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1 **Welcome**

2 **Apologies**

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

3 **Declaration of Interest**

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

4 **Confirmation of Minutes**

   That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
   a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 26 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 Puketāpapa 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.

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

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.”
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide an update to the Puketāpapa Local Board (the Board) on transport-related matters in its area, an update on its local board transport capital fund (LBTCF) and relevant consultations and the decisions of Auckland Transport’s (AT) Traffic Control Committee that affect the Board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The outcome of the tender process for Mt Roskill Streetscape upgrade is discussed in the report.

3. Information is given on the progress on the Board’s funded local board capital fund projects (LBTCF). The Board has allocated all of its LBTCF for this electoral term. If any savings are made on projects, they will be credited back to the fund.

4. Progress on the Community Safety Fund (CSF) allocation is noted.

5. The report provides an update to the Board on significant Auckland Transport (AT) projects in the Board area.

6. Relevant consultations and decisions of AT’s transport control committee are noted, as they affect the Puketāpapa Local Board area.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive the Auckland Transport July 2019 report.

Horopaki
Context

7. This report addresses transport related matters in the local board area.

8. 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 its Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.

9. The LBTCF is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council and delivered by Auckland Transport (AT). Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they believe are important 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
Mt Roskill Streetscape Upgrade

10. AT is very pleased to advise that it has received three competitively priced tenders for the Mt Roskill streetscape upgrade project. The contract has just been awarded and based on the successful tenderer’s programme, the works will be completed by mid-November 2019.

11. Various upgrade work has been planned in the village over the past years, with all projects having to be delayed or reconfigured due to changing expectations around the Dominion Road light rail project.

12. To provide some much-needed enhancements, Puketāpapa Local Board re-allocated the budget to provide short-term improvements to be delivered in tandem with a footpath renewal planned by AT.

13. To accommodate passengers on the very busy Dominion Road bus route, AT introduced double decker buses at the end of 2018. The introduction of double deckers required some changes to the road layout in the Mt Roskill Village area.

14. AT regrets that the streetscape enhancements could not be implemented at the same time as the recent changes to accommodate double decker buses, as originally expected. However the planned and designed streetscape improvements were more extensive and complex in nature than at first thought.

15. The delay has given an opportunity to obtain a more competitive price from the busy construction industry and time to consider a better construction programme and methodology to minimise disruptions to the local businesses and communities.

16. AT will engage with the local business owners to ensure that they are fully aware of the work when it takes place and any disruption is kept to a minimum.

Update on Puketāpapa Local Board Transport Capital Funded Projects

17. The table below reflects the status of projects which have been supported by resolution and are progressing using the LBTCF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Hay Park Lighting – Southern Section</td>
<td>Continuing the lighting project from the northern section to the southern end of the park past Noton Road carpark to Richardson Road.</td>
<td>This project is expected to be completed in May/June 2019. Noton Road to Arundel Street lighting will be operational once the pathway work is completed.</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Cycling Project – Route D (modified)</td>
<td>This route includes shared paths on Frost Road and then a combination of traffic calming measures, signs, markings along Britton and Dornwell Roads, shared paths through the laneways and then traffic calming on Hayr Road and Haughey Avenue through to, but not across Hillsborough Rd.</td>
<td>Material for public consultation has been prepared and public consultation has begun.</td>
<td>$600,000 (allocated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Road Crossing (1)</td>
<td>The installation of a pedestrian refuge on Hillsborough Road, vicinity of Haughey Street/Delargey Avenue. This will support the greenway cycle route by aiding</td>
<td>Resolved March 2019, project being set up.</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Road (2) Signalised Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>The installation of a signalised crossing of Hillsborough Road in the vicinity of Goodall Street. Residents have reported that Hillsborough Road can be very difficult to cross as there is a considerable distance between pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td>Resolved March 2019, project being set up. Funding stream now confirmed. $338,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Road Bus stop 8345</td>
<td>Improvements at bus stop 8345 on Dominion Road, including extending the hard surface and area and the provision of a new seat.</td>
<td>Concrete pour is completed. New seat will be fitted as soon as it arrives in stock. $14,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Roskill Village Upgrade</td>
<td>The Board approved a draft streetscape design on 16 August 2018. Some changes arose from Auckland Transport internal feedback, an independent road safety audit and a hui. Key design themes are retained. The aim is to create an improved environment for pedestrians, bus passengers, shoppers and the business community at Mt Roskill village. High-quality footpaths, seating and landscaping are proposed within the road corridor.</td>
<td>The tender has been awarded and the project is expected to be completed by mid-November 2019. $244,787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress being made on significant investigations and projects in the Board area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safer Communities 2018-21</td>
<td>This programme focuses on walking improvements in the Mount Roskill community. It aims to create safer walking environments for local people to get to and from key destinations such as schools, public transport hubs, shops, community centres and more, on foot.</td>
<td>The proposals for Frost Road and Carr Road were discussed following the analysis of the consultation. The outcome of the consultation will be shared with the community once funding details are confirmed. Progress on Mt Albert Road/Hayr Rd area is on-going with discussions being held with Three Kings Plaza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Road Double Decker Route</td>
<td>Changes are being made to the bus stops in the village area to accommodate double decker buses.</td>
<td>Line marking and signage is now completed. The LED luminaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carlton Street</strong></td>
<td>AT has reviewed the safety audit completed by consultants and provided responses to the matters raised at the May 2018 public meeting. AT has designed bus-friendly infrastructure designs that will ensure all vehicles travel slowly on Carlton Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The consultation results and report has now been sent out to submitters. Changes to Carlton Street are expected to take place later in 2019 to allow the 68 bus route to use the road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mt Eden Road Buslane Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>Tender documents have been finalised and approval from the Traffic Control Committee has been obtained. The work in the Puketāpapa Board area between Mt Albert Road and Landscape Road is on hold. Mt Eden Road reseal in the same area will be confined to the traffic lanes and flush median.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The work in the Puketāpapa Local Board area is on hold. Reasons for this were discussed with the Board in March 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duke Street Traffic Calming</strong></td>
<td>Speed calming devices will be constructed on Duke Street similar in design to the existing devices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project is almost complete. The location of the last hump is being finalised so it avoids a new driveway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May Road pedestrian crossings</strong></td>
<td>AT is developing a design for two new signalised crossings on May Road, in the vicinity of Glynn Street and Roma Road. A pedestrian refuge is proposed close to Denny Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board and public consultation was completed in May 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Community Safety Fund**

18. The 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan allocated $20m for local initiatives in road safety: $5m in financial year 2019/2020 and $15m in financial year 2020/2021. It is apportioned to local board areas by formula focused on numbers of Deaths and Serious Injuries (DSI).

19. The fund has been named the Community Safety Fund (CSF) and Puketāpapa Local Board has been allocated $604,664 over the two years, with decisions on projects due by 30 June 2019.

20. The Board developed a list of projects which AT assessed and costed. These projects put into a priority order during a workshop in June and confirmed at the June 2019 business meeting.

21. The Board came up with more projects than it could fund through its community safety fund. Any savings that AT makes during the development of the funded local board capital fund projects will be credited back to the Board’s account and therefore available to re-allocate to any prioritised but unfunded projects.

22. The prioritised list is itemised below. The first two projects are now able to be constructed out of the local board transport capital fund.
### Item 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Stream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 Hillsborough Road</td>
<td>Pedestrian refuge</td>
<td>LBTCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 Hillsborough Road</td>
<td>Signalised crossing</td>
<td>LBTCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383 Hillsborough Road</td>
<td>Signalised crossing</td>
<td>CSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639 Richardson Road</td>
<td>Safety improvements to the existing crossing</td>
<td>CSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pah Road Crossing Awareness</td>
<td>Signage and road marking to highlight existing crossing</td>
<td>CSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Primary School</td>
<td>Replace existing kea crossing on Potter Avenue with a raised table.</td>
<td>CSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Stoddard Road</td>
<td>Improvements to the existing crossing</td>
<td>CSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Rd Shops</td>
<td>Pedestrian Refuge</td>
<td>CSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Rd/Mt Eden Rd Crossing</td>
<td>Safety Improvements for pedestrians at this busy intersection</td>
<td>CSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arundel Street/Rogan St</td>
<td>Safety improvements which may include a roundabout</td>
<td>CSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

**Council group impacts and views**

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

---

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

**Infrastructure and Heritage Meeting – June 2019**

24. A cluster meeting was held with the Board in June 2019. This provided an opportunity for the Board to prioritise community safety projects.

25. AT’s team working with the Hobsonville Land Company (HLC) also discussed the redevelopment taking place in the Roskill area and how AT works with HLC to deliver the best possible outcomes.

**Auckland Transport Consultations**

26. AT provides the Puketāpapa Local Board with the opportunity to comment on transport projects being delivered in their area. The only consultation in this period was on the Board’s Greenway D project.

27. Copies of the brochure have been dropped into the local board office.

**Traffic Control Committee resolutions**

28. The report on the June decisions of AT’s Traffic Control Committee were not available at the time of writing so will be included in the report to the Board next month.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
29. 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
30. There are no financial implications that result from receiving this report.

Local Board Transport Capital Fund Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puketāpapa Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Remaining Budget left</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
31. There are no risks associated with receiving this report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
32. At will provide a further update report next month.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
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New community lease to Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated, Oriana Reserve, 18 The Avenue, Lynfield

File No.: CP2019/12500

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To grant a new community lease to Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated located on part of Oriana Reserve, 18 The Avenue, Lynfield.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated has a community lease with Auckland City Council commencing 1 January 2009 for five years to 31 December 2013. The lease has two further renewal terms of five years each. The lease finally expires 31 December 2023.

3. The property at 18 The Avenue, Lynfield is described as being located on Part DP 1467 and Part DP 2251, 7.4690 ha – NA14C/1115 (Part-Cancelled) and held in fee simple by the Auckland Council under the Local Government Act 2002.

4. Prior to any lease being granted, iwi engagement will be required in terms of section 4 of the Conservation Act 1987, together with the proposed community lease being publicly notified under Section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002.

5. Current rent is $250 plus GST per annum. The building and improvements are owned by the tennis club and the lease footprint is for the building and six tennis courts.

6. Auckland Council granted formal land owner approval to the tennis club on 27 June 2018 and 4 April 2019 to undertake repairs to extend its existing building, repair cladding and replace an old garage.

7. The current deed of lease signed and dated 1 March 2010 does not provide long term tenure to the tennis club and will expire in four years. The tennis club wish to apply for funding for the above works and wishes to surrender its current lease and enter into a new community lease for a longer term to satisfy funding requirements.

8. As specified in the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012, groups that own their own building have an automatic right to apply for a new community lease at the end of their occupancy term.

9. This report recommends Puketāpapa Local Board approve the surrender of the current lease and grant a new community lease to the tennis club for a term of ten years commencing 18 July 2019 with one ten year right of renewal as specified in the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) approves the surrender of the current Deed of Lease dated 1 March 2010 to Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated effective upon the date of entering into a new community lease.

b) grant a new community lease to Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated for 3,880 m² (more or less) on part of Oriana Reserve, 18 The Avenue, Lynfield, described as Part DP 1467 and Part DP 2251 (Attachment A), subject to iwi engagement and one
months’ public notification, and with no objections, on the following terms and conditions:-

i) term: ten years commencing 18 July 2019 with one ten year right of renewal;

ii) rent: $1.00 plus GST per annum if requested;

iii) the Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated Community Outcomes Plan as approved be attached to the community lease document (Attachment B);

iv) all other terms and conditions in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002 and the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines July 2012.

Horopaki
Context
10. This report considers the new community lease to the tennis club located on Oriana Reserve, 18 The Avenue, Lynfield.

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Oriana Reserve
12. The property at 18 The Avenue, Lynfield is described as being located on Part DP 1467 and Part DP 2251, 7.4690 ha – NA14C/1115 (Part-Cancelled) and held in fee simple by the Auckland Council under the Local Government Act 2002.

13. Prior to any lease being granted, iwi engagement will be required in terms of section 4 of the Conservation Act 1987, together with the proposed community lease being publicly notified under Section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated
14. The tennis club has submitted a comprehensive application in support of a new community lease.

15. The tennis club is affiliated to Tennis Auckland and has been incorporated under the Incorporated Societies Act 1908 since 1 October 1975. Its objectives are:

• to promote, encourage and advance the game of tennis
• to provide, control and maintain suitable grounds and premises for this purpose
• to protect the interest of club members.

16. Fifteen full-time volunteers contribute 300 hours per week of support to club activities to ensure the facility meets community needs. Current membership is 126 and estimated numbers for each group are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children 0-4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 5-13</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth 14-21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>51+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Membership</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. The facility is available to its members seven days per week with 24-hour access to the courts via an access card. Coaching is provided to members during the tennis season.

18. Non-members have the ability to hire the courts or participate on a casual basis. Other clubs utilise the courts most weekends of the tennis season for interclub games and there are 10-15 hirers utilising the site.

19. A site visit undertaken on 10 December 2018 ascertained the leased area to be in a neat and tidy condition.

20. Land owner approval has been granted to the tennis club to address leaky building issues which are:
   - re-cladding of the roof, the area around the proposed veranda extension and the area near the existing ramp;
   - undertake repairs to and extension of the existing building;
   - replacement of an existing old garage.

21. There will be minimal impact on the reserve and the users of the tennis club. The club has identified its intent to address these issues and will commit to these matters as a staged process when funding becomes available.

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

22. Staff obtained input from Parks, Sports and Recreation, Community Development and Operational Management and Maintenance staff in preparing this report.

23. Staff suggested that subject to membership numbers at the tennis club the new community lease should have the flexibility to allow other tennis clubs to use the courts.

24. While the Auckland Regional Tennis Facility Strategy stipulates that 45 members per court is considered the minimum level to ensure a sustainable club, utilisation of the courts at Oriana Reserve are also activated through:
   - non-members hiring the courts or participating on a casual basis;
   - other tennis clubs utilising the facilities most weekends of the tennis season for interclub games (junior and senior);
   - private hirers using the facility.

25. No other concerns were raised regarding a new community lease to the tennis club.

26. The new community lease has no identified impact 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

27. The Puketāpapa Local Board is the allocated authority to approve the granting of a new community lease.

28. The Puketāpapa Local Board expressed support for a new community lease at a workshop held 2 May 2019 and 6 June 2019.

29. The recommendations within this report support the Puketāpapa Local Board 2017 plan outcome of:
   - Connected community with a sense of belonging;
   - Improved wellbeing and safety.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

30. Engagement was undertaken on 2 May 2019 with mana whenua who have a key interest in the site located on Oriana Reserve.

31. Engagement involved detailed written information on the proposed new community lease. No objections were raised by the iwi representatives who responded.

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

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

33. Provided there are no objections, the cost implications for Auckland Council for the public notification of the lease will be an initial cost estimated at $750.00. This cost is met from the Community Facilities budget.

34. If the Puketāpapa Local Board adopts the recommendation for the new lease at a rental of $1 per annum there will be a $249 per annum reduction in the revenue accruing to the boards account. While this shows in the local boards budget it is for accounting purposes only and does not affect the funds available to apply to activities and projects.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

35. If a new community lease is not granted this will not allow the tennis club to:

- provide recreational activities to the local and wider communities it supports;
- apply for funding to undertake repairs to extend its existing building, repair cladding and replace the existing garage.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

36. Subject to the Puketāpapa Local Board grant of a new community lease and there being no objections received following the public notification, council staff will work with key representatives of the tennis club to finalise the lease documents.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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New community lease to Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated, Oriana Reserve, 18 The Avenue, Lynfield
New community lease to Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated, Oriana Reserve, 18 The Avenue, Lynfield

Attachment A – Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated

Site Map of Oriana Reserve outlined in blue. Leased area to Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated being 3,880 m² (more or less) outlined in red and marked A.
### Attachment B: Community Outcomes Plan for Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated, Oriana Reserve, 18 The Avenue, Lynfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Location of Land/Facility</th>
<th>Oriana Reserve, 18 The Avenue, Lynfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Community it serves</td>
<td>Puketāpapa and wider community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Area</td>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Community Group</td>
<td>Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Rodney Attwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Community Lease Advisor</td>
<td>Michelle Knudsen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Auckland Council and Local Board Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Outcome</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connected communities with a sense of belonging</td>
<td>Promote the clubs facility and purpose</td>
<td>Develop three promotional initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People will feel connected to each other and this place.</td>
<td></td>
<td>List the initiatives developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our diversity can be celebrated as a unifying force, and barriers overcome so everyone can be included and contribute to community life</td>
<td></td>
<td>Illustrate how these initiatives were implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Plan Outcome</td>
<td>Open Day</td>
<td>Hold one annual open day to promote the multi-use and value of the facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a strong, inclusive and equitable society that provides opportunity for all Aucklanders</td>
<td>Facility is well utilised, and opportunities are created within the community</td>
<td>List the community users of the tennis club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Area 1.1 – Putting children and young people first</td>
<td>Tennis club will deliver tennis programmes and activities designed for players of all ages and abilities</td>
<td>Club will produce an annual report that includes membership numbers and details of programmes delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support opportunities that celebrate Māori identity and heritage (e.g. Matariki and Māori language week activities)</td>
<td>List the number of activities supported that promote connected communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B: Community Outcomes Plan for Lynfield Tennis Club Incorporated, Oriana Reserve, 18 The Avenue, Lynfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Outcome</th>
<th>Making the facility available to the community</th>
<th>Members have 24-hour access via a security pin for the clubrooms for lights and amenities and a key for the tennis court gate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td>Non-members have access through hiring the courts or participating on a casual basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Plan Outcome</td>
<td>Provide volunteers to support the operations of the club</td>
<td>List the number of volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership is open and inclusive</td>
<td>List the number of members aged 21 years and under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leased area to be designated as a smoke free area</td>
<td>List the number of members aged 22 years and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of alcohol within clubs leased area</td>
<td>Club to comply with any smoke free policy adopted by the Landlord and any legislation governing smoke free areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The club to look at the future provision of alcohol in a way that reduces alcohol related harm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puketāpapa Local Board
18 July 2019

Puketāpapa Local Board Strategic Relationships Grant 2019/2020

File No.: CP2019/12186

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve the allocation of funding for the Strategic Relationships Grant 2019/2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Puketāpapa Local Board provides an annual Strategic Relationships Grant to build community capacity and support community organisations to deliver on the local board’s priorities and outcomes.
3. The total budget to allocate through the Strategic Relationships Grant 2019/2020 is $120,000.
4. Applications for 2019/2020 opened on 18 February 2019 and closed on 12 April 2019. Twenty applications were received requesting a total of $372,952.30.
5. The applications were presented to the local board at a workshop on 9 May 2019 and on 23 May 2019.
6. Staff recommend allocating $120,000 across 11 applicants.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) approve the following Strategic Relationships Grant 2019/2020 funding allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Recommended grant type</th>
<th>Recommended allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PKTSG 1920-03</td>
<td>English Language Partners</td>
<td>Multi-year (three years)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSG 1920-07</td>
<td>Migrants Action Trust</td>
<td>Multi-year (three years)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSG 1920-20</td>
<td>The UMMA Trust</td>
<td>Multi-year (three years)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSG 1920-05</td>
<td>Te Karanga Trust</td>
<td>Multi-year (three years)</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSG 1920-04</td>
<td>Earth Action Trust</td>
<td>Multi-year (three years)</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSG 1920-06</td>
<td>Belong Aotearoa (Auckland Regional Migrant Services)</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSG</td>
<td>Bhartiya Samaj</td>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) decline the following Strategic Relationships Grant 2019/2020 funding applicants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Funding type</th>
<th>Recommended amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PKTSRG 1920-02</td>
<td>Auckland Basketball Services Ltd.</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSRG 1920-09</td>
<td>YMCA North</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSRG 1920-11</td>
<td>WIZKIDS Learning Ltd.</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSRG 1920-13</td>
<td>Communicare CMA (AK) Inc.</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSRG 1920-17</td>
<td>Dress for Success Auckland</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSRG 1920-19</td>
<td>Earth Action Trust</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSRG 192022</td>
<td>The Mika Haka Foundation</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSRG 1920-23</td>
<td>WIZKIDS Learning Ltd.</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKTSRG 1920-24</td>
<td>YMCA North</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Horopaki Context**

7. The Puketāpapa Local Board Strategic Relationships Grants scheme is one of four local grants programmes provided by the local board to fund community groups to deliver on local board priorities and outcomes.

8. All applications are assessed against their alignment with five key criteria in the terms of reference (Attachment A) and each application is given a score out of 15.

9. The terms of reference for the Strategic Relationships Grant were reviewed in 2018 and a new option was introduced where applicants can apply for either one-off funding and/or multi-year funding of up to three years.
10. Applications for 2019/2020 opened on 18 February 2019 and closed on 12 April 2019. Twenty applications, submitted by 17 community organisations, were received requesting a total of $372,952.30 (Attachment B).

11. The applications were presented to the local board at a workshop on 9 May 2019 and on 23 May 2019.

**Tātaritanga me ā ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice**

12. The aim of the Puketāpapa Strategic Relationships Grant is to build relationships with community groups that are delivering projects and activities which align with the outcomes identified in the local board plan.

13. The applicants are assessed on the strength of their current strategic relationship with the local board and allocated to one of the following relationship categories:
   - Maintaining relationship – the local board had made previous investments into the groups
   - Strong relationship – the local board is keen to invest more into building group capacity
   - Some relationship – the groups have received funding through other local board grants
   - No relationship – the local board encourages these groups to apply through other local board grants before applying for the Strategic Relationships Grant.

14. Eleven applications show high alignment to the grants criteria and local board priority outcomes. Seven of these applications are in the ‘maintaining relationships’ category, and four in the ‘strong relationships’ category.

15. Twelve of the applications are requesting multi-year funding and eight for one-off funding, which includes three applications for both.

16. The following applicants applied for multi-year funding, which staff recommend for approval because a significant need for their services has been identified in the community:
   - English Language Partners
   - Migrants Action Trust
   - The UMMA Trust
   - Te Karanga Trust
   - Earth Action Trust.

17. The five recipients recommended for three-year multi-year funding make up a total of $55,000, which will be committed out of the total budget in 2020/2021 and 2021/2022.

18. The following applicants applied for multi-year funding, however, staff recommend approving a one-off grant because they are regional organisations that qualify for regional funds and are likely to have more available resources than smaller groups:
   - Belong Aotearoa
   - Te Whangai Trust
   - Bhartiya Samaj.

19. The following applicants applied for one-off funding, which staff recommend for approval to build their capacity:
   - Tread Lightly
   - Roskill Together
   - NZ Ethnic Women’s Trust.
20. Funding these organisations will enable the local board to strengthen its strategic relationships with more groups and provide a wider spread of themes and activities across the local board area. The grants will support the recipient organisations to maximise their impact in the community.

21. Table 1 shows a summary of the applications recommended to be approved for funding.

**Table 1: Summary of applications recommended to be approved for funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Requested funding type</th>
<th>What the grant is used for</th>
<th>Relationship with the local board</th>
<th>Requested amount</th>
<th>Recommended amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Partners</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>Teaching English to refugees and migrants</td>
<td>Maintaining relationship</td>
<td>$17,627.60</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Regional Migrant Services</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>Outreach work and improving internal systems</td>
<td>Maintaining relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants Action Trust</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>Driving school coordinator</td>
<td>Maintaining relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tread Lightly</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>Environment educational programmes for schools</td>
<td>Maintain relationship</td>
<td>$18,704.70</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhartiya Samaj</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>Resources for social services programmes</td>
<td>Maintaining relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UMMA Trust</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>Refugee Muslim women’s settlement</td>
<td>Maintaining relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roskill Together</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>Resources for children, seniors and Nga Herenga Waka</td>
<td>Maintaining relationship</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Action Trust</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>Operations and programmes</td>
<td>Strong relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Karanga Trust</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>Professional development for staff and youth leaders</td>
<td>Strong relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whangai Trust</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>Support recovery from alcohol and drug addiction</td>
<td>Strong relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Ethnic Women’s Trust</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>Wellbeing for vulnerable migrants and refugee women</td>
<td>Maintaining relationship</td>
<td>$19,760</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Summary of applications recommended to be declined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Requested funding type</th>
<th>What the grant is used for</th>
<th>Relationship with the local board</th>
<th>Requested amount</th>
<th>Recommended amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Basketball Services Ltd.</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>Basketball coaching, development and tournaments</td>
<td>No relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA North</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator for youth activities</td>
<td>Some relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIZKIDS Learning Ltd.</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>Technology and digital devices learning</td>
<td>Some relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicare CMA (AK) Inc.</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>Friendship Centers for Seniors</td>
<td>No relationship</td>
<td>$14,860</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress for Success Auckland</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>Services for women to gain confidence and employment</td>
<td>No relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Action Trust</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>Hui to discuss climate change</td>
<td>Strong relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mika Haka Foundation</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>Safe space to support youth learning</td>
<td>Strong relationship</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIZKIDS Learning Ltd.</td>
<td>Multi-year funding</td>
<td>Technological access to digital devices</td>
<td>Some relationship</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA North</td>
<td>One-off funding</td>
<td>Raise up youth festival</td>
<td>Some relationship</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$164,860</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

23. The applications are received through the Grants team and with the Digital and Transformation team, they also support advertising the grant round on the council and local board websites.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

24. The local board is responsible for the decision-making and allocation of the local board Strategic Relationships Grant 2019/2020.

25. The applications were presented to the local board at a workshop on 9 May 2019 and on 23 May 2019.

26. The grants enable the local board to strengthen its strategic relationships with community groups in the local board area and support the groups to achieve community and local board outcomes.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

27. Māori make up six per cent of the local board population. The majority of programmes recommended to be funded are accessible by all members of the local community, including Māori.

28. The assessment criteria aligns to the priorities and outcomes of the local board, which contain some measures specific to Māori outcomes.

29. One of the key objectives under the Puketāpapa Local Board 2017 Plan’s outcome of “connected communities with a sense of belonging” is that Māori are recognised and affirmed as mana whenua.

30. Groups such as Te Whangai Trust, Te Karanga Trust and Earth Action Trust have activities that respond to Māori aspirations and promoting tikanga Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

31. The total budget to allocate through the Strategic Relationships Grant 2019/2020 is $120,000.

32. Staff recommend allocating $120,000 across 11 applicants, including five multi-year funding agreements and six one-off funding agreements.

33. The five recipients recommended for three-year multi-year funding make up a total of $55,000, which will be committed out of the total budget in 2020/2021 and 2021/2022.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

34. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy and the local board’s Strategic Relationships Grant Terms of Reference. The assessment process has identified a low risk associated with funding the applications.

35. Successful applicants are required to complete an accountability report to ensure the grants are used in accordance with the grant criteria.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

36. Staff will confirm key performance indicators with the successful applicants and administer the funding agreements.

37. Staff will provide feedback to unsuccessful recipients about how to improve their applications.

38. Funding recipients will provide an accountability presentation to the local board at a workshop in quarter three 2019/2020.
Ngā tāpirihanga
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Ngā kaihaina
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Puketapapa Local Board Strategic Relationships Grant 2019 - 2020

Terms of Reference

1. Context

The purpose of the Strategic Relationships Grant is to develop strategic relationships with organisations that demonstrate a clear track record of achievement. Priority will be given to community groups that are delivering on priority outcomes of the local board. These are highlighted in this document. The Puketapapa Local Board will consider entering multi-year funding relationships with a small number of organisations for a maximum of three years. The aim of the multi-year funding is to support recipients to increase their capacity, expand their activities and make faster progress towards financial sustainability.

- The local board is keen to build capacity in community groups to enable them to have a more strategic focus which includes organisational growth and collaboration.
- The local board wants to achieve a breadth and depth of outcomes that will be of benefit to the Puketapapa local board area (Royal Oak, Hillsborough, Lynfield, Roskill South, Waikowhai, Mt Roskill, Wesley and parts of New Windsor) with this fund. These include community connectedness, health, safety and wellbeing, enhanced stewardship of the environment, and increased local employment opportunities.

The Strategic Relationship Grant sits alongside the board’s other contestable grants in the Local Grants Programme 2019/20.

Table 1: Contestable grants for Puketapapa Local Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant name</th>
<th>a) Neighbours Day Fund</th>
<th>b) Quick Response Grants</th>
<th>c) Local Grants</th>
<th>d) Strategic Relationships Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum and maximum amounts</td>
<td>Indicative amount per grant: Small grants under $200 in either voucher and/or cash form</td>
<td>Minimum amount per grant: $300</td>
<td>Maximum amount per grant: $5,000</td>
<td>1. Indicative amount per grant: $10,000-$20,000 for one off projects 2. For capacity development projects (using the self-assessment tool) multi-year funding is available up to $20,000/year up to 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rounds per year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Funding pool for 2019 - 2020

a) Indicative funding pool available is $102,000

b) Indicative funding: the amount for each project is $10,000-$20,000

c) Multi-year funding of $20,000 per year over three years.

Puketapapa Local Board will consider entering multi-year funding relationships with strategic organisations. Many of these organisations will have existing relationships with the local board and be able to demonstrate a clear track record of achievement. The multi-year funding enables organisations to develop their capacity and accelerate organisational growth to expand their activities and increase financial sustainability. Applications for multi-year funding will be required to complete the self-assessment tool to determine areas for capacity development and the type of strategic relationship the organisation currently has with the local board.
3. Outcomes sought from this fund

a) Priority Outcomes
The priority outcomes have emerged from the Puketapapa Local Board Plan as areas that would benefit from additional work. They are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Local Board Priority Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mana Tangata         | People and communities • creation of a sense of ownership and pride in Puketapapa through community-led place making  
                        | • supporting migrant and refugee communities                                                |
|                      | • improving health, safety and well-being for the people of Puketapapa (referencing models such as the Five Ways to Wellbeing and the Healthy Puketapapa Action Plan) |
|                      | • connected communities with a strong sense of belonging                                     |
| Mana Taiao           | Environment • increased use of the cycle network and other active transport modes            |
|                      | • initiatives to reduce carbon and other vehicle emissions                                     |
|                      | • transport choices meet our varied travel needs                                              |
|                      | • restoration of the harbour and waterways to greater health and ecological sustainability     |
|                      | • sustainability programmes and waste minimisation                                             |
|                      | • urban development meets community needs                                                     |
|                      | • vibrant and popular parks and facilities                                                    |
|                      | • treasured and enhanced natural environment                                                   |
| Mana Taurite         | Equity and fairness • recognition and affirmation of Maori culture as the foundational culture in our area |
|                      | • reduction of socio-economic inequalities in our community                                   |
|                      | • support for the provision of healthy, affordable housing (referencing the Healthy Puketapapa Action Plan) |
|                      | • thriving local economy and good job opportunities                                           |
4. Key application questions

i. Describe how your organisation’s vision, values (the way you work) and the difference you want to make in the community, align with the local board’s priorities as listed on section three of this document. How do your organisation priorities support the difference you would like to make?

ii. What is your organisation’s current priorities and key focus areas and how do you know that these are a priority for the community?

iii. To help the local board understand your organisation’s capacity development needs, could you please outline the number of full-time, part-time and volunteers involved in your work?

iv. Describe how you are working with other community groups and providers and in what ways are you collaborating? What has resulted from your collaboration?

v. On completion of the organisational self-assessment tool, describe your organisational capacity development priorities and activities and how your organisation will develop and grow in the next three to five years to expand your business and make faster progress to financial sustainability.

vi. If the local board did not provide funding, which of your objectives can you still achieve? Please explain

vii. If your application is successful, how would this funding make a difference to your organisation and your strategic relationship with the local board?

5. Criteria

The following criteria will be used when considering strategic relationships:

i. Location

Applications must be based, and benefit people in the Puketapapa Local Board area. Regional applications must be able to articulate the direct impact and benefits to communities within Puketapapa, including identifying specific communities they will be working with, and where appropriate, the percentage of local people this will impact.

ii. Credibility

Preference will be given to community groups that have a track record of delivering services to communities in the Puketapapa area.

iii. Nature of applicant’s group

The board is looking to support community-oriented groups, and local grass root organisations. Preferred applicants must be a community group, trust or organisation which must be legally constituted (i.e. an incorporated society or charitable trust).
iv. **Financial**

Applicants must submit a copy of their annual financial statements with evidence of good financial management, and annual plan and budget for the next financial year.

v. **Self-Assessment Tool**

*(If applying for multi-year funding)*

6. **Willingness to Acknowledge Funding**

The local board’s contribution must be recognised in printed material, events or social media. Successful applicants must contact the Puketapapa Local Board office to get guidance about the appropriate use of the Council logo.

7. **Ineligible Applications**

i. The fund will not support retrospective funding applications, debt funding or maintenance costs.

ii. Applications need to specify the total amount that is required. Any applications that are more than $20,000 will be ineligible for this fund.

iii. The grant will not support those with profit focussed business interests, nor institutions or government agencies including schools.

iv. The grant does not intend to substitute funding that would otherwise be obtained from central government agencies, i.e. Ministries

8. **Accountability Measures**

To ensure that the Puketapapa Local Board’s financial assistance is achieving positive results, recipients will be obligated to provide evidence that the grant has been used for the agreed purpose and stated outcomes have been achieved.

The following accountability measures will be required for all successful applicants:

- Meet the objectives and measures as outlined in the funding agreement.
- A mix of a face to face meetings and presentations to the local board will be scheduled to discuss progress and learnings, and a written accountability report on key milestones and achievements will be delivered.

9. **Funding Agreement**

Key performance indicators and reporting measures for delivery will be identified and agreed to in the funding agreement.

10. **Application Process And Timeline**

Funding forums will be offered for the Strategic Relationships Grant. These will provide information about the grant so that potential applicants can better understand what it is intended for. This will be a publicly advertised process where applications will be sought for consideration by the local board. The Puketapapa Local Board Specialist Advisor Rosetta Fuimaono (rosetta.fuimaono@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz 027 241 6179) is available to provide support for your applications.
## Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January – February 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Marketing and promotion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Grant is advertised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday 18 February 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Applications are open</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 March 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategic Relationship Grant Forums</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.30am – 11.30am</strong></td>
<td>The purpose of this forum is for the community and the local board to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 March 2019</strong></td>
<td>discuss the purpose of the Grant and to clarify the application process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6pm – 7pm</strong></td>
<td>You only need to attend one of the two sessions which are held at the:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikowhai Room, Fickling Convention Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>546 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday 12 April 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Applications close</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April / May 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Applications Assessments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff will assess and review all applications to ensure they meet the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eligibility criteria and have strategic alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local Board Workshops</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once assessed by staff, applications will be presented with recommendations to a local board workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local Board Report</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A report is written and submitted for local board consideration at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local Board Business Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions to fund successful applicants will be made by resolution of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the local board at their July business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All recipients are notified of the outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 2019:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Funding Agreements and Payments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding will be allocated subject to the completion of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreements (including accountability measures) by both parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>Report 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A short presentation to the local board to showcase achievements,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discuss progress, shared learnings, and future pathways for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31 July 2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>Report 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                     | A final written accountability report is due to the local board
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek adoption of the Puketāpapa Shade/Shelter Provision Assessment 2019 (Attachment A).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Puketāpapa Local Board commissioned an assessment of both existing and potential future provision of shade and shelter throughout the local board area (Attachment A).
3. This assessment responds directly to outcomes and recommendations in the Diversity in Parks Study and Accessibility Investigations (2018), and will support the delivery of a well-planned network of shelter/shade facilities throughout Puketāpapa.
4. It will also support the prioritisation of future renewals and LDI CAPEX budgets.
5. The investigation involved the mapping and analysis of current provision and opportunities for future investment. It considered provision principles (why to invest) and network opportunities (how/where to invest) as well as design principles.
6. From a service provision perspective, three categories emerged – shade for play spaces, shade for other recreational facilities and significant shelters.
7. Options provided are a starting point for discussion, and a suggested prioritisation of investment across the network with the local board and community. These are high-level and will require further feasibility studies to fully understand individual site opportunities and constraints.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
8. adopt the Puketāpapa Shade/Shelter Provision Assessment, 2019 (Attachment A).

Horopaki
Context
9. The Puketāpapa Local Board commissioned an assessment of both existing and potential future provision of shade and shelter throughout the local board area.
10. The provision assessment (Attachment A) is a network assessment which considers provision principles (why to invest) and network opportunities (how/where to invest) as well as design principles.
11. The key service provision principles fundamental to the assessment are aligned to three categories (below items).
1. **Shade for play spaces**
   - Encourage personal/parental responsibility for protection from UVR
   - Consider natural shade solutions
   - Prioritisation of shade provision for passive play areas
   - Use of temporary shade structures in destination play spaces
   - Provision of permanent or demountable shade in destination play spaces

2. **Shade for other recreational facilities**
   - Encourage personal/parental responsibility for protection from UVR
   - Natural shade solutions
   - Prioritising shade provision for informal recreation areas that are used continuously
   - Provision of temporary shade structures for community events
   - Provision of permanent or demountable shade where there is a high level of use by children and adolescents (most at risk from UVR exposure).

3. **Significant shelters**
   - Consider trialling a temporary shelter to determine the level of use and appropriateness of location prior to investing in a permanent structure
   - In order to maximise use of any built shelter, ensure formal programming/booking by Council and/or a community group
   - As budget allows consider smaller permanent structures for areas with a high level of use. An average duration of use of one hour or greater. Places where the provision of shelter from sun and rain would significantly enhance recreational use
   - Work with local schools that have weatherproof covered outdoor recreation area to facilitate shared use outside of school hours

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

12. None of the playgrounds in the Puketapapa Local Board have permanent or temporary shade structures.

13. However, the majority of play spaces within Puketāpapa parks have sufficient natural shade provision from trees, although additional planting is recommended in some locations.

14. There are a number of shade or shade/shelter structures within parks in adjacent local board areas. Most of these comprise shade sails over play areas or seating/picnic/BBQ areas. There are also permanent shade/shelter structures for other activities at Olympic Park and Te Kotuitanga Park in Whau, Waterview Park and Potters Park in Albert/Eden, and at Cornwall Park (not under Auckland Council ownership).

15. Large shade structures or waterproof shelters over basketball courts or other outdoor learning environments are present in some schools within the Puketāpapa area and adjacent areas. These include Three Kings School, Cornwall Park School, Gladstone Primary School, Western Springs College and Maungawhau School.

16. Where built shade is provided, it should be targeted to facilities or areas that have a high level of use by children and adolescents, used continuously - for more than one hour, and where provision of built shade would enhance recreational use.

17. Temporary or demountable built shade should be considered for new destination play spaces, particularly for passive play areas and caregiver seating.
18. Any significant permanent built shelters should be co-located in suburb parks with other existing facilities, should accommodate multiple uses, and should ideally be programmed to maximise their use.

19. Natural shade for play equipment or caregiver seating/picnic tables is significantly lacking at the new Harold Long/Fearon Park play space, at the Taylors Bay Reserve play space, at the two play spaces within Keith Hay Park, and at the Molley Green Reserve play space.

20. Potential locations for a larger permanent shelter sufficient for up to 30 people have been identified at Keith Hay Park, Margaret Griffen Park and War Memorial Park.

21. Provision of shade and protection from UVR exposure should prioritise personal/parental responsibility first, including use of sunblock and protective clothing, and provision of natural shade from trees where feasible.

22. Subject to local board approval, the recommendations outlined in the assessment are recommendations that will be investigated further by the Community Facilities Investigation and Design Team, as funding becomes available.

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

23. Community Facilities are aware of the assessment it is on their list for prioritisation.

24. If recommended outcomes are agreed, staff will work together and with the local board to identify possible opportunities for funding as part of any future Community Facilities work programmes.

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

https://acintranet.aklc.govt.nz/EN/workingatcouncil/techandtools/infocouncil/Pages/LocalImpactsAndLocalBoardViews.aspx

25. The recommendations will help to meet outcome one, two and six of the Puketāpapa Local Board Plan 2017, “our cultural diversity is valued and communities feel recognised and included”, “improved wellbeing and safety” and “vibrant and popular parks and facilities” through the provision of services supporting healthy and active lifestyles.

26. In February 2019 an initial Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop of provision principles was held.

27. The draft document was further workshopped in early April with the Puketāpapa Local Board. Feedback from the workshop has been incorporated into the final document.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

28. It is not anticipated that this project will impact Māori disproportionately than people of other cultures within Auckland.

29. Mana whenua will be engaged to provide input in the design and planning stages of all future development or renewal projects.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications


30. The assessments will inform future Community Facilities work programmes, as funding becomes available. There is no funding currently allocated for investigation and design or delivery.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

31. The investigation and design phase of project delivery may identify issues that require the feasibility of the project to be reassessed. This would be managed by the Community Facilities Investigation and Design Growth Team in discussion with the Puketapapa Local Board.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

32. If recommended outcomes are agreed, staff will work with the local board to identify possible opportunities for funding as part of future Community Facilities work programmes.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments
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1 Introduction

1.1 Project brief
The Puketapapa Local Board has commissioned an assessment of existing and potential future provision of shade and shelter across the local board area. Provision of structures for shade and shelter within Puketapapa parks and places is currently inconsistent, with only a few facilities provided across the network. This network assessment is intended to help the board to prioritise investment in shade or shelter provision for appropriate locations.

This report summarises the outcomes of a network assessment of shade and shelter provision across the local board area and provides guiding principles for future investment in shelter provision. It includes maps of current provision and opportunities for future investment.

2 Background information

A number of existing studies and planning documents produced by the Puketapapa Local Board, Auckland Council and other organisations provide a rationale for, or context to this shade/shelter assessment. These are discussed below.

2.1 Puketapapa Local Board Plan 2017
The relevant objectives and key initiatives of the 2017 plan include the following:

1. Objective - Our cultural diversity is valued and communities feel recognised and included.
   - Key initiative - provide more space for communities to meet and work, including encouraging shared use of buildings eg. leased spaces.
   - Key initiative – encourage and support a community-led approach to addressing local issues and developing neighbourhood identity eg. events, community gardens, and public art.

2. Objective – An accessible network of open spaces that provides a variety of sports and recreational opportunities.
   - Key initiative – Focus on filling gaps and increasing provision in the network of greenways and places to play.
2.2 Activating Parks for Diverse Cultural Communities in the Puketāpapa Local Board (June 2018)

In 2018, the Puketāpapa Local Board undertook research into how diverse cultural communities value and use local parks, with a focus on what the barriers to using parks are and what kind of one-off activities and ongoing programmes are needed so that Council can better serve these communities. Relevant to this shade/shelter provision assessment were the following comments within the report:

‘When asked what was preventing people from using parks the most common theme was a lack of shelter and seating (particularly prominent with Chinese and Korean participants), more toilets (and cleaner), unleashed dogs and feeling unsafe at night. The Earth Action Trust interviewee also observed with increasing adverse weather events and effects of climate change there will be even more of a need for covered areas in parks.’

Recommendations following on from the outcomes of the research included the following relevant aspects:

- Facilitate free exercise classes in parks, especially zumba, yoga, tai chi and singing/dancing.
- Provide a solid (and ideally covered) surface for tai chi.
- Consider lighting of parks where appropriate to allow evening use.
- Invest in picnic and barbecue areas to accommodate large families and groups with amenities including shelter; tables and seating.
- Consider covering basketball courts so they can be used in all weather.

2.3 Tākaro – investing in play

Auckland Council is developing a high level plan for how it invests in play across the Auckland region. A discussion document was released in 2017 and public and stakeholder feedback on this was collated in February 2018.

The discussion document highlighted that shade over children’s play equipment can be provided artificially with permanent or seasonal structures, or naturally with trees, but that artificial shade cannot be provided at every playground. It noted that the cost of personal sun protection is low compared with the public costs of artificial shade provision. The document promoted natural shade from trees as preferable to artificial shade.

Responses to this issue during consultation on the discussion document indicated that submitters felt that shade was important for play spaces, but the reasons given were diverse. They included overheating of children and equipment, the comfort of adults, as well as protection from ultraviolet radiation (UVR) and rain. There was no consensus on how shade should be provided, with shade sails, permanent structures, and planting more trees all identified as options.

The draft Tākaro – Investing in Play plan, to be released for consultation in April 2018, is intended to include guidance to support local board decision making on investment in ancillary infrastructure for play spaces, including fencing and artificial shade.
2.4 Auckland Sport & Recreation: Strategic Action Plan 2014-2024

The Strategic Action plan does not include any specific discussion about provision of covered outdoor recreation or provision of shelter to encourage recreation. The 18 actions within the plan do, however, include the following relevant goals:

- Auckland’s diverse range of communities being more active – Encourage recreation and sport opportunities that appeal to a diverse range of communities and bring communities together, particularly new migrants, older adults and people with disabilities.
- Accessible and activity friendly environments – Develop and improve accessibility of open spaces, facilities, harbours and waterways to encourage physical activity as part of everyday life and provide for a range of safe recreation and sport uses.
- Fit-for-purpose network of facilities – Provide quality fit-for-purpose facilities at regional, sub-regional and local levels for information recreation and sport.

2.5 Auckland Design Manual – buildings, shelters and toilets

The Auckland Design Manual does not provide any specific guidance on provision of shade and shelter in parks and other public places. It does however guidance on how built shelters should be planned and constructed:

- Consider the visual impact of shelters.
- Design structures that are sensitive to the surrounding landscape, in terms of built form, scale, materiality and location.
- Consider the impact of a shelter in terms of increased vehicular and pedestrian use and whether additional paths, vehicle access or parking are required.
- Combine or cluster structures to minimise overall visual impacts and loss of open space.
- Ensure safe and legible access.
- Ensure that structures have multiple uses where possible.
- Ensure universal accessibility.
- Direct views from shelters towards the landscape to reinforce important vistas and view shafts.
- Consider sustainable design principles.

2.6 Under Cover, Guidelines for shade planning and design (Cancer Society of New Zealand, 2000)

The Cancer Society of New Zealand has produced guidelines for shade planning and design. These aim to highlight the importance of shade in reducing exposure to solar UVR and to encourage the provision of shade that is functionally, environmentally and aesthetically sympathetic to the surrounding area.

The publication highlights the importance of providing shade at the right place, at the right time of day and at the right time of year. In the Auckland region, UVR exposure is greatest in the summer months (September to April) between 11am and 4pm, when the sun is more
directly overhead. Indirect or diffuse UVR from the atmosphere (the visible sky) or reflected from smooth or light coloured surfaces (eg sand, new concrete or a light coloured wall) also contributes to UVR exposure. Protection from UVR is greatest at the centre of any natural or built shade area and decreases towards the edges where indirect UVR exposure is greater. For example an umbrella gives little protection from diffuse UVR.

Natural shade provided by trees is preferable in terms of environmental benefits, embodied energy and cost, but the effectiveness of trees in preventing UVR exposure depends on the density of foliage. Built shade can be either permanent, demountable, retractable or temporary. Often a combination of natural and built shade will provide the best solution for reducing UVR exposure and improving human comfort levels.

Key principles described for providing good quality shade include:

- Providing at least 94% protection from UVR.
- Creating an environment that is comfortable to use in both summer and winter (eg. cooling breezes in summer, protection from south-westerly winds, access to winter sun and passive heating from ground surfaces or walls).
3 Network assessment

3.1 Puketāpapa Local Board area

Only two existing permanent shade or shelter structures are included in Auckland Council’s asset database for the Puketāpapa Local Board area (refer Figure 1 in Appendix A). One is a pergola within Wahine Toa Park on the corner of Warren Avenue and Mt Albert Road and the other is a shelter attached to the public toilets in the carpark at Monte Cecilia Park (refer Photograph 1 below). This shelter is a bespoke design that includes interpretive signage and two seats. Neither the GIS database nor site visits identified any playgrounds with permanent or temporary shade structures.

A new permanent fale structure, intended primarily for educational activities, is under construction in Walmsley Park as part of the Walmsley Underwood project (refer Image 2 below).

Photograph 1: Shade/shelter structure at Monte Cecilia Park
3.2 Neighbouring local board areas & schools

There are a number of shade or shade/shelter structures within parks in adjacent local board areas. Most of these comprise shade sails over play areas or seating/picnic/BBQ areas, but there are also permanent shade/shelter structures for other activities at Olympic Park and Te Kotuitanga Park in Whau, Waterview Park and Potters Park in Albert/Eden, and at Cornwall Park (not under Auckland Council ownership). Examples are shown in the photographs below.

The Olympic Park shelter provides space for several families picnicking or up to about 20 people undertaking group fitness/recreation/dance activities. While other shelters have a smaller capacity, it appears that the Olympic Park, Potters Park, Te Kotuitanga Park and Cornwall Park shelters could cater for small events, as they have sufficient surrounding area for audience seating.

Large shade structures or waterproof shelters over basketball courts or other outdoor learning environments are present in some schools within the Puketāpapa area and adjacent areas. These include Three Kings School (refer Photograph 9 below), Cornwall Park School, Gladstone Primary School, Western Springs College and Maungawhau School.
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Photograph 3: Shade/shelter/stage structure at Olympic Park, New Lynn

Photograph 4: Shade/shelter structure at Te Kotuitanga Park, New Windsor
Photograph 5: Shade/shelter structure adjacent to the skate park at Sister René Shadbolt Park, New Lynn

Photograph 6: Fale shade/shelter structure at Waterview Park, Waterview
Item 14
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Photograph 7: Rotunda at Potters Park, Balmoral

Photograph 8: Shade/shelter facility structure at Cornwall Park, Mtunzaniekie
Photograph 9: Shade/shelter structure at Three Kings School, Puketapapa
4 Provision and design principles for shade & shelter

The following principles provide guidance on whether, where and how to invest in shade/shelter in Puketāpapa parks and places. The guidance applies to renewals as well as new projects. Guidance is provided separately for shade provision in play spaces and for other recreational facilities, and for shelter from sun and rain/wind, either permanently/seasonally or temporarily.

4.1 Shade for play spaces

**Provision principles**

- Encourage personal/parental responsibility for protection from UVR, including use of hats, clothing, and sunblock, and avoidance of sun exposure during summer peak UVR exposure hours (11am to 4pm September to April)

- Where possible locate new or upgraded play spaces where existing trees provide shade during summer peak UVR exposure hours.

- Establish new large grade trees at existing, upgraded or new play spaces that will provide shade during summer peak UVR exposure hours for play equipment and caregiver seating

- Prioritise shade provision for passive play areas (eg. sand or water play, toddler play areas) and caregiver seating over active play areas (eg. jumping/climbing equipment)

- Minimise reflective UVR exposure be using non-reflective textured materials in and around play spaces

- Consider providing temporary built shade structures in new destination play spaces until trees mature

- Consider providing permanent or demountable built shade in addition to trees at destination play spaces where families typically stay for more than one hour

---

![Shade for play spaces image](image-url)
4.2 Shade for other recreational facilities

**Provision principles**

Encourage personal/parental responsibility for protection from UVR, including use of hats, clothing, and sunblock, and avoidance of sun exposure during summer peak UVR exposure hours (11am to 4pm September to April)

Where possible locate new facilities such as seating, picnic areas, BBQs, skateparks, basketball half courts and interpretive signage where existing trees provide shade during summer peak UVR exposure hours

Prioritise shade provision for informal recreation areas that are used continuously for an extended period of time and/or where use would be significantly enhanced by providing shade. These may include seating and picnic areas, BBQ areas, skateparks (particularly waiting or seating areas), spectator areas at sports facilities, interpretive signage areas (more than just a single sign) and outdoor areas for active recreation or events

Where shade rather than shelter from wind or rain is required, prioritise establishment of new large grade trees that will provide shade during summer peak UVR exposure hours

Choose and locate trees so that they do not compromise thermal comfort during cooler months (i.e. consider use of high canopy or deciduous trees where appropriate)

Consider providing permanent or demountable built shade in locations that have the following characteristics

- A high level of use of children and adolescents (most at risk from UVR exposure)
- An average duration of use of one hour or greater
- Provision of natural shade is not feasible
- Provision of shade would significantly enhance recreational use

Provide temporary shade structures at community events

Consider providing temporary shade structures in key locations during the months of peak UVR exposure (eg. sports fields and picnic spots)
4.3 Significant shelters

**Provision principles**

Consider providing permanent significant shelter that:

- Accommodates multiple uses (eg. perimeter or moveable seating, picnics, small events, recreational activities for up to 30 people)
- Is located in a suburb park with existing adequate car parking provision
- Is co-located with other buildings and facilities (eg. community centre, hall or swimming pool)
- Is near an existing public toilet
- Has an adjacent area suitable for audience seating if used for events
- Includes provision of water and power
- Avoids nuisance effects for park neighbours and other park users

Consider trialling a temporary shelter to determine the level of use and appropriateness of location prior to investing in a permanent structure

In order to maximise use of any built shelter, ensure formal programming/booking by Council and/or a community group

As budgets allow, consider smaller permanent shelter structures in locations that have the following characteristics:

- A high level of use
- An average duration of use of one hour or greater
- Provision of shelter from sun and rain would significantly enhance recreational use

Work with local schools that have weatherproof covered outdoor recreation area to facilitate shared use outside school hours
4.4 Design principles for permanent or demountable built shade

**Design principles**

Provide shade to key areas of play spaces or informal recreation facilities during summer peak UVR exposure hours (11am to 4pm September to April)

Provide a protection factor or PF15 or greater, or use a shade material that blocks at least 85% of UVR

Provide shade that extends beyond the target areas to minimise diffuse UVR exposure (could be provided by trees or climbers)

Allow sufficient warm-coloured light penetration for ambience and thermal comfort

Ensure that structures minimise adverse visual impacts and are compatible with the landscape setting

Ensure universal accessibility

Ensure safety for users in terms of physical hazards and personal safety. Aspects to consider include:

- play space fall zones
- tripping hazards
- sharp edges
- clearance heights for climbing on structures
- hiding and entrapment spaces
- passive surveillance

Minimise potential for vandalism and undesirable activities

Consider maintenance (OPEX) costs and overall life span, as well as the costs of storage for demountable shade.

Consider sustainable design principles (eg. prioritising renewable materials and low embodied energy)
### 4.5 Design principles for built shelter

**Design principles**

- Provide shade to the activity area during peak summer UVR exposure hours (11am to 4pm, September to April)
- Provide shade that extends beyond the target area to minimise diffuse UVR exposure (could be provided by trees or climbers)
- Provide shelter from the rain for the activity area
- Provide shelter from cool south-westerly winds (could be achieved by planting or climbers) but allow cooling breezes in hotter months
- Allow sufficient warm-coloured light penetration for ambience and thermal comfort
- Provide a flat well-drained surface within the shelter
- Ensure that structures minimise adverse visual impacts and are compatible with the landscape setting
- Ensure universal accessibility

Ensure safety for users in terms of physical hazards and personal safety. Aspects to consider include:

- play space fall zones
- tripping hazards or sharp edges
- clearance heights for climbing on structures
- hiding and entrapment spaces
- passive surveillance

Minimise potential for vandalism and undesirable activities

Consider maintenance costs and overall life span

Consider sustainable design principles (eg. prioritising renewable materials and low embodied energy)
5 Network opportunities

5.1 Play space shade

Desktop research and site visits indicate that the following play spaces (refer Figure 2 in Appendix A) are significantly lacking in natural shade for play equipment and/or for caregiver seating and picnic tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play space</th>
<th>Shade issues</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Harold Long/Fearon Park | Large grade trees have been planted at the new play space but will not provide adequate shade for the junior sand/water play area for many years. Some caregiver seating or picnic tables have no existing or newly planted trees nearby. | Temporary or permanent built shade over the junior play area  
Additional large grade tree planting to provide summer shade to caregiver seating |
| Taylors Bay Reserve  | No shade provided to equipment and highly reflective sand/sea environment. Some natural shade on bank for caregivers.                                                                                      | Large grade coastal tree planting to the north of play space                                         |
| Keith Hay Park       | No shade at south-western play space                                                                                                                                                                         | Provide informal or formal shade as part of playground renewal                                       |
|                      | One pohutukawa tree at central play space but no shade for caregiver seating                                                                                                                                 | Additional large grade tree planting to provide shade for caregiver seating                           |
| Molley Green Reserve  | No shade available for play space or adjacent seating and picnic tables                                                                                                                                     | Large grade tree planting to provide shade for play space and seating/picnic area                  |
The other play spaces investigated (refer Figure 2 in Appendix A) have natural shade from trees nearby. However, some play spaces would benefit from additional tree planting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play space</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Faulkner Reserve</td>
<td>Additional tree planting for shade to north of within play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Richards Reserve</td>
<td>Sufficient shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Reserve</td>
<td>Sufficient shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Moore Reserve</td>
<td>Sufficient shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynfield Reserve</td>
<td>Additional tree planting for shade at skatebowl and within play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Griffen Park</td>
<td>Additional tree planting for shade within play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quona Reserve</td>
<td>Additional tree planting for shade within or to the north of play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson Reserve</td>
<td>Sufficient shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Reserve</td>
<td>Existing trees and those planted as part of the play space upgrade will provide sufficient shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranolar Reserve</td>
<td>Sufficient existing tree planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikowhai Reserve</td>
<td>Additional tree planting for shade at picnic/seating area as part of play space renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairaki Stream Reserve</td>
<td>Additional tree planting for shade to north of play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Memorial Park</td>
<td>No additional shade needed at western play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider additional planting for shade as part of renewal of eastern play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Reserve</td>
<td>Sufficient shade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Significant permanent shelter

Potential locations for a larger permanent shelter sufficient for up to 30 people within Puketāpapa are at Keith Hay Park, Margaret Griffen Park, and War Memorial Park. A range of potential locations within these parks (refer to Figure 3 and photographs in Appendix A) are analysed below in terms of the provision principles for shelter in Section 4.3 above. Concept plans for Margaret Griffen Park and War Memorial Park are currently under development and any potential permanent shelter should be considered as part of the concept plan development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adequate car parking</th>
<th>Co-location with other facilities</th>
<th>Public toilet</th>
<th>Audience seating</th>
<th>Effects on neighbours/other users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Margaret Griffen Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball half court</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – BB players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central pole for the two basketball half courts could interfere with other uses. Site exposed to south-westerly winds. Little passive surveillance except during use of sports fields. Shelter would allow all weather basketball use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Margaret Griffen Park** |                      |                                  |               |                 |                                  |
| North of leisure centre  | Yes                  | Yes                              | 270m          | Yes             | Yes – neighbouring properties    |
| **Comments**             |                      |                                  |               |                 |                                  |
| Site is poorly drained and would require drainage improvements. There is little passive surveillance of the site and activities could create nuisance for neighbouring private properties. Site aligns with possible development projects (including a BMX pump track) identified in the draft Margaret Griffen concept plan, which is currently in development. |

<p>| <strong>Keith Hay Park</strong>       |                      |                                  |               |                 |                                  |
| Pavement area &amp; BB half court south east of Tristar gymnasium | Yes                  | Yes                              | 5m            | No              | Yes – BB players &amp; vehicle access to gymnasium |
| <strong>Comments</strong>             |                      |                                  |               |                 |                                  |
| Existing gymnasium building provides shelter from westerly winds. Site is divided by bollards that allow vehicle access to the side doors of the gymnasium. Shelter would allow all weather basketball use. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adequate car parking</th>
<th>Co-location with other facilities</th>
<th>Public toilet</th>
<th>Audience seating</th>
<th>Effects on neighbours/other users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Hay Park</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>150m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – impact on Three Kings United clubrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved area north of Three Kings United clubrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Existing buildings provide shelter from south-westerly but not westerly winds. Close proximity to play space means that shelter could be beneficial for play space users. The future of the existing Three Kings United clubrooms is uncertain as the club has plans to construct a multi-use building further north on the park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adequate car parking</th>
<th>Co-location with other facilities</th>
<th>Public toilet</th>
<th>Audience seating</th>
<th>Effects on neighbours/other users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Hay Park</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>150m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of central play space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Currently limited shelter from winds. Earthworks would be required to provide a flat paved surface. Close proximity to play space means that shelter could be beneficial for play space users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adequate car parking</th>
<th>Co-location with other facilities</th>
<th>Public toilet</th>
<th>Audience seating</th>
<th>Effects on neighbours/other users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>War Memorial Park</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – but under pressure at times</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Yes – vehicle access to open space for market &amp; events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved area south-east of community centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Space may not be sufficient for up to 30 people. Building provides shelter from westerly winds and existing afternoon shade but shelter could affect light access to the community centre. Space does not have high amenity as a result of proximity of entry road. Vehicle access for events and the Wesley markets occurs through the space. Potential locations for permanent shelter should be considered as part of the War Memorial Park Concept Plan, which is currently under development.
### War Memorial Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adequate car parking</th>
<th>Co-location with other facilities</th>
<th>Public toilet</th>
<th>Audience seating</th>
<th>Effects on neighbours/other users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB court adjacent to Roskill Youth Zone building</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – but under pressure at times</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Yes – BB players, market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Shelter over the court could affect light access to the Roskill Youth Zone (RYZ) building and would detract to some extent from the quality of the open space between RYZ and the community centre. Shelter would facilitate basketball games in all weathers. The community centre building provides some shelter from westerly and south-westerly winds. Potential locations for permanent shelter should be considered as part of the War Memorial Park Concept Plan, which is currently under development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adequate car parking</th>
<th>Co-location with other facilities</th>
<th>Public toilet</th>
<th>Audience seating</th>
<th>Effects on neighbours/other users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area between May Rd car park and playground</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – but under pressure at times</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

No existing shelter from westerly and south-westerly winds. Close proximity to play space means that shelter could be beneficial for play space users. Potential locations for permanent shelter should be considered as part of the War Memorial Park Concept Plan, which is currently under development.
5.3 Temporary shade/shelter

Local boards are currently only able to access temporary shade structures from the Auckland Council-wide pool and cannot guarantee a particular level of provision at any time. Commercial hire of shade structures is an option but involves access to OPEX funding for this purpose.

Should the local board decide to invest in a temporary shade/shelter structure, it is recommended that various locations for this structure be trialled to determine the level of use. It is also recommended that community programming (e.g. Wesley Community Centre programmes, Out and About programme, Roskill Youth Zone activities) of any temporary structure be undertaken to increase its use.
6 Conclusions

There are currently few permanent built shade/shelter facilities provided within Puketāpapa parks and places, and no demountable shade structures for play spaces.

It is recommended that provision of shade and protection from UVR exposure should prioritise personal/parental responsibility, including use of sunblock and protective clothing, and provision of natural shade from trees where feasible. Where built shade is provided, it should be targeted to facilities or areas that have a high level of use by children and adolescents, are used continuously for more than one hour, and where provision of built shade would enhance recreational use. It is recommended that temporary or demountable built shade be considered for new destination play spaces, particularly for passive play areas and caregiver seating.

Any significant permanent built shelters should be co-located in suburb parks with other existing facilities, should accommodate multiple uses, and should ideally be programmed to maximise their use. A trial of a temporary shelter would assist in determining the level of use and the appropriateness of a particular location prior to investment in a permanent shelter. Temporary shade/shelter structures could also be provided in key locations such as sports fields and picnic spots during the months of peak UVR exposure.

The majority of play spaces within Puketāpapa parks currently have sufficient natural shade provision from trees, although additional planting is recommended in some locations. Natural shade for play equipment or caregiver seating/picnic tables is significantly lacking at the new Harold Long/Fearon Park play space, at the Taylors Bay Reserve play space, at the two play spaces within Keith Hay Park, and at the Molley Green Reserve play space.

Potential locations for a larger permanent shelter sufficient for up to 30 people have been identified at Keith Hay Park, Margaret Griffen Park and War Memorial Park.
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Appendix A

Map and photographs of existing and potential shade/shelter provision
Figure 1: Existing and potential shade/shelter provision
Potential play space shade opportunities

Harold Long/FeaRon Park junior play area

Toylees Bay Reserve play space

Keith Hay Park south-western play space

Keith Hay Park central play space
Potential play space shade opportunities

Mokpy Green Reserve play space
Potential permanent shelter locations

Basketball half courts, Margaret Griffin Park

Grassed area north of leisure centre, Margaret Griffin Park

Paved area southwest of Tristar Gymnasium, Keith Hay Park

Paved area north of Three Kings United clubrooms, Keith Hay Park
Potential permanent shelter locations

- Grasped area east of central playground, Keith Hay Park
- Paved area east of community centre, War Memorial Park
- Basketball court adjacent to Roskill Youth Zone, War Memorial Park
- Grasped area between May Road carpark and play space, War Memorial Park
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Examples of permanent, demountable and temporary shelters
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Auckland Botanic Gardens, Manurewa

Brisbane Botanic Gardens, Queensland

Sandpit, Waitakaruru

Urban Efforts curved shelter
Shade/Shelter Provision Puketāpapa Parks

Stoddart proprietary shelter

Street Furniture Byron series

Omaha Beach, BBQ shelter

Walker Park, Avondale BBQ shelter
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Batim Park, Brisbane

Geelong Estate, Melbourne

Ruthe Park, Perth

Wattle Park, Melbourne
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Puketāpapa shade/shelter assessment

Pinehurst School, Auckland

Temporary container shelter

Play area shade sails, Auckland

Auckland Council eco-structure for glamping, Orakei
Developing an Integrated Area Plan for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas

File No.: CP2019/10949

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. Informs the Puketāpapa Local Board (the Local Board) of the intention of the Plans and Places Department of Auckland Council to develop an Integrated Area Plan for a part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas.

2. Outlines the proposed approach to be taken for developing the Integrated Area Plan for a part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas.

3. Seeks the nomination of four local board members to an Integrated Area Plan Working Party to support the development of the Plan. The nomination of ward councillors to the working party will be sought at the Planning Committee meeting in August 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

4. Over the next 10 to 15 years, the Urban Development Group (UDG), formerly Homes Land Community proposes to replace approximately 2,500 state houses with up to 10,000 new homes within the Mt Roskill redevelopment area (refer Attachment A).

5. The UDG is developing a draft spatial delivery strategy (SDS) for a part of Mt Roskill to support the increase in housing, alongside investments in infrastructure and community services.

6. In response to the transformational changes proposed by the draft SDS for Mt Roskill, the Plans and Places Department intends to develop an Integrated Area Plan for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas.

7. An integrated area plan working party comprising ward councillors and nominated local board members is proposed to be set up in order to support the development of the Plan.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) supports the process for developing an Integrated Area Plan for a part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas as set out in this report.

b) endorses the nomination of four members of the local board to the Integrated Area Plan Working Party to oversee the development of the Integrated Area Plan for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas.

Horopaki

Context

8. The Mt Roskill redevelopment area as defined by UDG has been identified by the Government as a development area because it has significant state housing holdings, the need to renew the state housing assets, good transport links, and community facilities.
9. The UDG is preparing a draft SDS for a part of Mt Roskill to support the Auckland Housing Programme, and to identify supporting actions for infrastructure and community services required to ensure their broader objective of providing quality homes and resilient communities.

10. The draft SDS is an aspirational document but is founded on previous Council documents, staff advice, and key technical reports.

11. Central to the draft SDS is consideration of the broader environment and the context in which the UDG’s redevelopment area sits including:
   - transport links, open spaces and community facilities
   - the character and function of neighbourhood and town centres
   - natural landscapes and heritage features
   - biodiversity, ecology and water quality.

12. The UDG’s mandate to provide more homes and create greater places to live has led the draft SDS to identify potential future plan changes to rezone land to support better land use and transport outcomes. These may be undertaken at the same time as the development of the Integrated Area Plan.

13. To date, the UDG has engaged with the council, mana whenua, infrastructure providers (e.g. Auckland Transport and Watercare Services), and crown agencies (e.g. Ministry of Education) on its draft SDS. Further, the UDG is actively progressing detailed neighbourhood masterplanning in part of the wider precinct area covered by the draft SDS.

14. The process to develop an Integrated Area Plan will provide a number of opportunities for the community, mana whenua and stakeholders to share their thoughts and ideas on the UDG’s draft SDS, and the future of their area. Community feedback will help inform the development of the Plan for a part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas.

**Process for preparing the Integrated Spatial Plan**

15. Development of the Integrated Area Plan is proposed to occur over a 15-month time frame from August 2019 to December 2020. The process to prepare the Plan is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Indicative dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review existing relevant information</td>
<td>August 2019 to January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First community consultation period</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of feedback and preparation of the draft Integrated Area Plan for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas</td>
<td>March to May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second community consultation period on the approved draft Integrated Area Plan for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas</td>
<td>June to August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of feedback received and plan amendments</td>
<td>September to October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and adoption of the final Integrated Area Plan for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas</td>
<td>November to December 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The development of the Integrated Area Plan could identify different land use opportunities, improvements to business centres, key infrastructure needs, and opportunities to enhance...
landscape and heritage features. However, the Integrated Area Plan is a non-statutory planning document and cannot set rules for controlling development or directly approve the funding of projects.

17. This approach anticipates regular inputs and integration from other council departments (e.g. urban design, open space, heritage, community, cultural and environmental teams and economic development), Council Controlled Organisations including Auckland Transport and key external infrastructure providers and other government organisations.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

18. There is a need to prepare an Integrated Area Plan for a part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas, where UDG’s draft SDS has identified key proposals and actions, including potential future plan changes to rezone land in Mt Roskill to achieve better land use and transport outcomes, and to support a quality compact urban form.

19. The development of the Integrated Area Plan provides the opportunity for the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Boards, council, UDG, and the community to work collaboratively together to capitalise on the transformational actions and projects proposed in the UDG’s draft SDS for the benefit of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas.

20. The exact boundary for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board areas, that will be subject to review and a detailed work programme will be presented at a workshop with the local board in August 2019.

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

21. The development of the Integrated Area Plan will involve relevant council departments, and agencies including Auckland Transport and Watercare Services.

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

22. The UDG’s draft SDS for Mt Roskill includes parts of the Albert-Eden, Puketāpapa, and Whau Local Board areas; with most relevance to the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Boards.

23. Partnering with the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Boards will be an integral part of developing an Integrated Area Plan for part of these local board areas. There will also be opportunities for the neighbouring Whau Local Board to provide comments to inform the development of the Plan.

24. Staff recommend that an integrated area plan working party comprising ward councillors and members from the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Boards be established to provide input and direction on:

- the development of the Integrated Area Plan, and its content
- engagement with the community and key stakeholders
- consideration of community feedback, and recommending to the local board and Governing Body on any amendments to the draft Plan.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

25. Consultation on developing the Integrated Area Plan by council has not yet occurred with mana whenua or mataawaka. However, the UDG have worked actively with mana whenua for over a year on the preparation of the draft SDS.
26. If the recommendations of this report are adopted, the preparation of the Plan will include engagement with all mana whenua groups with an interest and kaitiakitanga obligations in this area, and mataawaka. Early and ongoing engagement will help grow relationships with mana whenua and mataawaka, and establish key issues and matters to be considered during the development of the Plan.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

27. The preparation of the Integrated Area Plan will be funded from existing Plans and Places Departmental budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

28. There are risks that the Integrated Area Plan may raise expectations that the council will contribute resources to fund new actions and projects. Funding to support the actions and projects may be sought from the:
   - Annual Plan
   - Long-term Plan
   - Council Controlled Organisations
   - Central Government
   - Local Board Plan
   - Community groups.

29. There is a reputational risk if the actions and projects in the Integrated Area Plan do not progress, and council may be criticised for raising community expectations. Staff will develop an implementation and monitoring programme for the Plan to provide guidance to key council stakeholders, the local board, and delivery partners.

30. It is also possible that the key moves and actions in the Integrated Area Plan will differ from the key proposals and actions in the UDG’s draft SDS. During the preparation of the Plan, there will be opportunities to discuss these matters with the UDG.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

31. The next steps for developing the Integrated Area Plan are matters for the Puketāpapa Local Board to consider. This report seeks the support of the local board for the process to develop the Plan. A report on developing the Plan will also be prepared for the council’s Planning Committee in August 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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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 set 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 Puketāpapa 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 in the Pathways document (page 3):

   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 our 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 we need to do to be better prepared. There are 43 actions identified under 5 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 to Preparation: A Planning Framework for Recovery 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 workplan 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.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
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 multiagency collaboration
   • lead to increased costs, disruption and distress for affected communities and individuals.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
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\(^1\) 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.
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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 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>

4
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,” 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.
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](image)

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
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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 board 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>Access and tap into resources across the Auckland Council group and externally to better communicate and engage.</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 challenge 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>Leverage opportunities to raise the profile and discuss recovery with new audiences through the CDEM Group, Auckland Council group, partners and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Auckland Emergency Management’s education and outreach programme across the five R’s.</td>
<td>Cultivate improved cultural awareness to be able to understand specific concerns, to enable them to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and tap into resources across the Auckland Council group and externally to better communicate and engage.</td>
<td>Leverage the potential of Auckland Council’s demographic Advisory Panels – Seniors, Ethnic Peoples, Pacific Peoples, Disability, Youth and Rainbow Communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Managing Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The disruption to daily life and routines can be sudden and significant. Previously routine tasks become complicated and can subject to repeated change. The level of upset can be exacerbated by ongoing change due to recovery activities or weather changes. Previous plans go on hold.

Change of this magnitude can be disempowering and a source of frustration and distress for many. Everyone is eager to return to something that resembles what was normal before the event, as soon as possible.

The nature of the event, its impacts and the scale of the recovery effort required inform the type and extent of recovery efforts required. | Clear and consistent communication is critical to maintaining trust in the community.

Strike a balance between ambition and achievability in planning and preparations for recovery in a recovery.

Leverage creativity, community spirit and participation in a recovery to promote solutions and assist in the recovery effort. |
### Economy / Local Economy

Disruption can bring business, trade and commerce to a standstill. Orders and commitments may not be met, and employees may have not work. Everybody suffers hardships without cash flow or access to money to access necessities. Disrupted supply lines may need to be restored.

Distinctions between rural and urban local economies are also important. For example, seasonal activities may have needs or requirements with potential consequences for production over an extended period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate opportunities and mechanisms for local sourcing/procurement of goods and services during a recovery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Business Associations to encourage uptake of Business Continuity Planning and practices amongst their member businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage a better understanding of the Auckland’s and local economies through engagement with potential Task Group members for the economic environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage opportunities for youth employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the implications of seasonal cycles and underlying activities to identify factors which are critical to Auckland’s rural economy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding and resources

Replacing capital and social investment, restoring natural ecosystems and regenerating the environments that support social and economic well-being requires significant funding.

The commitment of financial and human resources to prioritise recovery activities is also significant. Accessing needed skills and expertise can be additional challenges.

Sustaining a recovery, prudent financial management, appropriate project management, while maintaining a focus delivering on the desired outcomes is complex in a pressured environment.

Recovery from smaller events can seem disproportionately large, while major and significant events present hurdles that are magnitudes greater.

The longer recovery continues the greater the pressure on resources as demand to deliver disrupted projects and work programmes builds. This can pose particular challenges where the event and recovery are limited to a part of the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building shared organisational understanding of what recovery may involve across Auckland Council group: CDEM group, Task Groups, and progressively, with Auckland’s communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of Standard Operating Procedures, plans and recovery documentation as appropriate, and subsequent updates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate a deeper shared understanding of arrangements regarding the servicing of recovery in respect of financial, information and project management, specialist and expert advice and general administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the way business units across Auckland Council group deliver their services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising the profile of recovery arrangements and the understanding of what might be required of service delivery business units and their contractors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying key skills, expertise and services contributing to recovery across Auckland Council group and partner organisations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Māori communities

Recent experience of response and recovery from disasters has benefited from the participation, support and leadership of mana whenua and local iwi at all levels – from delivering services to decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a shared understanding of recovery within Auckland Emergency Management’s wider engagement with mana whenua and mataawaka.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build on the opportunities for collaboration to cultivate leadership, participation and outcomes for Māori.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pre-existing issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</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 weakness 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>Opportunities</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>
</tbody>
</table>
## Task Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 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>Opportunities</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective recovery requires high levels of coordination and collaboration, with everyone actively participating.</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>Achieving this level of collaboration is supported by:</td>
<td>Share Standard Operating Procedures, plans and recovery documentation (and subsequent updates) with partners as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• strong institutional and personal relationships</td>
<td>Build and maintain institutional and personal relationships amongst key agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clear roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>Clarifying agreed roles and responsibilities amongst leading partners and key agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a shared understanding of what is to be achieved in a recovery</td>
<td>Formalise arrangements, roles, responsibilities in key areas through developing protocols, memorandum of understanding or similar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective support systems and communication.</td>
<td>(Key areas = support delivery of a critical service or critical resources or arrangements important in every recovery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Development of a monitoring and evaluation framework for recovery able to be applied to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide insight into the relevance of high-level independent metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>track the extent of progress towards achievement of the Framework’s vision for recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress towards completing items on the recovery work programme (generated from the Framework’s actions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide insight into the overall efficacy pre-event planning and preparations for recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>track progress towards the completion of actions and tasks under a Recovery Action Plan formulated for the recovery from an emergency event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide insight into the overall efficacy of actions and tasks under a Recovery Action Plan formulated to address the consequences in a disaster.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward Councillor Update

File No.: CP2019/12189

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To enable the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward Councillors to verbally update the Board.

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

a) thank Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward Councillors Cathy Casey and Christine Fletcher for their update.

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2019/12190

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Chairperson, Harry Doig, with an opportunity to update board members on the activities he has been involved with since the last meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. It is anticipated that the Chairperson will speak to the report at the meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) receive Chair Harry Doig's report for June 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Chair Harry Doig's report, 01 June- 30 June 2019</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Council workshops, meetings and briefings

05 June    Chair / Deputy Chair catch up
05 June    Chair/ Deputy Chair meeting with advisors
05 June    Community Forum
06 June    Board Workshop
06 June    Extra Board Meeting to discuss Annual Plan 2019/2020
10 June    Local Board Chairs only meeting
10 June    Local Board Chairs’ Forum
11 June    Chair/PA catch up
12 June    Infrastructure and heritage cluster
12 June    Chair/ Deputy Chair meeting with advisors and relationship manager
13 June    Board Workshop
13 June    Chair and Local Board Finance Advisor meeting
17 June    Local Board Members Cluster – Central
18 June    Watercare – Central Interceptor site visit
19 June    Chair / Deputy Chair catch up
19 June    Members Cluster
19 June    Chair/ Deputy Chair meeting with advisors
20 June    Meeting to discuss draft minutes for Business Meeting
20 June    Board Business Meeting

21 June – 30 June    On leave

Other meetings, events

08 June    attended Try a Craft Day
12 June    Introductory meeting with Te Roopu Kaumatua-Kuia o Owairaka ki Tamaki Makaurau

Other Issues/challenges

nil

Disclosures

nil

Recommendation/s

a) That the report be received.

Signatories

| Author | H Doig |

---
Board Member Reports

File No.: CP2019/12191

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the local board members on the activities they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. It is anticipated that Board members will speak to their reports at the meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) receive the member reports for June 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Anne-Marie Coury's Report 01 June - 30 June 2019</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Julie Fairey's Report, 06 June - 04 July 2019</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>David Holm's Report, 01 June - 30 June 2019</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shail Kaushal's Report, 03 May - 04 July 2019</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ella Kumar's Report, 01 April to 30 April 2019 and 01 June - 30 June 2019</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne-Marie Coury’s Monthly Report
1st June – 30th June 2019

Auckland Council workshops, meetings and briefings

5th June Community Forum
6th June Board Workshop
6th June Extraordinary Board Meeting
13th June Board Workshop
17th June Regional Cluster Workshop
19th June Members’ Cluster
20th June Board Business Meeting
27th June Green Cluster
28th June Board Workshop

Other meetings

15th June World Elder Abuse Day – by request of Shanti Niwas

Other issues/challenges

13th June Participated in Auckland Conversations on “Age Friendly” cities.
17th June Participated in Auckland Council’s “Age Friendly” consultation
21st June Attended Mayor’s meeting with seniors to discuss housing, & rates,
22nd June Participated in the Dawn Ceremony to mark the start of Matariki
22nd June Attended the opening of the Mt Roskill Housing Development
Information Centre in May Road with Board Colleagues, Deputy Chair
Julie Fairey, and Shail Kaushal.
22nd June Attended the “Culture and Diversity” event at Wesley Centre
22nd June Attended the opening of the Mangere Arts Centre Matariki offering -
the photographic exhibition of Te Puea Marae
23rd June Attended the Matariki event at Glen Eden Library
24th June Participated in Auckland Council’s Age Friendly consultation on
Housing for seniors with NGO’s and members from other Local Boards
Disclosures

My on-going focus when I am advocating on behalf of seniors in community forums representing Auckland Grey Power members, is reflecting the evidence that has been used to develop current Grey Power policies. I make sure to clarify I am not representing the Board.

My advocacy for seniors across the Auckland isthmus this month, has been primarily focused on rental housing issues, lack of choices and unaffordability factors, forcing seniors to live in basements, garages and vans or couch surf.

I continue to support the programmes of the Auckland Women’s Centre. I am renewing my membership of the Auckland Art Gallery and continue to support Migrant Action Trust volunteering with mentoring as and when needed. I make radio programmes on social issues at Planet FM 104.6 FM which are broadcast Sundays at 5.25 pm to provide interviews and information on what’s happening for seniors. I also support the planning and strategy efforts of the Access Alliance and am on the steering group planning the International Conference on Accessibility to be held in Auckland next March.

Recommendation/s

a) That the report be received.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Anne-Marie Coury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Report Name: Board Member Julie Fairey's report
Report covering the period 6th June – 4th July 2019

For the period 21st June to 9th July, inclusive, I have been Acting Chair while the Chair is on leave overseas.

Auckland Council workshops, meetings and briefings

6 June  Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Members Kumar, Holm, and Member Kaushal from 9.34am, Member Coury from 10am
6 June  Extra business meeting
10 June  Attended Chair’s Forum with Chair Doig, as an observer
11 June  Attended part of the Environment & Community Committee meeting considering the draft Auckland Climate Action Framework and the climate emergency declaration (pic)
12 June  Attended Infrastructure and Heritage Cluster with Member Holm (facilitating), Member Kaushal, Chair Doig
12 June  Regular advisor catch-up with Chair
12 June  Brief catch-up with Chair
13 June  Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Members Kaushal, Holm, Coury, and Member Kumar from 9.44am, until 1.38pm when I had to go home sick
17 June  Attended local board cluster briefing session with Chair Doig, Member Holm, Member Coury from 1.25pm, and elected members from other local boards
19 June  Regular catch-up with Chair
19 June  Attended Members’ Cluster with Members Coury (facilitator), Kaushal, Kumar (from 1.19pm) and Chair Doig
19 June  Regular advisor catch-up with Chair
20 June  Attended part of Draft Minutes meeting (preparation for business meeting) with Chair
20 June  Brief comms meeting by phone with Chair
20 June  Monthly business meeting
21 June  Attended NZ Walking Summit 2019 from 9.20am to 1.30pm. The second day of the two day summit, this was focused on the “natural partnership” between walking and public transport, and provided some useful insights into the role walking plays
as the main “first/last mile” mode for public transport users, and the experience of more vulnerable users with both modes. (pic)

25 June  
Attended catch-up with Local Board PA/Liaison (as Acting Chair)

26 June  
Regular advisor catch-up

26 June  
Facilitated Green cluster, attended also by Members Coury and Kumar

27 June  
Attended regular local board workshop, and facilitated as Acting Chair, with Members Holm, Kaushal, Coury, and Member Kumar (absent 11.45am - 1.40pm)

28 June  
Catch-up with Ward Councillor, Cathy Casey, and Albert-Eden Chair Peter Haynes

29 June  
Attended Manu Aute Kite Day, spoke on behalf of local board and set-up stall. Members Kumar and Kaushal also present when I was there, also Cr Casey, Michael Wood MP. (pic)

1 July  
PA/Liaison catch-up

1 July  
Attended and spoke at Citizenship Ceremony, with Members Kumar, Coury, Kaushal, and also Michael Wood MP

3 July  
Regular advisor catch-up

4 July  
Facilitated regular local board workshop, with Member Holm, Member Kaushal from 9.34am, Member Coury from 9.41am, Member Kumar from 9.52am
Other meetings, events

6 June  
Attended Mt Roskill War Memorial Park users group meeting, from 4.12pm

18 June  
Visit to Keith Hay Park

22 June  
Attended and spoke at HLC Info Centre opening for Roskill South (pic)

22 June  
Attended and spoke at Bhartiya Samaj Matariki celebration and World Elder Abuse Awareness Day, with Member Kaushal

23 June  
Attended Te Auaunga planting day at Underwood Reserve, with Member Kaushal (pic)

2 July  
Visit to HLC Info Centre for Roskill South to meet with HLC liaison

3 July  
Attended Keith Hay Park Users Group, with Member Kumar present until

Other issues/challenges

Over the reporting period I have worked on issues in response to constituent queries or my own observations in regard to the following list of areas. This has usually involved seeking and supplying information, a request for service, and/or forwarding to relevant Board members/officers for their action/information. Often these are conversations on social media (Facebook and Twitter, sometimes Neighbourly).

- Illegal dumping
- Local resource consent applications and alcohol licences monitoring
- Keith Hay Park sports fields, clubroom development, parking enforcement
- Mt Roskill War Memorial Park needs assessment and concept plan, water quality
- Wesley Community Centre carpark one-way system
- Noton Rd and Richardson Rd carpark projects (part of Keith Hay Park)
- Arthur Faulkner Reserve concept plan implementation, including pickleball and VHF club
- Waikowhai Coast boardwalk Stage 2
- Fearon and Harold Long Park park upgrade – current project and future possibilities
- Faded parking lines, particularly mobility parks at Denny Ave’s carpark for Mt Roskill War Memorial Park
- Mowing issues in Ernie Pinches area, on Housing NZ property
- Mt Roskill Village upgrade works
- Missing Greenways plinth sign on Frost Rd – AT have responded that it won’t be replaced, I am following up on why
- Dog off-leash areas signage
- Te Auaunga Project
- Playground upgrade queries for Waikowhai Park and Keith Hay Park south
- 252 bus timetable changes
• The Avenue bus stop changes and issues with visibility
• Dog bylaw review
• Freedom camping bylaw changes
• Sandringham Rd Extn pedestrian crossing maintenance (and nearby cycling infrastructure)
• Repeated flooding at Molley Green Place
• Graffiti on public assets
• Benches at The Avenue Reserve
• Cycling and walking signage

Thank you to our PA Liaison and other officers and elected members, including AT, for their assistance with these and other matters

Disclosures
I am an individual member of the Auckland branch of the National Council of Women. During the reporting period I attended the 10th June branch meeting, and organized and facilitated a discussion on local government at that meeting, on behalf of the Auckland branch.
www.ncwnz.org.nz

I am a trustee, and board secretary, for The Aunties, a charity established to expand and make sustainable work done to meet the needs of families dealing with domestic violence. During the reporting period I attended a monthly trust board meeting on 24th June. www.aunties.co.nz

I am also a trustee on the HE Fairey Family Trust, which gives grants to people with disabilities through CCS/Disability Action, but I am not currently one of the two “active” trustees.

I will be travelling to Wellington, from Auckland, return with my three children, on Friday 12th July returning Tuesday 16th July, paid for by Parliamentary Services to accompany my partner, a Member of Parliament, in his work during the school holidays.

Recommendation/s

a) That the report be received.

Signatories

| Author | Julie Fairey |
Board Member Report – David Holm

1 to 30 June 2019.

Board Workshops and Meetings Attended

5 June    Attended Community Forum – on Healthy Puketāpapa, Children’s Panels and Healthy Homes.
6 June    Attended Board Workshop.
6 June    Attended Special Board Business Meeting
13 June   Attended Board Workshop.
20 June   Attended Board Business Meeting
27 June   Attended Board Workshop.

Transport Meetings and Issues

12 June   Infrastructure and Heritage Cluster Meeting. Covered priorities for Local safety fund.

I have reported back on Auckland Transport responses on parking issues on Aldersgate Road and am dealing with concerns about speeding vehicles and parking on Stamford Park Road.

Environmental Meetings and Issues

10 June   Aircraft Noise Community Consultation Group.
11 June   Went to Public and Local Board Input Items on Green Buildings and Climate Emergency at the Governing Body Environment and Community Committee.
17 June   Manukau Harbour Forum Agenda RunThrough.
21 June   Manukau Harbour Forum Workshop and Business Meeting.
29 June   Dropped in on Generation Zero Zero Carbon Bill Submission Party at Oasis Roskill South

Reports I have received on further meetings about activities lacking resource consents on Sandringham Road Extension show little progress.

Other Meetings/ Functions

17 June   Sub regional cluster on Food Safety and Climate Change with Chair and members Fairey and Coury.
18 June   Visit Central Interceptor shaft site May Road with Chair and member Kumar – photo.
29 June Matariki Kite Day - manned board stall at Winstone Park - photos.

Other organisations
11 June Roskill Together Board meeting.

Declaration of interest I am Treasurer of Roskill Together.

Recommendation
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:-
receive the report from Member Holm.
Auckland Council workshops, meetings, briefings and events

8th May
Attended Infrastructure and Heritage Cluster Meeting alongside Members Doig, Holm, Fairey and Kumar.

9th May
Attended Board Workshop alongside Members Doig, Fairey, Kumar, Coury, and Holm.

9th May
Attended and spoke at the Local Citizenship Ceremony alongside Members Doig, Kumar, Fairey and Coury (Photo →).

15th May
Attended Members Cluster alongside Members Doig, Fairey, Kumar, Coury, and Holm.

16th May
Attended Board Business Meeting alongside Members Doig, Fairey, Kumar, Holm and Coury.

17th May
Attended Pink Shirt Day event at Wesley Community Centre (Photo →).

19th May
Attended Harold Long Reserve playground opening alongside Members Doig, Fairey, Kumar and Local MP Michael Wood.

20th May
Attended Auckland-Guangzhou Sister City 30th Anniversary Event at Pah Homestead alongside Member Doig.

23rd May
Attended Board Workshop alongside Members Doig, Fairey, Kumar, Coury, and Holm.

25th May
Attended Africa Day alongside Mayor Goff, Member Doig and Local MP Michael Wood.

28th May
Attended Samoan Language Week Celebration alongside Member Doig.

30th May
Attended Board Workshop alongside Members Doig, Fairey, Kumar, Coury, and Holm

8th June
Attended Try a Craft alongside Members Doig and Coury.
12th June  | Attended Infrastructure and Heritage Cluster Meeting alongside Members Doig, Holm and Fairey.
13th June  | Attended Board Workshop alongside Members Doig, Fairey, Kumar, Coury, and Holm.
18th June  | Attended RMA Commissioner Quarterly Forum.
19th June  | Attended Members Cluster alongside Members Doig, Fairey, Kumar, Coury, and Holm.
20th June  | Attended Board Business Meeting alongside Members Doig, Fairey, Kumar, Holm and Coury.
23rd June  | Attended dawn blessing of Mt Roskill Development Information Centre (Photo →).
23rd June  | Attended the public opening of Mt Roskill Development Information Centre.
23rd June  | Attended International Refugee Day at Wesley Community Centre alongside Member Kumar.
27th June  | Attended Board Workshop alongside Members Fairey, Kumar, Coury, and Holm.
29th June  | Attended Manu Aute Kite Day alongside Members Fairey, Kumar, Holm, Councillor Casey and Local MP Michael Wood (Photo →).
1st July   | Attended and spoke at the Local Citizenship Ceremony alongside Members Kumar, Fairey, Coury and Local MP Michael Wood.
4th July   | Attended Board Workshop alongside Members Fairey, Coury, Holm and Kumar.

**Other meetings and events**

11th May   | Attended Umma Trust’s interfaith Iftar event alongside Member Doig (Photo →).
18th May   | Attended Earth Action Trust’s meeting alongside Members Doig and Coury.
18th May   | Attended and spoke at community vigil to commemorate 10 years since ending of the Civil War in Sri Lanka, alongside Local MP Michael Wood.
24th May   | Attended Migrant Action Trust’s meeting with Local MP Michael Wood.
26th May

Attended Interfaith Iftar Event hosted by Local MP Michael Wood.

31st May

Attended Somali Education Trust’s Iftar Event alongside Member Doig.

14th June

Attended Shakti’s Conference on Racial Equity.

14th June

Attended Te Wananga o Aotearoa’s Graduation Ceremony alongside Minister Henare, Marama Davidson MP and Member Fuli (Otara-Papatoetoe) (Photo →).

15th June

Attended Shanti Niwas’ World Elder Abuse Awareness Day alongside Local MP Michael Wood.

23rd June

Took part in clean-up of Dominion Road (Photo →).

23rd June

Attended and spoke at Bhartiya Samaj’s World Elder Abuse Awareness Day alongside Member Fairey.

Other issues/challenges

None to be reported.

Disclosures

- In the reporting period, I have held my weekly CAB shifts for constituents on Fridays 1-4pm, regarding immigration support and other matters related to Citizens Advice Bureau Mt Roskill. These shifts were held on 3rd May, 10th May, 17th May, 23rd May, 31st May, 7th June, 14th June, 21st June and 28th June.

- I am also a member of the Mt Roskill Community Patrol and conducted my night patrol on 13th May and attended their AGM on 18th May.

Recommendation/s

a) That the report be received.

Signatories

| Author | Shail Kaushal |

---

Page 3
Report Name: Board Member Ella Kumar report
Report covering the period 03 April to 29 April and 05 June to 30th June 2019

Auckland Council Workshops, meetings and briefings

3rd April
Green Cluster workshop
Community Forum

4th April Workshop
Many Aute Kite Day
Community facilities
Healthy Puketapapa Action Plan
Community Empowerment Work Programme 18/19
Discussions on the 10/20 work Programme
Strategic Grant Plan

9th April 2019
Wesley Community Centre

10th April 2019
Infrastructure and Heritage Sub-Committee

11th April 2019
Local Board workshop
Agenda Run Through
Understanding Local Rates and their Implications
Community Places
Strategic Relationship Grant Accountability Update 18/19 Part 2
Local Board Agreement
PA Liaison Weekly Five

18th April 2019
Puketapapa Local Board Business Meeting

29th April 2019
Healthy Action Plan
Youth Connections (I was absent for this discussion)
AT Community Safety Fund
Election Year Policy

Other
7th April 2019
International Cultural Festival
5th June
Local Board Forum

6th June
Extra Ordinary Business Meeting
Local Board Workshop
- Tipuna Maunga Authority
- Community Facility Update
- FY20 CEU Work Programme - Community Safety Proposal
- Elected Member Survey

13th June
Local Board Workshop
- Quick Response Q 3
- Agenda Run Through
- Community Empowerment Work Programme Update 18/19
- Shared Space Project

18th June
Watercare Interceptor project

20th June
Puketāpapa Board Business meeting

27th June
Local Board Workshop
- Parks planning projects establishing criteria
- One Local Initiative
- Wesley Community Centre
- FY 20 Capacity building delivery
- Kainga Ora – homes and community bills

29th June
Puketāpapa Matariki Kite Day

Other meetings

Disclosures:
Contractor for YMCA as an aerobics instructor to deliver fitness classes. (Cameron Pools Leisure Centre and Lynfield Leisure and Recreation Centre is situated in PLB area who own the buildings) Roskill Together Committee Member.

I volunteered for many years before being on the local board and will continue with community as requested in my personal capacity in various ways like events, support, fitness or as required at many organisations where the board may have funded or will fund in the future and will declare these situations as they arise and applications come to the local board and when local board engages and funds groups.
Recommendations

a) That the report be received.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Ella Kumar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present the Puketāpapa Local Board with its updated governance forward work programme calendar (the calendar).

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The calendar for the Puketāpapa Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.
3. The calendar was introduced in 2016 as part of Auckland Council’s quality advice programme and aims to support local boards’ governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is expected and when
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar also aims to provide guidance for staff supporting local boards and greater transparency for the public.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
 a) receive the governance forward work programme calendar for July 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Programme Calendar, July 2019</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Puketapapa Local Board Governance Forward Work Programme - July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 December 2018</td>
<td>PPA First Quarter Report 2018-2019</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 2018</td>
<td>Three Kings Land Carpent Budget Allocation</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 2018</td>
<td>Annual Plan 2019/2020 Local Consultation Content</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 April 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Defend board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 June 2019</td>
<td>Adopt Local Board Work Programme FY20</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August 2019</td>
<td>Open Space Management Framework</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 September 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 2019</td>
<td>Shade Shaper Report</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 June 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Defend board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 September 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 November 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Climate Change Action Plan - Low Carbon Auckland</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Defend board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
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Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 06 June 2019 commencing at 9.30 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson:       Harry Doig
Members:      Anne-Marie Coury arrived at 9.59 am
               Julie Fairey
               David Holm
               Shail Kaushal arrived at 9.34 am
               Elia Kumar

Apologies:

Also present:   Trina Thompson, Mary Hay, John Adams and Selina Powell
### Workshop Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 21</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Tūpunga Maunga Authority John Adams Local Board Advisor</td>
<td><strong>Input into Regional Decision making</strong></td>
<td>The officer presented to the board on this item asking for their feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2a: Community Leasing a) Lynfield Tennis Club Lease – community outcome plan a) Local initiatives/specific decisions Michelle Knudsen Community Specialist Lease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2b: Keith Hay Park – Irrigation Phil Gedge Sports Parks Specialist</td>
<td><strong>Oversight and monitoring</strong></td>
<td>The officer presented on the project noting that there was now going to be a shortfall for the lighting. The board discussed the shortfall with the officer. The Board then agreed with the direction the officers were taking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2c: Pine tree removals update Will Kerry Senior Arboriculture and Eco Specialist</td>
<td><strong>Oversight and monitoring</strong></td>
<td>The officer gave the board an update on the pine tree removal noting they could now look to do further work in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2d: Project Delivery work programme update Fearon Park, update on works and basketball plan</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The officers gave the board an update on the work completed to date on Fearon Park. The board provided feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Phil Goulter  
Project Delivery  
| Jody Morley  
Project Delivery  
| Katrina Morgan  
Work Programme Lead |

| Item 2e: Operational Maintenance update:  
Justin Cash  
Operational Management and Maintenance | Oversight and monitoring | The officer gave the board an update on the following:  
a) Bamfield Reserve  
b) Pah Homestead, humidity lighting controller  
c) Pallister Reserve  
d) Hillsborough Cemetery  
e) Roskill Youth Zone  
f) Underwood and Walmsey |

| Item 3.0: FY20 CEU WP Community Safety Proposal  
Ronelle Baker  
Practice Manager - Operations Arts Community and Events  
Juanita De Senna  
Strategic Broker Arts Community and Events | Local initiatives/specific decision | The officers presented on closing the loop for the FY20 CEU WP Community Safety Proposal following the discussion from the 23 May 2019 workshop. |

| Item 4: Elected Member Survey  
Trina Thompson  
Relationship Mgr Mngke-Tmk Puketapapa Local Board Services | Oversight and monitoring | The officer presented to the board on the Elected Member Survey results. |
5.0 HLC Update (quarterly)

**Joby Barham**
Development Programmes
Lead, Development
Programme Office, Auckland
Council COO

**Alina Wimmer**
Manager Development
Strategy Development
Programme Office
Auckland Council COO

**Nick FitzHerbert**
Relationship Advisor
Relationship Management
Unit, Auckland Council COO

**Kirsten Fryer**
Community Engagement Manager,
Housing New Zealand (HLC)

**Karl Beazley (HLC)**

**Kirsty Charles**
Strategic Relationships and
Placemaking Manager, Homes
Land and Community (HLC)

**Christian Hurzeler**
Associate Precinct Director, Mt
Roskill (HLC)

**Lucy Smith**
Key Development Manager,
Roskill South

**David Wong**
Principal Planner
Plants & Places
Planning – Central/South

- Oversight and monitoring

The officer introduced the team and highlighted the agenda for the session. The board was updated on the following:

**Roskill South Local Paths Programme**

**Roskill Development Update**
- Mt Roskill precinct Update
- Three Kings Development

**Mt Roskill precinct level planning (Auckland Council Plans & Places)**
Next steps a report will come to the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting for the 18 July.

The workshop concluded at 3.11 pm.

Note: The Puketāpapa Local Board Business Meeting commenced at 10am for 1 hour and 15 mins this was after Item 1. The Puketāpapa Local Board workshop resumed at 11.30 am and the items followed the order set down in the agenda.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 13 June 2019 commencing at 9.30 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig
Members: Anne-Marie Coury
         Julie Fairey arrived 9.44 am – 1.38 pm
         David Holm
         Shail Kaushal
         Elia Kumar

Apologies:
Also present: Trina Thompson, Mary Hay, John Adams and Selina Powell
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Declarations of Interest      |                                                                                 | Member Shail Kaushal for Item 2 Quick Response Grants for the Citizens Advice Bureau  
Member Ella Kumar for Item 2 Quick Response Grants for her involvement with Roskill Together  
Member David Holm for Item 2 Quick Response Grants of his involvement with Roskill Together. |
| Item 1.0: OLI Roscoe Webb      | • **Local initiatives/specific decision**                                       | The officer provided the board with an update on the progress of the OLI to date.  
Next steps: a further workshop to discuss findings and then a report to the Puketāpapa Local Board 18 July 2019 Business meeting |
| Regional Programme Manager (One Local Initiative Community Facilities)       |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| William Brydon                |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Principal Policy Analyst      |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Community & Social Management |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Emma Goollighty               |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Team Leader Parks and Recreation Policy |                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Item 2.0: Quick Response Round 3 | • **Local initiatives/specific decision**                                       | The board reviewed the quick response round 3 applications.  
Next steps: a report to the Puketāpapa Local Board 20 June Business meeting. |
| Mounita Dutta                 |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Senior Grants Advisor         |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Commercial & Finance          |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Ann Kuruvilla                 |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Grants Coordinator            |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Commercial & Finance          |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Item 3.0: Agenda Run Through  |                                                                                 | The board reviewed the business meeting agenda for the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting being held on 20 June 2019                                  |
| Harry Doig                    |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Chair                         |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
### Item 4.0 Community Empowerment Work Programme Update 18/19

**Juanita De Senna**  
Strategic Broker  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment  

**Sunita Kashyap**  
Specialist Advisor  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment  

**Tanya Moredo**  
Specialist Advisor, Youth  
Specialist  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment  

**Rosetta Fulmaono**  
Specialist Advisor  
Arts Community and Events  

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The officer gave an update on the following inviting the respective officers to speak to their item:
  - Children’s Panel
  - Youth Board
  - Neighbour’s Day Support
  - Strategic Relationship Grant
  - Social Enterprise and Innovation
  - Social Cohesion
  - Community Partners

### Item 5.0: Shared Spaces Project

**Peter Loud**  
Senior Advisor  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Places  

**Juanita de Senna**  
Strategic Broker  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment  

**Anja Thomas**  
Contractor  

- **Local initiatives/specific decision**  
The officer updated the board on the project highlighting key findings.

### Item 6.0: Puketāpapa Local Board Transport Safety Fund

**John Adams**  
Local Board Advisor  

- **Local initiatives/specific decision**  
The officer presented to the board the draft list seeking the board’s direction and prioritisation noting this list had been discussed at the Heritage and Infrastructure meeting. The board discussed and provided feedback.

**Next steps:** a report on the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting agenda for the 20 June 2019. This list will be tabled at that meeting.

### Item 7.0: Weekly 5

**Delwyn Burke**  
PA/Liaison  

The board was updated on events in their calendar for the next fortnight.

---

The workshop concluded at 2.22 pm.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 27 June 2019 commencing at 9.30 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Julie Fairey
Members: Anne-Marie Coury stepped out 12.30 noon arrived back 1.05pm
          David Holm
          Shail Kaushal
          Ella Kumar absent 11.49 am – 1.40 pm

Apologies: Harry Doig
Also present: Trina Thompson, Mary Hay, John Adams and Selina Powell
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>The members did not have declarations for this workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Parks Planning Projects establishing criteria</td>
<td>Julie Fairey Deputy Chair</td>
<td>The Deputy Chair presented on this session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: OLI Report back</td>
<td>Roscoe Webb Programme Principal (One Local Initiative Community Facilities) Strategic Projects William Brydon Principal Policy Analyst Community &amp; Social Policy Parks and Recreation Policy Emma Golightly Parks and Rec Tui Team Leader Community &amp; Social Policy Phillip Shaw Principal Policy Analyst Community &amp; Social Policy Parks and Recreation Policy</td>
<td>• Local initiatives/specific decisions The officers reported back to the board on their findings. The board provided the officers with feedback. Next steps: a report will go to the Puketāpapa Local Board 18 July 2019 Business Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3.0 Wesley Community Centre regular update</td>
<td>Michael Matheson Place Manager Puketāpapa/Albert/Eden Infay Wong See Programme Coordinator Anaau Mamea Senior Venue Hire Advisor Arts Community and Events Jo Gallagher Programme Coordinator Arts Community and Events Christine Waugh Manager Venues for Hire Arts Community and Events Community Places</td>
<td>• Oversight and monitoring The officer introduced the team and built the conversation on from the previous discussion held with the board on the framework they also gave an update from the centre. The board asked questions and provided feedback to the officers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 4: FY20 Capacity building for delivery (Bike Train)

**Gill Plume**  
Project Manager  
Arts Community and Events Community Empowerment

- *Local initiatives/specific decisions*

  The officer introduced the item and spoke about various aspects of the project.  
  The board provided feedback.  
  Next steps the officer to come back to the board at the end of the trial period.

### Item 5: Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill

**John Adams**  
Local Board Advisor,  
Puketāpapa

- *Input into regional decision making*

  The officer presented on the Bill seeking the board’s direction for feedback.  
  The board provided draft feedback for inclusion with the Deputy Chair to review the final feedback.

### Item 6: Weekly 5

**Delwyn Burke**  
PĀliaison

The board was updated on events in their calendar for the next fortnight.

The workshop concluded at 2.00 pm.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1.0 To update the Puketāpapa Local Board on the performance of Regional Facilities Auckland for the third quarter period ending 31 March 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive the Regional Facilities Auckland third quarter performance report for the period ending 31 March 2019.
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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

Highlights, issues & risks for the quarter:

- RFA’s summer stadium concert line-up boosted the Auckland economy with a visitor spend of $20 million and a contribution to regional GDP of $10 million.
- 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.
- New Zealand Maritime Museum welcomed hundreds of Aucklanders on its heritage vessels as part of 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 $250k 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.

Financial Commentary

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></th>
<th>Previous 18 Quarter 3</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience RFA’s arts, environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td>1,686,306</td>
<td>2,423,215</td>
<td>2,585,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Māori in Auckland, Tamaki Makauraua</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</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 end 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 future proofed 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nth Harbour QBE Stadium – baseball reconfiguration</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Reconfiguration and construction to enable the hosting of the Auckland Tuatara’s home games for next season at QBE Stadium</td>
<td>This project is currently in procurement phase with construction to commence in March and completed by November 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Smart Stadium – seating replacement in the lower west stand</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>The replacement of the seating area entirely, including seats, structure and decking on the lower west stand of Mt Smart Stadium.</td>
<td>This renewals project for Mt Smart Stadium is required to ensure health and safety and tenancy obligations continue to be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nth Harbour Stadium – main stand roof renewal</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>To construct access to the grandstand roof and undertake roof repairs (renewals)</td>
<td>Awaiting the outcome of seismic assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Springs Stadium renewals</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>The replacement of two toilet blocks, gate entry building, maintenance shed, concourse and Stadium Road upgrade works.</td>
<td>Essential renewals currently in the procurement phase and expected to commence in March with completion due in November 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic context
RFA’s Venue Development Strategy (VDS) identifies the issues facing the current major outdoor stadiums in Auckland, and proposes key focus areas over the next 20 years to address these. 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 30%. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. E. Asia Precinct development</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the central area within the zoo to provide modern standards of housing and care for the Zoo’s South East Asian species, and new catering facilities</td>
<td>Largest renewals project ($60m) in the zoo’s history. Tracking to budget and expected to be completed in the 2019/20 financial year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic context
RFA is continuing with development of a world class zoo and conservation facility by addressing aging infrastructure at Auckland Zoo and long-term under-investment through a phased programme of works. This has the aim of essential renewals to ensure Auckland Zoo meets the modern standards of animal welfare, visitor amenity, wildlife exhibition and health and safety obligations.
Strategic focus area – Aotea Centre development

Key commentary
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 Nautilus 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 revenue potential from the centre for a longer period than previously anticipated. Significant distraction for Aotea and project teams through need to micro-plan access to conclude unfinished portions of work.
3. There will be some negative impact on the customer experience caused by ongoing construction works until completion.

Strategic context
The refurbishment and further proposed development and expansion of the Aotea Centre are aimed at creating a vibrant cultural and civic centre for Auckland focussed 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Refurbishment</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>The first significant refurbishment of the 30 year old centre, aiming to upgrade foyer and functions spaces and address long-standing weather-tightness issues</td>
<td>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>Aotea Square master plan</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>A precinct planning approach to the development of the square and its surrounds to ensure the precinct meets its potential as a key lively and active space for Aucklanders</td>
<td>This project is progressing with input from a broad group of stakeholders and is intended to help guide future investment proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Centre expansion</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Developing concept plans for expanding the current Aotea Centre to provide a home for performing arts organisations and 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 Toa Tārea / Fashion Activists opened at Auckland Art Gallery in February. The exhibition, which plays homage to a collective of Pacific and Māori designers, artists and performers that electrified 1990s Auckland, has been extended with an interactive art installation, DiscoVERY, by Rosanna Raymond and Ani O’Neill.
- Guardia Girls: Reinventing the ‘F’ word – Feminism! opened in March. The anonymous collective’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, Bandit, 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.

Sustainability and Climate change
- Since the 3rd of January 2019 Auckland Live have been using Globelet reusable wine glasses. Their use for the Aladdin season prevented over 13,500 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 Seaweek breakfast talk in March with Heni Unwin in partnership with Sustainable Seas National Science and Cawthron Institute. The scientist talked on the development of a new digital tool to track how ocean currents transport plastics.
- The zoo’s water savings have been reported as 42,300 m3 ($1.69k) 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 all recycling.
- 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.
### Direct operating performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net direct expenditure | A | 35.8 | 26.9 | 27.0 | 0.1 | 36.0 |
| Direct revenue | 58.4 | 41.3 | 46.9 | (5.6) | 62.5 |
| Fees & user charges | B | 46.0 | 30.0 | 37.9 | (7.8) | 53.1 |
| Operating grants and subsidies | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| Other direct revenue | 10.7 | 10.3 | 8.4 | 1.9 | 8.6 |
| Direct expenditure | 94.2 | 68.2 | 73.9 | 5.7 | 96.5 |
| Employee benefits | C | 46.8 | 38.5 | 33.7 | (4.8) | 44.9 |
| Grants, contributions & sponsorship | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | 1.3 |
| Other direct expenditure | D | 45.4 | 28.7 | 39.3 | 10.6 | 52.3 |

### Other key operating lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC operating funding</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC capital funding</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net interest expense</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Regional Facilities Auckland Q3 performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key performance indicators</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience Regional Facilities Auckland’s arts, environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td>1,686,306</td>
<td>2,423,215</td>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>The Viaduct Events Centre was leased to Team NZ during the second quarter. This re-purpose of the facility has had a negative impact on the overall visitor numbers. It is unlikely this target will be met by year end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to Auckland Zoo</td>
<td>346,806</td>
<td>551,427</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to Auckland Art Gallery</td>
<td>204,151</td>
<td>304,651</td>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors to the NZ Maritime Museum</td>
<td>78,570</td>
<td>124,285</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>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 $250k due to the acceleration of the visitor security programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Auckland residents surveyed who value RFA venues and events</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Maori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on Auckland Council Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw

File No.: CP2019/12314

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To update members on the board’s feedback to the Auckland Council Dogs and Dog Management Hearing Panel.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. On 6 June the local board delegated authority to Deputy Chair Fairey to provide formal feedback to the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw Hearing Resolution number PKTPP/2019/1
3. Prior to the hearing, Deputy Chair Fairey reviewed the deliberations report containing the summary of submissions. This traversed a number of local issues in regard to Waikowhai Park (signage being wrong, which is now fixed), Monte Cecilia Park (advocating whole area should be off-leash not just the bowl), Manukau Domain (seeking a water fountain). She determined that none of these are relevant to the hearing on Friday, 21 July 2019.
4. Deputy Chair Fairey noted that local feedback on regional proposals was consistent with regional feedback. Largely submitters were in agreement with the proposals. The one area of mixed feedback related to whether there should be a standardised regional time and season rule or whether local area variations should be considered.
5. Based on this assessment of community feedback, Deputy Chair Fairey decided that it was not necessary to speak to the hearing panel to convey local board views.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) note that the board did not speak to the Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Bylaw Hearing Panel.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide members with the board’s formal feedback from Deputy Chair Fairey on the Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities Bill that has been appended to Auckland Council’s submission on the Bill by the Auckland Council Planning Committee.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. At the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting of 20 June 2019 a report was presented seeking delegation for a member to provide input into Auckland Council’s submission on the Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities Bill. Deputy Chair Fairey was delegated to provide input per resolution PKTPP/2019/117.

3. The board held a workshop session on 27 June 2019 where members had the opportunity to consider their feedback.

4. Deputy Chair Fairey submitted this feedback so it could be to the Planning Committee appended to Auckland Council’s submission.

5. A copy of the board’s submitted feedback has been attached to this report as Attachment A.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) note the board’s formal feedback on the Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities Bill appended to Auckland Council’s submission on that Bill.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20190704 Puketapapa Local Board Feedback on Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities Bill</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Author | Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa
Authoriser | Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager
Date: 4 July 2019
To: Planning Committee - Auckland Council

Puketāpapa Local Board Feedback on Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

1. Support Auckland Council’s draft submission to the Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill, noting that it picks up some of the local board’s concerns expressed in response to the submission on the earlier discussion paper.
   a. This support aligns with our ‘urban development meets community needs’ outcome in the Puketāpapa Local Board Plan.

2. Agree with recognising within this legislation the important role local government (including local boards) has in urban planning and community development.

3. Support the adding of a ‘purpose’ section to this Bill to assist with interpretation of the legislation.

4. Note that Auckland Council has a range of fully consulted plans and strategies (including spatial and other plans for harbours and waterways) that need to be considered by the new urban development authority as part of the planning framework within the Auckland region.
   a. This should also include local planning documents and strategies which local boards have consulted on and adopted.

5. Note that the local board intends to provide input into Auckland Council’s submission on the second Bill of this proposed legislation.

This feedback is authorised in accordance with Puketāpapa Local Board resolution PKTPP/2019/117 - 27 June 2019.

Julie Fairey  
Deputy Chairperson  
Puketāpapa Local Board
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide members with the board’s formal feedback from Member Holm on the Climate Change (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill that has been appended to Auckland Council’s submission

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. At the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting held on 20 June 2019 a report was presented seeking delegation for a local board member to provide input into Auckland Council’s submission on the proposed Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill.

3. Member Holm was delegated to provide input as per resolution PKTPP/2019/118. The local board held a workshop on 4 July 2019 where members had the opportunity to consider their feedback.

4. This feedback has been appended to Auckland Council’s submission on the amendment bill.

5. A copy of the board’s submitted feedback has been attached to this report as Attachment A.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) note the board’s formal feedback on Climate Change (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill appended to Auckland Council’s submission.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20190704 Puketapapa Local Board Input into Climate Change (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Trina Thompson - Relationship Manager/Senior Advisor Waitemata Local Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 4 July 2019
To: Environment and Community Committee – Auckland Council

Puketāpapa Local Board Feedback on the Climate Change (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

1. Support legislation that will provide a framework for New Zealand to develop and implement clear and stable climate change policies – in response to the country’s Paris commitment.
2. Support the establishment of a Climate Change Commission.
3. Support reducing all greenhouse gases (except biogenic methane) to net zero by 2050.
4. Support a 47 per cent reduction target in biogenic methane emissions by 2050 and an 11 per cent reduction in biogenic methane emissions from the 2010 level (as recommended by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) by 2030.
5. Request that additional regular short-term milestones be included within the legislated emissions targets to better signpost the transition to net zero emissions.
6. Strongly support the establishment of specific emission budgets, including the visibility of three emission budgets at one time.
7. Strongly support the inclusion of climate adaptation in the amendment bill.
   a. Support a national adaptation plan that:
      i. Includes ringfenced funding support from central government to local government to achieve regional outcomes
      ii. aligns with local government long-term plans (to enable sufficient budget to be planned and allocated) and recognises specific demographic challenges.
   b. Support central government contingency funding for localised climate emergencies and encroachment issues, for example due to sea level rise and including situations exacerbated by climate change but not necessarily directly caused.
   c. Request that central government ensures that local government align their policies and practices to National Adaptation Plan standards.
   d. Request that the legislation mandate specific central and local government organisations and ‘lifeline utility providers’ to produce adaptation plans.
      i. Ask that ‘lifeline utility providers’ include specific transport providers such as airports (and aviation authorities), ports and transport infrastructure providers.
      ii. Request that local government be empowered to require adaptation reports from key infrastructure providers, such as Kiwirail, and the New Zealand Transport Agency, if central government does not mandate such reporting.
8. Request that the legislation enable a transformational shift to a low emission transport network (domestic and international) within the development and delivery of emission budgets and adaptation plans.
9. Strongly support insurance companies being required to disclose climate risk, as it is important for the public to understand areas at risk for future inability to be insured.
10. Note that consequences within the legislation for industry/sector failures to meet targets to achieve the national 2050 target should incentivise industry climate change planning.
11. Support consideration of enforcement measures to ensure the transition to a net zero future. Noting that fees and fines could be re-invested into supporting and meeting the outcomes of the National Adaptation Plan.
a. Note that potential enforcement should consider both 'strict liability' and 'wilful avoidance' consequences.

12. Support Auckland Council’s recommendations for stronger inclusion of Te Ao Māori throughout the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill. Including appropriate representation of Māori at the governance and executive levels of the Climate Commission.

This feedback is authorised in accordance with Puketāpapa Local Board resolution PKTPP/2019/118 - 27 June 2019.

David Holm
Puketāpapa Local Board
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Puketāpapa Local Board

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person. In particular, the report contains private financial information.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>