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1 Welcome

The Chair will open the meeting and welcome everyone present.

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Franklin Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 25 June 2019, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

5 Leave of Absence

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

6 Acknowledgements

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

7 Petitions

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

8 Deputations

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

8.1 Deputation - Clevedon A&P Association

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. Danielle Wright, Show Manager for the Clevedon A&P Association, will be in attendance to address the board on recent activities.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Clevedon A&P Association wish to address the board on their recent activities and forward plans.

3. Danielle Wright, Show Manager for the association, will be in attendance to address the board.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) receive the deputation from Danielle Wright, Show Manager for the Clevedon A&P Association, and thank her for her attendance.

8.2 Deputation - Franklin A&P Society

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Richard Holst, president of the Franklin Agricultural and Pastoral Society, and Craig Follett, past president of the society, will be in attendance to present to the board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The president of the Franklin Agricultural and Pastoral Society will provide an update to the board on the society’s past activities and future plans.
3. Craig Follett, past president of the society, will also be in attendance.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) thank Richard Holst, president of the Franklin Agricultural and Pastoral Society, and Craig Follett, past president, for their presentation and attendance.

8.3 Deputation - Life Education Trust Counties Manukau

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Lincoln Jefferson will be in attendance to address the board on Life Education Trust Counties Manukau.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Lincoln Jefferson from Life Education Trust Counties Manukau will be in attendance to present on the trust’s activities over the past year.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) receive the presentation from Lincoln Jefferson from Life Education Trust Counties Manukau and thank him for his attendance.
9 Public Forum

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

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

10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."
Allocation of the Franklin Local Board’s Transport Community Safety Fund

File No.: CP2019/13318

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. For the Franklin Local Board to allocate its share of the Transport Community Safety Fund to road safety projects in its area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

3. The objective is to accelerate local community-initiated safety projects in the local board which are currently not being delivered by Auckland Transport (AT).

4. The Franklin Local Board has put forward potential projects to be delivered with Community Safety Funding. These projects have been assessed, scoped and an estimated cost developed, which is attached to this report as Attachment A.

5. The scoped and costed list of projects was discussed in a workshop with the local board on 16 July 2019 and a prioritised list developed.

6. This report is intended to formalize the local board’s direction on projects to be funded from the local board funding allocation.

7. Should there be a shortfall in funding for board approved projects, AT will return to the board to seek further direction on alternative ‘top up’ funding e.g. from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund or for further prioritisation.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) approve the delivery of the Priority 1 projects listed in Attachment A, to be funded by the Community Safety Fund.

b) maximise the use of the Community Safety Fund by authorising a top-up from the board’s Local Board Transport Capital Fund, if required, to meet any shortfall in funding for the final project to be implemented; and that any top-up will be drawn based on prior discussion and resolution by the Franklin Local Board.

Horopaki
Context
8. The 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan allocated $20 million for Financial Year 2019/2020 and Financial Year 2020/2021 for local initiatives in road safety ($5 million in Financial Year 2019/2020 and $15 million in Financial Year 2020/2021). To promote safety at the local community level, the fund is apportioned to each local board area based on a formula that focuses on the numbers of Deaths and Serious Injuries (DSI) in that area.
9. The objective is to accelerate local community-initiated safety projects around identified high-risk locations and local schools. Local boards were invited to submit proposals for projects addressing safety issues their communities have identified.

10. The Franklin Local Board share of the Community Safety Fund is $1,699,483 over the two years.

11. Criteria for the fund includes physical measures raised by the local community to prevent, control or mitigate identified local road and street safety hazards which expose people using any form of road and street transport to demonstratable hazards which may result in death or serious harm. Individual project cost is to be no greater than $1 million. Projects must consist of best practice components, conform to AT standards and comply with New Zealand law.

12. The fund does not cover the following:
   - Projects with an unacceptably high maintenance cost.
   - Projects that clash with other planned public projects.
   - Complex projects that may take greater than 2 years to deliver including but not limited to projects requiring significant engineered structures, complex resource consents and complex traffic modelling.
   - Projects containing unconventional or unproven components including new trials or pilot projects.
   - Projects or components of projects that have no demonstratable safety benefit unless they are integral with a safety project.

13. The Franklin Local Board developed a list of projects from workshops in April and June 2019.

14. That list of projects was assessed and costed by Auckland Transport. If this costing is more than the budget allocated to the particular local board under this funding, then it has the option of using any of its available Local Board Transport Capital Fund to top up the project budget.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

15. The projects that were put forward for assessment and estimates are attached to this report as Attachment A.

16. The assessments were workshopped with the local board on 16 July 2019.

17. The local board prioritised this list, taking into consideration the purpose and scope of the Transport Community Safety fund and funding criteria.

18. The board indicated that budget be allocated to Priority 1 projects, with any balance applied to progressing Priority 2 projects.

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

19. The impact of information (or decisions) in this report is/are confined to AT and do/does not impact on other parts of the Council group.

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

20. The Franklin Local Board nominated projects for assessment and have subsequently prioritised them based on Transport Community Safety fund criteria.
21. The projects allocated funding in this report will improve the road safety environment in the communities within the Franklin Local Board area.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

22. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no impacts or opportunities for Māori. Any engagement with Māori, or consideration of impacts and opportunities, will be carried out on an individual project basis.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

23. The Franklin Local Board Transport Community Safety Fund allocation is $1,699,483.00.

24. Nominated projects that ‘pass’ fund criteria are costed at a total of $2,145,000.00.

25. Projects assessed by the local board at its July 16 workshop as priority 1 total $1,755,000.00.

26. The Franklin Local Board allocation of the Community Safety Fund is fully allocated with a projected $55,517 shortfall.

27. AT will return to the board to seek further direction on alternative ‘top up’ funding e.g. from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund or for further prioritization as detailed costings become available.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

28. There are no risks associated with receiving this report.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

29. Design and construction of approved list of projects.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board Community Safety Fund Priorities</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kenneth Tuai, Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon, Manager Elected Member Relationship Unit, Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CFFR1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CFFR1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CFFR1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CFFR1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gun Club Road/Patumahoe Intersection Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hart / Gun Club Road Intersection Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Henson / Whitford-Maraetai Road alignment Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jack Lachlan Drive/Whitford-Maraetai Road Intersection improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ness Valley Road/Kawakawa Bay Road intersection Safety Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the issue is with road alignment rather than the intersection; however, scale of intervention required does not meet fund criteria.
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>New Crossing Maraetai Drive</td>
<td>A new pedestrian crossing on Maraetai Drive that allows for safer pedestrian access to the Omana Regional Park</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Best option is side islands pedestrian crossing. Further investigation to confirm pedestrian count to verify pedestrian side island crossing treatment. If pedestrian demand is high, consider raised zebra.</td>
<td>CSFFR1.13 Priority 2 Note that an expanded 50KM speed limit could address this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Queen street and Victoria Avenue intersection improvements</td>
<td>Busy intersection with increasing traffic. Safety upgrades required to improve safety for vehicles and pedestrians.</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Best options is raised zebra and 2 refuge / splitter islands to provide safe pedestrian crossing that the intersection.</td>
<td>CSFFR1.14 Priority 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Racecourse/ Kitchener Road intersection improvements</td>
<td>Develop a safer turnout from Racecourse Road onto Kitchener Road</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Extend existing flush road markings to provide staged merge.</td>
<td>CSFFR1.15 Priority 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Station Road Parking Upgrade</td>
<td>Construct footpaths on Station Road adjacent rail station.</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Footpath on both sides of Station Rd from Subway Rd to Birch Rd with parking changes to Birch Road.</td>
<td>CSFFR1.18 Priority 1 Note that LBTCF funding of $181k is already allocated and cost of project is costed at $466k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Taurangaru Road Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Narrow windy road with limited road markings.</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Route study to establish appropriate safety measures – edge line road markings, centreline road markings, edge marker posts and RRPMs. ROC is a budget for study and installation of measures.</td>
<td>CSFFR1.19 Priority 1 Note open to reducing allocated budget for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Whitford Rd walkway -</td>
<td>Road reserve is narrow and people walk from the</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>Footpath to connect walking track to village</td>
<td>CSFFR1.20 Priority 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment A

### Item 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gun Club/ Helvetia Road Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Friction surfacing, Road marking and signage before crest warning of upcoming intersection.</td>
<td>CSFR1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Patumahoe / Maaku Road Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Improve visibility by removing 2 parks outside Ray Whites. Also request Ray White to relocate plant boxes which contribute to driver visibility.</td>
<td>CSFR1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Woodhouse Road Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Build a new raised zebra pedestrian crossing near the Patumahoe Village on Woodhouse Road to provide safe crossing for local children heading to the local school to the west of Woodhouse Road</td>
<td>CSFR1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projects below were nominated by the board by failed to be eligible for the Community Safety Fund due to cost and complexity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Hill/ Reynolds Road</td>
<td>Requires a roundabout as increasing traffic volumes</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>This project is to be delivered under the Minor Improvement Programme in 20/21.</td>
<td>CSFR1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Safety Upgrades</td>
<td>increasing risk of crashes at this intersection.</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Failed as CSF projects as not conventional or standard project in line with NZTA guidelines.</td>
<td>CSFFR1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashing 40kmh school signs variable speeds.</td>
<td>High-speed areas, which endanger schoolchildren, particularly at start and end of school period.</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
<td>CSFFR1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvements to Otau Mountain Road</td>
<td>Sealing and safety improvements for gated area on Otau Mountain road before intersection with McKenzie Road 2 – Sealing, barriers and safety improvements to length of Otau Mountain Road</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail – Seal extension prioritisation considered by other capital works programme</td>
<td>CSFFR1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To update the Franklin Local Board (FLB) about transport related matters in its area including Local Board Transport Capital Fund.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The report contains information about the following matters:
   • update on rural roading conditions
   • responses to local board resolutions
   • development of an Auckland Vision Zero Road Safety Strategy and Action Plan
   • Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) projects.
3. Decisions on prioritising the allocation of its Transport Community Safety Fund are addressed via a separate report.
4. No decisions are required in response to this report.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:
   a) receive the report entitled ‘Auckland Transport update to the Franklin Local Board July 2019’.

Horopaki
Context
5. This report addresses transport related matters in the local board area and includes information on the progress of the LBTCF projects.
6. Auckland Transport (AT) is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. It reports on a monthly basis to local boards as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting supports the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities on transport matters.
7. The Local Board Transport Capital Fund is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council and delivered by AT. Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they believe are important to their communities but are not part of AT’s work programme. Projects must also:
   • be safe
   • not impede network efficiency
   • be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome).
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF)
8. Through Auckland Council’s Long Term Plan 2018-2028, LBTCF funding has been increased to a total of $20.8 million per annum across all 21 local boards.
9. The allocation for the FLB has also increased, with the updated figures for the remainder of this electoral term reflected in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: FLB Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franklin Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Available</strong> in current political term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount committed</strong> to date on projects approved for design and/or construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unallocated budget</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Table 2 below shows the status of projects to which LBTCF has already been committed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Status update on current Local Board Transport Capital Fund projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade of Beachlands town centre gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First View Avenue, Beachlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second View Avenue, Beachlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road parking and pedestrian improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pukekohe. On 25 September 2018, the FLB approved $181,104

AT proposes accessing the Transport Community Safety Fund to cover the shortfall, to be confirmed via separate report.

| Beachlands Kerb and Channel | Improvements Project to install kerb and channel in Beachlands on following roads: • Shelley Bay Road • Karaka Road • First View Ave • Second View Ave | The local board approved project ROC estimate up to $1.18m to progress to detailed design. A Project manager has been appointed, and the procurement of services process has commenced. A consultant commenced design for the 4 sites with 75% of the topographical survey completed. | Yes | $1.18m |

| Tourist Road-Monument Road intersection electronic warning signage | Installation of electronic warning signage on each and smart studs on the Tourist Road. | The local board approved a ROC estimate up to $80,000 to progress this project. NZTA have advised that their trial is not accepting new sites. This project is on hold until the results of the trial, at which time the proposal will be revisited | No | $80,000 |

Responses to resolutions

11. At the FLB April 2019 business meeting the local board passed the following resolution

Resolution number FR/2019/50

That the Franklin Local Board:

b) request that AT investigate options for partnership approach to funding the Station Road parking and pedestrian safety improvements project noting the community safety outcomes anticipated.

12. This project was initially funded via the LBTCF but has since then been identified to have a funding shortfall. The current estimate to complete the project is now $440,000, a shortfall of $260,000

13. As requested by the local board, further investigation has been undertaken to seek partnership funding. Two options have been identified which are specified below:

- Funding shortfall to be met by Panuku Development Auckland as part of the ‘Unlock Pukekohe’ project regeneration programme.
- Funding shortfall to be met by local board’s Transport Community Safety Fund, as one of the local board’s priority projects.
14. In another report this month, the local board have the option of allocating funding via its Community Safety Fund allocation to complete this project with funding of $1,699,483 available to the board.

15. At this time, Panuku Development Auckland is still reviewing its programme for Unlock Pukekohe and has not yet confirmed this project as part of its programme, therefore funding has not yet been allocated at this time.

16. Ongoing discussions with Panuku are still on progress with staff from Panuku currently reviewing details of this project. An update will be provided in next month’s report regarding progress.

Local projects issues

Rural road conditions

17. Winter conditions provide a higher level of erosion and damage to the road seal than in drier weather.

18. This winter is no different, with an influx of service requests related to potholes and damage to the road received by AT via our various communications channels.

19. AT is working closely with our contractors to ensure that these requests are responded to urgently and made safe as soon as practically possible.

20. We continue to encourage the community to report these issues/items and will continue to work with the elected members and community improve services where we can.

Self-Explaining Rural Roads project (SERR)

21. The Self-Explaining Rural Roads (SERR) project covers approximately 130km of roads within the South East area of Auckland, namely Clevedon, Maraetai and Whitford areas.

22. The aims of the SERR project is to create a consistent look and feel for the design of the road so that it matches its intended function and is appropriate for the type of vehicles using it. The result of this will then improve road safety by promoting better driver behaviour.

23. To achieve these aims, the project includes the implementation of the following:

   • rationalise the existing signs and signing of destinations
   • improve the signing of curves
   • improve road markings including the introduction of a wide centre line where feasible
   • consistent gateway treatments at approaches to Whitford, Clevedon and Maraetai villages
   • shape correction on Brookby Road
   • safety barrier at a few locations.

24. The signs and road marking improvements were scheduled to be completed by the end of June 2019.

25. Glenbrook Road is the third SERR package and was scheduled to start in June and completed in the new financial year.

Rural Delineation Programme (RDP)

26. The Rural Delineation Programme aims to provide road users with a consistent series of messages about the severity of approaching bends and other hazards on the rural road network so that they can negotiate these hazards in a safer manner.

27. Initial implementation of these works has previously been undertaken in the Franklin area and the current package of works was intended to be completed by the end of June 2019.

28. There may be some additional road marking requirements to re-mark existing road markings scheduled for the current financial year, and this will be aligned with the road maintenance programme to minimise the potential for conflict with the maintenance programme.
29. Upon completion of the RDP works we have arranged for a monitoring tool to track the effectiveness of the projects.

30. At this stage, there is not enough data to report on the monitoring of previous schemes. Once we have a robust post-construction monitoring result from the projects within the Franklin Local Board area, the project team will be able to provide this information to the local board as requested.

Regional projects and activities

Community Safety Fund

31. The 2018 RLTP allocated $20m for local initiatives in road safety; $5m in FY19/20 and $15m in FY20/21. It was apportioned to local board areas by formula based on numbers of Deaths and Serious Injuries (DSI).

32. The Franklin Local Board has been allocated $1,699,483 over the two years.

33. The remaining Local Board Transport Capital Fund may be used to supplement any shortfall in funding for the final project, to maximise the utilisation of the Community Safety Fund.

34. The Franklin local board proposed 21 different projects, at workshops in 9 April and 19 May workshops, which were reviewed and prioritised by the local board members at the 16 July workshop.

35. Their prioritised list of projects is to be reported on in another report on this agenda.

Development of an Auckland Vision Zero Road Safety Strategy and Action Plan

36. In 2018, 54 people died and 595 were seriously injured using Auckland’s transport network.

37. Vision Zero is a paradigm shift in thinking about road safety, it mandates that no death or serious injury on our roads is acceptable. To achieve this requires the prioritisation of safety over speed or convenience.

38. Assuring the safety of all road users in Auckland is vital to meeting the objectives of the Auckland Plan 2050, the Government Policy Statement and the soon to be released National Road Safety Strategy 2030.

39. Auckland currently has a commitment to a 60% reduction in road crash deaths and serious injuries by 2028 (from a 2017 baseline), reducing annual deaths to 25, and annual serious injuries to 300.

40. Auckland Transport is the lead agency responsible for delivery of these objectives as part of the strategy. Implementing the strategy will be integral to achieving these objectives. It will require transformational shifts in policy and practice within AT and across its partnerships and stakeholder relationships.

41. The strategy must be built on strong partnerships and stakeholder relationships across core government agencies, mana whenua, road user groups, communities, industry and business.

42. To ensure this outcome the Tāmaki Makaurau Road Safety Governance Group has been tasked with assisting in the development of the Strategy. Members of the Tāmaki Makaurau Road Safety Governance Group will also be accountable for actions within the Strategy.

43. This group is led by Auckland Transport and includes the NZ Police, NZTA, Accident Compensation Corporation, Ministry of Transport, Auckland Council and Auckland Region Public Health Service.

44. A road safety stakeholder reference group has been established which includes NGO’s, Road User groups and business. The Tāmaki Makaurau Road Safety Governance Group will also partner with Mana Whenua, engage with Elected Members and communities.
45. The timeline for the development process is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March – June</td>
<td>Engagement with Tāmaki Makaurau Road Safety Group partners and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Tāmaki Makaurau Road Safety Governance Group members endorsed the draft strategy and their individual component of the action plan are now taking this through their internal approval processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-August</td>
<td>Subject to AT Board review: final approvals from Tāmaki Makaurau Road Safety Group partner organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late August</td>
<td>Final strategy presented to AT Board for endorsement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. Once the strategy is endorsed by the Auckland Transport Board it will be adopted by Auckland Transport.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

47. The impact of information (or decisions) in this report is confined to Auckland Transport and does not impact on other parts of the Council group.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

**Auckland Transport consultations**

**Local Board consultations**

48. Auckland Transport provides the Franklin Local Board with the opportunity to comment on transport projects being delivered in the local board area.

49. The local board's views on any proposed schemes are taken into account during consultation on those proposals.

50. In the reporting period from May/June 2019, one proposals put forward for comment by the local board. The local board transport representative’s views and ongoing communication are recorded in the table below.

**Table 3: Local Board Consultations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Details and Local Board Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Traffic and Parking Resolution - Drury South | Significant number of traffic controls, streetscapes, shared paths and removal of existing roads. | 1. Generally comfortable with scheme plan as part of overall project. Their queries and responses from the consultants are documented below:  
2. Would like to see and understand communication plan for locals who will encounter significant changes both permanent and temporary so the surprise factor is mitigated including proposed time frames for coming changes.  
**Response:** Both permanent changes have been communicated to the public via the Project Open Day (Thursday 25 October 2018, over 200 people attended the open day). Temporary changes to the roading layout are being communicated to the public via... |
contractor letter drops to surrounding properties and local residents before the temporary changes to the roading layout are undertaken.

DSL’s website (www.druysouthcrossing.co.nz) also provides the opportunity for the public to ask questions regarding the development and we will post updates here. A further Open Day for the public is being planned for October 2019.

3. Would like AT to advise what investigation/plans has been done/planned in regard to the probable impact on existing roads and intersections outside the project boundary that are likely to be impacted by these changes? Looking at the overall concept plan I am concerned about the intersection of Ararimu and Davies Road (Davies looks like it could become the “rat run” route for those coming from Ararimu wanting to head to Drury Village and Papakura) and also intersection of Willow/Davies (with western end of Willow stopped).

Response: Willow Road will be stopped in 2019/20 and Davis Road will be maintained but as local street servicing the immediate residents. Several initiatives will be implemented to ensure that Davis Road is an unattractive option for heavy vehicles, this includes the closure of Willow Road and design changes where the road meets the structure plan. This was a key outcome from the Transport Assessment and Council hearings in relation to the Industrial Precinct plan change, in terms of reducing the traffic (particularly heavy trucks) using Davies Road. Upgrades have been constructed at the Ramarama Interchange and will also be occurring on Fitzgerald Road, Quarry Road and Great South Road.

Traffic and Parking Resolution - Drury South

This was circulated to the FLB transport representatives on the 26 April. The local board reps have concerns about the proposed bus stop on Maraetai Drive and objected to its location. The reps are concerned about maintaining existing parking which is used by cars and trailers who use the nearby boat ramp and requested that the bus stop be relocated.

A response is still being considered and will be included in next month’s August report to the local board.

Traffic Control Committee resolutions

51. Traffic Control Committee decisions within the Franklin Local Board area are reported on a monthly basis. The decisions within the local board area in the period of June 2019 were not provided in time to be included in this month’s report and therefore will be included in the August report to the local board.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
52. The proposed decision of receiving the report or requesting cost estimates has no impacts or opportunities for Māori. Any engagement with Māori, or consideration of impacts and opportunities, will be carried out on an individual project basis.

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

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

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
55. AT will provide another update report to the board at the next monthly meeting.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kenneth Tuai, Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport</th>
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<td>Jonathan Anyon, Manager Elected Member Relationship Unit, Auckland Transport</td>
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</tbody>
</table>
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Regional Facilities Auckland
Quarter 3 Performance Report
For the period ending 31 March 2019

This report outlines the key performance of Regional Facilities Auckland

Regional Facilities Auckland Q3 summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights, issues &amp; risks for the quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• WA’s summer stadium concert line-up boosted the Auckland economy with a visitor spend of $30 million and a contribution to regional GDP of $10 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disney’s Aladdin the Musical ran for nine weeks at The Civic, with 70 performances drawing theatre-goers from around the country with spectacular sets and costumes, and talented cast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Zealand Maritime Museum welcomed hundreds of Aucklanders on its heritage vessels as part of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financials (m)</th>
<th>YTD actual</th>
<th>YTD budget</th>
<th>Actual vs Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital delivery</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>(18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct revenue</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct expenditure</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net direct expenditure</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Commentary
Auckland Anniversary weekend festivities at the waterfront.

Issues/Risks:
- The financial operational performance is currently forecasted at an unfavourable variance of approximately $250k. Focus remains on securing revenue opportunities and deferral or cutting non-essential variable costs. The $230k variance relates to the accelerated visitor security programme. Conventions, Stadiums, and Auckland Live revenue remains cyclical and volatile.
- Business interruption caused by the capital works at the Aotea Centre and Auckland Zoo is having a significant negative impact on revenue generation.
- The loss of the VEC as a conventions venue will hamper RFA’s ability to grow the conventions market.

Capital delivery: The RFA capital programme for FY19 consists of 247 projects, with a forecast 86% delivery by year end. The delivery lag is primarily driven by changes in phasing of the two major projects – the Aotea Centre refurbishment and the South East Asia Precinct which, collectively, are budgeted at $113m over several years.

Direct revenue: Revenue is unfavourable to budget due to two large theatre events have been postponed and three outdoor concerts did not proceed as budgeted. This has also had a consequential flow on effect on other revenue.

Direct expenditure: Overall direct expenditure is $5.7m favourable to budget as costs are actively controlled to offset the unfavourable revenue.

Key performance indicators
(Refer to pg. 8 for complete list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience RFA’s arts, environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td>1,686,906</td>
<td>2,423,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Māori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic focus area – Stadia

Key commentary
For the nine months to 31 March 2019, a total of $4.7m was spent towards stadia against a budget of $17.9m, with a forecast year and spend of $15m.

Highlights
1. North Harbour Stadium: reconfiguration of the main field to accommodate baseball has been agreed with stakeholders and design is underway. Works are anticipated to be completed by November 2019. Seismic assessments of the main stand will be concluded shortly and will inform the design of the roof replacement. Detailed design will be completed this financial year.
2. Mt Smart Stadium: works on the lower west stand and the south stand will be completed this financial year.
3. Western Springs: detailed designs will be received by 15 April for the four building renewals, with works projected to be completed by November 2019. In consultation with users, the entry road renewal has been delayed until the end of August, following the conclusion of the rugby season. The building locations and designs have been finalised to accommodate various alternative future uses of the venue.

Issues/Risks
1. Seismic assessments are currently being undertaken across our stadiums. The outcomes of these assessments will need to be taken account of in the context of future asset management strategies.

Key programme of works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Reconfiguration and construction to enable the hosting of the Auckland Taniwha’s home games for next season at OBE Stadium</td>
<td>This project is currently in procurement phase with construction to commence in March and completed by November 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On track</td>
<td>The replacement of the seating area entirely, including seats, structure and decking on the lower west stand of Mt Smart Stadium.</td>
<td>This renewals project for Mt Smart Stadium is required to ensure health and safety and tenancy obligations continue to be met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Key commentary
For the nine months to 31 March 2019, a total of $20.0m was spent towards zoo development against a budget of $40.3m.

Highlights
1. Renewal of the Old Elephant House as a restaurant and functions venue to improve visitor amenities has been completed.
2. Construction of the South East Asian Precinct and new café is well underway.
3. The new Zoo administration wing has been completed, increasing capacity to accommodate staff and providing permanent location for previously isolated staff. Planning for the Stage 2 renovation of the old administration wing has also begun.
4. A significant programme of general renewals and infrastructure upgrades is progressing well.

Issues/Risks
1. The extent of the construction work currently underway at the Zoo (the South East Asia project is currently impacting on more than 20% of the site) is impacting on the visitor experience and perception of value at the Zoo. A range of mitigation strategies are in place, the most significant of which is the implementation of an adjusted pricing strategy, reducing the cost of entry by as much as 20%. Visitation numbers are being maintained as a result, although revenues are necessarily impacted.
2. A significant portion of general renewals is planned following the Easter school holidays to avoid visitor impact. This increases the risk of delays due to weather.

Key programmes of works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S. E. Asia Precinct development | On track Redevelopment of the central area within the Zoo to provide modern standards of housing and care for the Zoo’s South East Asian species, and new catering facilities | Largest renewals project ($20m) in the Zoo’s history. Tracking to budget and expected to be completed in the 2019/20 financial year.

Strategic focus area – Aotea Centre development

Key commentary

Strategic context
FMA is continuing with development of a world class zoo and conservation facility by addressing aging infrastructure at Auckland Zoo and long-term under-investment through a phased programme of works. This has the aim of essential renewals to ensure Auckland Zoo meets the modern standards of animal welfare, visitor amenity, wildlife exhibition and health and safety obligations.
Franklin Local Board
23 July 2019
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For the nine months to 31 March 2019, a total of $24.3m was spent towards the Aotea Centre development against a budget of $52.8m. This project remains substantially challenged by delays associated with the need for comprehensive re-design to meet new standards.

Highlights
1. Refurbishment of the interior of the Aotea Centre was sufficiently completed in March 2019 to enable successful hosting of the Auckland Arts Festival.
2. The outdoor "Digital Stage" screen in Aotea Square continues to provide free live and enhanced digital experience for visitors to the Aotea Arts Quarter, playing a significant role during the Auckland Arts Festival.
3. Work on developing a precinct master plan for Aotea Square is well advanced and on track to be presented to the Board mid-2019.

Issues/Risks
1. Changing consenting requirements in relation to the tragic events at Grenfell Tower and Notcutt Orewa have caused significant delays with progressing the façade and external weather-tightness work on the centre. This has resulted in redundant work, the need to re-establish the project design team, and conduct a comprehensive re-design of the building’s cladding and weather-protection systems. Some portions of work remain in design. An additional $14m in additional costs are estimated as a result, and additional funding will be sought as part of the Annual Plan 2019/20 budget process.
2. Delays to completion of the project will reduce leverage potential from the centre for a longer period than previously anticipated.
3. There will be some negative impact on the customer experience caused by ongoing construction works until completion.

The refurbishment and further proposed development and expansion of the Aotea Centre are aimed at creating a vibrant cultural and civic centre for Auckland focused on the Aotea Square precinct, and as part of a wider Aotea Arts Quarter. This will include a significantly upgraded and expanded Aotea Centre and integrated Aotea Square, providing a home for the development and presentation of performing arts in Auckland.

**Key programme of works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>The first significant refurbishment of the 30 year old centre, aiming to upgrade foyer and function spaces and address long-standing weather-tightness issues</td>
<td>NZ’s growing understanding of the safety implications of building façades and cladding standards has required substantial changes to this project mid-programme. There are significant additional costs associated with these changes, and further funding will be sought through the annual plan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On track</td>
<td>A precip planning approach to the development of the square and its surrounds to ensure the precinct meets its potential as a key lively and active space for Aucklanders</td>
<td>This project is progressing with input from a broad group of stakeholders and is intended to help guide future investment proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Developing concept plans for expanding the current Aotea Centre to provide a home for performing arts organisations and to foster the work of performing arts groups</td>
<td>This project is in its early stages – the concept, funding and potential timing of this proposed development will be discussed with Council in 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Statement of Intent focus areas**

**Arts & Culture Strategy**

- Pacific Sisters: He Too Tātea J Fashion-Activists opened at Auckland Art Gallery in February. The exhibit, which plays homage to a collective of Pacific and Māori designers, artists and performers that electrified 1950s Auckland, has been extended with an interactive art installation, Distant Distant, by Rosanna Raymond and Ali O’Neill.
- Guernica Girl: Reminiscence of the 3rd World – Feminism opened in March. The anonymous collection’s humorous and provocative work has challenged discrimination in the art world, politics, film and music for three decades.
- The first boat built by Sir Peter Blake more than 50 years ago, Ranui, has been restored and put on display at the New Zealand Maritime Museum. A new sustainability-themed space for families was opened, with interactive activities encouraging children to contribute ideas on caring for our oceans.
- Auckland Live produced additional NZ Sign Language-Interpreted and Audio described performances for Disney’s Aladdin the Musical, with positive feedback from hearing and visually-impaired theatre-goers.
- Auckland Zoo announced a partnership with Mazda Foundation for its Outreach Conservation Education programme.

**Contribution towards Māori Outcomes**

Te Reo Māori:
- All business units which have direct customers service responsibilities have implemented te reo Māori, assets and tikanga Māori staff training opportunities.
- Aotea Centre upgrade includes te reo Māori signage in its tri-lingual wayfinding plans.
- Identity and Culture
  - Internationally renowned artist Lisa Reihana has been commissioned to create a unique world-class Māori digital media work for Aotea Centre.
  - Effective Māori Participation
    - Relationships and engagement with iwi, Māori specialists are continuing to be developed and strengthened.
    - Auckland Stadiums has met with Te Puna Trust (owners of Ratana/Mt Smart Land). Arrangements have been made with the Trust to provide access to meeting rooms within the Stadium.
    - New Zealand Maritime Museum – Hui Te Awanui a Tangaroa has a Memorandum of Understanding with Te Toi Voyaging Trust.
    - Auckland Live and Convictions staff organised and supported 75 members of the cast and crew from Aladdin-the Musical to participate in a formal powhiri at Orākai Marae by Ngāti Whāitu Orākei.
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- Since the 3rd of January 2019, Auckland Live have been using Globelet re usable wine glasses.
- Their use for the Auckland season prevented over 13,000 disposable cups from going to landfill. Globelet cups were also trialled at four of Auckland Stadium’s major events over the 2018-2019 summer season.
- A project has been initiated to progressively replace the Art Gallery’s 300 Watt halogen external up lights with 30 Watt LED replacements resulting in a 10-fold improvement in energy efficiency. 26 of these will be replaced starting in April.
- The New Zealand Maritime Museum hosted a Seawork breakfast talk in March with Honi Uswin in partnership with Sustainable Seas National Science and Caudron Institute. The scientific talk was on the development of a new digital tool to track how ocean currents transport plastic.
- The Zoo’s water savings have been reported at 42300 m3 ($194,684) since April 2017 due to improved metering and real-time leak notification allowing for immediate leak repair.
- 0% of the Zoo’s recycling was rejected (sent to landfill) due to contamination this quarter, following a new initiative to hand sort aluminium.
- Rainwater harvesting tanks installed in the Zoo’s South East Asia precinct brings the Zoo’s total rainwater collection capacity from quarter of a million to half a million litres of water annually.

Local Board Engagement

- In February, the annual function for local boards, hosted by the chair of RFA, was attended by approximately 50 guests as well as RFA board members and senior management. Guests enjoyed informal tours of the New Zealand Maritime Museum and the opportunity to talk with people from RFA, advisory panels and other local boards across the city. Fourteen local boards were represented.
- The RFA Directors of Stadiums and Stadiums Strategy met with Waitamata Local Board, Manukau-ki-te-Tamaki Local Board and Upper Harbour Local Board to discuss the stadia within the board areas and the Auckland Stadiums Venue Development Strategy.
- The Deputy Director, Auckland Live, presented an update of activities and developments to the Waitamata Local Board, and is working with the board around developments in Albert Square, such as the Digital Stage, and citizenship ceremonies at the Auckland Town Hall.
- By the end of the quarter, six boards had placed the second quarter report on meeting agendas, while others are yet to do so or are distributing the report to members for reading.

### Regional Facilities Auckland Q3 performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key performance indicators</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD</th>
<th>YTD Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: RFA has a total of 4 LTP measures and 8 SO1 measures for the nine months to 31 March 2019, all of the measures have been measured against a quarterly target. 5 have been met / 3 have not been met.</td>
<td>Previous Quarter</td>
<td>FY 19 Quarter 3</td>
<td>YTD Target</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Facilities Auckland Q3 financials

#### Direct operating performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ (million)</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net direct</td>
<td>A 35.8 20.9 27.0 0.1 36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>B 58.0 41.3 46.9 (5.8) 62.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp;</td>
<td>C 46.0 53.0 37.9 (7.8) 55.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>D 1.7 0.9 0.6 0.3 0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>E 10.3 8.4 1.9 8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Financial Commentary

A: The RFA performance for the nine months to 31 March 2019 is tracking to budget. This has been achieved through tight control over expenditure by all the RFA divisions. The forecast for the financial year is unfavourable to budget by $205k, due to the acceleration of the visitor security programme.

B: Fees and user charges are unfavourable to budget due to planned events not occurring. Two large live theatre events have been postponed and two large outdoor concerts budgeted (but not secured) for this quarter did not proceed. This has also impacted food and beverage sales.

C: Funding Benefits.
### Attachment A
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual 1</th>
<th>Actual 2</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience Regional Facilities Auckland’s arts,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,080,305</td>
<td>2,423,215</td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,585,627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to Auckland Zoo</td>
<td>346,806</td>
<td>551,427</td>
<td>503,833</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to Auckland Art Gallery</td>
<td>204,131</td>
<td>304,651</td>
<td>374,067</td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to the NZ Maritime Museum</td>
<td>78,570</td>
<td>124,285</td>
<td>121,651</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Auckland residents surveyed who value RFA venues and events</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Maori in</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland, Tāmaki Makaurau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Viaduct Events Centre was leased to Team NZ during the second quarter. This re-purposing of the facility has had a negative impact on the overall visitor numbers. It is unlikely this target will be met by year end.

International visitor numbers did not achieve the targets set for the summer months and it is forecast that the year-end target will not be met due to a lower number of paid exhibitions and potentially also due to the introduction of the international visitor charge.

The forecast shows that revenue targets will not be met this year, however tight control over expenditure means that the expected forecast for the financial year end is that RFA will be unfavourable to budget by only $256k due to the acceleration of the visitor security programme.
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek local board feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery has been developed to ensure Auckland is better prepared to recover from a disaster.
3. The planning framework sets out in the document:
   • identifies community values and priorities
   • sets a vision for recovery
   • focuses on the consequences to be addressed in recovery
   • focuses on building capacity and capability and addressing barriers
   • identifies actions to build momentum.
4. It has been developed with local board engagement over 2018 and local board feedback is now sought particularly on:
   • community values
   • community priorities
   • the vision
   • the way we will work in recovery
   • the work to be done to be better prepared for recovery.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:
a) review and provide feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery.

Horopaki
Context
5. Following the Christchurch and Kaikoura earthquakes, the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 was amended and new guidelines were issued requiring better preparation for, and implementation of, recovery from a disaster.
6. Auckland Emergency Management began development of the Resilient Recovery Strategy to ensure Auckland is better prepared. This included:
   • workshops on recovery with local boards between 24 May and 12 July 2018
   • reporting back on the workshops in September 2018
• presentations to local board cluster meetings in March and November 2018
• updating local boards on the development of the Resilient Recovery Strategy in November 2018 and advising that a draft would go the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee in February 2019.

7. At the beginning of this year, the Resilient Recovery Strategy was renamed ‘Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework to Recovery’ (refer Attachment A) as it better described the document’s intent and contents.

8. The Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee approved the draft pathways document for targeted engagement in February 2019.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice


10. The pathways document is structured around this process, as illustrated in the components of Figure 1 on page 3 of the document:

i) Identifying community values and priorities
   The planning framework set out in the pathways document is described as community centric. Community values and priorities guide us in our preparations enabling recovery to be set up and implemented in a way that helps to meet community needs and aspirations.
   An initial set of community values and priorities was derived from workshops with local boards and advisory panels. They will be refined through community engagement as a part of actions to build a better understanding of recovery.

ii) Setting the recovery vision
   The pathways document sets the vision whereby ‘Auckland’s people, communities, businesses and infrastructure are well-placed to recover from a disaster.’
   Being well placed means being well-prepared.

iii) Anticipation of consequences and opportunities of Auckland hazards and risks
   Anticipating potential consequences and opportunities from the impacts of Auckland’s hazards and risks provides insight into what might be required of a recovery. Auckland’s hazards and risks are identified in the Group Plan and some are the focus of the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan. Building on previous work is part of the work programme resulting from the planning framework under the pathways document.

iv) Building capacity and capability, addressing barriers to recovery
   Another way in which the planning framework is community centric is in the way we will work in a recovery. Taking a collaborative, partnership approach means structuring and implementing recovery in a way that maintains its focus on community outcomes.
   A significant recovery will require ‘big government’ structures and processes to effectively mobilise resources and coordinate large scale effort. Such approaches can seem remote from local communities. Effort is required to ensure good communication and community engagement are effectively maintained.

v) Identifying actions to build momentum
   Another significant focus is the work to be done to be better prepared. There are 43 actions identified under five focus areas: Recovery is communicated; Recovery is
understood; Capacity and Capability is available; Collaboration is supported; and progress is monitored and evaluated.

The actions will form a work programme to be implemented in the lead-up to the review of the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan which is due by October 2021, unless delayed by events.

11. Against this background, comments and views on the pathways document strategy is particularly required on:

- community values
- community priorities
- the vision
- the way we will work in recovery
- the work to be done to be better prepared for recovery.

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

12. Many parts of the Auckland Council group potentially become involved in responding to a disaster and subsequent recovery. The planning framework in the pathway's document seeks to provide clarity about what will be required to support effective collaboration across the council group in recovery.

13. Views from across the council group are being sought during targeted engagement through June and July 2019.

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

14. Auckland’s hazards and risks may give rise to events with local, sub-regional or region-wide impacts. Their consequences will be influenced by the circumstances of the time and place in which the event took place.

15. Local board views on their community’s values and priorities are important in determining the way we will work together collaboratively in recovering from a disaster.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

16. Recovery addresses the consequences of an emergency and their impacts across the natural, social, built and economic environments. The goals, objectives and execution of recovery holds implications for iwi, environmental guardianship, Māori communities (iwi, hapu and mataawaka), marae, assets and the Māori economy.

17. Building relationships amongst Auckland’s Māori communities to develop a deeper understanding of our potential collaboration across reduction, readiness, response, resilience and recovery, is a goal of Auckland Emergency Management. It is also part of the work plan arising from the planning framework set out in the pathways document.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

18. There are no financial implications arising out of this report.
Risks and mitigations

19. Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery and the work programme it will establish are intended to address the risk of Auckland being unprepared to recover from a disaster.

20. Recovering from a disaster is complex, lengthy and costly. An absence or lack of preparation can:

- delay commencement of recovery efforts and lengthen the time taken to complete recovery
- inhibit multi-agency collaboration
- lead to increased costs, disruption and distress for affected communities and individuals.

Next steps

21. Local board feedback will be collated and considered for reporting to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee and incorporation into the final iteration of the pathways document.
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Introduction

How Auckland might recover from a disaster is important. Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery (the Framework) sets the scene for recovery, provides direction based on community values and principles, outlines our approach to recovery and identifies actions to build momentum on improving our preparedness to recover from a disaster.

A detailed recovery work programme will be developed to deliver on these actions across Auckland Council group and with our partners.

The process we followed

In the wake of lessons learned from Christchurch’s unanticipated, catastrophic earthquakes the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 was amended to make greater provision for recovery. Among other things, the amendments require strategic planning to be undertaken to prepare for recovery before disaster strikes. The Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management issued guidelines stepping out how this can best be done.

We followed this process to:

- identify an initial set of community values and priorities to inform our planning.
- set our recovery vision
- anticipate the consequences and opportunities of Auckland’s hazards and risks
- focus on building capacity and capability; and addressing barriers to recovery
- identify actions to build momentum.

---

1 ‘Disaster’ in the Recovery Framework is defined as an emergency (under section 4 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002) event that requires a recovery.
Figure 1. Pathways to Preparedness
Community Values and Priorities

The Framework takes a community centric approach, recognising the significant challenges confronting all recovery efforts (from relatively localised events to large-scale disasters).

Community wellbeing is the focus of recovery. In the aftermath of a significant event, individuals and communities will want to get things moving back to normality as quickly as possible. They will also want to see how we keep community at the heart of any recovery effort.

Understanding community values and priorities provides guidance on what will be important to communities, as a basis for pre-event planning and preparations for recovery. They indicate preferences for community involvement and the things communities hold dear. For example, decision-making underestimated the value, the people of Christchurch attached to their built heritage, meaning the pace, manner and extent of demolition caused great upset. Through understanding community values and priorities, we are better able to ensure appropriate decision-making and priority setting processes, and opportunities for participation.

Identifying community values and priorities

Auckland Emergency Management has worked with Auckland Council’s local boards and Auckland Council’s demographic Advisory Panels (Seniors, Ethnic Peoples, Pacific Peoples, Disability, Youth and Rainbow Communities). Our discussions have highlighted some key values and priorities that will be consulted on across Auckland communities.

Strong themes centred on retention of heritage in the natural built and cultural context. The need for local knowledge, leadership, partnerships and voice. Communication and connection was a common theme in the discussions. It was felt that multiple avenues for communicating was a high priority and suggestions for connecting across diversity, hard to reach communities and leveraging traditional and digital media would need to be sought.

The importance of getting key infrastructure such as hospitals, lifelines utilities and social and community infrastructure up and running fast was also identified. Personal safety was also highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity, Diversity and Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence, Resilience and Self Reliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Connection and Culture, Heritage, Amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Knowledge, Leadership, Partnership and Voice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Social Connections, Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Local Input, Lifelines and Key Infrastructure, Economic Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Health and Personal Wellbeing (including our pets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Personal Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Recovery Vision

Auckland’s people, communities, businesses and infrastructure are well-placed to recovery from a disaster.

Recovery

Recovery means “the coordinated efforts and processes used to bring to about the immediate, medium-term, and long-term holistic regeneration and enhancement of a community following an emergency.” Correspondingly, recovery activities deal with the consequences of an emergency. An emergency is when something happens which causes or may cause loss of life or injury, or endangers public safety or property that:

- cannot be dealt with emergency services or
- requires a significant and coordinated response.

The definition of an emergency refers to the likes of earthquakes, tsunami, tornado, plague and floods as well as the leakage or spillage of dangerous substances or failure of or disruption to an emergency service or lifeline utility. For convenience and brevity, we use ‘disaster’ to mean and emergency event that requires a recovery.

The essential issue of recovery is that; what has been built up over many decades through private and publicly funded development, individual, family and civic effort can be destroyed or damaged all at once, needing to be regenerated within a comparatively short period of time. Resulting disruption to businesses, housing, infrastructure networks, facilities and amenities impact on daily life and living standards, potentially for some time.

Recovery is complex and takes time. Recovery initially faces high levels of uncertainty, as the situation evolves. Time required for recovery to be completed can challenge people’s expectations and aspirations. They may feel like their life is on hold.

Preparations for recovery under this Framework aim to respond to and be fit for purpose for any scale of event. For example, depending on its scale, Auckland Council may have to reprioritise its activities to support a recovery.

What does Well-placed mean?

An underlying theme of recovery and its essential problem is complexity. Well-placed means being well prepared.

Lessons have been learnt from recent large events such as the Christchurch earthquakes and Kaikoura earthquakes. Intentionally preparing for recovery rather than leaving matters to chance or orchestrating recovery on the fly, greatly increases the prospects of more effective recovery – that is:

- the early commencement of organised recovery activities

---

3 Adapted from definitions in the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.
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- with a clear sense of purpose
- supported by participants and affected communities.

Achieving a successful start to a recovery requires a shared understanding of what a recovery is; what needs to be done (at least initially), and access to funding and resources. This in turn requires clear roles and responsibilities supporting cooperation and collaboration across many organisations and people, across many work streams. At a more detailed level it requires:

- clear, well understood processes for the transition to recovery
- assessing people’s needs and the damage to buildings and infrastructure
- procuring, allocating and managing resources
- managing the delivery of services and implementation of activities and projects.

Reinstatement, regeneration or enhancement?

Ultimately questions arise as to how ambitious or achievable recovery should be.

‘Build Back Better’ is a term arising out of the fourth priority for action (of 4) – “Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to build back better in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction”, of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction endorsed by the United Nations.

“Over the years there has been an appreciation that reconstruction is an opportunity to build back better. Today recovery is defined as the restoration and improvement of facilities, livelihoods and living conditions of disaster-affected communities, including efforts to reduce disaster risk factors,”4 and is reflected in the definitions for recovery and recovery in the Civil Defence Emergency Act 2002.

What this means in practice can be very difficult. What was lost may not be able to be replaced exactly, the values of assets written down, insurance may only cover what previously existed in its then condition and regulations may impose their own requirements.

Responsible and cost-effective rehabilitation of a community does not guarantee a community will be restored to its original state. However, there may be opportunities to enable communities to improve on previous conditions. Through taking a broad, flexible or innovative view, enhancements may include new behaviours increased personal or community resilience, application or urban design and or universal design principles rather or improved structures or upsized infrastructure.

---

4 UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, 14-18 March 2015, Sendai, Japan.
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Understanding consequences and opportunities

New Zealand and international experience demonstrates the advantages of pre-event planning and preparation over leaving it to chance or having to orchestrate a recovery on the fly.

Pre-event planning and preparation for recovery is supported by analysis of the likely impacts and consequences of emergency events. The potential hazard and its impacts interact with the circumstances existing at the time and in the area the emergency event takes place. Further community values and priorities form part of and inform these circumstances. Understanding the impacts and circumstances, and their interaction in time and place is integral to planning for recovery. Scenario planning and running scenario-based exercises can assist greatly in this area.

This approach helps identify critical factors to an effective recovery, opportunities to improve community resilience and where possible, mitigate existing and identified hazards and risks. Through working with communities, we can prioritise areas of vulnerability while leveraging and supporting continued resilience within recovery.

![Diagram](https://example.com/diagram.png)

Figure 2  Anticipating what recovery may have to address.

The Auckland CDEM Group’s Plan ‘Resilient Auckland’ identifies several hazards and risks to the Auckland region, including natural events (such as volcanic eruption, severe weather events, tsunami, and coastal inundation) and infrastructure and lifeline utility failures (such as disruption to electricity, water, and transport networks).

When planning for impacts of hazards and risks, consideration needs to be given to the four recovery environments – social, built, economic and natural.

Auckland faces unique challenges - super diversity, rural and urban contexts, housing supply, homelessness, aging infrastructure and high rates of growth and development, which are key considerations for a potential disaster and ongoing recovery effort.

Emergencies and their consequences can be localised, affecting an area within a single local board’s boundaries or of wider impact, affecting an area that is part of multiple local boards, or the entire region.

Some emergencies may involve a series of cascading events, each of which may require different, but complimentary recovery activities. For example, a volcanic eruption in the north
of the Auckland Volcanic Field may cause evacuations and damage on the North Shore, but
ashfall may progressively damage wastewater treatment networks that eventually leads to
region-wide lifeline utility failures. The context of a recovery can be extremely dynamic.

It should be noted however, there are limitations to the extent to which impacts of hazards
and circumstances can be fully anticipated. Work to better understand Auckland’s hazards
and risks and their impacts is part of Auckland Emergency Management’s ongoing work
programme.
Building capacity and capability, and addressing barriers

Auckland Emergency Management and the Auckland CDEM Group are particularly focused on building capacity and capability for recovery and to addressing barriers that may inhibit or obstruct effective recovery.

The Framework takes a broad view to shaping the way we will work in recovery and enabling the work we will do recovery, informed by the community values and priorities.

The way we work – a partnership approach

Auckland Emergency Management and the CDEM Group takes a partnership approach, seeking the best of organic forms, supportive of community action and emerging solutions, and highly structured institutional / governmental forms to provide coordination and operate at scale. This will enable Auckland Emergency Management, Auckland Council and our partners to deliver a more effective and coordinated recovery informed by community values and priorities.

The partnership approach recognises and respects diversity to ensure recovery is inclusive and provides opportunities for community participation. It is implemented through:

- prioritising the wellbeing of individuals, families and communities and their recovery
- restoring and/or improving the function of infrastructure, structures, physical networks and urban fabric that support communities
- enabling the restoration and/or regeneration of natural environments and their habitats and ecosystems
- supporting the interactions between businesses, business people, employees, resources and assets, and the commerce and trade generated in the economic environment.

The partnership approach identifies scalable, flexible and adaptable coordinating structures, aligned to key roles and responsibilities. It is a mechanism to link local and central government, the private sector and non-government (NGO) and community organisations that play a vital role in recovery. For example – the larger the scale of a recovery the more likely it will orient towards government structures and processes. This raises potential for flexibility, innovation and empowering the recovery of individuals to be unintentionally inhibited.

This approach builds on the work of Auckland’s CDEM Group / Auckland Emergency Management across the 5 R’s – reduction, readiness, response, recovery and resilience, our focus on communities and strengthening resilience and the strengths of the Auckland Council group and its partners. It provides opportunities for communities of practice to be activated, and guides and champions in the community to play a role informing and supporting the recovery effort assisting their communities.

Building upon existing partnerships the approach will also work across wider groups to embrace new formal and informal partnerships.
The way we work – collaborating across formal and informal partnerships

Auckland Emergency Management provides the specialist roles serving Auckland Council’s civil defence function under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 and would lead the initial stages of recovery.


Auckland Council’s governing body has delegated responsibility to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee as the decision maker for the Group.

Auckland Emergency Management and the CDEM Group works closely and collaboratively with many stakeholders. For example, the Auckland Welfare Coordination Group is made up of 26-member agencies active in response. Many of these emergency services, social and health service and non-governmental organisations will also support recovery.

Auckland Emergency Management engages Auckland Council’s local boards across the pre-event recovery work programme and will work closely with local boards when undertaking a recovery in their area or areas.

Auckland Emergency Management will further develop its relationships across the emergency management sector and its communities through the implementation of this Framework. Developing and building relationships with Auckland’s iwi and mataawaaka is a particular focus and a priority.

The work we do – addressing barriers to recovery

Recovery gives rise to a range of inherent challenges and issues, as multiple activities are delivered simultaneously across workstreams addressing recovery in the natural, social, built and economic environments.

Through the development of this Framework, engagement with the Ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management, recovery literature and our engagement with our partners we have identified five focus areas to assist in preparing for recovery. They direct activity towards what is crucial to recovery or address barriers to recovery in Auckland. Focusing on effective recovery the five areas seek to ensure:

- capacity and capability is available
- collaboration is supported
- recovery is communicated
- recovery is understood
- monitoring and evaluation.
It is recognised that effective recovery requires supporting work programmes in addition to implementation of the Framework, such as:

- refining Standard Operating Procedures for recovery
- implementing the readiness work programme of the Incident Management Team
- incorporating and learning from international and New Zealand recovery efforts
- supporting the development of emergency management recovery networks, like the Northern Recovery Managers Group.
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Actions to build momentum

The following section outlines high-level, short to medium-term actions. They respond to the set of initial community values and priorities outlined earlier and are directed towards the five focus areas.

They will drive the recovery work programme across the breadth of preparation, relationship building and communication. Delivering on the identified actions will progress us towards achieving the longer-term vision, and that progress will be monitored and evaluated.

Auckland Emergency Management will develop a prioritised work programme to deliver on the identified actions. Our Civil Defence Emergency Management partners will be involved along the way to ensure inter-agency operability is maintained, operational needs are assured and to affirm our shared understanding.

Initially focused within Auckland Emergency Management, a whole-of-council approach to implementing the work programme will involve Auckland Council group first, and then our partners, before expanding outwards engaging additional partners and reaching out into the community.
## Auckland’s diversity

Auckland hosts a rich and diverse population by age, gender, religion, sexuality, nationality and culture. This is a strength of Auckland while also meaning specific needs might present themselves in a recovery.

Achieving effective recovery will require the flexibility to ensure recovery works for all Aucklanders and their communities.

Communication, understanding recovery, and being able to engage and participate may be challenging for some communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate improved cultural awareness to be able to understand specific concerns, to enable them to be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and tap into resources across the Auckland Council group and externally to better communicate and engage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage the potential of Auckland Council’s demographic Advisory Panels – Seniors, Ethnic Peoples, Pacific Peoples, Disability, Youth and Rainbow Communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Building a better understanding of Recovery

Understandably, recovery is not well understood.

It has a limited profile beyond the CDEM sector and people with personal knowledge.

The current level of understanding is a barrier to people’s ability to anticipate and prepare in advance of an emergency event.

Auckland hosts a rich and diverse population by age, gender, religion, sexuality, nationality and culture. This is a strength of Auckland while also meaning specific needs might present themselves in a recovery.

Achieving effective recovery will require the flexibility to ensure recovery works for all Aucklanders and their communities.

Communication, understanding recovery, and being able to engage and participate may be challenging in some communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a ‘Recovery story’ supported by key messages and education materials (translated in different languages).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage opportunities to raise the profile and discuss recovery with new audiences through the CDEM Group, Auckland Council group, partners and communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Auckland Emergency Management’s education and outreach programme across the five R’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate improved cultural awareness to be able to understand specific concerns, to enable them to be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and tap into resources across the Auckland Council group and externally to better communicate and engage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage the potential of Auckland Council’s demographic Advisory Panels – Seniors, Ethnic Peoples, Pacific Peoples, Disability, Youth and Rainbow Communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Expectations</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The disruption to daily life and routines can be sudden and significant. Previously</td>
<td>Clear and consistent communication is critical to maintaining trust in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>routine tasks become complicated and can subject to repeated change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of upset can be exacerbated by ongoing change due to recovery activities or</td>
<td>Strike a balance between ambition and achievability in planning and preparations for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather changes. Previous plans go on hold.</td>
<td>recovery in a recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of this magnitude can be disempowering and a source of frustration and distress</td>
<td>Leverage creativity, community spirit and participation in a recovery to promote solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for many.</td>
<td>and assist in the recovery effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is eager to return to something that resembles what was normal before the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event, as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nature of the event, its impacts and the scale of the recovery effort required inform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the type and extent of recovery efforts required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy / Local Economy</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption can bring business, trade and commerce to a standstill. Orders and</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities and mechanisms for local sourcing/procurement of goods and services during a recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitments may not be met, and employees may have not work. Everybody suffers</td>
<td>Work with Business Associations to encourage uptake of Business Continuity Planning and practices amongst their member businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardships without cash flow or access to money to access necessities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrupted supply lines may need to be restored.</td>
<td>Leverage a better understanding of the Auckland’s and local economies through engagement with potential Task Group members for the economic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctions between rural and urban local economies are also important. For example,</td>
<td>Leverage opportunities for youth employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seasonal activities may have needs or requirements with potential consequences for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production over an extended period.</td>
<td>Understand the implications of seasonal cycles and underlying activities to identify factors which are critical to Auckland’s rural economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding and resources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacing capital and social investment, restoring natural ecosystems and regenerating</td>
<td>Building shared organisational understanding of what recovery may involve across Auckland Council group, CDEM group, Task Groups, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the environments that support social and economic well-being requires significant</td>
<td>progressively, with Auckland’s communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding.</td>
<td>Sharing of Standard Operating Procedures, plans and recovery documentation as appropriate, and subsequent updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The commitment of financial and human resources to prioritise recovery activities is</td>
<td>Generate a deeper shared understanding of arrangements regarding the servicing of recovery in respect of financial, information and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also significant. Accessing needed skills and expertise can be additional challenges.</td>
<td>project management, specialist and expert advice and general administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining a recovery, prudent financial management, appropriate project management,</td>
<td>Understanding the way business units across Auckland Council group deliver their services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while maintaining a focus delivering on the desired outcomes is complex in a</td>
<td>Raising the profile of recovery arrangements and the understanding of what might be required of service delivery business units and their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pressured environment.</td>
<td>contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery from smaller events can seem disproportionately large, while major and</td>
<td>Identifying key skills, expertise and services contributing to recovery across Auckland Council group and partner organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant events present hurdles that are magnitudes greater. The longer recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continues the greater the pressure on resources as demand to deliver disrupted projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and work programmes builds. This can pose particular challenges where the event and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recovery are limited to a part of the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori communities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent experience of response and recovery from disasters has benefited from the</td>
<td>Develop a shared understanding of recovery within Auckland Emergency Management’s wider engagement with mana whenua and mataawaka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation, support and leadership of mana whenua and local iwi at all levels –</td>
<td>Build on the opportunities for collaboration to cultivate leadership, participation and outcomes for Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from delivering services to decision making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Pre-existing issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-existing issues</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any existing issues at the time of an event will be magnified in their effect and consequence.</td>
<td>Environmental scanning to maintain general awareness of issues and challenges facing Auckland across the four recovery environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing is under pressure in Auckland, with elevated house prices and rental costs, homelessness and high demand for social housing and refuge. Emergency accommodation will be a challenge in these circumstances.</td>
<td>Maintain engagement with partners and stakeholders and leverage opportunities to gather information and intelligence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples health conditions, disabilities, or personal circumstances may make them especially vulnerable to sudden change and disruption to their environment.</td>
<td>• in recovery planning and preparations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport bottlenecks or previously known weakens in a network may have a pronounced effect in a particular event.</td>
<td>• through the duration of recovery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Psychosocial recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychosocial recovery</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International and more recent experiences in New Zealand has raised awareness of the way that emergency events can have very different impacts on people.</td>
<td>Ensuring people involved in recovery maintain an awareness of the complexities of psychosocial recovery that individuals may be going through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some may be unscathed, and others impacted to varying degrees. Impacts may only become apparent after the passage of time.</td>
<td>Sharing best practice amongst experienced practitioners with and amongst front-line staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person individual circumstances can make it more difficult to cope with ongoing disruption and change, to make decisions and to support others.</td>
<td>Apply case management and debriefing principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally, individual recovery from such impacts takes time and is non-linear or continuous, with many ‘ups’ and ‘downs’ possible.</td>
<td>Psychosocial first aid training or other for all people in contact roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness raising of the psychosocial impacts on responding agencies and staff and the putting in place of support mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Groups</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Groups are established to provide advice and assistance for each of the natural, social, built and economic environments. Each Task Group has a Terms of Reference, setting out its functions, roles and responsibilities. Task Groups may also comprise sub-task groups. Potential members are practitioners, experts or leaders in their field whose knowledge would benefit a recovery. They are generally busy people, which can be a barrier to maintaining Task Groups, keeping informed and abreast of best practice in recovery. Further, the membership of Task Groups needs to reflect the nature and scale of the task for each event.</td>
<td>Establishing a ‘pool’ of potential Task Group members to ensure readiness and the ability to scale a recovery proportionate to the nature of the disaster. The pool for each recovery environment may be comprised of both: a core membership comprised of people within the wider Auckland Council group / emergency sector a wider membership of people who might only be called upon if the event demands it. Core members would be more involved with up to 4 meetings/exercises a year. Wider group members would be less involved, though steps taken to ensure relationships and awareness is maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intensity and pressure of a response is very demanding. People in lead roles in response can be expected to be exhausted. Although the same agencies may have lead roles/key roles, they will need to identify specific staffing to support the recovery effort.</td>
<td>Explore the current capacity and capability for recovery within participating agencies. Explore potential arrangements they may operate in a recovery and their staffing. Ensure key staff in the recovery are different from key staff in response. Train staff for recovery as required. (potentially based on common arrangements).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective recovery requires high levels of coordination and collaboration, with everyone actively participating. Achieving this level of collaboration is supported by:</td>
<td>Develop guidelines setting out the process, considerations, information/intelligence required and potential sources to assist in considering whether a recovery process needs to be activated - incorporate key elements into Standard Operating Procedures, with thresholds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• strong institutional and personal relationships</td>
<td>Share Standard Operating Procedures, plans and recovery documentation (and subsequent updates) with partners as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clear roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>Build and maintain institutional and personal relationships amongst key agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a shared understanding of what is to be achieved in a recovery</td>
<td>Clarifying agreed roles and responsibilities amongst leading partners and key agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective support systems and communication.</td>
<td>Formalise arrangements, roles, responsibilities in key areas through developing protocols, memorandum of understanding or similar. (Key areas = support delivery of a critical service or critical resources or arrangements important in every recovery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monitoring and evaluation**

The response to, and recovery from an event are frequently reviewed to identify what went well/not so well and improvements to future practice.

Monitoring and evaluation are integral to programme management and the development of best practice.

Levels of disruption or distance from previous norms are readily identifiable from common high-level metrics, such as regional GDP or the unemployment rate. Comparisons of these types of metrics (when available) lend themselves to debates on the progress or success of recovery from a significant event. These types of metrics are important and produced methodically by agencies external to a recovery.

More particularly, indicators need to be identified to be able to track progress towards fulfilling the vision and objectives for recovery. Similarly, indicators are required to provide information on the extent to which the principles are being applied.

Indicators are also required to track progress on the tasks/actions identified in Recovery Action Plans, formulated after an event.

Development of a monitoring and evaluation framework for recovery able to be applied to:

- provide insight into the relevance of high-level independent metrics
- track the extent of progress towards achievement of the Framework’s vision for recovery
- progress towards completing items on the recovery work programme (generated from the Framework’s actions)
- provide insight into the overall efficacy of event planning and preparations for recovery
- track progress towards the completion of actions and tasks under a Recovery Action Plan formulated for the recovery from an emergency event
- provide insight into the overall efficacy of actions and tasks under a Recovery Action Plan formulated to address the consequences in a disaster.
New road names in the subdivision at 425 Clarks Beach Road, Waiau Pa by Orepunga Farm Limited

File No.: CP2019/12288

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Franklin Local Board for the name of a new road to be created in a subdivision at 425 Clarks Beach Road, Waiau Pa by Orepunga Farm Limited.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the Council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across the Auckland Region.

3. The applicants, Orepunga Farm Limited, have submitted the following names for consideration for a new road name at 425 Clarks Beach Road, Waiau Pa:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Orepunga Farm Proposed Road Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Road Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) approve road name ‘Orepunga Way’ for the new road name in the subdivision at 425 Clarks Beach Road, Waiau Pa, in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974.

Horopaki
Context
4. The subdivision at 425 Clarks Beach Road, Waiau Pa (SUB60303760) will create nine lots (Lots 1-9) and one cul-de-sac road to vest (Lot 10). The road will serve eight lots (Lots 1-8). Balance lot 9 will have its own road frontage onto Clarks Beach Road.

5. The road is required to be named in accordance with the national addressing standard as it serves more than 5 lots.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
6. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect:
   - A historical or ancestral linkage to an area;
   - A particular landscape, environment or biodiversity theme or feature; or
7. The Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines allow that where a new road needs to be named as a result of a subdivision or development, the subdivider/developer shall be given the opportunity of suggesting their preferred new road name for the Local Board’s approval.

8. The applicant has proposed the following names for consideration for the new road created as part of the subdivision at 425 Clarks Beach Road, Waiau Pa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Road Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orepunga Way</td>
<td>Orepunga is the area that the applicant’s family farmed in the Waikato for over a hundred years and is the company name of the current ownership of this farm. (Applicant Preferred and supported by iwi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle Dell Lane</td>
<td>A dell is a small glen or valley, namely with reference to the wetland area within the development. (First Alternative not supported by iwi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repo Way</td>
<td>‘Wetland Way to reflect the wetland within the development. (suggested by iwi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Land Information New Zealand has confirmed that the above names are acceptable to use although pointed out that Dingle Dell Lane would be ‘a stones throw away’ from Dell Road.

10. The proposed suffix of ‘Way’ or ‘Lane’ is deemed acceptable as it accurately describes the characteristics of the road.

11. The name proposed by the Applicant is deemed to meet the road naming guidelines.

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

12. The decision sought for this report has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report’s advice.

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

13. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate impact beyond those outlined in this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

14. The applicant has consulted with local iwi and one response has been received from Ngati Te Ata. Ngati Te Ata support the name “Orepunga Way”, or instead of “Dingle Dell Way”, “Repo Way” (wetland way).

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

15. The applicant has responsibility for ensuring that appropriate signage will be installed accordingly once approval is obtained for the new road name.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

16. There are no significant risks to council as road naming is a routine part of the subdivision development process with consultation being a key part of the process.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

17. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand who records them on their New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by councils.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Attachment A - Site locality plan</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0</td>
<td>Attachment B - Scheme Plan</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Lesley Wood, Subdivision Advisor - South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>David Snowdon - Team Leader Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A:

Site locality plan of Orepunga Farm, 425 Clarks Beach Road, Waiau Pa.
Attachment B:

Scheme Plan of Subdivision for Orepunga Farm Limited, 425 Clarks Beach Road, Waiau Pa

New road names in the subdivision at 425 Clarks Beach Road, Waiau Pa by Orepunga Farm Limited
Franklin Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar

File No.: CP2019/08792

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To consider the monthly update of the Franklin Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This report provides an update on the Franklin Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar. A schedule of key decisions that will come before the board at business meetings over the next year is attached (Attachment A).
3. The calendar aims to support the local board’s governance role by:
   i) Ensuring advice on agendas and workshop material is driven by local board priorities
   ii) Clarifying what advice is required and when
   iii) Clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar will be regularly updated to ensure that formal reporting milestones for new projects are added to the schedule. Sitting behind the publicly reported calendar is a less formal but more detailed meeting schedule, which will help to coordinate the work of staff on local board projects and ensure that previous resolutions are acted upon.
5. At its business meeting on 6 June 2017, Franklin Local Board resolved that the governance forward work calendar would be reported monthly to enable greater public transparency on forthcoming local board key decision timescales (Resolution number FR/2017/82).

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:
   a) note the July 2019 update of the Franklin governance forward work calendar (Attachment A to the report entitled ‘Franklin Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar’).

Horopaki / Context
6. The governance forward work calendar brings together reporting on all of Franklin Local Board’s projects and activities previously approved in the local board plan, long-term plan, departmental work programmes and through other board decisions. It includes governing body policies and initiatives that call for a local board response. Inclusion on a formal business meeting agenda will allow greater transparency for the public.
7. Sitting behind the publicly reported calendar is a more detailed meeting schedule, which will help to coordinate the work of staff on local board projects and ensure that previous resolutions are acted upon.
8. The forward work calendar is arranged in three columns: ‘Topic’, ‘Purpose’ and ‘Governance Role’:
   i.) Topic describes the items and may indicate how they fit in with broader processes such as the annual plan.
ii.) Purpose indicates the aim of the item, such as formally approving plans or projects, hearing submissions or receiving progress updates.

iii.) Governance role is a high-level categorisation of the work of local boards.

9. At its business meeting on 6 June 2017, Franklin Local Board resolved that the governance forward work calendar would be reported monthly to enable greater public transparency on forthcoming local board key decision timescales (Resolution number FR/2017/82).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

10. This report is an information report providing the governance forward work programme for the next six months.

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

11. All local boards have been receiving governance forward work calendars on their business meeting agendas. This will support more effective management of the local board’s governance work.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

12. The projects and processes referred to in the governance forward work calendar will have a range of implications for Māori which will be considered when the work is reported.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

13. There are no financial implications relating to this report.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

14. This report is a point in time of the governance forward work calendar. It is a living document and updated month to month. It minimises the risk of the board being unaware of planned topics for their consideration.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

15. Staff will review the calendar each month and will report an updated calendar to the board.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Denise Gunn - Democracy Advisor - Franklin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Governance Forward Work Calendar – July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Draft Resilient Recovery Strategy</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
<td>Animal Management Bylaw</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
<td>Productivity Commission’s inquiry into local government funding and financing</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Review of Auckland’s film protocols</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>August/ Sept</td>
<td>Last business meeting report (delegations for election period)</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Oct/Nov</td>
<td>First business meeting report</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Nov/Dec</td>
<td>Auckland climate action plan (previously Low Carbon Auckland)</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Draft Golf Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Signage Bylaw 2015</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin Local Board workshop records

File No.: CP2019/08793

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To receive the Franklin Local Board workshop records for workshops held on 18 and 25 June, and for 2 July 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Workshop records for the Franklin Local Board are attached for 18 and 25 June, and for 2 July 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Franklin Local Board:

a) receive the Franklin Local Board workshop records for 18 and 25 June, and for 2 July 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board workshop record 18 June 2019</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board workshop record 25 June 2019</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board workshop record 2 July 2019</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Denise Gunn</td>
<td>Democracy Advisor - Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers</td>
<td>Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Franklin Local Board held in the Local Board Chambers, Pukekohe Service Centre on 18 June 2019, commencing at 9.30am 11 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Angela Fulljames
Members: Andrew Baker (from 1.54 pm), Alan Cole, Niko Kloeten, Murray Kay, Sharlene Druyven, Amanda Hopkins (from 9.50 am), Malcolm Bell
Apologies: Andrew Baker (late on council business), Amanda Hopkins (lateness)
Also present: Georgina Gilmour, Senior Advisor; Vileea Naidoo Advisor, Lucy Stallworthy Engagement Advisor, Denise Gunn, Democracy Advisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunua Trails update&lt;br&gt;Katharine&lt;br&gt;MacGillivray, Inovo&lt;br&gt;Chris Lock, ATEED&lt;br&gt;Sharon Rimmer, Strategic Partnerships Specialists, PSR&lt;br&gt;Debra Langton, PSR Portfolio Manager</td>
<td>Local initiative/ specific decisions</td>
<td>Staff and contractors updated the board on progress of the Hunua Trails plan. A report will be presented requesting endorsement by the governing body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants – Quick Response Round 3, and Coastal Rescue Fund 2018/2019&lt;br&gt;Agus Castro Pons, Grants Advisor</td>
<td>Local initiative/ specific decisions</td>
<td>The board reviewed the applications for grants for the two rounds, prior to the report coming to the June 25 business meeting for decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Corridor Initiative update&lt;br&gt;Jenni Wild, NZTA</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The Southern Corridor Initiative work progress was presented to the board. This project is due for completion by Xmas 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura to Bombay&lt;br&gt;Jenni Wild, NZTA&lt;br&gt;Prasad Tala,&lt;br&gt;Ronnie Salunga</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The P2B (Papakura to Bombay) project plans were outlined for the board’s information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>AT staff presented the monthly update to the board and noted elected member queries and input on various topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Tuai, Elected Member Relationship Manager AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.03 pm
Franklin Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Franklin Local Board held in the Local Board Chambers, Pukekohe Service Centre on 25 June 2019, commencing at 11.25 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Angela Fulljames
Members: Andrew Baker, Alan Cole, Niko Kloeten (till 2.25 pm), Murray Kay, Sharlene Druyven, Amanda Hopkins (till 2.18 pm), Malcolm Bell
Apologies: Nil
Also present: Georgina Gilmour Senior Advisor; Vileeka Naidoo Advisor, Denise Gunn Democracy Advisor, Arlene Frederick, RMPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Plan discussion</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>The board discussed themes of the current local board plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgina Gilmour, Senior Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Keeping informed / providing direction on specific issues</td>
<td>An early draft plan for potential playground, skate park and toilet renewals at Clarkes Beach Recreation Reserve was reviewed. The board noted this should not progress until the needs assessment is completed and a master plan progressed. Puriri Road Reserve work is on hold pending further advice from other council departments. Staff advised that the transfer of operational maintenance of town centres commences on 1 July 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Greive, Landscape Architect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichola Painter, Stakeholder Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Pizzaro, Manager Project Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumeet Prasad, Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Ewens, Snr Maintenance Delivery Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 2.50 pm
Franklin Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Franklin Local Board held in the Local Board Chambers, Pukekohe Service Centre on 2 July 2019, commencing at 9.30 am.

**PRESENT**

**Chairperson:** Angela Fulljames  
**Members:** Andrew Baker, Alan Cole, Murray Kay, Sharlene Druyven, Amanda Hopkins (from 9.42 am), Malcolm Bell  
**Apologies:** Niko Kloeten  
**Also present:** Nina Siers, Relationship Manager, Georgina Gilmour, Senior Advisor; Vilececa Naidoo Advisor, Lucy Stalworth Engagement Advisor, Denise Gunn Democracy Advisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ACE update  
Coral Timmins, Strategic Broker  
Simon Huggett, Film-maker  
Sarah Edwards, Arts & Culture Advisor  
Brownwyn Bent, Flock  
Amelia Yiakmis, Flock | Keeping informed | The board viewed a short film produced locally for which they had provided a grant.  
The Arts Broker and Arts Advisors provided a report on the work for the past year and indicated future plans.  
The Strategic Broker updated the board on the transfer of CCTV management in Pukekohe to Auckland Transport. |
| Plans and Places – Waiuku and Pukekohe update  
Jimmy Zhang, Planner  
Vanessa Leedra, Planner | Keeping informed | Advisors provided a summary of the year’s work by Plans and Places on the Pukekohe Area Plan, and also provided a short update on work being done on the Waiuku Scoping Plan. |
| Elected Members Engagement Survey  
Nina Siers, Relationship Manager  
Georgina Gilmour, Senior Advisor | Engagement | The board and staff discussed the results of the elected members Engagement Survey. |

The workshop concluded at 1.10 pm