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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

Members were 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.

Specifically members are asked to identify any new interests they have not previously disclosed, an interest that might be considered as a conflict of interest with a matter on the agenda.

The following are declared interests of the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Organisation/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sandra Coney | - Waitemata District Health Board – Elected Member  
- Women’s Health Action Trust – Patron  
- New Zealand Society of Genealogists – Member  
- New Zealand Military Defence Society – Member  
- Cartwright Collective – Member  
- Titirangi RSA – Member  
- Portage Trust – Member  
- West Auckland Trust Services – Director  
- Community Waitakere – partner has contract |
| Neil Henderson | - Portage Trust – Elected Member     
- West Auckland Trust Services (WATS) Board – Trustee/Director  
- Kaipatiki Project - Employee |
| Greg Presland | - Lopdell House Development Trust – Trustee  
- Whau Coastal Walkway Environmental Trust – Trustee  
- Combined Youth Services Trust – Trustee  
- Glen Eden Bid – Member  
- Titirangi Ratepayers and Residents Association - Member  
- Waitakere Ranges Protection Society - Member  
- Titirangi RSA - Member  
- Maungakiekie Golf Club - Member |
| Steve Tollestrup | - Waitakere Licensing Trust – Elected Member  
- Waitakere Task force on Family Violence – Appointee  
- Piha RSA - Member |
| Saffron Toms | Nil |
| Ken Turner | Nil |
Member appointments
Board members are appointed to the following bodies. In these appointments the board members represent Auckland Council:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Organisation/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Coney</td>
<td>- Friends of Arataki Incorporated – Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Henderson</td>
<td>- Friends of Arataki Incorporated – Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rural Advisory Panel - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Tollestrup</td>
<td>- Glen Eden Business Improvement District - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aircraft Noise Consultative Committee Group - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local Government New Zealand Zone One Committee - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Presland</td>
<td>- Glen Eden Business Improvement District (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron Toms</td>
<td>- Ark in the Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Manukau Harbour Forum - Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Confirmation of Minutes
That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 27 June 2019, as true and correct.

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 Waitākere Ranges 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.

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To receive a deputation from Amanda Hookham-Kraft, on behalf of the Auckland Composting Network.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Amanda Hookham-Kraft will provide a presentation to the proposed Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw, 2019.

3. The Auckland Composting Network is made up of many individuals and collective groups working, teaching and facilitating regenerative development and practices throughout Auckland.

4. Understanding the primary function of composting as a soil amendment and a globally known and recognised effective climate mitigation strategy when carried out within a whole system approach.

5. Initiatives beyond community gardens are recognized and endorsed as effective, regenerative and pro-social means of managing and minimising waste and collectively enabling Auckland to proactively engage with the Climate and Environmental crisis that we are now experiencing.

6. The presentation will outline views on the current draft Bylaw (including important amendments and/or inclusions), case studies functioning both in Waitakere and other areas of Auckland, shared with collected data of the positive effects and results they bring.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) receive the presentation of views on the proposed Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw, 2019 and thank Amanda Hookham-Kraft of the Auckland Compost Network, for her attendance.

9 Public Forum

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

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

10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-
(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."
Waitākere Ward Councillor Update

File No.: CP2019/12365

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To enable the Waitākere Ward Councillors to verbally update the Board.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) thank Waitākere Ward Councillors Linda Cooper and Penny Hulse for their update.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Brenda Railey - Democracy Advisor - Waitakere Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consideration of Chicken Management Options & Rodent Control Activity - Titirangi Village

File No.: CP2019/12635

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To consider options for the management of chickens at Titirangi Village and to note recent activity to better manage rodents (predominantly rats) on council owned assets and in partnership with the community in the Titirangi Village area and surrounds.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Local residents and businesses in the Titirangi Village area raised concerns around the negative impact of the wild chicken population around the village. This included concerns about the increased number and size of rats (attracted by chicken feed) and the negative impact of the chickens on amenity, public health, road safety and the ecological surrounds of the area. (Attachment A)

3. To enable a local board decision on management of the chicken population staff commissioned Wildlands consultants to undertake a survey of chicken numbers at the site and develop a report to determine and analyse options for chicken management in Titirangi Village. The Wildlands report ‘Management Options for Chickens in Titirangi Village’ July 2019 is attached to this report (Attachment B).

4. In summary the report has concluded that there is a large population of wild chickens in Titirangi Village that are causing visible public health and safety issues. Several rats were observed during the chicken survey and the report concludes that this is likely a direct consequence of feeding the chickens.

5. To address the problem the Wildlands report recommends that all wild chickens are removed from the site and surrounding areas. They have prepared two options:

   1) remove the entire population; or
   2) remove most of the population and undertake ongoing management to maintain a small population of chickens

6. Staff recommend that local board supports the Wildlands recommendation to remove the entire population. Taking this approach will fully remove the negative effects of the wild chicken population and may positively impact on the number of rodents in the surrounds. This recommendation involves rehoming where possible with humane culling to occur secondarily.

7. As is noted in the report previous attempts to manage the chicken population have not received the buy-in of all members of the community. This negatively impacted on the success of the approach. There is a risk that some members of the community do not agree with the removal of the population and this may continue to negatively impact on the desired outcomes. This will attempt to be mitigated by community engagement.

8. The approximate cost of the recommended approach is $25,000 initially for the capture and rehoming option. There is no regional funding for chicken control nor is it a prioritised pest control activity. The local board will need to determine if it wants to fund this activity from its LDI budgets. If the local board chooses this option staff can manage the contract for delivery in the current financial year.

9. Over the last few weeks Auckland Council has taken additional measures to deal with the rat population in Titirangi. This has included increasing rodent control activity in local parks and facilities and working with community groups to support control measures on private
properties. It is proposed that the local board continue to endorse and support this community activity.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations
That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) approve option one ‘the removal of all wild chickens from the Titirangi Village and surrounding areas’ and note that this approach will focus on capture and rehoming with culling as a secondary option.

b) request staff to identify local board LDI funding to manage the wild chicken population in the 2019/2020 financial year and approve this investment

c) note the additional activity to control the rat population on local assets

d) continue to support community pest control, as appropriate, through existing mechanisms such as advocacy and local board community funding.

Horopaki
Context

10. Local residents and businesses in the Titirangi Village area raised concerns around the negative impact of the wild chicken population around the village.

11. A deputation and public input at the May 2019 Waitākere Ranges Local Board meeting included much complaint from community members on the topic and the tabling of a presentation with photographs to illustrate the extent and the problem and community concerns. (WTK/2019/54 and WTK/2019/58). The presentation from the deputation from Tanya Wilkinson is attached as Attachment A to this report.

12. Concerns described the negative impact of the chickens on amenity, public health, road safety and the ecological surrounds of the area and noted additional concern around the increased number and size of rats (attracted by the chicken feed) in the village.

13. The local board and council have also received a number of complaints on both topics. There is a high level of community frustration that the chicken population has gotten out of control and some have linked the chicken population with the increase in rats. The Titirangi rat and chicken scenario has also resulted in many media reports and queries from local, national and international agencies.

14. An increase in rodent populations is not entirely unexpected as we head into winter as this is the season when we typically see a spike in rodent infestations as they seek out food and shelter. However, this year’s well documented super mast has increased the issue beyond normal levels in several environments.

15. The council has limited regulatory powers to control chickens, rats and non-native species under both its own bylaws and the Biosecurity Act. Management of wild chickens is not a priority activity within council’s biosecurity, parks or facilities work programmes. Chickens are not a classified ‘pest’ under the current pest management strategy or proposed plan and are therefore not prioritised for pest management control.

16. The council has authority to act in its parks and open spaces and has increased rodent control measures on local facilities.

17. It is the responsibility of homeowners and businesses to manage pests such as rats, mice and possums on their own premises. Council investigated and is implementing support for business owners and private residents, including traps on private property and community pest free work.
18. While the council has limited powers to control chickens, rats and non-native species under both bylaws and the biosecurity act, in the short term it has commissioned a report on chicken control options to go to Waitākere Ranges Local Board in July and is investigating the support it can give to business owners and private residents, including placing traps on private property.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

19. Following the local concern, council commissioned Wildlands to develop a report on chicken control options to go to Waitākere Ranges Local Board. Wildlands have delivered this report and it is attached to this agenda as Attachment B to this report.

The extent of the problem

20. In summary the report has concluded that, following a survey, there are an estimated 100-200 birds, including newly hatched chickens. The chicken population is well-fed and rodents (specifically rats) also benefit from the abundance of food supply on site. The report concludes that wild chickens and rats are causing a number of amenity as well as health and safety issues throughout Titirangi Village and that both the chicken and increasing rat population pose ecological issues for local flora and fauna.

Management Options and Methodologies

21. Wildlands recommend that the site is managed to reduce or remove the chicken and rat populations. They also recommend that most if not all of the chickens are removed, and that control will need to occur on both public and private land. Private land will need to be in voluntary manner.

22. Wildlands have developed two main options for the management of wild chickens at Titirangi Village:

1) Removal of the entire population
2) Removal of most of the population and undertaking ongoing management to maintain a small population of chickens

23. Wildlands have described the potential methods to give effect to these options including capture and rehoming where possible. They have also looked at options which include cull, poison or maintain the population – see Table 1 in Attachment B.

24. As shown in Table 1 below, staff have assessed the options against various criteria including removal of the problem, alignment to local board plan objectives, cost, ease of implementation and responsiveness to community concern. These criteria were chosen as they reflect considerations the local board may wish to apply to their consideration of this topic.

Table 1. Staff analysis for chicken control options against relevant criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Removal of Problem</th>
<th>Alignment to LB Plan Outcomes¹</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
<th>Responsive to Community Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option one – remove entire population</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium – dependent on community buy-in</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option two – remove majority of population and maintain a small number</td>
<td>Medium – reduction</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High - ongoing</td>
<td>Medium – dependent on community buy-in</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Specifically against the following local board plan outcomes (1. people actively protect the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area, 2. our unique natural habitats are protected and enhanced, 3. local communities feel good about where they live, and 6. our community spaces, parks, sports and recreation facilities meet local needs and are easy to get to)
25. On balance staff recommend that the local board supports the Wildlands recommendation to remove the entire population of chickens as this option most strongly aligns to the local board’s aspirations (as described in its local board plan), responds to community concerns raised and will reduce the likelihood of ongoing issues and cost. The second option is not recommended as it leaves part of the problem in place and previous attempts to maintain a small population of chickens at Titirangi Village have proven unsuccessful.

Logistical Considerations & Methodology

26. As described in the report the recommended option will involve capture and rehoming where possible. Staff note that there have been several offers to rehome the hens. Any rehoming would be supported by communication on the requirements for keeping birds and poultry expected under Auckland Council’s Animal Management Bylaw 2015 – as described in appendix three to Attachment B. Culling will be a last resort option for the recommended approach. In the event of this scenario this will be undertaken in a humane manner by qualified contractors and or staff.

27. It is important to note that rehoming hens is much easier than roosters. Staff will attempt to rehome roosters where possible, but it is likely that some will need to be culled to deliver on the recommended option.

28. Previous attempts to control the chicken population to manageable levels at Titirangi Village have been unsuccessful as not all members of the community have supported the removal or reduction in chicken population. This negatively impacted on the success of approach. There is a risk that some members of the community do not agree with the removal of the population and this may negatively impact on the desired outcomes.

29. As described in the Wildlands report the success of the recommended approach is reliant on stopping the feeding of the chickens so that they can be managed. Ongoing community support and buy in for the recommended approach will be essential.

Rats – a growing problem?

30. Community feedback has linked the chicken problem to the evident rat problem. It is clear from the community pictures (see Attachment A) that rats are feeding on the chicken feed. In addition, during the survey undertaken by Wildlands it was noted that rats were observed feeding during the day with the chickens and that they were habituated to the feeding regime.

31. An increase in rodent activity is common in the winter months as rodents seek out food and shelter. However, this year’s well documented super mast has increased the issue beyond normal levels in several environments.

Increased Council Activity

32. The council has authority to act in its parks and open spaces and has increased rodent control measures on local facilities at ten sites around the Titirangi Village area from 25 June 2019. At the time of writing this report no bait take has been taken across all (10) rat devices installed within the Titirangi Village area.

33. Our contractors have undertaken three checks on the devices to date and noted no bait has been taken. The technician has observed that locals are still feeding the chicken population. Having more than ample food options are the most likely reason why the rats are not showing any interest in the bait.

34. The contractor’s recommendation is that in order to provide successful control on the existing rat population, both the chickens and their supply of food (feed and food scraps) will need to be addressed first.

Community Action

35. It is the responsibility of homeowners and businesses to manage pests such as rats, mice and possums on their own premises. Council’s Pest Free Auckland programme is a community-centric programme to eradicate pest species and restore Auckland’s natural environment. The programme has capacity to support community groups, schools and mana
whenua with conservation action, including the provision of tools, resources, and specialist advice. Council investigated and is implementing support for business owners and private residents, including traps on private property and community pest free work.

36. Staff and the Chair of the Waitākere Ranges Local Board have been working with community groups to support community and individual pest control options. They have supported the South Titirangi Neighborhood Network who will set up and lead a bait station network (with tools/devices ordered by council) in the village. Until a village champion is trained up to maintain the bait stations, the regional parks team will service the bait stations on an interim basis as a way of supporting the community which has, and continues to, support the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park.

37. Staff will continue to work with the Titirangi community to support private efforts including targeting landowners in the village for permission to access and maintain bait stations. This is funded from the Natural Environment Targeted Rate and supported by Pest Free Auckland.

38. It is possible that community groups may apply for local board contestable funding to support pest control efforts. These will support the council investment in this space and it is recommended that the local board favorably consider any applications of this type as they would align strongly to the local board plan outcomes.

39. Staff have been working with Auckland Transport who have supported control. It is noted that control in the road corridor has particular safety issues and there is a preference to...
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

46. Approximate funding costs have been provided for the purposes of this report back. These are subject to procurement and change but they provide a base point to inform discussion on the options and indicative quantum of costs to aid decision making.

47. If the local board approves the recommended options, to remove all chickens, the approximate financial implication is a one-off cost of either $17,500-22,500 or $13,000-$18,000 depending on the level of re-homing able to be achieved. This excludes potential community engagement and support the local board may wish to add to the option. It is recommended that an indicative total budget of $25,000 is allocated to this option to cover all costs.

48. If the local board approves option two, to maintain a small population of chickens at Titirangi Village, then there would be the initial approximate control cost of around $18,000, $2,000-3,000 for no feeding signage, plus two monitoring visits per annum (ongoing) to check on numbers. Further control costs will depend on how fast or big the numbers grow to. If the chickens are not feed and or reintroduced, then there will be no additional control cost. If chickens are fed and more get dumped, then control would be undertaken before the numbers get back to current levels. Potential future costs for the maintenance of this nature are estimated to be $5,000-10,000 per annum.

49. Following local board consideration of this matter staff will work through its procurement processes to ensure value for money and fair costings of the work.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

50. As described in this report there is a risk that the recommended option will be unsuccessful in the event the chickens continue to be fed. This will attempt to be mitigated by engagement with the community. Given previous attempts to control the population have failed because of this ongoing feeding this is a likely risk and mitigation may not be successful.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

51. Subject to local board consideration and funding, regional staff have confirmed that they can manage the contract for the recommended approach within the current financial year.

52. Community support for rodent and pest control will continue as described in the report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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1. INTRODUCTION

Auckland Council has received a number of public enquiries regarding the excessive number of wild chickens in Titirangi Village, Auckland. The large numbers of chickens are creating amenity issues, potential public health issues, road safety issues, and are causing negative ecological impacts to surrounding vegetation. To address the public concerns surrounding wild chickens, Auckland Council contracted Wildlands Ltd to undertake a survey of chicken numbers at the site and provide suggested management options.

2. METHODS

The survey was carried out over four hours on 5 June 2019. Locations chickens were currently occupying were noted along with potential roosting sites. Photographs were taken of the chickens throughout the area and were later counted using the images. The local area was surveyed to determine any amenity along with health and safety issues that chickens and rats could be posing. Flora and fauna on site was assessed for damage to determine the ecological impact of both rats and chickens in Titirangi also. Chickens and rats were the focus of this survey; however, ducks were also counted.

3. RESULTS

A member of the public feeds the chickens on a daily basis. Chickens were found concentrated in the four areas where feeding takes place. The survey took place while the chickens were being fed. Chickens were also fed by separate groups on another two occasions during the survey.

The population of wild chickens in Titirangi Village is estimated to be between 100 and 200 birds, based on the number observed and the likelihood of additional birds not seen during the survey, including newly hatched chicks (Appendix 1: Plate 1). Multiple clutches of chicks were observed during the survey which is clear evidence of an increasing population. The majority of birds were found to be concentrated around the Titirangi library carpark. A small group of mallard ducks (c. 15) were also present and feeding with the chickens.

Several rats were also observed feeding with the chickens in broad daylight, and were obviously habituated to the ongoing feeding regime.

4. DISCUSSION

Chickens are causing visible public health and safety issues in Titirangi Village. The defecation from the large number of chickens is creating an extremely messy environment and poses concerns for disease transference. Chicken faeces were present throughout a local kindergarten grounds which poses a number of health and safety concerns for kindergarten staff and children. Chickens are also frequently
disrupting traffic, as vehicles try to avoid hitting chickens, which could lead to vehicle incidents.

Chickens are also posing visible ecological issues in Titirangi Village. During the survey it was noted that there was very little understorey vegetation in indigenous forest areas. This is due to the chickens feeding on and destroying seedlings, as well as digging up the area. This will affect forest regeneration. Similarly, roadside garden plantings were destroyed by the chickens and it is noted that private gardens are also being impacted (Appendix 1: Plate 2). Small areas of erosion were observed where chickens and potentially rats were likely to have been digging.

The local resident mentioned above has previously carried out some control on the population of chickens. She has been removing eggs from the site, and mentioned that people often remove chicks to take to home. The population of chickens was previously reduced to 25 individuals but this was not maintained and the population eventually increased to the current numbers.

In addition to the control described above, the local resident discussed other attempts that have been made to control the chicken population:

- Trapping was carried out but was unsuccessful in removing the whole population; this was mentioned as being due to bad weather, which lead to unsafe terrain and working conditions.
- Poisoning (actually sedation – refer Section 5.2.3) has been carried out previously, both professionally and by disgruntled members of the public. This lead to chickens dying throughout the village, and left many people upset. News media around the world ran the story of poisoned chickens throughout the village and led to some pushback by the public in regards to removal.

Several rats were seen during the survey and this is likely a direct consequence of the copious food provided to the chickens by the public (Appendix 1: Plate 4). Chickens are being fed a grain mix on at least a daily basis by a local resident, and further groups of people were observed feeding the birds during the survey. This feeding has led to an abundance of food (Appendix 1: Plate 5) that rats have been able to take advantage of. Within the area there are a number of cafes and eateries that are being impacted by the increased rat numbers. Local residents also provided anecdotal evidence that rats were at very high numbers, and were frequenting areas close to local businesses. The rat problem has now reached such a proportion that the media have picked up the story.

The impacts on fauna with high rat population densities have been well documented in New Zealand (King and Barret 2005) and chickens alone can also have drastic impacts on indigenous fauna such as lizards.

Rat control on council assets is being undertaken at present. Staff are also working with community groups and businesses on how best to support community rat control activity such as trapping and baiting on private property.
5. WILD CHICKEN MANAGEMENT

5.1 Overview

Wild chickens and rats are causing a number of amenity, as well as health and safety, issues throughout Titirangi Village. Both the chicken population and increasing rat population pose ecological issues for local flora and fauna. Management of the site is recommended to reduce and/or remove the chicken and rat populations. To ensure that most/all chickens are removed control will need to occur on both private and public land. Prior permission will need to be sought for contractors to access private properties to remove chickens. The cost of chicken removal from private properties will need to be considered by Auckland Council and/or the Local Board and business association so landowners have a single point of contact.

It is our overall recommendation that all chickens are removed from the site and surrounding areas, thereby minimising ongoing management. If the village would like to maintain a small population of chickens for amenity value, we have prepared an estimated costing for ongoing management.

Management methodologies and options for population management are below with a summary in Table 1. It is however recommended that no culling occurs on site, due to the public nature of the area.

5.2 Management methodologies

5.2.1 Chicken capture

Chickens will be captured in the areas the birds are fed daily to target majority of the group. The four feeding areas are all in easily accessible open areas, where it should be possible to catch the birds using nets, traps and by hand. All birds are unlikely to be caught in a day, and we suggest that capture occurs over multiple days/weeks targeting each feeding site (Appendix 2). It will be requested that birds remain unfed during this period, to ensure they can be coaxed/lured into cages/grouped up by the presence of food placed specifically for this purpose. Birds may not remain in the specific target areas so further days will be utilised to scope other areas and capture remaining birds as required. Permission will need to be sought from private landowners as required.

Logistical requirements for capture:

- All public feeding must cease one week prior to commencement of rehoming operation. Clear signage and communication required.
- Pens should be installed at all capture locations and pre-fed over several days at the same time every day before attempts are made to capture chickens. Capture attempts should be delayed until most chickens within any given area are using the pens during feeding time. Chicken capture methodologies must comply with animal welfare requirements for manual handling of poultry.
- Methods used to transport chickens from Titirangi Village elsewhere must meet animal welfare guidelines.
• A secure location with shelters that meet animal welfare requirements must be provided to house chickens until they are rehomed or culled. Food and water must be provided.

5.2.2 Rehoming
Most chickens observed on site were in good condition and could be successfully rehomed if appropriate homes can be found. This will require capturing the chickens and relocating them to a new location or housing them short-term until they can be successfully relocated.

An animal sanctuary in Matakana has recently been contacted by members of the public about plans to rehome chickens from Titirangi Village (Shawn Bishop, The Sanctuary, pers. comm.). This organisation was involved in two previous operations to reduce the wild chicken numbers in Titirangi Village. The operations proved to be logistically challenging due both to the distance between the organisation’s base in Matakana and Titirangi Village, and resistance from locals. The Sanctuary is not able to provide assistance in capturing or housing chickens for any future rehoming operations. Ms. Bishop has however offered to use her social media network to advertise that chickens are available for rehoming and she may be able to assist in vetting applicants to ensure chickens are sent to appropriate homes.

Maintaining chickens in captivity prior to rehoming could be a costly and challenging exercise. If chickens are to be rehomed it is recommended that chickens are only made available for collection on the day of capture and that any chickens that have not been rehomed by the end of the working day are culled (refer below). Chickens will only be made available to approved persons (see below).

Logistical requirements for rehoming:

• Captured chickens intended for rehoming need to have their wings clipped and to be treated for worms and external parasites.

• Chickens must only be sent to appropriate homes. Homes must be able to provide appropriate shelter, feeders, and drinkers, and sufficient space (Appendix 3). No more than six hens can be housed on urban-zoned properties smaller than 2,000 square metres or no more than 12 hens on urban-zoned properties larger than 2,000 square metres. Roosters may not be housed on urban-zoned properties. There are no restrictions on how many chickens can be housed on rural-zoned properties; however, it is suggested that no more than 12 chickens are taken by any one person.

• The Sanctuary may be prepared to vet potential applicants to ensure chickens are only sent to appropriate homes.

• Chickens can only be rehomed to be pets or laying birds. Chickens cannot be rehomed to breeders or given away to be culled for meat or animal feed.
5.2.3 Culling
Captured chickens that are unable to be rehomed will be culled. Culling will occur off-site to ensure that it can be carried out appropriately, without interruption and/or distress from the public. Culling will be carried out humanely, by appropriately trained staff, and will consist of either shooting or cervical dislocation. Carcasses will then be transferred to a local animal crematorium where they can be destroyed.

5.2.4 Poisoning
Poisoning (actually sedating) of birds on site has been carried out before and is not recommended. Alphachloralose (a sedative) can be used to anesthetize birds (at concentrations of less than 2.5%) whereby birds are rendered comatose and can be removed from the site and humanely culled. Due to public backlash in regards to poisoning we do not consider this a viable method and believe birds should be removed from site alive. Further there is likely to be by-kill of other non-target species present in the area.

However, if birds cannot be captured following multiple days of trapping/catching, specific areas could be targeted with low concentration Alphachloralose to ensure that all birds are removed from the site.

5.2.5 Rat control
Rat control on council assets is being undertaken at present. Staff are also working with community groups and businesses on how best to support community rat control activity such as trapping and baiting on private property.

5.2.6 Social license
Previous attempts to rehome chickens from Titirangi Village through trapping have faced public opposition and people working on the operation have been subjected to abuse by locals. Other locals have deliberately sabotaged the operation by feeding chickens away from capture locations in an attempt to reduce capture success (Shawn Bishop, pers. comm.). This highlights the importance of obtaining community support/buy-in for the project at an early stage and maintaining support through effective communication between Auckland Council and the local community.

It is hoped that early engagement with Shawn Bishop of The Sanctuary to discuss rehoming options will prove beneficial for the project. Other rehoming organisations could be involved in the project as appropriate.

Should the local community be in favour of maintaining a small population of chickens, the local community could be approached to manage the population with support from Auckland Council. Key to this would be to prevent feeding of birds through the installation of appropriate signage, and enforcement if required.
5.3 Management options

5.3.1 Overview and recommendation
The two main options for management of wild chickens at Titirangi Village are:

1. Removal of the entire population; or,
2. Removal of most of the population and undertaking ongoing management to maintain a small population of chickens.

In order to fully remove all negative effects of the wild chicken population and to reduce ongoing costs associated with population management it is recommended that the entire population is removed (Section 5.3.2). Ideally the majority of the chickens will be rehomed (to improve public perception of the operation), with the remainder culled.

5.3.2 Population removal
Wild chickens will be captured using the methods outlined in Section 0 over the course of multiple days/weeks to ensure the whole population is captured. Ongoing monitoring will be required over several weeks to locate and capture any chickens that evade capture. Chickens on both public and private land will be targeted and Auckland Council/Contractor will need to liaise with private landowners to obtain permission to access private properties.

The majority of the birds captured could be rehomed (Section 5.2.2). The remainder of the population (those that can’t be rehomed) will be removed from the site and culled (Section 5.2.3).

5.3.3 Population reduction
If the community/council insists a population of birds is to remain on site, it will need to be maintained at a low number of birds. Previously, the population was reduced to c. 25 birds. This was not maintained and the population increased to the current extent, both through in situ breeding and probably through additional birds being dumped.

Maintenance will consist of initially reducing the population to an appropriate number (c. 12-15 birds). Ongoing population maintenance will consist of six-monthly survey, with rehoming or culling undertaken as required to keep the population at the appropriate number (c. 12-15 birds).

To assist in maintaining a low population, all feeding should be banned/discouraged. Signs/interpretation panels should be erected in the area to ensure that the public does not feed the remaining population.
5.4 Summary of management options

A summary of management options, pros and cons, and cost estimates are presented below.

Table 1: Management options for wild chickens in Titirangi Village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (Excl. GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capture and rehome (limited culling)</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>• Majority, if not all, of the population removed.</td>
<td>• Birds may scatter once capture begins&lt;br&gt;• Time consuming&lt;br&gt;• Have to hold the birds till they can be rehomed&lt;br&gt;• May be returned to the area by adoptees&lt;br&gt;• Weather dependent</td>
<td>$17,500-$22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture and cull (all chickens)</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>• Majority, if not all, of the population removed.</td>
<td>• Birds may scatter once capture begins&lt;br&gt;• Weather dependent</td>
<td>$13,000-$18,000 (includes disposal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisoning</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>• Majority, if not all, of the population removed.</td>
<td>• By-kill&lt;br&gt;• Public backlash&lt;br&gt;• Contaminated meat</td>
<td>$13,000-$18,000 (includes disposal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Maintenance (six monthly survey and rehoming/culling)</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>• Public goodwill re amenity values</td>
<td>• Ongoing expenses&lt;br&gt;• Maintenance required indefinitely&lt;br&gt;• Population likely to increase again&lt;br&gt;• Risk of people dropping unwanted chickens off (to join the existing population)</td>
<td>Initial costing as above plus $2,000-$3,000 for signage. Ongoing costs of $1,500-$2,000 per annum (cost excludes any rehoming/culling)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 1

SITE PHOTOGRAPHS
Plate 1: A group of juvenile chickens, common throughout the village, 6 June 2019.

Plate 2: Public gardens destroyed by chickens (Image courtesy of Waitakere Local Board)
Plate 3: Chickens and ducks in the library carpark. 6 June 2019.

Plate 4: Rats eating food left out for chickens (Image courtesy of Waitakere Local Board).
Plate 5. Abundant food left for chickens. 6 June 2019.
APPENDIX 3

REQUIREMENTS FOR KEEPING BIRDS AND POULTRY

Under the Animal Management Bylaw 2015, you must meet certain requirements for keeping birds and poultry.

Provide Shelter

Birds should have access to an area of land greater than three square metres and include:

- an enclosed rainproof chicken coop for sleeping and laying eggs
- at least 30cm of roost or perch per chicken
- a minimum roof height of 60cm
- a surface for pecking and scratching
- a secluded nesting area.

Where to place your chicken coop

- Set up the coop in a place that is least likely to cause a nuisance to neighbours.
- Keep chicken coops at least 1m from neighbouring fences.
- Ensure that chickens are confined and that they cannot freely leave the property.

Keep chicken coops clean

To keep your chicken coop clean, you should:

- Line nesting boxes and chicken coop floors with hay, wood chips (untreated), sawdust or shredded newspaper so that it can be easily removed when cleaned out
- Regularly bag and remove waste (at least once a week).

Prevent infestations of vermin

Excess food and bedding waste can attract flies, mice and rats to a property.
Once vermin find an accessible food supply, they will continue to return, leaving excrement that can:

- Contaminate chicken feed and water.
- Expose owners and neighbours to diseases.
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Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

File No.: CP2019/12283

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek local board feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery has been developed to ensure Auckland is better prepared to recover from a disaster.

3. The planning framework sets out in the document:
   a) identifies community values and priorities
   b) sets a vision for recovery
   c) focuses on the consequences to be addressed in recovery
   d) focuses on building capacity and capability and addressing barriers
   e) 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:
   a) community values
   b) community priorities
   c) the vision
   d) the way we will work in recovery
   e) the work to be done to be better prepared for recovery.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Waitākere Ranges 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:
   a) workshops on recovery with local boards between 24 May and 12 July 2018
   b) reporting back on the workshops in September 2018
   c) presentations to local board cluster meetings in March and November 2018
d) updating local boards on the development of the Resilient Recovery Strategy in November 2018 and advising that a draft would go the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee in February 2019.

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

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

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**


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

i) **Identifying community values and priorities**

   The planning framework set out in the pathways document is described as community centric. Community values and priorities guide us in our preparations enabling recovery to be set up and implemented in a way that helps to meet community needs and aspirations.

   An initial set of community values and priorities was derived from workshops with local boards and advisory panels. They will be refined through community engagement as a part of actions to build a better understanding of recovery.

ii) **Setting the recovery vision**

   The pathways document sets the vision whereby ‘Auckland’s people, communities, businesses and infrastructure are well-placed to recover from a disaster.’

   Being well placed means being well-prepared.

iii) **Anticipation of consequences and opportunities** of Auckland hazards and risks

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

iv) **Building capacity and capability, addressing barriers** to recovery

   Another way in which the planning framework is community centric is in the way we will work in a recovery. Taking a collaborative, partnership approach means structuring and implementing recovery in a way that maintains its focus on community outcomes.

   A significant recovery will require ‘big government’ structures and processes to effectively mobilise resources and coordinate large scale effort. Such approaches can seem remote from local communities. Effort is required to ensure good communication and community engagement are effectively maintained.

v) **Identifying actions to build momentum**

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

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

11. Against this background, comments and views on the pathways document strategy is particularly required on:
   a) community values
   b) community priorities
   c) the vision
   d) the way we will work in recovery
   e) the work to be done to be better prepared for recovery.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

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

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

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

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

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

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

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

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

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

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

**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:
   a) delay commencement of recovery efforts and lengthen the time taken to complete recovery
   b) inhibit multi-agency collaboration
   c) 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.


Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Wayne Brown - Principal Recovery Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers                  | Jennifer Rose, Response and Recovery Manager  
                              | Sarah Sinclair, General Manager, Auckland Emergency Management  
                              | Louise Mason, General Manager, Local Board Services  
                              | Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau |
Auckland Transport's update for July 2019
File No.: CP2019/12921

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Waitakere Ranges Local Board on transport matters in their area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report updates the Board on the Safe Speed Bylaw, Parau Footpath, West Coast Road Safety, Piha Road Reseal and next steps for the Transport Safety and Community Safety Funds and other current issues.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) receive Auckland Transport’s update for July 2019.

Horopaki
Context
3. This report addresses transport related matters in the Local Board area.
4. Auckland Transport (AT) is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways and reports on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
Safer Speed Bylaw Consultation
5. AT is currently fast-tracking implementation of a speed management plan for Auckland and Public Consultation has closed on the Speed Bylaw. Auckland Transport received 11,719 submissions on its proposal to reduce speeds on some 700km of high-risk roads around the region.
6. AT’s team of analysts have been reading through each and every piece of feedback and grouping these into relevant themes. This coding process helps to give AT a high-level understanding of the public's views as well as making it easier for us to dig deeper into the detailed feedback that requires further investigation.
7. AT has a team of seven road safety engineers analysing the feedback. The comments received range from general views on speed limits and road safety to location specific feedback on the roads included in the proposed bylaw.
8. AT also received feedback requesting reductions in speed limits on 876 kilometres of roads which were not part of the proposal that we consulted on. Some of the location specific
feedback is resulting in our engineers carrying out further investigations to assess the road safety issues that have been raised.

9. The feedback will be used to create a report which will also include AT’s responses. AT expects to publish the report in the next three to four months.

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

10. The other issues reported are confined to Auckland Transport and do not impact on other parts of the Council group.

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

Parau Footpath Installation

11. AT are proposing a footpath along Huia Road in Parau. Currently, there is no footpath connecting Parau village to the school bus stops further down Huia Road or the beach via Armour Road.

12. Alongside this new footpath, we are also proposing the following improvements:
   - Four new pram crossings to make crossing the road easier
   - Coloured road surfacing raising awareness of people crossing
   - Broken Yellow Lines on the corners of Huia and Staley Road and along Huia Road leading up to Shirley Road to improve visibility of pedestrians.

13. This proposal is part of our region-wide footpath programme that aims to improve walking connections across Auckland.

14. The period for feedback is 25 June to 9 July. Board members have been sent copies.

West Coast Road Safety Project

15. AT a workshop in August the Board will be briefed on a proposal to improve pedestrian safety in particular for crossing West Coast Road. It is the first phase it a number of proposals for the town centre.

Piha Road Reseal

16. AT are currently seeking feedback from Mana Whenua on the preliminary designs for Piha Road. Following this we will be able to provide more information on a date for the public information drop in session etc.

Transport Capital Fund and Community Safety Fund

17. Staff are currently assessing the projects workshoped and put forward for potential funding from The Transport capital and Community Safety Fund. Once the assessments are complete the information will be referred to board workshop and then to a Board meeting

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

18. For all projects consideration of impacts and opportunities for engagement will be carried out on an individual project basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

19. The proposed decision of receiving this report has no financial implications.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

20. The proposed decision of receiving this report has no risks. Auckland Transport has risk management strategies in place for the transport projects undertaken in the local board area.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

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

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Bruce Thomas – Elected Members Relationship Manager (Western Boards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers | Jonathan Anyon – Manager Elected Member Relationship Unit, Auckland Transport  
Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau |
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To update the Waitākere Ranges Local Board members on projects, activities and issues.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Board members are responsible for leading policy development in their areas of interest, proposing and developing project concepts, overseeing agreed projects within budgets, being active advocates, accessing and providing information and advice.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:
a) receive the Chair’s report for July 2019.

Horopaki
Context
Matariki celebration and Crescendo Trust
3. There was a local celebration of Matariki outside the Glen Eden library. The Kura from Hoani Waititi marae were involved and provided their usual outstanding cultural performance.

4. Further entertainment was provided by some young artists associated with Crescendo Trust. This trust, that I have not previously heard about, provides mentoring and assistance to budding musicians. It is based in different parts of Auckland and out west has a base in the Corbans Estate Art Centre.
5. The three artists were outstandingly good. So good that I asked to meet with David Atai who had accompanied them and had supported them with sound and backing music. It turns out that David was previously with Nesian Mystic, who are in my mind one of the best bands the country has produced. Their Polyunsaturated album seems to be on regularly during summer in my home.

6. We also met David Parker who is a well-known local muso and the man behind the Titirangi Festival of Music. It was a great chance to talk about the educational, therapeutic and valuable role that music plays. I am keen to see what Council can do to help this Trust. And, the local board now has a stunning collection of local young artists we can now hire for local events particularly, for Beats and Eats, which is our attempt to enliven Glen Eden.

**Climate emergency resolution**

7. I recently had the opportunity of talking to the Environment and Community Committee of Auckland Council. I told them about the board’s resolutions in support of declaring a climate emergency. The meeting was interesting. During public input, there was a series of passionate presentations from members of the public. The presentation from young people was particularly compelling. The young have the most to lose.

8. After a spirited debate the motions were passed.

9. People may ask what will this resolution achieve? It is symbolic only and will not of itself achieve anything. But the driver is that our world is facing an environmental crisis. And we, and by this I include elected representatives, need to keep reminding ourselves of this.

10. The recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report indicated that if temperatures increase by 1.5 degrees celsius or more, we face unprecedented risks and weather events. Current trends in emissions suggest that we are facing a temperature increase of over 3 degrees. To use the words of Greta Thunberg:

   "Either we reach a tipping point where we start a chain reaction with events way beyond human control, or we don't. Either we go on as a civilization, or we don't. There are no gray areas when it comes to survival."

11. Currently Auckland Council’s goal is to achieve a 40% reduction in greenhouse gas generation by 2040. Under the recently released Zero Carbon bill the Government is proposing that New Zealand becomes carbon neutral by 2050. This will mean that Auckland
Council needs to aggressively review its target. Not only are we facing a climate crisis, but we are facing various environmental crises.

12. It has been estimated that at current rates of degradation all of the world’s top soil could be gone within 60 years. Our fisheries are crashing with predictions that by 2048 fishing stocks will be depleted. And a recent UN report suggests that a million different species are facing extinction within the next 50 years. These changes are not solely related to climate change. The use of unsustainable farming and fishing techniques play their part. But climate change is also having an effect.

13. There has been a world-wide movement to declare climate change emergencies. Local Councils are doing the same. I believe that declaring the emergency is the correct thing for us to do. So that we can focus our minds on what we have to do to make sure that our kids can grow up in basically a not too different world to the world that we grew up in.

**Titirangi’s Chicken and rat crisis**

14. This is not the sort of news that a village likes to have however, for a while, Titirangi was internationally famous for its chicken and rat crisis. The rats, or at least the large numbers of them, are a more recent phenomenon although there have been rats in the bush for decades. But numbers have recently spiked.

15. Many are concerned that the large numbers of chickens that we have are causing the large numbers of rats. I don’t think it is that simple. There have been a number of reports of a significant mega mast throughout the country. Basically, the forest is producing too many seeds and the rats are going for it.

16. Council had previously arranged for action to be taken to reduce chicken numbers. Earlier actions to humanely rehome them was clearly not working. A contract that had been arranged for implementation in December 2017 was for reasons that I still do not fully understand not proceeded with. Since then, there has been some inter-departmental churn as departments tried to work out who had responsibility to deal with it.

17. I am aware that some people have questioned what the Local Board has been doing about the issue. Alas we are 6 dedicated representatives and six dedicated staff and none of us have rat or chicken eradication skills. But, we are keen to do what we can.

18. Council’s problem is that it has limited powers to control chickens, rats and non-native species under bylaws and the Biosecurity Act. To deal with the immediate problem, it has
increased rodent control activity in local parks and facilities and local roads. I went for a walk through the village recently and spoke to local business workers and I understand the rat problem has been greatly reduced. This will help to hold the problem but to resolve the issue there will need to be enhanced trapping of rodents. I met with representatives from the South Titirangi Neighbourhood Network who perform great work in the peninsular. They are keen to help and Council has committed to providing them with further resources to address the rat problem.

19. In relation to the chickens the local board is considering a report on chicken control options. There are some kind-hearted individuals in the community who feed the chickens. I would ask that they stop as there are too many chickens and roosters in the area. One other feature about the chicken population is that they drive out the native birdlife and numbers of Tui and Kereru seem to be down.

20. It would be great if we could convert the South Titirangi peninsular into a native bird sanctuary. One dominated by Kereru and not by chickens.

The Mayor’s million tree campaign

21. Phil Goff had pledged that if he became mayor Auckland Council would plant a million trees. That milestone has now been reached and the millionth tree has been planted. The programme is one that I have always thought was a great idea.

22. A recently released scientific analysis suggests that the world could reduce the effects of climate change by planting lots of trees, about a trillion of them and that we have the spare land to do this. That is 125 per person on the planet or 207 million for all Aucklanders. One down 206 to go …

Paturoa Kauri

23. Legal protection for Awhi Awhi has recently been lifted. And, concerns have been expressed to me that two magnificent roadside Kauri may also be under threat. If the analysis is correct, there will have to be a significant retaining wall constructed in the road reserve and the trees would have to go.

24. Awhi Awhi’s plight highlights how difficult it is to protect trees in the urban area. Law changes made a few years ago meant that general tree protection rules were no longer effective. I was always surprised at this because there are so many things that the Resource Management Act can regulate, for instance, the shade and intensity of the colour that you paint your house yet. It was thought that trees should be exempt from more rigorous control.

25. And they pay an important role, especially out west. They hold banks together and prevent subsidence, they deal with stormwater, they sequester carbon and they provide a habitat for native flora and fauna, not to mention exotic creatures. And, they make Titirangi a special tranquil place to live in. My view is that as far as possible we need to be protecting every single Kauri we have, especially the large ancient ones.

26. With the onset of Kauri dieback and with a cure or an immune strain still not having been discovered, we should make sure that all existing kauri are protected. Particularly those who remain healthy despite being ringbarked in an area where kauri dieback is well and truly established. The fact that Awhi Awhi survived this event without developing dieback, at least so far, suggests that we should be careful before consigning her to an early death.

27. The local board recently passed resolutions urging Council to reinstate significant ecological area zoning on both Awhi Awhi and on the roadside Kauri. And for the roadside Kauri, I would prefer that there was as much protection of them as possible. Subject to existing legal obligations I would prefer that Auckland Council, as owner of the trees, determined that they will not be felled no matter what.
Zig zag track – now reopened

28. I went for a walk on it recently and I was very happy with the way that it has been completed. Kauri trees have been protected by boardwalks. Other areas have compacted finish and there was no sign of mud anywhere.

29. The local community is also very pleased that it is now re-opened and usage has been high. I hope and trust that some of the other closed tracks particularly the Mahoe track and the Bill Haresnape Track will also be repaired and reopened in the near future.

Playhouse Theatre

30. I am pleased that relationships with the trust that oversees the theatre have been strengthened recently. The building is an important part of local history and an iconic part of the village.

31. The building is looked after by a charitable trust. It used to be that there was a Council representative on the board but through historical events this ceased. The board has worked on improving relations with the trust. We have received a request from the trust to appoint a local board member in an advisory role to the trust. Because of the pending election we will not be able to do this until after October.

Regards
Greg Presland
Waitakere Ranges Local Board Chairperson
greg.presland@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Phone +6421998411
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