 year wait

• Real estate and commercial sexual services signage treated separately in Bylaw

• Opportunity for Alcohol signage to be treated in a separate section
Best Practice

- Windows clear and transparent above 1.2m / frosted below 1.2m
- No alcohol brands visible on any part of exterior of the premises
- Alcohol products not visually depicted
- Drinking occasions/participants not depicted/implied
- No product prices visible from outside
- Name/brand of premises displayed once only on sign not exceeding 2m
- Neutral colour scheme – premise branding devices limited to single small sign
Next steps

- Meet with Bylaw Compliance team, Licensing team, Social Policy team
- Present at Auckland Council Regulatory Committee meeting
- Present at Auckland Transport Board meeting
- Meet with local MPs
  - Jacinda Ardern, David Seymour, Michael Wood, Denise Lee, Peeni Henare
  - Jenny Salesa, Jami-Lee Ross, Louisa Wall, Aupito William Sio
- Utilise media advocacy
- Mobilise communities during Public Consultation process (Special Consultative Procedure) = we need communities speaking up
Opportunity - licensing

- Build routine consideration of the Bylaw requirements into licensing process
- Licence renewal should be conditional on compliance with the Bylaw
  - Clear windows good start for CPTED but ≠ Bylaw compliance or reduction of youth exposure
  - Whose responsibility to check for non-compliant signage?
    - Reporting agencies (Licensing Inspector, Medical Officer of Health, Police)?
    - District Licensing Committees?
    - Communities?
- Recommend Signage Bylaw compliance be a routine section of licensing inspectors report (suitability of applicant, object of the act, amenity)
- DLCs increase understanding of Bylaw requirements, compliant signage must be a minimum mandatory requirement but make use of Section 117 to impose best practice
Opportunity - compliance

• Compliance is low, enforcement is needed

• Whose role is it to make the complaints to trigger enforcement?
  • Bylaw and Compliance team? (reactive approach to signage complaints)
  • Leadership from local board?
  • Alcohol Healthwatch and local/regional organisations in alcohol space?
  • Local community networks, movements, and members?

• Compliance with Bylaw is desirable – but still leaves kids exposed
  • Fewer, smaller signs – we still need to do better to protect kids
Thank you
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whether the Report takes into account numerous irrelevant matters, does not take into
32 count numerous relevant matters and contains numerous errors of fact which have
37 arially effected its recommendations to such a degree that it would likely be unlawful
39 for the Local Board to endorse the recommendations in the Report.

re relevant matters that are not considered in the Report include:

That the number of rounds played at CP in the 12 months to 31 March 2019 was
60,108, an increase of 20.2% on the 49,996 rounds played in the 12 months to 31
March 2018.

- The following motion: “That the Albert Eden Local Board: (b) request staff to con-
- sider the development options provided by Save Chamberlain Park Inc (option on
- following pages) and provide advice to the local board on the feasibility of the
- options” was carried its March 2019 meeting. However, the Save Chamberlain Park
- Inc Option was not considered in the Report.

errors in the Report include:

- That constructing a Neighbourhood Park (NP) at the western end of CP would
- help meet the identified shortfall in NPs in Albert Eden. However, there is already
- a NP at the western end of RP, Rawalpindi Reserve. Constructing a NP adjacent
- to an existing NP would not help meet the shortfall in NPs as claimed.

- That there “an economic case that identifies a preferred option(s) that delivers
- community benefits and value for money.” In fact the unsubstantiated claim in
- the Report of estimated community benefits of $26 million is less than the estimated
- cost of $29.7 million. There is no “economic case” as claimed, and the proposal
- to implement Option 2 would not deliver “value for money” as claimed.

- That “Offering a mixture of sport and recreation opportunities (by implementing
- Option 2) will allow a wider and more diverse section of the population to utilise
- public open space.” There is more than sufficient sport and recreation opportuni-
- ties in the vicinity of Chamberlain Park. Changing the offer at Chamberlain Park
- would merely transfer some sport and recreation activities from close by parks
- such as Western Springs Park, Fowlds Park and the Unitec Campus which is be-
- ing developed into a residential area with generous open space provision amount-
- ing to several NPs and a Suburban Park to Chamberlain Park resulting in no net

- “There is a current shortfall in sports field hours of 27 hours, growing to 87 hours
- by 2028” necessitating the construction of 2 sports fields on Chamberlain at a
- cost of $16.2 million.

The demand for sports fields in Auckland in 2017 was estimated to be 8.7 full field equi-
alent, hours per week for every 1,000 people in the active age group (5 to 49) in the
Auckland Council commissioned report Longdill 2017. The demand of 6.7 in 2017 was
considerable decrease in sports field demand compared with the 7.4 estimated in the
equivalent 2014 report, which was itself a considerable decrease in sports field de-
mand compared to the 8.0 estimated in the 2011 report.

The active age group comprised 64.7% of Auckland's total population in 2017 by cens
data. The estimated demand equates to 4.33 hours of field demand for every 1,000 peo-
ple in all age groups. Albert Eden has an active age group of 11,974 (16.7% of the popu-
lation). Put in another way, 1 hour of field demand is expected by every 231 residents (1,000 / 4.33). Each sand carpet field provides 18 hours use at
each hybrid field provides 27 hours use per week, in both cases including a 10% allow-
ance for wet weather closures. This means that one sand carpet field can satisfy de-
mand from 4,158 Aucklanders (18 x 231) and 1 hybrid field can satisfy demand from
6,237 Aucklanders (27 x 231).

Albert Eden’s population in 2018 was 107,000 and is expected to increase to 142,000 by
2042 under the Auckland Unitary Plan. Albert Eden has 29.4 sports fields which can
accommodate demand from a population of 122,000 if all fields were sand carpeted
and 183,000 if all fields were upgraded to hybrid turf. Albert Eden’s existing sports fields can accommodate current demand and demand enabled by the Unitary Plan.

Albert Eden’s northern neighbour, the Waitakere Local Board, had a population in 2011
of 102,000, enabled to increase to 183,000 under the Unitary Plan. Waitakere’s 30.3
sports fields can accommodate demand from a population of 126,000 if all fields are
sand carpeted and 189,000 if all have hybrid turf installed. Waitakere’s existing sports fields can accommodate current demand and demand enabled by the Unitary Plan.

Albert Eden has five neighbouring local boards: Whau, Puketapapa, Maungakiekie,
Orakei and Waitakere. These six LBA’s had population of 520,000 in 2018, enabled to
increase to 842,000 under the Unitary Plan. The six LBA’s have a total of 217.5 sports
fields which can accommodate demand from a population of 904,000 if all fields are sand
 carpeted and 1,357,000 if all have hybrid turf installed. Albert Eden’s and its five neigh-
bouring local board’s existing sports fields can accommodate current demand and dem-
and enabled by the Unitary Plan.

This is a small sample of the omissions, wrongful inclusions and errors in the Report. It
is our view that the Report does not provide a basis for lawful action by Council and
should be withdrawn.

Yours sincerely

Geoff Senascall
Chair of Save Chamberlain Park Inc
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The budget report now shows that the design of Chamberlain Park would be as shown on the following pages:

- The driving range, sportsfields and aquatic centre would not be built and no golf holes would be reconfigured.
- The existing green-keeper's shed would be moved to the location shown on the following diagram or elsewhere on the course which would necessarily remove the health and safety hazard of green – keeping machinery operating in the new public open space.
- The greenkeepers house would be removed and the land (1,500 m²) devoted to new open space.
- Waitakiko / Meloa Creek restoration as in Stage 3, page 13 of the Master Plan other than the differences illustrated in the attached diagrams to follow.
- Shared paths around and through the course as in Stage 4, page 14 of the Master Plan other than the differences illustrated in the diagrams to follow.
- Clubhouse improved to provide enhanced services to golfers and the local community allowing the clubhouse to become a community hub.

The “baseline investment option” is estimated to cost the same $6.9m as Stages 2, 3 and 4 of the Master Plan, however the benefits to the community would be substantially greater as the 18 hole course would be retained and the $0.9m slated for course recontouring would instead be used to move the green-keepers shed and to make improvements to the clubhouse.

We have done considerable research into the possibility of enhancing Chamberlain Park with elements of the Wairakei Golf Sanctuary and Zealandia, at minimal cost. Chamberlain Park's boundary is a 3 kilometre long 2 metre plus tall chainlink fence which could be improved to create a 32 ha predator free urban park allowing many of the benefits of Wairakei and Zealandia (see following pages) to be enjoyed by the residents of Albert Eden and the rest of Auckland. The ecology of the park could be further enhanced with one or more “green bridges” across the motorway to the long, narrow str of Chamberlain Park left isolated by the construction of the NW Motorway in the 1960s.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Quince, Secretary

cc Albert Eden Local Board members
or Elsewhere. Destination Playground Built on concrete Building Platform utilising the 18 existing 6 m tall Building Poles.

Carpark (existing)

0.9 ha Local Park Extension

Baseline Investment Option

Chambers Park Golf Course

Clubhouse Upgrade would allow the Clubhouse to function as a Community Hub

Possible New Green-keeper’s Shed Location

Norwood Reserve

Areas of Ecological Enhancement

Baseline Investment Option

Destination Park
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Chamberlain Park Public Golf