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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

An apology from Chairperson K Parkinson has 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 minutes of the Ōrākei Local Board held on Thursday, 20 June 2019 be confirmed 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 Ōrākei 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.

9.1 Public Forum - Kali Haenga - C3 Christmas Event

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To deliver a presentation to the Board during the public forum segment of the business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Kali Haenga, Funding Coordinator from C3 will be in attendance to present to the Local Board on a proposed free Christmas event in Ellerslie.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Ōrākei Local Board:

a) receive the presentation and thank Kali Haenga.

Attachments
A  Support information - C3 Proposed Christmas Event.................................251

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 update the Ōrākei Local Board on the performance of Regional Facilities Auckland for the quarter ending 30 March 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

a) receive the Regional Facilities Auckland Quarterly Performance Report for the quarter ending 30 March 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Regional Facilities Auckland Quarterly Performance Report for quarter ending 30 March 2019</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories
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</tr>
</thead>
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</tr>
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</table>
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:**

**Highlights:**
- 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.

### Financials (in $m)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financials (in $m)</th>
<th>YTD actual</th>
<th>YTD budget</th>
<th>Actual vs Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital delivery</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>(18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct revenue</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct expenditure</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net direct expenditure</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Commentary**
- **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 having been postponed and three outdoor concerts did not proceed as budgeted. This has also had a consequential flow on effect on other revenue.
- **Direct expenditure:** Overall direct expenditure is $5.7m favourable to budget as costs are actively controlled to offset the unfavourable revenue.

### Key performance indicators

*(Refer to pg. 8 for complete list)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The number of people who experience RFA's arts, environment and sports venues and events</strong></td>
<td>1,686,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland's audiences and participants</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</strong></td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Māori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau</strong></td>
<td>26</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 stadia. 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 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%. Visitations 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.

## 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.

<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 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.

<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 Tātea | Fashion Activists** opened at Auckland Art Gallery in February. The exhibition, which pays 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.
- **Guerrilla 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 Sea Week 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 ocean currents transport plastics.
- The zoo’s water savings have been reported as 42300 m3 ($169k) 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.

Contribution towards Māori Outcomes
- **Te Reo Māori:** All business units which have direct customers service responsibilities have implemented te reo Māori, waiata and tikanga Māori staff training opportunities.
- Aotea Centre upgrade includes te reo Māori signage in its tri-lingual wayfinding plans.
- **Identity and Culture**
  - Internationally renowned artist Lisa Reihana has been commissioned to create a unique world class Māori digital media work for Aotea Centre.
- **Effective Māori Participation**
  - Relationships and engagement with iwi, Māori specialists are continuing to be developed and strengthened.
  - Auckland Stadiums has met with Te Puna Trust (owners of Raratonga/Mt Smart Land). Arrangements have been made with the Trust to provide access to meeting rooms within the Stadium.
  - New Zealand Maritime Museum: Hui Te Anau i a Tangaroa has a Memorandum of Understanding with Te Toki Voyaging Trust.
  - Auckland Live and Conventions staff organised and supported 75 members of the cast and crew from Aladdin-The Musical to participate in a formal powhiri at Orākei Marae by Ngāti Whāitu Orākei.

Local Board Engagement
- In February, the annual function for local boards, hosted by the chair of RFA, was attended by approximately 50 guests as well as RFA board members and senior management. Guests enjoyed informal tours of the New Zealand Maritime Museum and the opportunity to talk with people from RFA, advisory panels and other local boards across the city. Fourteen local boards were represented.
- The RFA Directors of Stadiums and Stadiums Strategy met with Waitemata Local Board, Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board and Upper Harbour Local Board to discuss the stadiums within the board areas and the Auckland Stadiums Venue Development Strategy.
- The Deputy Director, Auckland Live, presented an update of activities and developments to the Waitemata Local Board, and is working with the board around developments in Aotea Square, such as the Digital Stage, and citizenship ceremonies at the Auckland Town Hall.
- By the end of the quarter, six boards had placed the second quarter report on meeting agendas, while others are yet to do so or are distributing the report to members for reading.
## Regional Facilities Auckland Q3 financials

### Direct operating performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net direct expenditure</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct revenue</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; user charges</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating grants and subsidies</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct revenue</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct expenditure</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, contributions &amp; sponsorship</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct expenditure</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>

### Financial Commentary

A: The RFA performance for the nine months to 31 March 2019 is tracking to budget. This has been achieved through tight control over expenditure by all the RFA divisions. The forecast for the financial year end is unfavourable to budget by $250k due to the acceleration of the visitor security programme.

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

C: Employee Benefits contains $7.5m staff costs that are recharged against events. These recharges are budgeted under Cost of Goods Sold (COGS) within other direct expenses. Actual staff costs are favourable to budget.

D: Other direct expenses contains COGS which includes salary recharges of $7.5m. The $7.5m recovery should offset against employee benefits – RFA will continue to work with Auckland Council officers to rectify this reporting issue going forward.
# Regional Facilities Auckland Q3 performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key performance indicators</th>
<th>Previous Quarter YTD</th>
<th>FY 19 Quarter 3 YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Target</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>2,585,627</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>503,833</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>374,067</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>121,651</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>18</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>65%</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>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>10</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mā te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the prioritised programme for implementation of the Īrākei Local Paths (Greenways) Plan.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Īrākei Local Paths Programme Plan provides a detailed breakdown of how to implement the 13 routes in the Īrākei Greenways planning document 2016. It prioritises:
   a) routes for the Īrākei Local Board to fund in the coming years
   b) key routes to start advocacy discussions and
   c) routes to align with Auckland Transport priorities from 2023 onwards.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Īrākei Local Board:
   a) adopt the Īrākei Local Paths Programme Plan 2019.

Horopaki
Context
3. The Īrākei Greenways planning document was adopted in August 2016. This document identified 13 aspirational greenway routes through the Īrākei Local Board area.
4. The Īrākei Local Board has set five linked outcomes to define a greenway in the local area:
   • safe and enjoyable walking and cycling connections
   • improve, restore and protect natural environments
   • connect communities to parks and the sea
   • improve links between schools, neighbourhoods and places of work
   • improve the ability for local streets to function as slow speed environments where the communities can gather for activity.
5. Greenways generally consist of quiet streets and paths through parks. In places they intersect with long-distance commuter paths on busy roads.
6. More recently the term ‘Local Paths’ has replaced ‘Greenways’ within Auckland Council and Auckland Transport language and documents. The meaning remains the same.
7. The Īrākei Local Paths Programme Plan identifies the work that is required to implement each of these routes. The plan recommends priorities for implementation and priorities for advocacy.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

8. Each route is broken down into express path, local path, trail, on-street and open space categories. Appendix B: Route Prioritisation Analysis describes each section of each route in detail. Information includes:
   • who is responsible for delivering a section of path
   • estimated costs where they are currently available
   • whether funding is already allocated
   • benefits
   • descriptions of improvements
   • interdependencies and risks.

9. The body of the report identifies three sets of priorities.

10. The first group of priorities are routes or parts of routes which are the Ōrākei Local Board’s responsibility to fund. The Gowing Drive link is already funded as a partnership project which will be implemented by Auckland Transport. Ōrākei Basin Walkways have recently been completed.

11. The second group of priorities are routes which require a high degree of collaboration with other agencies. The Tāmaki Drive to Glen Innes route is partially complete. Continued advocacy is needed to ensure all sections are funded and completed. The remaining priorities are not yet planned or funded. Advocacy is recommended to start initial discussions about how to implement these routes.

12. The third group of priorities aligns with Auckland Transport’s priority areas for investment between 2023 and 2028. Simultaneous investment in the open space sections of the route and on-street sections of the route will bring maximum benefits.

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

13. The report acknowledges many interdependencies between Auckland Council and Auckland Transport to deliver the full Ōrākei Local Paths network. This is described in detail for each route. Continued communication between Auckland Council and Auckland Transport during the planning and implementation of each route is critical.

14. The report identifies ‘painted on street lanes’ as a means of defining some on road routes. Alternative design options to deliver the same outcome are now being considered by Auckland Transport.

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

15. The Ōrākei Local Board Plan 2017 contains “outcome 3: People can move around our area easily and safely”. One objective is “Local shops, schools and community facilities are connected through safe walking and cycling paths”. A key objective is to “Carry out the Ōrākei Local Paths Plan and other linkages to schools, transport hubs and local centres”. The Ōrākei Local Paths Programme Plan is a tool that will assist in meeting this objective.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

16. Routes 11 and 13 cross the Whenua Rangatira/Takaparawha Park. Route 13 could also link to the Pūrewa Creek Recreation Reserve. Both areas of land are owned by Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei. The Ōrākei Local Paths Programme Plan was prepared in consultation with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei and references the Pūrewa Creek Recreation Reserve Draft Reserve.
Management Plan. A priority outcome of the plan is further collaboration with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei to progress these routes.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

17. Implementation of all routes require funding. There are a variety of budget sources from the New Zealand Transport Agency, Auckland Transport and Ōrākei Local Board which can be investigated. The estimated costs for the on-road components of the Local Paths plan, provided on page 11 of the report, are high level only. They are presented to provide a comparison between projects rather than representing definitive costs. Detailed costs would form part of the detailed design for each route.

18. Community Facilities are aware of the Ōrākei Local Paths Programme Plan. They will consider this in future work programme discussions with the Ōrākei Local Board.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

19. The main risk is implementing ad-hoc sections of routes which do not form a cohesive network. Early collaboration between Auckland Transport and Auckland Council to align funding and work programmes will help to deliver local paths in an efficient and coordinated manner.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

20. Secure funding from Auckland Council and Auckland Transport work programmes to implement the priorities in the Ōrākei Local Paths Programme Plan.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Draft Ōrākei Local Path Programme Plan 21 March 2019 (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Hayley Dauben - Parks &amp; Places Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Mace Ward - General Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Ōrākei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve the key moves to inform the development of the Ōrākei Local Board Open Space Network Plan.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. An open space network plan is being prepared for the Ōrākei Local Board area.
3. The plan will assist decision-making and provide a framework for the development of parks and open space over the next 10 years.
4. Staff recommend five key moves that focus on improving the quality of, and access to, open space in the local board area. These are:
   - protecting and enhancing our natural environment
   - recognising our culture and heritage
   - encouraging activation
   - improving connectivity
   - responding to growth.
5. No additional funding is allocated to implement projects set out in the plan. The document can be used to advocate for new funding as part of the annual and long-term plan processes.
6. A final plan will be presented to the local board for adoption in September 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

a) approve the following key moves to guide the development of the Ōrākei Local Board Open Space Network Plan:
   i) protecting and enhancing our natural environment
   ii) recognising our culture and heritage
   iii) encouraging activation
   iv) improving connectivity
   v) responding to growth.

Horopaki
Context

7. A 10-year open space network plan is being prepared for the Ōrākei local board area.
8. This plan will inform local board decision-making and expenditure across the park network, as the area grows and changes over time.
9. The plan will set out key moves for the development of the open space network. The key moves respond to findings from the current state analysis.

10. The final document is presented in three key areas:

- **Current state**: Investigate and report on how well the park and open space network is achieving the areas of focus and priorities of "treasure, enjoy, connect and utilise".

- **Key moves**: Identify the key moves required to improve the parks and open space network.

- **Prioritised actions**: Identify and prioritise localised place-based actions and projects to achieve the key moves.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

**Demographic data**

11. Staff have researched the growth projections and demographic data for the Ōrākei local board area. The key findings are:

- the total population at 2015 was 86,400 (7th highest by local board area)
- the area contains six per cent of the regional population
- the ethnic composition is 77 per cent European, 18 per cent Asian, five per cent Māori and three per cent Pasifika (one of the lowest levels of ethnic diversity across the 21 local boards)
- the projected population growth by the year 2033 is 109,100
- the median age is 40.2 years (compared with 35.1 years for the region)
- 33 per cent of residents were born overseas.

**Open space provision**

12. The current state of the open space network has been assessed by desk-top research, park-user surveys and discussions with specialist staff highlighting the following key facts:

- the network includes 112 local parks and open spaces
- there are eight swimming beaches, 20 kilometres of coastal walks and six volcanic features.

13. There is good open space distribution across the Ōrākei local board area when assessed against the Open Space Provision Policy (2016), with some provision gaps in:

- Ōrākei (west)
- Kohimarama
- St Heliers
- Remuera
- Ellerslie.

14. Park-user research indicates that 89 per cent of respondents are “satisfied or very satisfied” with neighbourhood parks in the Ōrākei local board area.
The 2016 Ōrākei Greenways Plan identifies priority connections for the network

15. The Greenways Plan identifies 13 aspirational routes which will create better connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists to schools, parks, train stations, community facilities and ecological areas.

16. Two priority greenway routes are:
   - an east – west connection linking Tāmaki Drive to Glen Innes (through the Pourewa Valley)
   - a south – north connection linking Ellerslie to the sea.

Five key moves are proposed

17. The key moves were developed to inform and analyse options and actions in the open space network plan. They respond to the current state and anticipated growth in the area.

18. Staff engaged with the local board at two workshops to present the current state and formulate the key moves.

19. Staff also engaged with mana whenua on the development of the open space network plan in June 2019.

20. The 2017 Ōrākei Local Board Plan identifies five outcomes to guide work and to make the Ōrākei local board area a better community for all. The aspirational outcomes are set out in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Local board priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ōrākei Local Board aspirations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Our local parks and open space areas are valued and enjoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our residents are proud of their community facilities and public places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People can move around our area easily and safely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The natural environment is valued, protected and enhanced by our communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A thriving economy which supports local businesses and town centres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Staff recommend five key moves based on the current state analysis and feedback from the local board. The key moves are summarised in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Key moves and focus areas for action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current state</th>
<th>Mana whenua feedback</th>
<th>Key move</th>
<th>Focus areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The natural environment has been highly modified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Streams and wetlands have been drained and culverted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development has occurred right up to the coastal edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many of the parks and open spaces have tracts of vegetation, waterways and coastal foreshore.</td>
<td>• Reinstate native vegetation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stop the use of glyphosates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve storm water management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restoration of mauri and wairua.</td>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>Protecting and enhancing our network of parks and open spaces which embody many of the treasured aspects of our natural environment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• champion iwi and community-led environmental restoration projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved quality waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coastal protection by way of soft engineering initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current state</td>
<td>Mana whenua feedback</td>
<td>Key move</td>
<td>Focus areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are many sites of significance to mana whenua and early Auckland</td>
<td>• Protection of waahi tapu sites.</td>
<td>Culture and heritage</td>
<td>Protecting and enhancing our network of parks and open spaces which embody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some sites require more care, improved awareness and appreciation by user.</td>
<td>• Place-naming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>many of the treasured aspects of our culture and heritage:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Awareness of sites of significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• te ao Māori (the Māori world view)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural narratives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• colonial heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Walking, running and informal exercise are the most popular.</td>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>• emerging landscapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park experiences are limited in some areas.</td>
<td>• Provide recreational spaces aimed at the needs of Māori youth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create natural play spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a good spread of public access-ways connecting the existing street and</td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Developing walking, cycling and green corridor networks to connect and engage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The city to coast access is good but with potential for more improvement.</td>
<td>• Create cultural narratives which are more than just signage and wayfinding.</td>
<td></td>
<td>our communities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Population growth put pressure on the network</td>
<td>Responding to growth</td>
<td>• walking, cycling and green corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision levels are reasonably good but with some gaps</td>
<td>• Protect the network for future generations by prioritising conservation and ecological outcomes in response to growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Optimisation of poor-quality pocket parks are an opportunity.</td>
<td>• Responding to urban intensification:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• spatial planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• open space provision</td>
<td></td>
<td>• cultural design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• open space quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. The key moves will inform the development of actions and their prioritisation within the final open space network plan.

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

23. There are no council group impacts at this stage of the development of the network plan.

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

24. Improving the quality of open space will have a positive impact on all local board residents.

25. The following workshops have been held with the Ōrākei Local Board:
February 2019 – to introduce the open space network plan and process
May 2019 – to discuss parks-user research, current state and key moves.

26. Local board approval of the key moves is sought through this report.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

27. Data from the 2013 Census shows that the Ōrākei local board area has a lower proportional Māori population (5 per cent) than the average population across Auckland (11 per cent).

28. The provision of quality parks and open spaces will facilitate Māori participation in sport and recreation.

29. Sport New Zealand’s *Active NZ 2017* participation study finds that Māori and Pasifika adults have lower than average weekly informal recreation participation but are more likely to participate in competitive sports and activities. However, Māori youth spend the most time, when compared with other ethnicities, in sport participation in any given week.

30. Staff engaged with mana whenua in June 2019 to seek their views and values in relation to the open space network in the Ōrākei local board area.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

31. There are no financial risks arising from the development of the network plan. The Parks and Recreation Policy unit is developing the plan within baselines.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamarutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

32. The lack of funding to implement the plan could create a reputational risk. However, the local board can use the network plan to advocate for increased funding as part of the Annual Plan and Long-term Plan processes.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

33. Staff will prepare a draft open space network plan using the key moves. The key moves will inform the prioritisation of actions to be included in the final open space network plan.

34. The open space network plan will be presented to the local board in September 2019 for adoption.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Richard Mann - Principal Policy Analyst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Emma Golightly - Team Leader - Parks and Recreation Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Marriott-Lloyd - Senior Policy Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Ōrākei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera Lessee Relocation

File No.: CP2019/12322

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve the relocation of the Remuera Citizens Advice Bureau from 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera to the Ōrākei Community Centre and to approve modifications to the Centre to accommodate the Bureau.

2. To approve the lease variation for Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust to allow for three months’ notice to be given to vacate 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

3. Ōrākei Local Board approved the sale of 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera on 19 July 2018 (OR/2018/145), with the proceeds from the sale being ring-fenced to support the redevelopment of the Meadowbank Community Centre.

4. This decision requires the existing lessees of 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera to relocate their services prior to settlement.

5. Several location options were explored to relocate Remuera Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB). Of the options explored, Ōrākei Community Centre is the preferred location of both the council and the CAB.

6. Modifications are required to Ōrākei Community Centre to support the relocation of the CAB. Four options (attachment A) have been considered and assessed against a number of criteria including:
   - Strategic alignment
   - Impact on centre – current and future use
   - Impact on existing users
   - CAB use – areas available for shared or exclusive use.

7. Option 1 which moves the kitchen to the centre office is considered the best option overall for strategic alignment, impact on the centre and existing users. It is not the CAB’s preferred option.

8. Plunket expressed an interest in moving its services to the new Meadowbank Community Centre when it opens. Plunket services will relocate to other local venues while Meadowbank Community Centre is being developed. The current Plunket lease for 4 Victoria Avenue expires in 2025 and does not have a clause that allows the council to terminate the lease early. A lease variation is required to introduce three months’ notice to terminate the lease and Plunket has agreed to the variation.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

a) approve the relocation of the Remuera Citizens Advice Bureau from 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera to Ōrākei Community Centre.

b) approve modifications to Ōrākei Community Centre as shown in Ground Floor Plan – Option 1 dated 31 July 2018 at an estimated cost of $215,000 (to be funded from the proceeds of sale of 4 Victoria Avenue), subject to written agreement from Remuera
Citizens Advice Bureau confirming its acceptance of the move to Ōrākei Community Centre.

c) approve a Deed of Variation of Lease for 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera, Auckland between Auckland Council and Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust to allow for three months’ notice to be given to vacate 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera.

d) approve the lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust being terminated in accordance with the three months’ notice to vacate in the Deed of Variation of Lease for 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera, Auckland between Auckland Council and Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust.

e) delegate to the Head of Stakeholder and Land Advisory to sign the Deed of Variation of Lease and to also sign and serve the termination notice to terminate the lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust in accordance with the right granted in the Deed of Variation of Lease upon being requested by Panuku Development Auckland Limited.

Horopaki Context

9. Ōrākei Local Board approved the sale of 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera on 19 July 2018 (OR/2018/145) as part of the optimisation project for Meadowbank Community Centre. To settle the property with vacant possession, the current lessees will need to relocate their services.

10. The CAB lease for 4 Victoria Avenue expires on 30 June 2020. There are no clauses which allow for council to terminate the lease early.

11. The Plunket lease for 4 Victoria Avenue expires in 2025 and there are no clauses which allow for council to terminate the lease early.

12. Ōrākei Community Centre is part of the community places network. The strategic direction for community places is to:

- Optimise the council’s investment in its facilities
- Realise the community benefits of co-locating services and activities
- Fully activate facilities with locally relevant services.

The direction seeks to maximise the council’s investment in community facilities by providing as much shared space as possible. The emphasis is on:

- Access rather than occupation
- Short term tenure, aligned to current local board planning
- Shared use and commitment to facility or venue
- Community or customer need rather than organisational need
- Ability to add value to the operation of any facility or venue.

13. There has been regional work undertaken on the allocation of funding to Citizens Advice Bureaux. Ōrākei Local Board gave feedback to this process in March 2019 (OR/2019/35). In relation to council facilities, the board indicated that it would like to see alternative business models that enable the CABx to be more agile in adapting their service provision, increased flexibility in how the CAB services are provided in the local board area and more flexible ways of working which allow for community space to be used by other groups when not used by the CAB.
14. A number of options were considered in 2018 for the relocation of CAB services, as outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Retail unit in Remuera</th>
<th>St Lukes Community Centre</th>
<th>Ōrākei Community Centre</th>
<th>Retail unit at Eastridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic alignment</strong></td>
<td>No opportunity for co-location with other council services</td>
<td>Co-location with other services</td>
<td>Co-location with other services</td>
<td>No opportunity for co-location with other council services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lease costs</strong></td>
<td>$30,800 – $48,090 per annum incl OPEX</td>
<td>$9,600 per annum incl OPEX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No units available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital expenses</strong></td>
<td>Fit out ~$56,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$150,000 - $300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Town centre</td>
<td>680m from Newmarket 1.5km from Remuera</td>
<td>700m from Eastridge Shopping centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment with CAB preference</strong></td>
<td>Good alignment</td>
<td>Close to volunteer base May breach principle of universality e.g. some people may not use the service because of the church</td>
<td>Close to CAB location preference</td>
<td>Preferred location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Potentially short term solution (lease costs likely to be unaffordable long term)</td>
<td>Loss of space at Centre for other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Remuera Library and Bridge Club discounted as options due to lack of capacity

15. Ōrākei Local Board gave direction at a workshop in May 2018 to continue discussions with the CAB to relocate to Ōrākei Community Centre. A paper to the CAB board from June 2018 stated that Ōrākei Community Centre provides an opportunity to make the Remuera service more relevant and accessible to the local community and supported the move, subject to agreeing areas for the CAB use.

16. Four options for modifications to Ōrākei Community Centre are considered below. The concept plans are shown in attachment A. The key principles for the modifications are to enhance the community centre for all users and ensure the relocation is cost effective.

17. Each option has been assessed against the below criteria:

- Strategic alignment – whether the modification supports Community Places strategic direction and the Ōrākei Local Board feedback on the CAB funding allocation
- Impact on the centre current and future use – the impact of modifications on the kitchen, entrance and foyer, community office, access to toilets and future flexibility
- Impact on existing users – the impact of modifications on the existing users of the Community Centre.
- CAB use – the areas available for exclusive or shared use assessed against information provided by the CAB on their requirements, specifically three exclusive use, lockable rooms within view of each other, access to a reception/waiting area and security of tenure.
18. The following tables outline the criteria assessment of the four options. A summary table is provided in paragraph 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 – Move kitchen to centre office</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic alignment</td>
<td>- Strategic alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supports ACE direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supports OLB feedback on the CAB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on centre – current and future use</td>
<td>Impact on centre – current and future use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen – improved connection with hall</td>
<td>Centre office – removed; staff will need to share office space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance and foyer – no change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community office – no change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to toilets – no change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future flexibility – limited change; front offices could be used for other community purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on existing users</td>
<td>Impact on existing users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited impact</td>
<td>- Shared foyer space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved connection between kitchen and hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAB use</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAB use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two exclusive use rooms provided rather than three requested; access to whānau room and shared use of community office not within view of exclusive use rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated cost</strong> $215,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option 3 – Construct new offices in foyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited support for ACE direction and OLB feedback on CAB funding allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact on centre – current and future use**

**Community office** – no change

**Pros**

**Impact on centre – current and future use**

**Kitchen** – smaller, reduced functionality; tea and coffee only – not appropriate for capacity of hall

**Centre office** – removed; staff to share office space

**Entrance and foyer** – limited space for gathering; loss of wind lobby could make centre colder

**Access to toilets** – less direct with narrow corridor

**Future flexibility** – limited benefit if CAB moves

**Cons**

**Impact on existing users**

- Loss of kitchen space and functionality
- No space for informal gathering in foyer
- Potential to make centre feel less welcoming and accessible for users.

**CAB use**

Exclusive use of four offices including two new offices in foyer

All offices within view of each other

**Estimated cost** $293,000

### Option 4 – Move kitchen to community office; modify centre office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited support for ACE direction and OLB feedback on CAB funding allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact on centre – current and future use**

**Entrance and foyer** – no change

**Access to toilets** – no change

**Pros**

**Impact on centre – current and future use**

**Kitchen** – smaller, reduced functionality, less prominent location but access to back of hall

**Centre office** – exclusive CAB use; staff to share other space

**Community office** – removed

**Future flexibility** – limited impact but kitchen location not ideal

**Cons**

**Impact on existing users**

- No space to congregate outside kitchen
- Shared foyer space

**CAB use**

Exclusive use of three front offices including the centre office

All offices within view of each other

**Estimated cost** $255,000
19. The summary table of the criteria assessment across the four options is below. A tick is positive or no change, a dash is neutral and a cross is negative change or impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1: Kitchen to centre office</th>
<th>Option 2: Kitchen to community office</th>
<th>Option 3: New offices in foyer</th>
<th>Option 4: Kitchen to community office, modified centre office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic alignment</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Community Centre current and future use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre office</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance and foyer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community office</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to toilets</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future flexibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on existing users</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB use</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Option 1 which moves the kitchen to the centre office is considered the best option overall for strategic alignment, impact on the centre and existing users. It is not the CAB’s preferred option as it does not provide three exclusive use rooms within view of each other.

21. New doors from the back of the hall to the corridor with the toilets will be included in Option 1 provided the modifications remain within the cost estimate of $215,000.

22. No alterations will be made to Ōrākei Community Centre without written agreement from the CAB to relocate. The CAB may choose to remain at 4 Victoria Avenue until its lease expires on 30 June 2020. Given there are no other council facilities that can accommodate the CAB in the Ōrākei Local Board area, the CAB will need to arrange its own accommodation if agreement on Ōrākei Community Centre is not reached.

**Plunket**

23. The Plunket lease for 4 Victoria Avenue expires in 2025 and there are no clauses which allow for council to terminate the lease early. A lease variation is required to terminate the lease to sell 4 Victoria Avenue with vacant possession prior to 2025.

24. Plunket has agreed to sign the deed of lease variation (Appendix B). It introduces the right for Auckland Council to terminate the lease with Plunket on giving three months’ notice to vacate 4 Victoria Avenue. To streamline the process, staff delegation is sought to serve the termination notice with three months’ notice. This will be no later than 1 April 2020 to align with the CAB lease expiry date of 30 June 2020.

25. Plunket services are being considered in the redeveloped Meadowbank Community Centre on a pack-in/pack-out basis. During the redevelopment, Plunket will operate its services from other local facilities. Staff will work with Plunket to minimise disruption during the transition.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

26. Moving CAB and Plunket services from 4 Victoria Avenue will have some impact on members of the community who use these services. Ōrākei Community Centre is 4.1 kilometres from 4 Victoria Avenue and is approximately 6 minutes’ drive or 22 minutes by bus.

27. Numbers from CAB provided in March 2019 show that over 70 people visit the branch each week. A paper to the CAB board from June 2018 suggests that there is an opportunity to make the service more relevant and accessible to the local community and that there could be a significant increase in foot traffic for the branch at Ōrākei Community Centre.

28. The CAB relies on volunteers. The move to Ōrākei Community Centre will impact on the 33 volunteers at Remuera CAB (as at March 2019) as they may need to travel further to Ōrākei Community Centre. However, there is car parking available at the centre and the building is in better condition than 4 Victoria Avenue, so the impact could be positive.

29. Workshops have been held with Ōrākei Local Board in March and May 2019.

30. Ōrākei Local Board’s views on the CABx funding allocation model are consistent with Option 1 and 2 which have shared spaces as well as exclusive use spaces for the CAB. This moves towards flexibility in service provision arrangements, working on a pack-in/pack-out basis, and enabling community space to be used by other groups when not needed by the CAB.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

31. Mana whenua have been advised of the wider optimisation concept of which the sale of 4 Victoria Avenue is a part, and a framework for engagement has been agreed through the Panuku Mana Whenua Governance Forum. Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei was consulted as part of the community needs assessment for Meadowbank, Remuera and Ōrākei.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

32. The delivery of any of the options to modify the Ōrākei Community Centre to accommodate the Remuera CAB will be funded from the proceeds of sale of 4 Victoria Avenue. A cost estimate has been prepared for each of the four options and these are set out above.

33. One of the key principles of the relocation of CAB is to ensure the modifications are cost effective. Option 1 is a cost-effective option because it improves the connection between the kitchen and the hall which is beneficial to the centre overall. Option 1 does not limit future use or flexibility of the centre and maintains current access to the entrance, foyer and toilets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

34. The following table outlines identified risks and mitigations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a risk that the council cannot reach agreement with CAB over the Ōrākei Community Centre modifications.</td>
<td>The CAB lease for 4 Victoria Avenue expires on 30 June 2020. It is possible for the CAB to stay at 4 Victoria Avenue until its lease expires. It will need to arrange its own accommodation at the expiry of its lease as there are no other council facilities that can accommodate them in the Ōrākei Local Board area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Plunket may not agree to the lease variation which allows for Auckland Council to have a right upon three months’ notice to terminate the lease. The Plunket lease does not expire until 2025 and without a variation, Plunket could refuse to vacate 4 Victoria Avenue which would delay the sale of 4 Victoria Avenue and the optimisation of Meadowbank Community Centre.

Plunket has agreed to sign the lease variation and has expressed interest in moving to the new Meadowbank Community Centre.

| Physical works on Ōrākei Community Centre could exceed the cost estimate; additional building works could be required due to unknown/unexpected building condition or infrastructure issues. | Quantity surveyors have provided cost estimates, including contingency, for all options. The Project Delivery team in Community Facilities has been engaged early on the project. |

| Timeframes do not align causing a delay in the delivery of the programme of work or loss of continuity of service for the CAB. | The project team will continue to monitor key dates and milestones in the programme. |

---

### Ngā koringa ā-muri

**Next steps**

35. Formal written agreement from the CAB is required for relocation to a modified Ōrākei Community Centre. This needs to be received before 1 August 2019 to allow construction works at Ōrākei Community Centre to be planned for the Christmas holiday period when the centre is quieter. If agreement is not reached by 29 November 2019, there is no guarantee that the CAB will be able to move to Ōrākei Community Centre before 30 June 2020 and may experience a disruption to its service.

36. Following written agreement from CAB to relocate, the Community Facilities Project Delivery team will begin detailed design and consenting. If there is no agreement to relocate, no further work will be undertaken.

37. Community Facilities Community Leasing team will progress the variation to the Plunket lease to introduce three months’ notice to terminate.

---
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Option 1: Kitchen to centre office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic alignment</td>
<td>Impact on centre – current and future use Centre office – removed; staff will need to share office space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moderate</td>
<td>Kitchen – Improved connection with hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supports ACE direction</td>
<td>Entrance and foyer – no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supports CLB feedback on CAB funding allocation</td>
<td>Community office – no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to toilets – no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future flexibility – limited changes front offices could be used for other community purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on existing users – Limited impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved connection between kitchen and hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAB use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two exclusive use rooms provided rather than three requested; access to whanau room and shared use of community office not within view of exclusive use rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated cost $215,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment A

Item 14
Option 2: Kitchen to community office

### Pros

- Strategic alignment
  - Moderate
  - Supports ACE direction and CLB feedback on CAB funding allocation
- Impact on centre – current and future use
  - Centre office – no change
  - Entrance and foyer – no change
  - Access to toilets – no change

### Cons

- Impact on centre – current and future use
  - Kitchen – smaller, reduced functionality, less prominent location
  - Community office – removed
  - Future flexibility – limited impact but kitchen location not ideal
- Impact on existing users
  - No space to congregate outside kitchen
  - Shared foyer space
  - Transportation of food from kitchen could be a hazard due to lack of direct access to hall

### CAB Use

- Centre office (shared use) within view of exclusive use rooms
- CAB use
  - Two exclusive use rooms provided rather than three requested; access to wharenui room and shared use of centre office

**Estimated cost $175,000**
Option 3: New offices in foyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited support for ACE direction and OLB feedback on CAB funding allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on centre current and future use</td>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community office – no change</td>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen – smaller, reduced functionality, tea and coffee only – not appropriate for capacity of hall</td>
<td>Impact on centre current and future use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre office – removed; staff to share office space</td>
<td>Entrance and foyer – limited space for gathering; loss of wind lobby could make centre colder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to toilets – less direct with narrow corridor</td>
<td>Future flexibility – limited benefit if CAB moves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future flexibility</td>
<td>Impact on existing users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Loss of kitchen space and functionality</td>
<td>- No space for informal gathering in foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential to make centre feel less welcoming and accessible for users</td>
<td>Estimated cost $293,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAB use
Exclusive use of four offices including two new offices in foyer
All offices within view of each other

Attachment A
Item 14
Option 4: Kitchen to community office; modified centre office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic alignment</td>
<td>Impact on centre – current and future use&lt;br&gt;- Low&lt;br&gt;- Limited support for ACE direction and OLB feedback on CAB funding allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on centre – current and future use&lt;br&gt;- Entrance and foyer – no change&lt;br&gt;- Access to toilets – no change</td>
<td>Impact on centre – current and future use&lt;br&gt;- Kitchen – smaller, reduced functionality, less prominent location but access to back of hall&lt;br&gt;- Centre office – exclusive CAB use; staff to share other space&lt;br&gt;- Community office – removed&lt;br&gt;- Future flexibility – limited impact but kitchen location not ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB use&lt;br&gt;- Exclusive use of three front offices including the centre office&lt;br&gt;- All offices within view of each other</td>
<td>Impact on existing users&lt;br&gt;- No space to congregate outside kitchen&lt;br&gt;- Shared foyer space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated cost $255,000
DEED OF VARIATION OF LEASE

4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera, Auckland

Landlord
AUCKLAND COUNCIL

Tenant
ROYAL NEW ZEALAND PLUNKET TRUST

Dated 2019
DEED OF VARIATION OF LEASE

4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera, Auckland

DATED 2019

PARTIES

1. AUCKLAND COUNCIL ("Landlord")

2. ROYAL NEW ZEALAND PLUNKET TRUST ("Tenant")

BACKGROUND

A. By a deed of lease dated 24 December 2010 ("Lease") the Landlord leased the premises at 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera, Auckland ("Premises") to the Tenant on the terms and provisions contained in the Lease.

B. The current term of the Lease expires on 30 April 2020. The parties have agreed that the Landlord is entitled to terminate the Lease upon the Landlord serving three (3) months' notice to the Tenant.

C. The parties agree to vary the Lease as set out in this Deed.

1. INTERPRETATION

1.1 In this Deed, unless the context indicates otherwise, "GST" means tax charged under the Goods and Services Tax Act 1985 and includes any tax charged in substitution for that tax.

1.2 In this Deed, unless the context indicates otherwise:

(a) expressions defined in the main body of this Deed have the defined meaning throughout this Deed, including the background;

(b) clause and other headings are for ease of reference only and will not affect this Deed's interpretation;

(c) references to a person include an individual, company, corporation, partnership, firm, joint venture, association, trust, unincorporated body of persons, governmental or other regulatory body, authority or entity, in each case whether or not having a separate legal identity;

(d) references to the singular include the plural and vice versa;

(e) references to clauses, schedules and attachments are to clauses in, and the schedules and attachments to, this Deed. Each such schedule and attachment forms part of this Deed;

(f) references to any statutory provision are to statutory provisions in force in New Zealand and include any statutory provision which amends or replaces it, and any by-law, regulation, order, statutory instrument, determination or subordinate legislation made under it;

(g) any obligation not to do anything includes an obligation not to suffer, permit or cause that thing to be done;
(h) references to any document (however described) are references to that document as modified, novated, supplemented, varied or replaced from time to time and in any form, whether on paper or in an electronic form;

(i) this Deed is supplemental to the Lease and whenever capitalised terms appear in this Deed that are not defined herein, then those terms will have and include the meaning set out in the Lease;

(j) references to the Landlord include the successors and assigns of the Landlord; and

(k) references to the Tenant include the successors and permitted assigns of the Tenant.

2. VARIATION

2.1 On and from the date of this Deed, the following sections of the Lease are deleted and replaced with the following:

(a) a new clause 2.5 is inserted in the General Provisions section of the Lease:

"2.5 Notwithstanding anything else in this Lease, the Council is entitled to terminate the Lease by giving the Tenant three (3) months’ notice which it is entitled to give at any time. At the expiry of that notice, this Lease will be at an end, the Tenant will give up vacant possession of the Premises and neither party will have any further liability under the Lease excepting for any pre-existing breach."

3. CONFIRMATION OF OTHER LEASE COVENANTS

The Landlord acknowledges the Tenant will continue to hold the Premises on the same terms and provisions expressed or implied in the Lease subject to the variations set out in this Deed and the Tenant and the Landlord each covenant and agree that they will respectively duly and punctually perform and observe the covenants and provisions of the Lease as varied by this Deed.

4. COUNTERPART

This Deed may be executed in any number of counterparts (including facsimile or scanned and emailed PDF counterpart), each of which will be deemed an original, but all of which together will constitute the same instrument. No counterpart will be effective until each party has executed at least one counterpart.
EXECUTED and delivered as a deed by:

Landlord )
EXECUTED as a DEED for and on behalf of AUCKLAND COUNCIL as Landlord )

Witness signature

Full name

Occupation

Address

Tenant

Executed for and on behalf of ROYAL NEW ZEALAND TRUST by its Authorised Attorneys in the presence of:

Authorised Attorney Full name

Witness signature

Full name

Address

Occupation
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

That the Ōrākei 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 whakamaaurutanga
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.


Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Draft Pathway to Preparedness - A Planning Framework for Recovery</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Wayne Brown - Principal Recovery Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jennifer Rose - Head of Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Sinclair - Chief Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Ōrākei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

**Introduction**

How Auckland might recover from a disaster is important.

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

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

**The process we followed**

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

We followed this process to:

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

---

1 ‘Disaster’ in the Recovery Framework is defined as an emergency (under section 4 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002) event that requires a recovery.
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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 will want to get things moving back to normality as quickly as possible. They will also want to see how we keep community at the heart of any recovery effort.

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

Identifying community values and priorities

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recovery

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

- cannot be dealt with emergency services or
- requires a significant and coordinated response.3

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.

![Figure 2](attachment:image)

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
Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

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.
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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.
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></td>
<td>Access and tap into resources across the Auckland Council group and externally to better communicate and engage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>Managing Expectations</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Capacity and capability is available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy / Local Economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption can bring business, trade and commerce to a standstill. Orders and commitments may not be met, and employees may have not worked. 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 require needs or requirements with potential consequences for production over an extended period.</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities and mechanisms for local sourcing/procurement of goods and services during a recovery. Work with Business Associations to encourage uptake of Business Continuity Planning and practices amongst their member businesses. Leverage a better understanding of the Auckland's and local economies through engagement with potential Task Group members for the economic environment. Leverage opportunities for youth employment Understand the implications of seasonal cycles and underlying activities to identify factors which are critical to Auckland's rural economy.</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. | Building shared organisational understanding of what recovery may involve across Auckland Council group. CDEM group, Task Groups, and progressively, with Auckland's communities. Sharing of Standard Operating Procedures, plans and recovery documentation as appropriate, and subsequent updates. 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. Understanding the way business units across Auckland Council group deliver their services. Raising the profile of recovery arrangements and the understanding of what might be required of service delivery business units and their contractors. Identifying key skills, expertise and services contributing to recovery across Auckland Council group and partner organisations. |

<p>| <strong>Māori communities</strong> | |
| 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. | Develop a shared understanding of recovery within Auckland Emergency Management's wider engagement with mana whenua and mataawaka. Build on the opportunities for collaboration to cultivate leadership, participation and outcomes for Māori. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-existing issues</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any existing issues at the time of an event will be magnified in their effect and consequence.</td>
<td>Environmental scanning to maintain general awareness of issues and challenges facing Auckland across the four recovery environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing is under pressure in Auckland, with elevated house prices and rental costs, homelessness and high demand for social housing and refuge. Emergency accommodation will be a challenge in these circumstances.</td>
<td>Maintain engagement with partners and stakeholders and leverage opportunities to gather information and intelligence:&lt;br&gt;• in recovery planning and preparations&lt;br&gt;• through the duration of recovery.</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>Access expertise, knowledge available, information and advice through the membership of the task groups established to support recovery after an event (see below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport bottlenecks or previously known weaknesses in a network may have a pronounced effect in a particular event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychosocial recovery</th>
<th></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>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task Groups

Task Groups are established to provide advice and assistance for each of the natural, social, built and economic environments.

Each Task Group has a Terms of Reference, setting out its functions, roles and responsibilities. Task Groups may also comprise sub-task groups.

Potential members are practitioners, experts or leaders in their field whose knowledge would benefit a recovery. They are generally busy people, which can be a barrier to maintaining Task Groups, keeping informed and abreast of best practice in recovery.

Further, the membership of Task Groups needs to reflect the nature and scale of the task for each event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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.</td>
<td>The pool for each recovery environment may be comprised of both:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a core membership comprised of people within the wider Auckland Council group / emergency sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a wider membership of people who might only be called upon if the event demands it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core members would be more involved with up to 4 meetings/exercises a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wider group members would be less involved, though steps taken to ensure relationships and awareness is maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore the current capacity and capability for recovery within participating agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore potential arrangements they may operate in a recovery and their staffing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure key staff in the recovery are different from key staff in response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train staff for recovery as required. (potentially based on common arrangements).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective recovery requires high levels of coordination and collaboration, with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>everyone actively participating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieving this level of collaboration is supported by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• strong institutional and personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clear roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a shared understanding of what is to be achieved in a recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective support systems and communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monitoring and evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 to 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>Development of a monitoring and evaluation framework for recovery able to be applied to: - provide insight into the relevance of high-level independent metrics - track the extent of progress towards achievement of the Framework’s vision for recovery - progress towards completing items on the recovery work programme (generated from the Framework’s actions) - provide insight into the overall efficacy of event planning and preparations for recovery - track progress towards the completion of actions and tasks under a Recovery Action Plan formulated for the recovery from an emergency event - provide insight into the overall efficacy of actions and tasks under a Recovery Action Plan formulated to address the consequences in a disaster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Transport July 2019 reports to the Ōrākei Local Board

File No.: CP2019/12624

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To receive the Auckland Transport reports to the Ōrākei Local Board for July 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Each month, Auckland Transport provides an update to the Ōrākei Local Board on transport-related matters and relevant consultations in its area, Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) projects and decisions of Auckland Transport’s Traffic Control Committee.

3. The Auckland Transport update for July 2019 and Allocation of Ōrākei Local Board Safety Fund reports and the Community Safety Project Prioritised Proposals - Ōrākei Local Board July 2019 attachment are attached to this report.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations
That the Ōrākei Local Board:

a) receive the Auckland Transport July 2019 update report.

b) agree the following prioritised list to utilise the Community Safety Fund allocated to the Ōrākei Local Board area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RoC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiatarua Reserve/Abbotts Way crossing and path</td>
<td>Establish a crossing facility on Abbotts Way and complete a small section of footpath.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carmel School</td>
<td>Establish a safe crossing point on Temple Street and other appropriate safety measures to support students accessing Mt Carmel School through Lucia Glade.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohimarama School</td>
<td>Change the existing kea crossing on Rawhitiroa Road to a raised zebra and consider the use of colour/texture to highlight the crossing.</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Reserve playground crossing</td>
<td>A crossing to be established near the T intersection of Riddell Road and Roberta Avenue. This would service the school/kindergarten/rest home and the reserve area.</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei School</td>
<td>A new crossing is requested as the school has closed its back entrance on Coates Avenue. The desire line for pedestrians has now altered and a new crossing point needs to be established.</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Park School</td>
<td>Warning signage and gateway treatment on Riddell Road requested to alert drivers of children entering and exiting from the back entrance of the school.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitoto Ave/Ranui Road intersection, Remuera</td>
<td>Concerns over speeding and careless driving in this area. Treatment suggested is splitter islands on the side roads to improve vehicle tracking.</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mcfarland/Grand Drive Intersection</th>
<th>Request for speed calming measures on Grand Drive and/or crossing points on Grand Drive and Mcfarland Street.</th>
<th>$300,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kepa Road Pedestrian Facility</td>
<td>Request for a crossing point at approximately 110 Kepa Road where the footpath runs out. This needs further investigation of the recommended treatment due to the topography.</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combes Road, Remuera</td>
<td>Treatment requested to help prevent careless driving and speeding in this street. Estimate includes chevrons, cats-eyes and roadmarking.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ngā tāpirihanga

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
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</tr>
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<td>A</td>
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<td>69</td>
</tr>
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<td>B</td>
<td>Allocation of Ōrākei Local Board Safety Fund report</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Community Safety Project Prioritised Proposals - Ōrākei Local Board July 2019</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
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</table>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Transport July 2019 Update

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Ōrākei Local Board (the Board) on transport related matters in its area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report informs the Board of progress on its funded local board transport capital fund projects (LBTCF). The Board has $361,803 remaining in its fund for allocation in this political term as $2,000,000 has been indicatively allocated to the major Gowing Drive project.
3. This report responds to Board resolutions concerning Meadowbank Pony Club relocation, St John’s Park Lighting request, Ladies Mile Cycleway, Gowing Drive Safety Improvements, St Andrews Retirement Village, Clonbern Road carpark, a red light camera request and bells on bikes.
4. An attachment records the outstanding resolutions of the Ōrākei Local Board that concern Auckland Transport.
5. Information on the progress of the Community Safety Fund is included.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Ōrākei Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport July 2019 report.

Horopaki
Context
6. This report addresses transport related matters in the local board area.
7. 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.
8. 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

Responses to resolutions

Meadowbank Pony Club Relocation
9. In February 2018 the Ōrākei Local Board resolved to:

Request Auckland Transport to favourably approve the Meadowbank Pony Club relocating onto the Club’s adjacent site, the vandalised and obsolete bus shelters stored in the open at 400 St Johns Road, St Heliers and the club using them as shelters for the spectators at the Riding for the Disabled and other events, on such reasonable terms as agreed between Auckland Transport and the Club.

10. As AT does not hold the lease for the land under question, it is unable to approve the Pony Club relocating.

11. At this stage, AT has no plans for repurposing the bus shelters. Most of these shelters will be refurbished and returned to the network.

Lighting Walkways in St John’s Park area
12. In June 2018, the Ōrākei Local Board resolved to:

Request Auckland Transport to undertake a CPTED report on the 12 identified walkways in the St Johns Park area to specified lighting requirements

13. This was reported back to the Board in June 2018. The CPTED report was undertaken in May 2018 and the recommendation to the June 2018 business meeting was that $200,000 be allocated from the LBTCF for lighting the walkways.

14. This recommendation was not supported by the Board. AT’s lighting budget is not able to fund a lighting upgrade of this scale. As previously reported this would need to be supported from the Board’s transport capital fund.

Ladies Mile Cycleway marking removal and realignment
15. In February 2019 the Ōrākei Local Board resolved to:

Request Auckland Transport to provide a rough order of costs for removal of the cycleway marking and realignment of the medium strip on Ladies Mile, Elerisie.

16. AT does not support this proposal to remove cycle lanes, without an alternative facility being provided. It is contrary to AT’s strategic goals which are Road Safety, Public Transport and Active Modes.

17. There were no crashes in the CAS (crash analysis system) that involved people on cycles in this section of Ladies Mile colliding with vehicles, which supports the argument that the cycle lane is achieving its primary goal of providing additional separation between vehicles and vulnerable road users.

18. Removing the cycle lane and putting people on cycles in to conflict with vehicles would increase the likelihood of serious injury crashes occurring. In addition, the cycle lane decreases the lane width at this straight section of road decreasing the likelihood of drivers speeding and therefore limiting the severity of any crashes that might occur.

19. The Board proposed a project within their Community Safety Fund projects list that incorporated the above issue, while looking at broader issues around the Morrin St intersection.

20. The evaluation of the proposal to make safety improvements to this intersection determined that this project would exceed the cap for the Community Safety Fund.

21. It is a complex intersection and AT’s road safety team are looking at safety issues that the Board has highlighted.
Gowing Drive Safety Improvements

22. In February 2019 the Ōrākei Local Board resolved:

That Auckland Transport provide the Board with a report on recent data from speed tubes on Gowing Drive and an assessment of the suitability of current location of sites.

23. The safety improvements proposed for Gowing Drive were workshopped with the local board in June 2019. The speed and volume count information, parking survey, visibility checks, proposed bus stop locations, proposed speed calming measures and proposed driver feedback signs were discussed.

24. The plans are due for external consultation with residents shortly. A drop-in session is being organised to discuss the proposals with residents.

St Andrews Retirement Village

25. In June 2019, the Ōrākei Local Board resolved to:

Request Auckland Transport to investigate measures to ensure safe entry/exit for residents of the St Andrews Retirement Village at the entrance on West Tamaki Road.

26. AT undertook an assessment of this intersection between the entrance to the retirement village and West Tamaki Road. Several factors need to be considered prior to the implementation of broken yellow lines or other parking restrictions, such as the traffic speed and volumes, crash history and the topography of the area.

27. Having undertaken this assessment, it is not considered that this intersection meets the criteria for implementation of broken yellow lines. The driveway is similar to many across the network and while it is acknowledged that the removal of a short stretch of parking appears to be a straightforward request, doing so would set a precedent for future requests. Therefore AT will not be undertaking further works here at this time, however we will continue to monitor the situation.

Red Light Camera Request Remuera Road and Meadowbank Road intersection

28. In June 2019, the Ōrākei Local Board resolved to:

Request Auckland Transport to investigate installing a red light camera to deter red light running by traffic east along Remuera Road at the intersection with Meadowbank Road and reassess current phasing.

29. Auckland Transport and NZ Police strongly support the use of red light cameras as a safety tool in the management of red light running at high-risk intersections, where appropriate. These high-risk sites have been assessed using Ministry of Transport and NZ Transport Agency criteria as benefitting most from automated safety camera enforcement. They are large urban intersections with significant traffic volumes, where significant safety issues are evident and the severity of crashes is unusually high.

30. Looking to the particular intersection of Meadowbank and Remuera Road, it is not considered as high priority as other high risk intersections across the Auckland region. As such, the installation of a fixed red light camera at this intersection is not considered appropriate at this time.

31. The New Zealand Police are responsible for the enforcement of red light running at various locations across the region. Your request will be forwarded to the appropriate District Road Policing Manager, for consideration.

32. A request has been sent to AT’s technical services team to check the functioning of the signals at this intersection.
Clonbern Road Carpark

33. In June 2019, the Ōrākei Local Board resolved to:

Support the Remuera Business Association and request that Auckland Transport investigate and implement other parking alternatives in Remuera such as relaxed parking restrictions during the Clonbern Road, Remuera carpark closure period.

34. The transfer of Clonbern Road carpark to Auckland Council/Panuku has been completed.

35. At Panuku’s request, AT will continue to enforce time restrictions, mobility spaces etc until such time as any development takes place.

36. AT is also working with the Business Association on other parking time restriction adjustments in the immediate vicinity. A recent site meeting with the Business Association and AT identified several spaces on Clonbern Rd which could be changed from P60 to P15 to increase turnover.

37. AT’s parking team continues to work with the Business Association to further these proposals.

Bells on Bicycles

38. In October 2018, the Ōrākei Local Board resolved to:

Ask Auckland Transport whether in the interests of road/pedestrian safety, if Auckland Transport supports the installation of bells and lights on cycles and legislation to implement this proposition, and if not, why not.

39. There are not any rules regarding bell use. NZTA is the decision maker for the road code for cyclists riding on roads, but there is nothing on bells. There is a guideline for letting pedestrians know you are approaching them on shared paths for which bell use is one option, but this is not a rule.

40. Later this year AT is going to be doing a Share the Path Customer Central Sprint to develop a range of etiquettes for all users on shared paths. Bell use is likely to be included in that from a cycling perspective.

Local Board Transport Capital Fund

41. The table below summarises the balance of the LBTCF remaining budget. The Board has access to $2,361,803 that it can use from the 2019/2020 financial year, noting that $2,000,000 has been indicatively allocated to the Gowing Drive project.

42. There is a considerable amount of reserve in this fund that could be allocated to projects in the Board’s area, noting that the indicative business case for the Gowing Drive project is still being developed. In the next political term, the Board will receive a further allocation of transport capital funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ōrākei 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>
Update on Ōrākei Local Board Transport Capital Fund Projects

43. The table below reflects the status of projects under the LBTCF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Landing Entrance Upgrade</td>
<td>Redesign the entrance to The Landing at Ōkahu Bay on Tāamaki Drive for safety and ease of access for users.</td>
<td>This was on hold while the marina sports centre was completed. It can now proceed to the next stage and the Firm Estimate of Costs is being revised. This is due to be workshopped with the Board in July 2019.</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāamaki Drive Bus Stop Extension</td>
<td>Building a raised crossing to improve safety for bus patrons needing to cross Tāamaki Drive.</td>
<td>The project has now been superseded by the speed management programme. It will build the raised crossing and Board will fund the footpath.</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngahue Road Footpath extension</td>
<td>Widen and extend the footpath from the Ngahue Road end of College Road.</td>
<td>Deferred.</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$76,000 has been allocated but costs may increase due to increase in project scope. Awaiting a transport analysis of the area which is being progressed by Auckland Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei Shared Path</td>
<td>A pedestrian and cycle pathway providing a connection to the Glen Innes to Tāamaki Drive shared path.</td>
<td>The indicative business case is being developed and its progress will be reported to the Board at agreed intervals.</td>
<td>$2,000,000  (unallocated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gowing Drive, Meadowbank</td>
<td>To provide driver feedback signage as a speed management tool.</td>
<td>The proposed locations for the speed feedback signs have been established. Nearby residential addresses will be informed of the locations over the next month.</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findlay/Hewson Walkway</td>
<td>Improvements to the walkway connection between Findlay Street and Hewson Street in Ellerslie, including lighting.</td>
<td>Project is being set up.</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Safety Fund

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

45. Ōrākei Local Board was allocated $819,718 over the two years. The Board has prioritised its list of projects and a separate report to confirm this list is on this agenda.

Progress on Significant Projects in the Ōrākei Board area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen Innes to Tāmaki Drive Scheme Cycle Way - Provision of an off road Cycle</td>
<td>Project is in detailed design. Update:</td>
<td>• Section 2 (St Johns Rd to Meadowbank Station) - Remaining resource consents lodged. Detailed design being finalised. Land owner agreements progressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highway from Glen Innes Rail Station to Tāmaki Drive.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 3 (Ōrākei Basin Boardwalk) - Current construction contract completed. New contractor will complete balustrade replacement by mid-2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 4 (Ōrākei Basin to Tāmaki Drive) - Preparation for resource consent lodgement underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Update:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In response to concerns raised by the board about the Ngapipi Road section of the shared path, a safety audit is underway. The outcome of this will be shared with the board. In addition, a visit to the Whakataketaka Bay reserve will be organised to show the board members the proposed route of the path through the reserve and also the gradient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmaki Drive (Plumer St to Ngapipi Rd) - This route will provide connection</td>
<td>Project is in detailed design. Update:</td>
<td>The Tāmaki Drive Cycleway final detailed design was issued and resource consent has been approved by Council. The project team is preparing the tender documents to procure a contractor to undertake the physical work. Construction is planned to start in June 2019. The Solent Street intersection is still under review as agreement with Ports Of Auckland has not yet been achieved and will be progressed separately. This project will be worked with the Board workshop later this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between Glen Innes to Tamaki Drive shared path and Quay Street cycle route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupe St/Takitimu St/Te Arawa St - Intersection pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>In detailed design phase.</td>
<td>Delivery expected in the 2019/2020 financial year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bonnie Brae Road/Meadowbank Rd - Pedestrian Refuge  
In detailed design phase.  
Delivery expected in the 2019/2020 financial year.

Wootton Road / Remuera Rd - Pedestrian crosswalk  
Construction completed.

Feltom Matthew / St Johns Rd - Signalisation  
Construction has started but was delayed due to utility services relocation.  
Project is now programmed for completion in September 2019

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

48. 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

Local Board Workshops – June/July 2019

47. In late June 2019, AT workshopped the priority of the proposed Community Safety Fund projects with the Board. A separate report on the allocation of the Community Safety Fund is on this agenda.

48. The July workshop will discuss the re-assessment of the LBTCF project, “The Landing”, and an update on the Ōrākei Shared Path.

Consultation

49. AT provides the Ōrākei Local Board with the opportunity to comment on transport projects being delivered in their area. No projects went to public consultation in the last reporting period.

Traffic Control Committee Resolutions

50. There were no decisions to note in this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

51. 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

52. There are no financial implications that result from receiving this report.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

53. There is a considerable amount of funds left in the LBTCF that the Board may allocate or reserve for the Ōrākei Shared Path project.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

54. Auckland Transport will prepare a further report for the Ōrākei Local Board next month and report back on other outstanding resolutions.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Resolution schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Lorna Stewart, Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon, Manager Elected Member Relationship Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21/06/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18/10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18/10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21/2/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21/2/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21/2/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16/5/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16/5/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16/5/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 20   | June 2019 | Gowing Drive Safety improvement petition | a) receive the petition regarding Gowing Drive road safety improvements and thank Barry Stewart and Deborah Hollier for their attendance.  
b) request that the petition be forwarded to Auckland Transport for consideration as part of any planned road safety improvements work for Gowing Drive, Meadowbank. | Bruce Thomas in receipt of petition |
<p>| 21   | June 2019 | Clonbern carpark | noting the Board’s resolution from its 16 May 2019 meeting requesting ‘Auckland Transport, Panuku Development Auckland and Auckland Council staff to expedite the plans for | Under investigation |
|      |       |        |               | Referred to Parking team |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>June 2019, OR/2019/109</td>
<td>Mission Bay and St Heliers Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Project team advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>June 2019, OR/2019/114</td>
<td>request Auckland Transport to investigate installing time restrictions on the angle parking on Meadowbank Road at the commercial and retail</td>
<td>Investigation initiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

redeveloping the carpark site’ is pleased with the recent decision of the Auckland Transport Board to transfer the Clonbern Road carpark, Remuera to Auckland Council to enable Panuku Development Auckland to develop the site, and the requirement to increase parking capacity in any development.

c) support the Remuera Business Association and request that Auckland Transport investigate and implement other parking alternatives in Remuera such as relaxed parking restrictions during the Clonbern Road, Remuera carpark closure period.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>request Auckland Transport to investigate installing a red light camera to deter red light running by traffic travelling east along Remuera Road at the intersection with Meadowbank Road, and reassess current light phasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR/2019/114</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>request that Auckland Transport advise on the current status of public access to the Ballarat Street, Ellerslie paper road extension, reporting on the feasibility and providing a rough order of costs to install a walking/cycling pathway from Abbotts Way to the formed part of Ballarat Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR/2019/114</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>request Auckland Transport renew and provide more visible “No Entry” signage for the Robert Street, Ellerslie carpark at the exit onto Ladies Mile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR/2019/114</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent to parking design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>request Auckland Transport to investigate measures to ensure safe entry/exit for residents of St Andrews’ Retirement Village at the entrance on West Tamaki Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR/2019/114</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported in July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>OR/2019/114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. For the Ōrākei Local Board to allocate its share of the Community Safety Fund to road safety projects in its area and to decide on a prioritised list of projects to fully utilise the Ōrākei Local Board area’s allocation of the fund.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Established in the 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan, the Community Safety Fund sees $20 million dispensed across all 21 local boards for road safety initiatives. A local board’s share of the fund is based on a formula that assesses the number of deaths and serious injuries in that area. Ōrākei Local Board’s budget is $819,718 over two years.
3. The Community Safety Fund is a capital budget designed to deliver projects raised by the local board that will help to prevent, control or mitigate identified local safety hazards.
4. Individual projects must cost less than $1 million, be best practice, not be already funded and conform to Auckland Transport’s (AT) standards. Nor will projects containing unconventional or unproven components such as new trials or pilot projects be considered.
5. The Ōrākei Local Board has put forward a number of potential projects, these have been assessed, scoped and an rough order of cost (RoC) developed. The scoped and costed list of projects has been worked up with the board and a prioritised list developed. The priority of this list is noted below for confirmation by the Board at this meeting.
6. If the board does not allocate all its share of the Community Safety Fund, it will be returned to AT’s capital programme. If the board wishes to progress projects in excess of the available funds, then the balance can be funded from the board’s Transport Capital Fund.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Ōrākei Local Board:
a) agree the following prioritised list to utilise the Community Safety Fund allocated to the Ōrākei Local Board area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RoC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiatara Reserve/Abbots Way crossing and path</td>
<td>Establish a crossing facility on Abbotts Way and complete a small section of footpath.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carmel School</td>
<td>Establish a safe crossing point on Temple Street and other appropriate safety measures to support students accessing Mt Carmel School through Lucia Glade.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohimarama School</td>
<td>Change the existing kea crossing on Rawhitiroa Road to a raised zebra and consider the use of colour/texture to highlight the crossing.</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B</td>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roberta Reserve playground crossing</strong></td>
<td>A crossing to be established near the T intersection of Riddell Road and Roberta Avenue. This would service the school/kindergarten/residential area.</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orakei School</strong></td>
<td>A new crossing is requested as the school has closed its back entrance on Coates Avenue. The desire line for pedestrians has now altered and a new crossing point needs to be established.</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Churchill Park School</strong></td>
<td>Warning signage and gateway treatment on Riddell Road requested to alert drivers of children entering and exiting from the back entrance of the school.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rangitoto Av/Ranui Rd intersection, Remuera</strong></td>
<td>Concerns over speeding and careless driving in this area. Treatment suggested is splitter islands on the side roads to improve vehicle tracking.</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mcfarland/Grand Drive Intersection</strong></td>
<td>Request for speed calming measures on Grand Drive and/or crossing points on Grand Drive and Mcfarland Street.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kepa Road Pedestrian Facility</strong></td>
<td>Request for a crossing point at approximately 110 Kepa Road where the footpath runs out. This needs further investigation of the recommended treatment due to the topography.</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combes Road, Remuera</strong></td>
<td>Treatment requested to help prevent careless driving and speeding in this street. Estimate includes chevrons, cats-eyes and roadmarking.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Horopaki Context**

7. The 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan allocated $20 million for Financial Year 2019/2020 and Financial Year 2020/2021 for local initiatives in road safety, ($5 million in Financial Year 2019/2020 and $15 million in Financial Year 2020/2021). In order to promote safety at the local community level, the fund is apportioned to each local board area based on a formula that focuses on the numbers of Deaths and Serious Injuries (DSI) in that area.

8. The objective is to accelerate local community initiated safety projects, around identified high-risk locations and local schools. Local Boards were invited to submit proposals for projects addressing safety issues their communities have identified and also worked with Auckland Transport’s Community Transport Team to identify projects using the new toolbox developed for the Safe School Streets pilot.

9. The Ōrākei Local Board share of the Community Safety Fund is $819,718 over the two financial years.

10. Criteria for the fund includes physical measures raised by the local community to prevent, control or mitigate identified local road and street safety hazards which expose people using any form of road and street transport to demonstrable hazards which may result in death or serious harm. Individual project cost is to be no greater than $1 million. Projects must consist of best practice components, conform to AT standards and comply with New Zealand law.
11. The fund does not cover the following:
   - Projects that are funded by existing AT road safety or other capital works programmes including, but not limited to setting speed limits, seal extensions, maintenance, renewals and planned footpath upgrades (but can be used to augment these projects).
   - Projects not within the street, including parks, rail corridor, beaches and property not owned or controlled by AT.
   - Projects that have unacceptable effects on network efficiency or introduce unacceptable secondary hazards or effects.
   - Projects with an unacceptably high maintenance cost.
   - Projects that clash with other planned public projects.
   - Complex projects that may take greater than 2 years to deliver including but not limited to projects requiring significant engineered structures, complex resource consents and complex traffic modelling.
   - Projects containing unconventional or unproven components including new trials or pilot projects.
   - Projects or components of projects that have no demonstratable safety benefit unless they are integral with a safety project.

12. The Ōrākei Local Board developed a list of projects over workshop sessions and received advice from AT’s Community Transport team in regard to requests for safety measures from local schools.

13. That list of projects has now been costed by AT. If this costing is more than the budget allocated to the particular local board under this funding, then it has the option of using any of it’s available Local Board Transport Capital Fund to top up the project budget.

14. The board prioritised its list of projects at its June workshop and is asked to confirm this prioritisation in order to allow time for design and implementation of the projects in the two following years.

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

15. The list of projects put forward for assessment and costing to the board is attached to this report as Attachment C.

16. The budget allocated to the board does not cover all the list of projects. Funding will be used to deliver the board’s top prioritised projects, but others can be topped up and completely funded from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund.

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

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

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

18. The projects allocated funding in this report will improve the road safety environment in the communities within the Ōrākei Local Board area.

19. The board members views have been canvassed at three workshops.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
20. 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
21. The Ōrākei Local Board area’s allocation of the Community Safety Fund is fully utilised.
22. Unfunded Community Safety Projects can be considered for funding through the Board’s Transport Capital Fund.

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

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
24. Design and construction of the approved list of projects.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Community Safety Project List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Lorna Stewart, Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon, Manager Elected Member Relationship Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Community Safety Project Prioritised Proposals— Ōrākei Local Board July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Waiaatarua Reserve/Abbotts Way crossing and path | There is no safe crossing and path into Waiaatarua Reserve at the Abbotts Way entrance close to the Man’s Shed. The walking school bus has raised this as an issue. The only path on Abbots Way is on the opposite side of the road. | Pass   | Routine – detailed design required  
Abbotts Way: Secondary arterial.  
Crash history: 5 reported in the last 5 years. (1 serious 2 minor) on the bend.  
There are 2 existing refuges that lead to two separate park entrances.  
Suggested treatment:  
Pedestrian Refuge.  
Approximately 20m footpath link required.  
Pedestrian refuge with pram crossings. | $50,000 | CSFO 1.9 |
| Mt Carmel School            | A crossing on Temple Street is requested to allow pupils attending Mt Carmel Primary School to cross safely. And other appropriate safety measures to support the number of students accessing Mt Carmel School through Lucia Glade. | Pass   | Routine – detailed design required  
Suggested treatments:  
- Splitter island on Blackett Cres  
- Pedestrian survey required  
- Convert existing speed hump to zebra crossing | $300,000 | CSFO 1.4 |
| Kohimarama School          | The school has an issue with the crossing on Rawhitiraoa Road (kea)                                                                                                                                       | Pass   | Routine – Investigation and Design  
CRM – No related cases were found. | $260,000 | CSFO 1.2 |
## Community Safety Project Prioritised Proposals – Ōrākei Local Board July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Reserve playground crossing</td>
<td>Crossing near the T intersection of Riddell Road and Roberta Avenue.</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Routine – Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>CSFO 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This would service the school/ kindergarten/ rest home/ park which are near this area. The only crossing point is further up the road near the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing raised table. 1 non-injury crash. Cyclist in blind spot of turning vehicle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riddle Road – Collector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roberta Ave – Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested treatments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Raised crossing near Roberta Ave close to reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Zebra Crossing across Riddell Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pedestrian count needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ōrākei School                    | Students are not using the pedestrian crossing on Coates Avenue, instead they are | Pass   | Routine – detailed design required                                                      | $280,000 | CSFO 1.5 |
|                                  |                                                                            |        | No concerns raised with shifting the crossing. Will require pedestrian survey and may require |        |         |
## Community Safety Project Prioritised Proposals – Ōrākei Local Board July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Park School</td>
<td>Concerns about pedestrians being able to cross on Riddell Road at the rear entrance of the school, (595 Riddell Rd). The local resident reported cars travelling at speed on this part of the road which is very bendy with poor visibility.</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Routine – Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>CSFO 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitoto Av/Ranui Rd intersection, Remuera</td>
<td>People speed through the intersection, particularly going onto Ranui Road where they often cut the corner, as they use it as a rat-run.</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Complex – Investigation and Design No crashes reported in the last 5 years. Local/Local intersection – slow speed environment.</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>CSFO 1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested treatments:
- Red patch/gate way treatment
- Pedestrian survey

Suggested treatments:
- bus stop relocation depending on new crossing location and survey outcomes.

Suggested treatments:
- Crossing will need to be raised table in accordance with current AT design standards.
### Community Safety Project Prioritised Proposals – Ōrākei Local Board July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| McFarland/Grand Drive Intersection | Parents/intermediate students crossing McFarland St feel unsafe with drivers speeding down Grand Drive. Could there be a traffic calming measure put in place or could there be a traffic island installed in the vicinity of 1 McFarland Street/Grand Drive. Possibly a pedestrian refuge. | Pass    | Routine – Investigation and Design  
Collector/collector intersection.  
2 crashes last 5 years, 1 non-injury - fail to give way, 1 serious - skateboarder rode out into oncoming traffic.  
Suggested treatments:  
Could install pedestrian refuge across McFarland.  
- Raised zebra Swedish style  
- Splitter on McFarland                                                                 | $300,000 | CSFO 1.10 |
| Kepa Road Pedestrian Facility      | The footpath on one side of Kepa Road runs out at approximately 110 Kepa Road. A crossing facility in this location would assist those who need to continue walking to the Ōrākei train station. | Evaluating | Routine – Investigation and Design  
Pedestrian/Traffic Survey  
Kepa Road, Primary Arterial.  
Suggested treatment:  
Raised Zebra crossing. This would need further investigation due to the topography.                                                                 | $260,000 | CSFO 1.14 |
| Combes Road, Remuera               | People speed through the S-bends making it dangerous.                        | Pass    | Simple – Investigation and Design  
No crashes on these bends, last 5 years.                                                                                                                                                                   | $25,000 | CSFO 1.1  |
### Community Safety Project Prioritised Proposals – Ōrākei Local Board July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladies Mile Pedestrian Facility</td>
<td>There is currently no safe crossing point for Ladies Mile between Main Highway &amp; Peach Parade – A distance of 1.4km.</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Significant peak-hour congestion turning right off Ladies Mile onto Morrin St. The day-care centre is recently constructed on the Ladies St. intersection all seem to be related to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Attachment C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 16 ID</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFO 1.3</td>
<td>Over 1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mile/Morrin St corner brings increased safety risks.</td>
<td>iii. The steep terrain means that turning either way out of Morrin St onto Ladies Mile is difficult. Congestion means that drivers try to cut into gaps in oncoming traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new 782 bus route runs through the Ladies Mile/Morrin St. intersection.</td>
<td>iv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility on this staggered intersection is a significant issue, also with sunstrike as drivers exit Pukerangi Cres.</td>
<td>v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The under-utilized cycleway on Ladies Mile is posing safety issues of its own with wider vehicles regularly having to cross the median line.</td>
<td>vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is nowhere safe for students accessing nearby Michael Park School and other pedestrians, such as bus passengers, to safely cross anywhere along Ladies Mile, including near this junction and particularly across the top of Morrin Street.</td>
<td>vii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei Train Station Entrance/Exit</td>
<td>A safety treatment at the site entrance and exit to increase visibility and safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested treatment:**

Auckland Transport’s Road Safety team are investigating signals at this intersection. This project will be over $1 million.

**Potential Risks**

Negative operational effects, major services relocation, large offset intersection design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| St Josephs School, 152 Kepa Road | It’s a busy road and cars often speed down here and don’t stop for the crossing. | Fail   | **Routine – detailed design required**  
The pedestrian crossing here has been raised under AT’s MAPI programme. Do other measures need to be introduced here to slow traffic such as coloured patches or anti-skid?  
**Comment**  
This crossing is already on an Auckland Transport works programme. |        | CSFO 1.8 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 135 St Johns Road | Truman Street and Ipswich Place exiting onto St Johns Road. This intersection is problematic for both motorists attempting right hand turns from Truman Street and Ipswich Place onto St Johns Road. Both of these streets are on a steep incline with St Johns Road being on the crest of a ridge and consequently there is visibility issues. The bus stop servicing this area is on the western side of Ipswich Place pedestrians alighting from the bus service wishing to cross the very busy St Johns Road at the existing pedestrian crossing east of Ipswich Place encounter several difficulties as followings: Ipswich Place where it intersects with St Johns Road is extremely wide and pedestrians must navigate through up to four lanes of traffic. Pedestrians crossing Ipswich place are not easily visible to drivers moving straight through to Truman Street | Fail   | Routine – detailed design required  
AT previously tried to move the bus stop and provide another crossing facility. This was not supported by the consultation and dropped.  
Ipswich Place could be narrowed and the slip lanes removed and move the bus stop built out the kerb and provide a crossing.  
Truman St/Ipswich Pl – Local  
St Johns Rd – Primary Arterial  
On Connected Communities Route - not advised to proceed with this one.  
**Suggested treatment:**  
- Kerb Build outs, Slip lane removal  
- Upgrade zebra (raise) but is dependent on Connected communities project  
- Truman street Splitter island |        | CSFO 1.13
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board - Notice of Motion - Auckland Transport Delegations to Local Boards

File No.: CP2019/11991

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To receive the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board’s Notice of Motion and resolutions in relation to Auckland Transport delegations to local boards.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. On Tuesday, 18 June 2019, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board resolved the following:

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson G Gillon, seconded by Member M Cohen:

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

a) request that Auckland Transport consider delegating the required local responsibilities, duties, functions, and powers to allow:
   i) landowner approval,
   ii) prioritisation of proposed projects, and
   iii) approval of related budgets.

b) to the respective local board, where they affect roads or assets in the local street network, noting that this is allowed for under section 45 “Delegations” of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, in particular clauses (1) and (8).

c) request where any required responsibilities, duties, functions, or powers to give effect to resolution a) above are determined to be contrary to the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 or any other legislation, that an equivalent process is found (such as Auckland Transport formally adopting local board resolutions).

d) note that local boards currently have the equivalent delegation as outlined in resolution a) above in regards to assets, projects and land administered by the Community Facilities department of Auckland Council, and this may be a suitable model for Auckland Transport to consider adopting.

e) request that this Notice of Motion and subsequent resolutions are circulated to all local boards for their information and consideration.

CARRIED

3. This report is to receive Devonport-Takapuna Local Board’s Notice of Motion and resolutions in relation to Auckland Transport delegations to local boards from its 18 June 2019 meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Ōrākei Local Board:

a) receive the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board’s Notice of Motion and resolutions from its 18 June 2019 business meeting in relation to Auckland Transport delegations to local boards.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna Local Board - Notice of Motion and supporting documentation - Auckland Transport</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kim Lawgun - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Ōrākei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notice of Motion  
Submitted on 18th of April 2019-For the next available business meeting of the Devonport Takapuna Local Board

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson G Gillon, seconded by Member M Cohen

That the Devonport Takapuna Local Board:

a) request that Auckland Transport consider delegating the required responsibilities, duties, function, and powers to allow:
   i) landowner approval,
   ii) prioritisation of proposed projects, and
   iii) approval of related budgets.

   to the respective local board, where they affect roads or assets in the local street network, noting that this is allowed for under section 45 “Delegations” of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, in particular clauses (1) and (8).

b) request that where any required responsibilities, duties, functions, or powers to give effect to resolution a) above are determined to be contrary to the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 or any other legislation, that an equivalent process is found (such as Auckland Transport formally adopting local board resolutions).

c) note that local boards currently have the equivalent delegation as outlined in resolution a) above with regard to assets, projects and land administered by the Community Facilities department of Auckland Council, and this may be a suitable model for Auckland Transport to consider adopting.

d) request that this Notice of Motion and subsequent resolutions are circulated to all local boards for their information and consideration.

Background:

According to section 10 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, the purpose of local boards is to enable decision-making by an on behalf of local communities:

10 Local boards

A local board must be established for each local board area for the purposes of—

(a) enabling democratic decision making by, and on behalf of, communities within the local board area; and

(b) better enabling the purpose of local government to be given effect to within the local board area.

Section 10(1)(a) replaced, on 1 December 2012, by section 43 of the Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Act 2012 (2012 No 93).

However local boards are currently excluded from any decision-making related to Auckland’s roading network, public transport network, and road corridor infrastructure located within the respective local board area. Despite the large sums of public money being spent in this sector, local boards are often only asked for informal feedback on transport or roading proposal, which undermines the purpose of local boards, prevents local governance, disenfranchises the local community, and denies electoral accountability.

In the above recommended motion, we are proposing a way to redress the lack of democratic accountability and local governance through a mechanism that currently exists within legislation. In section 54 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009
(reproduced in attachment B), Auckland Transport may delegate (within specified limits) "any of its responsibilities, duties, functions, and powers" to “1 or more local boards”.

We believe that as a publicly-owned and publicly-funded body that is part of a democratic city entity, that this is something that Auckland Transport is duty-bound to seriously consider and through this proposal, we are requesting it to do so.

Grant Gillon
Deputy Chair of the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Mike Cohen
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Member
Attachment A:

Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 - section 54 (highlighting added)


54 Delegations

1. Auckland Transport may delegate to a committee or an employee of Auckland Transport, or to the Auckland Council, any of its responsibilities, duties, functions, and powers except—
   (a) the power to approve or adopt any policy or programme that it is required to consult on using the special consultative procedure; and
   (b) the power to approve or adopt a regional land transport plan or a regional public transport plan under the Land Transport Management Act 2003; and
   (c) the power to make a bylaw under any enactment referred to in section 46(1); and
   (d) any duty to appoint a chief executive officer.

2. This section applies subject to any provision to the contrary in this or any other enactment.

3. Nothing in this section restricts the power of Auckland Transport to delegate to a committee or an employee of Auckland Transport, or to the Auckland Council, the power to do anything precedent to the exercise or performance by Auckland Transport (after consultation with the committee, employee, or the Council) of any power or duty specified in subsection (1).

4. A committee or an employee of Auckland Transport, or the Auckland Council, may delegate any of its or his or her responsibilities, duties, functions, or powers to a subcommittee or person, subject to any conditions, limitations, or prohibitions imposed by Auckland Transport when making the original delegation.

5. A committee, a subcommittee, or an employee of Auckland Transport or the Auckland Council to which or to whom any responsibilities, duties, functions, or powers are delegated may, without confirmation by Auckland Transport, the Council, or the committee or person that made the delegation, exercise or perform them in the same way and with the same effect as if Auckland Transport itself had exercised or performed those responsibilities, duties, functions, or powers.

6. Auckland Transport may delegate to the Auckland Council, or any other organisation or person, the enforcement, inspection, licensing, and administration related to bylaws and other regulatory matters for which it is responsible.

7. To avoid doubt, no delegation relieves Auckland Transport of the liability or legal responsibility to perform or to ensure the performance of any function or duty.

8. A delegation to the Auckland Council may be made generally or specifically to the governing body or 1 or more local boards.

9. The delegation powers in this clause are in addition to any power of delegation Auckland Transport has under any other enactment.

Section 54(1)(a): replaced, on 13 June 2013, by section 72 of the Land Transport Management Amendment Act 2013 (2013 No 35).
Section 54(1)(ab): inserted, on 13 June 2013, by section 72 of the Land Transport Management Amendment Act 2013 (2013 No 35).
Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2019/12979

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Chairperson with an opportunity to update the Ōrākei Local Board Members on projects, activities and issues since last reported.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
a) That the report be received.
b) That the Ōrākei Local Board formally endorse its feedback on the review of the Walking Access Act 2008 (Attachment B).
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Chairperson’s Report – Kit Parkinson

Purpose of the report
1. To update the Ōrākei Local Board Members on projects, activities and issues.

Recommendation(s)
   a) That the report be received.
   b) That the Ōrākei Local Board formally endorse its feedback on the review of the Walking Access Act 2008 (Attachment B).

Portfolio Lead: Parks and Reserves (Joint); Events, Landowner Approvals & Leases; and Communications

Other Appointments (Lead): Friends of Madills Farm Incorporated, Friends of Tahuna Torea
Michael’s Avenue Reserve Community Liaison Committee, Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Reserves Board,
Ōrākei Basin Advisory Group, Tamaki Drive Protection Society, Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki
Makaurau Authority

Other Appointments (Alternate): Mission Bay Business Association, Mission Bay-
Kohimarama Residents Association Incorporated, East City Community Trust

Residents’ concerns/issues
2. The Ōrākei Local Board office has fronted enquiries on:
   Renewing dog registrations, tree maintenance, rates queries, rates rebates, rubbish and
   recycling queries, drain issues, pest problems, footpath maintenance, parks maintenance,
   bus changes, grants and funding, speeding issues, berm mowing and fence issues.

Activities: 8 June 2019 to 7 July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 June</td>
<td>Hobson Bay and Basin Clean-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June</td>
<td>Local Board Chairs Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland NZ Transport Agency NLTP workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Heliers Village Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 June</td>
<td>East City Trust presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council Planners meeting regarding resource consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Reserves Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kohimarama / Mission Bay residents meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 June</td>
<td>Meeting with Ellerslie Residents Association Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June</td>
<td>Karaka Bay meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair-Deputy Chair meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ōrākei Local Board workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 June</td>
<td>Ōrākei Basin Walkway Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Walking School Bus Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June</td>
<td>Glover Park War Memorial Tree Rededication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 June</td>
<td>Ōrākei Local Board agenda run through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clonbern Road Carpark meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
St Heliers and Glendowie Residents Association
Ellerslie Residents Association Administration meeting

18 June  
Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Hui
NACRAs Event update

19 June  
Mayor in Ōrākei – St Heliers Community Centre

20 June  
Chair / Relationship Manager catch up
Ōrākei Local Board business meeting
Noises Talk evening – Outboard Boating Club

23 June  
Newmarket stream planting day

25 June  
Chair / PA catch-up
Auckland Transport update

26 June  
Eastern Bays Network meeting
Outboard Boating Club update to the Local Board
Stonefields Residents Association

27 June  
Chair – Deputy Chair meeting
Ōrākei Local Board workshop

28 June  
Amplify - Ōrākei Youth Leadership Workshop

29 June  
Waiata Reserve planting day

1 July  
Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority Hui
St Heliers Village Association

2 July  
2nd Mission Bay working group meeting
Mission Bay Business Association
Mission Bay / Kohimarama Residents Association

4 July  
Ōrākei Local Board workshop

Parks and Reserves

Churchill Park

3. The Churchill Park Pathways project is on-track. The two boardwalks are 90 per cent complete and site excavations are finished. Two of the six planned farm gates have been installed and three of the four pathway transitions from wooden walkway to aggregate surface are completed. The boardwalks will have mesh covering and safety rails installed.

Waitarua Reserve

4. The Local Board has received early notice of a planting day in this reserve on 17 August 2019 at 1pm. Members of the public are welcome to join their Local Board Members and take part in the planting. Although a small supply of garden tools will be available, people are asked to bring a spade, sunhat and wear suitable clothing and footwear at this working-bee event. Come along and meet your neighbours.

Landowner Approval and Leases

Landowner Approvals

- Wastewater and stormwater connections were approved for Stonesfields
- The Lawry Reserve, Ellerslie existing deck upgrade has been approved
- Ngake Walkway temporary access and storage has been approved

Leasing

Kohimarama Yacht Club – Madills Farm (storage facility) lease

5. Discussions to be held between the Local Board and the Club regarding the future of the site at Tamaki Drive.
Eastern Sub Football Club – Madills Farm lease
6. Discussions to be held between the Local Board and the Club regarding future expansion plans at the site.

Tāmaki Yacht Club – Atkin Avenue
7. Consultation with iwi at the Mana Whenua Forum on the classification of the site has taken place and the lease will continue to roll over until the Omnibus Management Reserve Plan is complete.

Remuera Parnell Sports Trust – Shore Road Reserve
8. Council is working on options regarding complex issues with the proposed variation and the new lease.

Ellerslie Sports Club – Michaels Avenue (YMCA building)
9. The streamlines renewal is under review and the Local Board will be notified once approved.

Community Awareness
Increased bird numbers in Ōrākei Local Board Area
10. Bird life in the Ōrākei Local Board area is on the increase and examples of the variety viewed in the Basset Road (Remuera) area is shown below. The local board’s drive to eradicate pests in the eastern areas is proving to be effective in encouraging birds to the area and to multiply their numbers. (Photos supplied by Ian Judson, United Kingdom)

11. Contributing to the increase in bird life is the planting done by volunteers who have been very generous with their weekend. Sunday, 23 June 2019 was the annual planting day with volunteers from Conservation Volunteers NZ (77 volunteers from all over the world and across Auckland). 1200 plants were laid out in their correct place and planted around the Newmarket Stream.

Kingfisher

Pukako

Fantail

Tui
Ellerslie Recreation Centre
12. The old air conditioning units have been removed from the roof and re-roofing will commence. Gym fitness equipment has been relocated into the adjacent sports hall to allow for floor reconditioning and replacement of the glass skylight.

Review of the Walking Access Act 2008
13. The Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) is reviewing the Walking Access Act 2008 which is about providing free access to the outdoors for walking and for types of access that may be associated with walking, such as access with firearms, dogs, bicycles, or motor vehicles and is seeking feedback on what is working well and what could be improved.

14. A copy of the Board’s feedback is attached (Attachment B).

Michaels Avenue Reserve Community Liaison Committee
15. No meetings were held during the past month.

Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Reserves Board
16. The minutes of the meeting held on 11 June are attached to this report.

Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority Hui 48
17. The Agenda and Minutes of the meeting held on 1 July are attached to this report.

Attachments
Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Reserves Board Minutes - 11 June 2019
Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority Hui 48 – 1 July Agenda and Minutes
Ōrākei Local Board submission on the Walking Access Act
Signatory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kit Parkinson – Chairperson, Ōrākei Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>4 July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ōrākei Local Board (the Board) supports increasing and promoting public access to the outdoors through walking, cycling and horse riding.

The Board adopted the Ōrākei Local Paths Plan in 2016 and continues to implement the plan to improve the open space network for walking, cycling and ecological connections. There are many key benefits to increasing walking access, including:
- Recreation
- Environmental
- Transport
- Social
- Health
- Education
- Economic.

The Board supports the role of the Walking Access Commission in overseeing the increase in public access to the outdoors, particularly for recreational, environmental and economic benefits.

The Board notes the crucial role community groups play in developing and maintaining connected public access in both rural and urban settings.

The Board supports mechanisms provided for by the Walking Access Act to community groups and private individuals in developing more public walking and cycling access, particularly when it creates options for better access to other public amenities and recreation areas.

The Board strongly supports the Walking Access easements, in particular, extending this opportunity over unformed legal roads. For example, the Board is investigating options to extend public walking and cycling access through the unformed section of Ballarat Street in Ellerslie which is widely supported by the local community.

The Board supports the investigation of an easement for a public walking and cycling route from Ōrākei Point to Judges Bay via the south side of the rail line across Hobson Bay.
Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Reserves Board
OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Reserves Board held in the Town Hall, 301 Queen Street, Auckland on Tuesday, 11 June 2019 at 4.00pm.

PRESENT
Chairperson
Member Marama Royal
Deputy Chairperson
Cr Desley Simpson, JP
Member Renata Blair
Members
Cr Linda Cooper, JP
Member Kit Parkinson

ABSENT
Member Wyllis Maithi

IN ATTENDANCE
Jamie Sinclair
Jane Aickin
Manu Pihana
Munen Prakash
Tom Irvine
Maea Petherick
Chief Executive Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Trust
Kaiwhakahaere Te Waka Tai-ranga-whenua
Programme Manager
Lead Financial Advisor
General Manager Ōkahu Raku
Senior Governance Advisor
Attachment C

Item 18
Chairperson's Report

1. Apologies

Resolution number NGA/2019/14

MOVED by Mr R Blair, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Simpson:

That the Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Reserves Board:

a) accept the apology from Member W Malhi for absence.

CARRIED

2. Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Confirmation of Minutes

Resolution number NGA/2019/15

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson D Simpson, seconded by Mr K Parkinson:

That the Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Reserves Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Monday, 13 May 2019, as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

4. Extraordinary Business

There was no extraordinary business.

5. Minutes of the Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Reserves Board meeting, 13 May 2019

The minutes were confirmed at item 3.

6. Pourewa Creek Recreation Reserve entranceway and nursery developments

Resolution number NGA/2019/16

MOVED by Mr R Blair, seconded by Mr K Parkinson:

That the Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Reserves Board:

a) authorise expenditure of up to $1.88m in the 2019/20 financial year to complete the Pourewa entranceway and nursery development.

b) note that the Pourewa Creek Recreation Reserve entrance way and nursery works have been granted resource consent and it is forecast the works will be completed by May 2020.

c) note that the Pourewa Nursery Project in line with the project charter (attachment A of the report) has been approved to commence and $220k has been approved from the 2018/19 budget (see resolution NGA/2019/10).

CARRIED
7 Financial reforecast and revision of the Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Reserves Board Financial Plan

Resolution number NGA/2019/17

MOVED by Mr R Blair, seconded by Cr L Cooper:

That the Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Reserves Board:

a) approve the capital budget reforecast in Attachment A of the report

b) request management to revise the Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Reserves Board Financial Plan 2018-28 by replacing the capital table currently included in this plan with the reforecast shown in attachment A of the report.

CARRIED

Whakawātea

Member Renata Blair closed the meeting with a karakia.

4.32pm

The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE NGĀTI WHĀTUA ŌRĀKEI RESERVES BOARD HELD ON

DATE: ..........................................................

CHAIRPERSON: ............................................
Date: Monday, 1 July 2019
Time: 3.30pm
Venue: Reception Lounge
Level 2, Auckland Town Hall
301 Queen Street, Auckland

TŪPUNA MAUNGA O TĀMAKI MAKAURAU AUTHORITY
HUI 48 – 1 July 2019
Open Agenda

Chairperson
Paul Majurey
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Marutūahu Rōpū)

Deputy Chairperson
Cr Al Filipaina
Auckland Council (Governing Body)

Members
Cr Josephine Bartley
Auckland Council (Governing Body)
Cr Dr Cathy Casey
Auckland Council (Governing Body)
Glenda Fryer
Auckland Council (Deputy Chair – Albert-Eden Local Board)
Kit Parkinson
Auckland Council (Chair – Ōrākei Local Board)
Malcolm Paterson
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Ngāti Whāitu Rōpū)
Joe Pihema
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Ngāti Whāitu Rōpū)
Hauāuru Rawiri
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Marutūahu Rōpū)
Lenauga Lydia Sosene
Auckland Council (Chair – Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board)
Josie Smith
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Waikumetā-Tāmaki Rōpū)
Karen Wilson
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Waikumetā-Tāmaki Rōpū)
Stefan Corbett
Crown Representative

ITEM TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Apologies
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Confirmation of minutes
4. Maungawhau MT Eden Scout Hall update
5. Maungawhau Kiosk
6. Devonport Folk Music Club Incorporated Lease Renewal
7. Hikoia te Kōrero proposed event
8. Ōhuiaangi planting restoration programme
10. Registers
    A Health & Safety
    B Events
    C Media

(Quorum is 7 members, comprising the chair or deputy chair and 2 members appointed by the rōpū entities and 2 members appointed by Auckland Council)
109 Functions and powers

(1) The Maunga Authority has the powers and functions conferred on it by or under this Act or any other enactment.

(2) In exercising its powers and carrying out its functions in relation to the maunga, the Maunga Authority must have regard to—

(a) the spiritual, ancestral, cultural, customary, and historical significance of the maunga to Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau; and

(b) section 41(2).

(3) In exercising its powers and carrying out its functions in relation to the administered lands, the Maunga Authority must have regard to the spiritual, ancestral, cultural, customary, and historical significance of the administered lands to Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau.

[Emphasis added]

41 Maunga must remain as reserves vested in trustee

(1) This section applies to each maunga once the maunga is—

(a) vested in the trustee under subpart 1, 2, or 3 of this Part; and

(b) declared a reserve under any of sections 18 to 29, 33, and 39.

(2) The maunga is held by the trustee for the common benefit of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau and the other people of Auckland.

[Emphasis added]
Date: Monday, 24 September 2018  
Time: 3.30pm  
Venue: Reception Lounge  
Level 2, Auckland Town Hall  
301 Queen Street, Auckland

---

**TŪPUNA MAUNGĀ O TĀMAKI MAKAURAU AUTHORITY**  
**HUI 48 – 1 July 2019**  
**Open Minutes**

**Chairperson**  
Paul Majurey  
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Marutūāhu Rōpū)

**Members**  
Cr Dr Cathy Casey  
Auckland Council (Governing Body)

Glenda Fryer  
Auckland Council (Deputy Chair – Albert-Eden Local Board)

Kt Parkinson  
Auckland Council (Chair – Ōrākei Local Board)

From 3.16pm, item 5B  
Malcolm Paterson  
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Ngāti Whātau Rōpū)

HeaRūru Rawiri  
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Marutūāhu Rōpū)

Josie Smith  
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Waiohua-Tāmaki Rōpū)

Karen Wilson  
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Waiohua-Tāmaki Rōpū)

**Apologies**  
Karen Adair  
Crown Representative

Cr Josephine Bartley  
Auckland Council (Governing Body)

Cr Alf Filipana  
Auckland Council (Governing Body)

Joe Pihema  
Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (Ngāti Whātau Rōpū)

Leinauga Lydia Sosene  
Auckland Council (Chair – Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board)

---

Nick Turoa, Manager, Tūpuna Maunga Authority opened the hui.
Open Minutes

1. Apologies

Moved: Kit Parkinson          Seconded: Karen Wilson

That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority:

   a. accept the apologies from Malcolm Paterson for timing, and Karen Adair, Cr Bartley, Cr Filipaina, Joe Pihema, and Lemauga Lydia Sosene for absence.

   CARRIED

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Confirmation of Minutes

Moved: Kit Parkinson          Seconded: Karen Wilson

That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority:

   a. confirm the minutes of Hui 39 held on Monday, 27 August 2018, as a true and accurate record.

   CARRIED

4. Matukutūruru entranceway concept

Moved: Hauāuru Rawiri          Seconded: Josie Smith

That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority:

   a. adopt the design for the Matukutūruru entranceway as set out in the report.

   b. note the wider concept design for Matukutūruru.

   CARRIED
Malcolm Paterson joined the meeting at 3.16pm.

5. Registers

Moved: Cr Casey          Seconded: Glenda Fryer

That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority:

a. note the attached Registers, which have been updated since Hui 39 (27 August 2018).

CARRIED

3:18pm  The Chairperson thanked members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

Nick Turoa closed the hui.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE TŪPUNA MAUNGA O TĀMAKI MAKARAU Authority HELD ON

DATE:.............................................................................................................................................

CHAIRPERSON:..........................................................................................................................
Open Agenda

1. **Apologies**
   
   No apologies had been received at the close of the agenda.

2. **Declarations 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.

3. **Confirmation of Minutes**

   That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority:

   a. **confirm** the minutes of Hui 39 held on Monday, 24 September 2018, as a true and accurate record.
Maungawhau/ MT Eden Scout Hall update

Nicholas Turoa, Tūpuna Maunga Manager; Dominic Wilson, Head of Co-Governance

| Purpose | To seek agreement from the Tūpuna Maunga Authority to negotiate a lease with Youhtown for the old scout hall situated on Maungawhau/ Mount Eden. |
| Recommendations | That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority delegates to the Chair and Deputy Chair the authority to negotiate and execute a five + five year lease with Youhtown for the old scout hall at Maungawhau/Mt Eden upon the standard terms and conditions of Tūpuna Maunga leases. |

Background

1. At Hui 33 (9 February 2018), Management advised the Tūpuna Maunga Authority (Authority) that the Scouts Association of New Zealand (Scouts) was not seeking another lease at Maungawhau/ Mt Eden.

2. At Hui 38 (23 July 2018), Management provided a building assessment of the Scout Hall (owned by the Scouts Association) estimating approximately $116,500 to bring the building back to a standard where it would pass a Building Warrant of Fitness.

3. At Hui 46 (6 May 2019), Management briefed the Authority on the public expressions of interest process and received feedback.

4. The Scouts have formally confirmed that they will not seek compensation if the Tūpuna Maunga Authority wishes to occupy the building or lease the property to another tenant.

Statutory context

5. The process and any decision to lease space within a reserve must take into account the legislative and policy framework.


7. Section 109(2) of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 requires the Authority to have regard to the spiritual, ancestral, cultural, customary, and historical significance of the maunga to Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau and that the tūpuna maunga is held in trust for Ngā Mana Whenua and the other people of Auckland.

8. The Tūpuna Maunga Authority’s Integrated Management Plan was adopted by the Authority in terms of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 and the Reserves Act 1977. The Integrated Management Plan describes a series of “Values” and “Pathways” that guide all activities on the tūpuna maunga.

9. Under s54 of the Reserves Act 1977 the Authority should consider whether any business that is offered a lease is necessary to enable the public to obtain the benefit and enjoyment of the space or for the convenience of persons using the space. Before granting any lease the
Authority must make a public notice and offer to hear any submissions (pursuant to s119 and s120 of the Reserves Act 1977).

10. The Tōpuna Maunga are within the catchments that support the Hauraki Gulf. The purpose of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000, among other matters, is to "recognise the historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship of the tangata whenua with the Hauraki Gulf".

Delegation

11. Management recommend that the Authority authorise the Chair and Deputy Chair to engage with Youhtown to negotiate and execute a lease for the old scout hall at Maungawhau from a time to be negotiated until 30 September 2029.
Maungawhau Kiosk

Authors: Dominic Wilson, Nicholas Turoa, Tūpuna Maunga Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To conclude lease agreement/s for the kiosk at Maungawhau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority delegates to the Chair and Deputy Chair the authority to negotiate and execute leases with Te Manu Taupua Limited for Areas 1 and 2 of the Kiosk building at Maungawhau/ Mt Eden and upon the standard terms and conditions of Tūpuna Maunga leases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

1. At Hui 37 (18 June 2018), the Authority requested Management to undertake a publicly advertised process seeking proposals of interest in the kiosk site. At Hui 41 (29 October 2018) the Authority considered leases for the main area as a café (Area 2) and agreed to offer a lease to Pūha & Pakehā. At Hui 42 (3 December 2019) the Authority agreed to offer a lease for Area 1 to Te Manu Taupua Limited to sell ice-creams until 24 November 2019.

**Statutory context**

2. The process and any decision to lease space within a reserve must take into account the legislative and policy framework.


4. Section 109(2) of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 requires the Authority to have regard to the spiritual, ancestral, cultural, customary, and historical significance of the maunga to Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau and that the tūpuna maunga is held in trust for Ngā Mana Whenua and the other people of Auckland.

5. The Tūpuna Maunga Authority’s Integrated Management Plan was adopted by the Authority in terms of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 and the Reserves Act 1977. The Integrated Management Plan describes a series of “Values” and “Pathways” that guide all activities on the tūpuna maunga.

6. Under s54 of the Reserves Act 1977 the Authority should consider whether any business that is offered a lease is necessary to enable the public to obtain the benefit and enjoyment of the space or for the convenience of persons using the space. Before granting any lease the Authority must make a public a notice and offer to hear any submissions (pursuant to s119 and s120 of the Reserves Act 1977).

7. The Tūpuna Maunga are within the catchments that support the Hauraki Gulf. The purpose of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000, among other matters, is to “recognise the historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship of the tangata whenua with the Hauraki Gulf”.

**Completing leases for the kiosk**

8. Management have undertaken various negotiations for leasing the Kiosk areas with Pūha & Pakehā and Te Manu Taupua Limited and suggest that the Authority authorise the Chair and
Deputy Chair to engage with Te Manu Taupua Limited to negotiate and execute a lease or leases for a café and for ice-cream sales within Areas 1 and 2 of the Kiosk.
Devonport Folk Music Club Incorporated Lease Renewal

Author: Dominic Wilson, Tūpuna Maunga Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To report on a recommended lease renewal for the Devonport Folk Music Club at Takarunga/Mount Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Recommendations | That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority:  
  a. resolves to accept the exercise of the right of renewal of the existing lease to 15 May 2029 by the Devonport Folk Music Club Incorporated,  
  b. directs Management to request the Devonport Folk Music Club to agree to Maunga Outcomes Plan |

Background

1. The Devonport Folk Music Club’s (the Club) lease expired on 15 May 2019 but is the subject of a final right of renewal for a further ten years until 15 May 2029. The Club has confirmed it wishes to renew its lease.

Renewal of Expired Lease

2. Since this is a renewal of an existing lease, no new terms may be added without the agreement of the Club. Nevertheless, Management will discuss with the Club the potential for including a Maunga Outcomes Plan to accompany the lease and which could require the Club to carry out activities that contribute to the health and well-being of the maunga.

3. The Maunga Outcomes Plan sets out activities for each year that the lessee will do to contribute to the health and well-being of the Tūpuna Maunga. The activities to be carried out by the lessees are co-designed by the lessees and Authority management and reflect the Tūpuna Maunga values. The lessee would also agree to a series of measures within the Maunga Outcomes Plan that track progress.

Statutory context

4. The process and any decision to lease space within a reserve must take into account the legislative and policy framework, but also recognises that the lessee has existing legal rights.

5. The Authority administers the Tūpuna Maunga under the Reserves Act 1977 and pursuant to Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014. The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 is also relevant.

6. Section 109(2) of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 requires the Authority to have regard to the spiritual, ancestral, cultural, customary, and historical significance of the maunga to Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau and that the tūpuna maunga is held in trust for Ngā Mana Whenua and the other people of Auckland.

8. The Tūpuna Maunga are within the catchments that support the Hauraki Gulf. The purpose of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000, among other matters, is to "recognise the historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship of the tangata whenua with the Hauraki Gulf".

Attachments
   A. Some background information on the Devonport Folk Music Club Incorporated
Attachment A: Some background to the Devonport Folk Music Club Incorporated

1. The Devonport Folk Music Club Incorporated (the Club) is the Lease holder and occupier of a building erected on Takarunga/Mount Victoria. The Club is described in the following websites:
   - http://www.visitdevonport.co.nz/the-bunker
   - http://www.devonportfolkmusic.co.nz/

2. The websites state that the club has been going for over 46 years. They meet every Monday evening and some Sundays.

3. The Auckland Council owns the building that the Club occupies (the Bunker). The lease location is shown below in red:
4. The actual lease area is shown in red above (from the lease document).

5. The Club’s lease expired on 15 May 2019 but is the subject of a final right of renewal for a further five years until 15 May 2029. The Club has confirmed it wishes to renew its lease.

6. Accordingly, if the Club renews its lease then it will be upon the existing lease terms. The lease states that the land can be used as a “Folk Music Club”.
Hikoia te Kōrero proposed event

Authors: Nick Turoa, Manager Tūpuna Maunga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To determine a request to hold the Hikoia te Kōrero event at Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. approve the Hikoia te Kōrero event to be held at Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill on Thursday 12 September 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. direct management to provide support for the event, funded by Auckland Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of request

1. The Authority has received an application from Auckland Council to hold the Hikoia te Kōrero (Walk the Talk) event at Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill on Thursday 12 September 2019. This is an event to celebrate the importance of te Reo Māori during Te Wiki o te Reo Māori / Māori Language Week.

2. Hikoia Te Kōrero celebrates the anniversary for when the late Hana Jackson delivered a petition to parliament demanding that te Reo was taught in New Zealand Schools. Hikoia Te Kōrero began in Wellington in 2016 and is now a national event with hundreds of schools, businesses and agencies participating.

3. Last Year two Hikoia te Kōrero events were held in Manukau and Aotea Square respectively. Tūpuna Maunga Management participated alongside members of the Authority in the Aotea Square event.

Statutory and other considerations


5. Section 109(2) of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 requires the Authority to have regard to the spiritual, ancestral, cultural, customary, and historical significance of the maunga to Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau and that the tūpuna maunga is held in trust for Ngā Mana Whenua and the other people of Auckland.

6. The Tūpuna Maunga Authority’s Integrated Management Plan (IMP) was adopted by the Authority in terms of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 and the Reserves Act 1977. The Integrated Management Plan describes a series of “Values” and
“Pathways” that guide all activities on the Tūpuna maunga. The primary focus of the IMP is to protect the health and well-being of the Tūpuna Maunga. There are also objectives to ensure mana whenua are reconnected with the maunga and to their stories, traditions and history on the maunga (pp56-58, 60-63, and 72-74). In particular the IMP looks to explore opportunities for walks that celebrate Māori culture and provide unique spaces for community gatherings (pp 80-83).

7. The Tūpuna Maunga are within the catchments that support the Hauraki Gulf. The purpose of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000, among other matters, is to “recognise the historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship of the tangata whenua with the Hauraki Gulf”.

Tūpuna Maunga event permits and thresholds

8. An event permit is required for any organised event on the maunga that has event related infrastructure and/or more than 50 people; including community picnics and ceremonies. The Tūpuna Maunga Authority Events Rōpu consider the majority of event applications. However in the case of major events such as this, the Rōpu will generally refer these to the wider authority for a decision.

9. Events are considered major events when:
   a. Is likely to be significant disruption to maunga operations, maunga visitors or neighbouring properties.
   b. Any activity where there is likely to be significant mana whenua or public interest
   c. Any activity that involves earthworks.

10. In consideration of the size of this event and the likely interest and participation of mana whenua in this event, the proposal is a major event. There are no earthworks as part of this event.

Proposed Event outline

11. The current proposal is to stage a Hikoi (parade) from the bottom of Summit Drive to the tihi of the maunga. The hikoi will move continuously to the tihi of the maunga, around the loop road and conclude back down at the grassed area in the front of Stardome. Figure 1 outlines the Hikoi route. Upon arrival at Stardome, The hikoi will be met by Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau where a pōwhiri will take place. After the pōwhiri, there will be information stalls from various organisations for participants to engage with. The Tūpuna Maunga marquee will be set up on site during the event. There will also be food vendors selling kai, bouncy castles and a kaumātua tent set up. This will be managed by the Auckland Council Events Team. Tūpuna Maunga management staff will be involved in the planning of the event.
12. Based on previous year numbers it is anticipated that between 3,000 and 5,000 people are likely to participate in the hikoi. This will include Kura Kaupapa, Kohanga Reo and Puna Reo from around Tāmaki Makaurau.

Health and Safety considerations

13. As part of the event all roads will be closed from vehicle traffic from the beginning of the day through to after the event has been packed down. There will also be parking restrictions. Signage will be on site in days leading up to the event advising of road closures. A full Traffic Management Plan will be required from the applicant prior to the event taking place. Figure 2 outlines the proposed road closures and signage for the event.
14. The event organiser have engaged specialists to advise on the appropriate number of pedestrians that can safely walk to the tihi at any one time. They have anticipated that the road has the capacity to accommodate the expected number of participants provided that people walk in a continuous stream from the beginning of the hikoi until it reaches its end destination. This means that the hikoi will walk up the left side of the road on the way to the tihi, around the loop and back down the other side of the road on their way down. People will not be able to stop at the tihi.

15. To mitigate this, the event organiser will make the route using road cones and signs indicating the direction to walk.

16. There will also be an ambulance and drink station along the tihi road. A mini bus will also be utilised to carry kuia and kaumatua along the route.
17. Prior to the event a full health and safety plan will be required from the applicant outlining methodology to eliminate or mitigate all potential hazards associated with the proposed event.

Event Set out

18. Figure 2 outlines the event set up.

19. The following table outlines the proposed facilities and utilities required for the event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portaloos/Toilets:</th>
<th>2 toilets at Olive Grove carpark for participants prior to hikoi. 11 toilets installed in/near event site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structures:</td>
<td>Cones used on Summit Drive to aide crowd control. Water station at mid-way carpark on summit drive and at tīhōi carpark entrance. Event Site:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staging with cover and PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3x3 marquee for stalls (weighted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chairs/benches for kaumātua and tamānki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pacific mats on grass for rangatahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Catering BBQ and CCBs for queue management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Electricity / Gas / Power / Generator: | Generator for stage PA and stalls if required (requesting access to power on site if available). |
| Drone | 1 drone will be utilised to capture photography of the hikoi to the tīhi of the maunga |

**Conditions**

20. The following conditions will be in place to manage the impacts of this event:
   a. The Tūpuna Maunga are alcohol and smoke free spaces. Alcohol and smoking is not permitted at any time during this event.
   b. The applicant will provide a health and safety plan for event
   c. The applicant will provide a waste management plan and ensure no rubbish is left on the maunga.
   d. Pedestrian access to the maunga must be made available to other members of the public at all time during the event
   e. The applicant will provide an approved Traffic Management Plan for the event.
   f. The applicant will provide appropriate security for the event.
   g. The applicant will ensure that all participants remain on the road or formed pathways and tracks as part of the hikoi.
   h. The Tūpuna Maunga Authority will be provided with high resolution copies of all photographs from the event.
   i. The applicant will comply with the Tūpuna Maunga Authority Drone Policy.
   j. The event details must be approved by the Tūpuna Maunga Authority.
   k. The applicant will liaise with the Tūpuna Maunga Communications Manager on all communications.
   l. The Tūpuna Maunga brand will be included on all communications and publications where practical.
   m. The applicant will follow the direction of the Tūpuna Taonga Trust on all matters of tikanga.
   n. The applicant will compensate Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau for their involvement in the event.
   o. Public Acknowledgement of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority and Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau for allowing the event to occur.

**Fees**

21. The Tūpuna Maunga Fee schedule determines that no application or location fee will be charged for Auckland Council run events that can demonstrate a positive contribution to the protection and enhancement of the Tūpuna Maunga and/or relationship of Mana Whenua.

**Next steps**

22. Management considers that this proposed event is in natural alignment with the IMP and should be approved.

23. If the Authority approves the application, Management will support the event organisers as necessary.
Ōhuiarangi planting restoration programme

Authors: Jordan Winiata, Nicholas Turoa, Tūpuna Maunga Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To update the Tūpuna Maunga Authority on the Ōhuiarangi planting restoration programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>That the Authority note the planting days scheduled for Ōhuiarangi / Pigeon Mountain for 27 July and 3 August 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planting Restoration Programme

1. Work has begun on a programme to restore native vegetation and habitat for native wildlife on Ōhuiarangi / Pigeon Mountain. Over 30,000 new native shrubs and trees will be planted in selected locations on the maunga.

2. During this year 500 native shrubs will be planted on the thī terraces and another 1200 native shrubs and trees around the old quarry slope areas of the maunga. Some of the 30,000 new native shrubs and trees being added around the wetland ecological area on the western side of Pigeon Mountain Road will be planted this Autumn, and the remaining over 2020-2021.

3. Two public planting days have been publicised for 10am to 1pm on Saturday 27 July and on Saturday 3 August 2019 at the maunga. Attached is a pamphlet setting out the details (Attachment A).

4. A further two days of planting by local schools are also scheduled for the maunga in late August.

Attachment

A Ōhuiarangi planting days pamphlet.
PLANTING DAYS
Ōhuiarangi / Pigeon Mountain

Nau mai haere mai

Join us in planting thousands of native shrubs and trees at the Ōhuiarangi / Pigeon Mountain wetland.

Bring your own spade and gardening gloves if you have them. Some spades will be provided, along with sunscreen, water, snacks and a BBQ. Follow signs opposite the maunga carpark on Pigeon Mountain Rd.

DATES  Saturday 27 July and Saturday 3 August
TIME  10.00 am to 1.00 pm

Register your interest and preferred date to:
jordan.winiata@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Help fight against Kauri Dieback disease.
Bring only clean footwear and equipment.
## Operational Plan 2019-20

*Authors:* Dominic Wilson, Nicholas Turoa, Tūpuna Maunga Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To update on the Tūpuna Maunga Authority’s Operational Plan 2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority note that the Tūpuna Maunga Authority’s Operational Plan 2019/20 has been agreed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. At Hui 47 (7 June 2019), the Authority adopted the Tūpuna Maunga Authority’s Operational Plan 2019-20 and the Summary.


3. These documents are now agreed in terms of s80(1) of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014.

4. Management will insert photographs of Tūpuna Maunga in the Operational Plan and other pictures as required. Management will then have the Operational Plan formatted and printed with appropriate Tūpuna Maunga Authority collateral.
Registers

Authors: Nick Turoa; Mike George, Tūpuna Maunga Authority

| Purpose | To provide the Tūpuna Maunga Authority with updated registers for:
|         |   c. Health & Safety (Attachment A)
|         |   d. Events (Attachment B)
|         |   e. Media coverage (Attachment C) |

Recommendations

That the Tūpuna Maunga Authority note the attached Registers, which have been updated since Hui 47 (7 June 2019).

Registers

1. Attachment A - Health & Safety Register.

2. Attachment B - Events Register.

3. Attachment C - Media Register.
## Attachment A: Health and Safety Register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hui reported to</th>
<th>Maunga</th>
<th>Summary of Incident</th>
<th>Number of any near misses</th>
<th>Outcome of investigations into any incidents and near misses</th>
<th>Health and Safety management matters arising</th>
<th>Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hui 48         | Maungakiekie | Octopus play equipment was found broken off, rusting at the top was the cause |                         |                                            | Potential injury to public | - Cordoned off, remaining ems chained to base to prevent use.  
- Management investigating alternative replacements for this playground piece. |
| Hui 48         | Ohirereu | Arborist reported that pine tree was actively failing and that removal was needed as soon as possible. |                         | Investigated methodology for removal, for health and safety reasons controlled felling was only the viable option.  
An Archeologist reviewed the methodology and identified safe places to drop the tree without damage to any archaeology | Tree was situated near the track, but leaning down the hill, potential injury to public and damage track as well as archeology if left to fall naturally. | The Tree was felled by a professional arborist  
Area was closed off during operation.  
Afterwards, the tree was made safe by cutting branches and ensuring trunk would not move, left in situ. |
| Hui 48         | Ōwairaka / Te Ahi-kū-ū-Rakataura / Mt Albert | Contractor verbally abused by maunga visitor because they were upset that the whau trees planted in carpark were not native and belonged at Maungawhau. Visitor also physically blocking cars from leaving the carpark. |                         | | | Notified police of the incident. Followed up with contractor to ensure she is alright. |
| Hui 48         | Maungawhau | Alarmed by police report of a male fisher that had been exposing himself to females the early morning and afternoons in the maunga. |                         | Police conducting their own investigation. | | Notified staff, contractors, volunteer groups of this risk. |
| Hui 47         | Otahuhu | Four bulls escaped from Auckland Meat Processors abattoir onto Great South road and crossed over into the maunga on the Mt Richmond side. The police were contacted and bulls were shot.  
No damage to the maunga was spotted. |                         | | Bulls were reported as aggressive and a risk to public safety | Followed up with Auckland Meat Processors to check that their fences and gates had been checked and secure. |
<p>| Hui 47         | Maungawhau | Roofing contractor not operating safely and fell off half way down a ladder | 1 | The contractor did not follow their health and safety procedures or best practice for working on ladders. | Contractor management | Review internal process for managing contract health and safety requirements |
| Hui 46         | Maungakiekie | Contractor failed to unlock the security bars on playground fort. A child entered the fort and became caught in the gap | | | Safety requirements of playground equipment | The security bars will be replaced with a catch so that this incident cannot happen again |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hui reported to</th>
<th>Maunga</th>
<th>Summary of Incident</th>
<th>Number of any near misses</th>
<th>Outcome of investigations into any incidents and near misses</th>
<th>Health and Safety management matters arising</th>
<th>Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hui 46</td>
<td>Ōwariake / Te Ahitā-tōa-Rakataura / Mt Albert</td>
<td>Increase of dog droppings being reported by contractors at Ōwariake.</td>
<td></td>
<td>health and wellbeing issues for contractors</td>
<td>New dog dropping bin being ordered for installation near the dog fountain by the near carpark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 46</td>
<td>Te Pana a Mataoho / Te Ara Pueru / Mangere Mountain</td>
<td>Individuals breached site security during tree removal operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>individuals were escorted out of the processing area but remained behind the safety cordon line. Police were called and the incident logged with the police.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 45</td>
<td>Ōwariake / Te Ahitā-tōa-Rakataura / Mt Albert</td>
<td>A group of adults drinking in their car at the titihana’s agreement with contractors for the tree removal operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Security on the maunga.</td>
<td>Police called and group fled. A media release was put out making people aware of dangerous behaviour on the maunga.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 45</td>
<td>Te Tahu a Rakiura</td>
<td>Mowing contractors report that the amount of dog litter left in mowed areas is getting worse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health and wellbeing issues for contractors.</td>
<td>Flyers handed out to members of the public asking them to pick up after their dogs. Engaged with Local Board Members to put information on social media.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 44</td>
<td>Maungakioke</td>
<td>Contractor assaulted while working near Stardome</td>
<td>Neighbour tried 3 times to hit a Cornwall Park Trust Board staff member with a piece of a concrete block. Verbal abuse contractor and showed him the chest. Final throw of breeze block also narrowly missed passing member of public.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Police called and attended. Trespass notice issued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 44</td>
<td>Maungawhau</td>
<td>Visitor has injured ankle on the track</td>
<td>Tourist was walking up to the trig when he has injured his ankle, requiring an ambulance. Unable to get any more information from paramedics due to privacy reasons and tourist spoke limited English.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambulance called and attended. Track upgrade this year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 44</td>
<td>Takarunga</td>
<td>Car attempted to drive around track, became stuck on a slope</td>
<td>The incident occurred approx. 12.30am 5th of February. Person has used his employers 4WD Ute to drive around the lower track to attempt to bypass auto gate.</td>
<td>Fence and gate was damaged and needed repair.</td>
<td>Incident reported to police. Bill for damages and time to be passed onto offender.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui reported to</td>
<td>Maunga</td>
<td>Summary of Incident</td>
<td>Number of any near misses</td>
<td>Outcome of investigations into any incidents and near misses</td>
<td>Health and Safety management matters arising</td>
<td>Actions Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 43</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>Car driving into fence and abandoned</td>
<td></td>
<td>Has come to the end to realise he can’t get through, attempted to reverse back down the path but has become stuck on the slope below the track.</td>
<td>Incident related to car. Reason for incident.</td>
<td>Offender will be trespassing from ngi Topuna Maunga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 43</td>
<td>Maungawhau</td>
<td>Visitor broke ankle on tihi track</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist was walking up to the trig when she tripped and broke ankle.</td>
<td>A new fence for the maunga is now required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 43</td>
<td>Maungawhau</td>
<td>Visitor had a minor heart attack in the car park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist walking up summit road had a minor heart attack.</td>
<td>Summarising Field Officers offered to contact emergency services – this offer was refused by the visitor in question. He eventually self-administered his own medication and left the maunga on his own accord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 42</td>
<td>Maungarie</td>
<td>A small grass fire approximately 5m x 7m occurred on Maungarie. The fire occurred above the summit road and was put out by the Fire and Emergency Department. The fire occurred on Guy Fawkes Night. 5 &quot;Roman Candles&quot; were found at the tihi car park.</td>
<td></td>
<td>All maunga had signage put up and extra patrols by the security contractor organised. We are still awaiting a final report from the Fire Department on the incident.</td>
<td>Management will be meeting with our security contractor and the Fire Department to review processes prior to the Christmas and New Year Period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 41</td>
<td>Maungakiekie</td>
<td>Incident where a Father and son were reported in the Archery field area with a BB gun</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hue Lodge visitor centre were informed by a member of the public who then contacted Matrix security to investigate. The security officer then approached the two males who immediately made the gun safe. The officer advised them that they could not use the gun in the maunga and explained the safety reasons and confirmed it was a breach of park rules. The two males packed up their equipment and left the car park.</td>
<td>Safety protocols for Security staff to follow up when attending to these incidents - Police should have been requested to attend</td>
<td>Refreshing SOP training for Matrix Security officers working in both Maungakiekie and Cornwall Park. All security officers to review personal safety and lone worker policy and procedures. Topuna Maunga Management team to run through Emergency Response Plan reporting requirements with Cornwall Park Trust Board and Recreational Services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment B: Events Register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hui reported to</th>
<th>Maunga</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Event date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hui 48</td>
<td>Maungakiekie</td>
<td>Ngāti Whāitu Whai Maia – Drone photography</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>25/06/2019</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 48</td>
<td>Takarunga</td>
<td>TVP Japanese Travel Show</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>08/09/2019</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 48</td>
<td>Maungakiekie</td>
<td>IDFNZ Kids Foundation Fun Run</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>26/05/2019</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 47</td>
<td>Maungawhau</td>
<td>Griffis Kiwi Adventure Ltd</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>21/05/19</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 47</td>
<td>Maungawhau</td>
<td>City of Auckland Morris Dancers</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>01/05/2019</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 46</td>
<td>Īwirerika</td>
<td>Fuhu Films</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>23/04/19</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>$1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 46</td>
<td>Takarunga</td>
<td>Combined Churches of Devonport</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>19/04/19</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 45</td>
<td>Pukerewi Puketapapa</td>
<td>Filipino Catholic Church</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>19/04/19</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 46</td>
<td>Te Pane a Mataoho Mangere</td>
<td>St Theresse Parish</td>
<td>Community 15</td>
<td>19/04/19</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 46</td>
<td>Maungakiekie</td>
<td>University of Auckland</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>04/04/19</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>$380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 45</td>
<td>Maungawhau Tahaki</td>
<td>Auckland Down syndrome Association Buddy Walk</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>17/03/19</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 45</td>
<td>Maungauika</td>
<td>NZHL XRACE – Davenport</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>24/02/19</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>$380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 45</td>
<td>Maungakiekie</td>
<td>ANCOP Walk 2019</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>23/02/19</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>$280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 44</td>
<td>No events for Hui 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 43</td>
<td>Maungakiekie</td>
<td>Gladstone School – End of Year fun day</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>16/12/2018</td>
<td>Cancelled – due to weather</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 43</td>
<td>Maungakiekie</td>
<td>Greenlane Christian Centre</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>03/12/2018</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 43</td>
<td>Maungawhau</td>
<td>Baha'i Spiritual Assembly – Christmas Kids day</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>01/12/2018</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 43</td>
<td>Maungawhau</td>
<td>Auckland Grammar School – end of year concert</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>22/11/2018</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui 43</td>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>Lilian Moala – 10 year wedding anniversary with a vow renewal ceremony</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>17/11/2018</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Takarunga Pou

14 June – Devonport Flagstaff
‘Mountain monument plan active but inactive’

Mountain monument plan active but inactive

A pou monument planned for the top of Takarunga/Mt Victoria is still on local authority documents – but the Tūpuna Maunga Authority knows nothing about it.

A key initiative in the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Agreement 2018/2019 is to: “Work with the Tūpuna Maunga Authority and local community groups to install a pou on Takarunga - Mt Victoria.”

A Pouwhenua or pou whenua (land post) is a carved wooden post used by Māori, to mark territorial boundaries or places of significance.

The Flagstaff asked the Tūpuna Maunga Authority about the status of the proposed pou, Authority chair Paul Majurey said: “There is no proposal for a pou at the tihi of Takarunga / Mt Victoria, and there have been no discussions about a pou between the Tūpuna Maunga Authority and the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board.”

A spokesperson for the authority asked: “Have you come across misinformation about a pou on social media?”

Board chair George Wood said officers had told him a decision was made to not proceed with the proposal for a monument on top of the mountain.

He would be investigating further how it was still in the board agreement,

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Hui

14 June – Devonport Flagstaff
‘Editor comment’

By Rob Drent

I’m uneasy about these behind-closed-doors meetings, which seem to have gained credence in the past year of the board’s term. Board briefings with the Maunga Authority and Auckland Transport (AT) are being held out of sight of the public and the media.

The local board, battered down by its lack of influence over key decisions in its patch, seems to be taking the line that it needs to cosy up to the powermongers to be kept in the loop. ‘Trust us, we will do right by the community,’ seems to be the mantra.

That’s all very well, but in a working democracy the performance of both the elected board members and ratepayer-funded council departments should be open to evaluation and scrutiny.

And given the mishandling of the pedestrianisation of Takarunga/Mt Victoria by the authority, and the glacial pace of any work by AT to improve Lake Rd, scrutiny and early knowledge of what is intended is surely needed.
The Māori Archeology of Te Raki Paewhenua/North Shore

31 May – Devonport Flagstaff
‘Booklet traces early history of Devonport’

Booklet traces early history of Devonport

Moa bones excavated at Torpedo Bay suggest Devonport was one of the first parts of Aotearoa to be settled by Māori, according to a new booklet by archaeologist David Yeart, published by Auckland North Community and Development. The booklet was inspired by a talk Yeart gave in Takapuna last July about settlement in the area. This is an abridged excerpt.

For tens of thousands of years, humanity spread out across the globe. Originating in Africa, modern humans walked, floated and sailed their way to every corner of the planet.

The final land mass to be discovered was Aotearoa/New Zealand in about 1250 AD.

So, what did these first people find when they arrived in their large, double-hulled waka?

Aotearoa/New Zealand had evolved in isolation for millions of years and contained a unique ecosystem almost devoid of mammals. Instead, it was a land of birds.

On the North Shore there were stands of northern broadleaf podocarp forest, tōtara, mātai, miro, conifer forests of kauri, kahikatea on the swampy parts and pōhutukawa on the coasts.

The fish we catch today would have been present but much bigger and in much larger numbers, with birds everywhere. And there would have been moa – more about them later.

There was something else on Auckland’s North Shore the new Polynesian colonists especially wanted – the warm volcanic soils. These soils were very free draining, which meant they were warm, because unlike the clay soils the cooling water did not remain.

The crops [brought from tropical Hawai‘i] needed to be planted and work would have started clearing the bush from the garden sites. As the gardeners worked, they turned up large amounts of volcanic rock, which they used to build things; low boundary walls, and stone and earth mounds, which helped warm the soil as the stone stored the sun’s heat.

We can see remains of these stone garden structures in early photographs of Devonport and North Head.

The only sign of these big gardens now surviving are the kūmara storage pits, rua kūmara which can still be seen near the top of Takurunga/Mount Victoria. As well as plants, the East Polynesian colonists brought animals.

In most of the Pacific, people brought dogs, pigs and chickens, as well as the kiore, the Polynesian rat, which may have just hitched a ride.

In Aotearoa, only the dog and the rat survived.

The chickens did not make it [the journey] either, but then there were much bigger birds to eat in New Zealand.

Before retirement, I worked for the Department of Conservation at the area office at Maungauika/North Head in Devonport.

One of the adjacent military sites was Torpedo Bay, an old defence establishment, which had been converted into New Zealand’s naval museum.

Prior to the museum development, archaeologists were called in to determine what

Once were gardens… An 1879 photograph showing Maungauika/North Head and part of Devonport. David Yeart says the line in the middle foreground is Vauxhall Road and past this we can see a rocky area where Māori garden structures remain. These are the irregular pale lines and rectangular enclosures marked on the landscape. Burgess Road and Domain Street would be built here in the future.
remained of the old mine base that was not visible on the surface.

One day I received a phone call from a colleague, who said: ‘You might like to wander down to the excavation at Torpedo Bay. Some amazing things are turning up.’

When I got there, I saw a group of archaeologists working in one small corner of the site; it was part of the mine base but what they were finding was older than that… much much older.

I met Mica Plowman, the archaeologist in charge, who showed me what they had been finding. It consisted of a series of hāngi pits, one on top of another, a place where people had been cooking and eating for centuries.

The oven on the top had broken clay tobacco pipe stems associated with it, probably dating from the nearby village visited by [German-Austrian geologist Ferdinand] von Hochstetter [who visited the North Shore in the 1850s]. There were other, older ovens below that and then a layer of red volcanic soil, possibly washed down from the gardens above the site on Maungawhau.

Below this layer was a very unexpected find – a hāngi where people had been cooking moa, the now extinct giant bird. At least five moa had been cooked here from three separate coastal species of moa, all of which were probably caught along the coast of what is now the North Shore. This was a completely unexpected find; the hunting of moa was not part of the known economic activity of early Māori in the Tamaki area.

Also unexpected was how early the dates for this early settlement were. While this excavation research has yet to be published, Mica kindly shared the radiocarbon dates with me. Radiocarbon dates can be taken from organic materials and measure amounts of a radioactive isotope, carbon 14, which decays at a known rate. The dates for the earliest part of this site concentrate at about 1350 AD, the very earliest period of human settlement in Aotearoa.

I find this very exciting. Those of us on the North Shore live in a part of the country where people first landed, the first people in the last part of the earth to be discovered and settled.

If you are interested in getting a copy of the booklet, The Māori Archaeology of Te Raki Paewaehuna/North Shore, email info@ancad.org.nz.

---

**Looking back...**
**David Veart is the author of The Māori Archaeology of Te Raki Paewaehuna/North Shore**

---
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Purpose of the report
1. To update the Ōrākei Local Board Members on projects, activities and issues.

Recommendation/s
a) That the report be received.
b) That the Ōrākei Local Board support Isaac Mercer’s request to Auckland Transport for his appointment to the Mission Bay and St Heliers Safety Improvement working groups as the Amplify Youth Representative for the Ōrākei Local Board area.
c) That the Ōrākei Local Board request Community Facilities to remove all plastic bag dispensing units from all reserves in the Ōrākei Local Board area.

Portfolio Lead: Transport
Other (alternate portfolio holder): Parks and Reserves

Transport

Walking Access Act 2008
Part of the solution to our transport problems both locally and regionally is to support alternative modes of travel. Providing necessary links and infrastructure so that people who are able to travel by means other than a private motor vehicle can do so easily is an important part of our role as a local Board. The Board has provided a submission supporting the amendments to the Walking Access Act 2008 accordingly.

Bike Tāmaki Drive
I am meeting periodically with Bike Tāmaki Drive representatives to discuss their ongoing safety issue concerns and long-term aspirations for better on and off-road cycling capabilities on Tāmaki Drive. Matt Cole – a key member of the Bike Tāmaki Drive group is meeting directly with senior Auckland Transport representatives, with outcomes from that meeting to be brought to me as Transport Lead where Local Board decision making and funding is concerned. One of the key concerns for the group is that significant investment in cycling infrastructure has been pushed out to 2028, and that significant regional funding is key to many of the solutions sought. In the meantime there are maintenance issues and smaller scale projects that can be delivered through Local Transport capital funding but need to be considered alongside other potential extant projects such as reviewed safety improvements plans for Mission Bay and St Heliers. It is also essential that the Bike Tāmaki Drive works alongside and has the support of the Bike Auckland group to ensure that what they proposed is mandated.

Temple Street / Lucia Glade
Local residents of Lucia Glade, members of the Parish of Our Lady of Fatima - including their priest Father Sam and Mt Carmel school continue to take a keen interest in finding a solution to the periodic hazardous traffic situation at this street entry point accessing the school. A resident who runs the Neighbourhood watch group has already very helpfully canvassed the views of residents. That preliminary feedback and a map of suggested layout of improvements has been provided to me and two meeting have now taken place with interested parties. I have passed the residents’ comments and designs on to Auckland Transport’s engineers working on the plans for the projects falling within the ambit of the Community Safety Funding initiative. An assurance has been received that the aspirations of the people directly affected will be taken into consideration.
when drawing up the draft plans. Whilst there is a minority viewpoint being expressed that there is not a problem in the street needing addressing it is fair to say that at this stage there is good community buy in already for making safety improvements in this area, notwithstanding this may involve the loss of some on street parking.

**Gowing Drive Safety Proposals**

It is somewhat disappointing that after being promised installation of the Board funded driver feedback signs within weeks after the public meeting in February we are still waiting for them in Gowing Drive. Community expectation was that they would be delivered promptly and managing expectation would have been easier if Auckland Transport had signalled a more realistic timeframe for delivery in the first place. The Gowing Drive community are eager to see the progression of the additional safety measures proposed through to consultation phase, and are currently waiting, as is the Board on the revised plans to be finalised by Auckland Transport.

**Auckland Transport “Megastars” Awards**

The Walking School Bus / Travelwise programme involves 380 buses, 162 schools, 4254 children and 1550 volunteers. The people involved, including teachers within schools acting as Leads, do so as volunteers – helping get our children to and from school safely and easing congestion on the roads during peak hours. On 14th Auckland Transport held an awards event at Ellerslie Events Centre to recognise these admirable individuals. Together with fellow Board member Ros Rundle, I attended as an elected representative to honour these men and women. It was heartening to see a big turnout from our own Ōrākei Local Board area with finalists for awards in the Central Area category – Kirsten Beggs – Kohimarama School, Kath Manning - Meadowbank School, and category winner Kathleen Lonergan - St Mary’s School, Ellerslie.

**Ballarat St Extension**

The potential use of this currently unformed paper road as a walking/cycling connection continues to be a matter of wide interest in the Ellerslie community.

**Road Works in Remuera**

The Remuera business community continue to be frustrated with the number and frequency of road works negatively affecting their custom. The issue appears to be a lack of forewarning and by simply issuing a warning that essential works are to be carried out will make it possible for business owners to plan accordingly. Member Ros Rundle has been working closely with the Remuera Business Association to ensure their concerns are communication clearly to Auckland Transport.

**Bus Idling St Heliers**

Café patrons and restaurant owners and visitors are reporting continuing problems with idling buses outside the stops on Tāmaki Drive by the eatery precinct block. I understand there is a petition circulating in the community requesting Auckland Transport move the bus stops.

**Felton Matthew Intersection**

After an initial flurry of activity works on the signalisation and safety improvements to the Felton Matthew / St Johns Rd intersection seem to have ground to a halt. There has been no activity on site now for approximately two weeks. The project was scheduled for completion by the end of June but to date there has been no explanation for the hold up.

**Other (alternate portfolio holder): Parks & Reserves**

**Tahapa Reserve Links/ Playground**

Local residents are expressing concern that the works in Tahapa Reserve on development of the playground and new tracks for connection to the Glen Innes to Tāmaki Shared Path have ground to a halt. I have advised them about the discovery of the shell midden and the need for the temporary halt while this is properly investigated.
Waiatarua Reserve Bins
A bin at the pedestrian entrance to the Waiatarua Reserve 71-73 Grand Drive seems to have mysteriously disappeared. Unfortunately, some park users used to the bin being there are simply dropping their full doggy poop bags on the ground where the bin used to be. I am checking the site on my regular walks and collecting the inappropriately dumped bags, but this is not a long-term solution. I have contacted Community Facilities about this and have been advised that the bin was not removed by Council contractors. I have requested it be replaced asap.

Community Clean up Ellerslie
On Saturday 29th June MP for Maungakeikei Denise Lee hosted a clean-up day in the Ellerslie Town Centre which I attended. It was attended by approximately 35 people. Local businesses Bakers’ Delight and Ellerslie Four Square sponsored the event. A positive sign was that there was a good deal less rubbish collected than last year’s event, hopefully a sign that people are becoming more conscious of the need to dispose of their litter in a responsible way.

Amplify Youth Forum
The Meadowbank Community Centre was filled with youthful energy and potential when the young people involved in the Ōrākei Local Board’s “Amplify” youth programme gathered for the first time. Sharing their ideas, concerns, and how they want to see our community shaped the attendees provided useful and much appreciated input on the day. It was a pleasure to attend and give a brief power point presentation explaining the Local Board’s place in the governance of Auckland, and what is we do within the parameters of our own Local Board area. One of the areas of concern for our young people is transport. They tend to be higher users proportionally of public transport, walk more and ride bikes/ scooters. Their input into our decision making around transport initiatives is important. A forum attendee, and potential leader of the Amplify group Isaac Mercer has expressed his interest in attending the Auckland Transport Working Groups for the Mission Bay and St Heliers safety improvement proposals and it is my view that the Board should support him in that. A resolution to that effect has been sought accordingly.

TEEF Update
After a fairly lengthy process, with input from a number of Forum members, the Tāmaki Estuary Environment Forum has officially adopted their term of reference which are attached. The Forum continues to run its clean up events, work towards establishing dialogue with the plastics industry, supporting the Nurdle project and strengthening relationships with other community groups. One objective is to search out and collate any available data on the sediment level build up and / or changes in the Tāmaki waterways. Identifying the problem is the first necessary step and once that is properly established by reliable evidence solutions to the problems adversely affecting the ecosystem and destroying the health of our flora and fauna can be sought.

Forum meetings continue to attract good attendance, and a healthy level of engagement from interested organizations and individuals.

Plastics Free July
A plastic bag dispensing unit that is no longer being stocked remains in Waiatarua Reserve. This unit, and any others in our Reserves should be removed. It is incumbent on all responsible dog owners that when they walk their dogs in public spaces they must ensure they take their own bags, preferably biodegradable ones, to remove any waste discharged from their pet. There is currently a practice in Waiatarua Reserve for people to tie unwanted plastic bags to the fences at entrances. Another popular place is at the duck pond after feeding. Although the sentiment behind this is good – people kindly offering their bags for use by others – what happens is that the bags get blown around, deteriorate, and just look tacky and unsightly. It is preferable that dog owners exercise self -responsibility and take their own bags rather than there be an expectation that there will be bags available at our Reserves.
**Activities:** 10th June – 7th July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10th June</td>
<td>Bike Tāmaki Drive meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th June</td>
<td>Barfoot &amp; Thompson Stadium update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th June</td>
<td>Auckland Transport meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th June</td>
<td>Informal meet with Meadowbank Chair &amp; committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th June</td>
<td>Meadowbank St Johns Residents’ Assoc meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th June</td>
<td>Health &amp; Wellbeing expo – St Heliers Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th June</td>
<td>Ōrākei Local Board workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th June</td>
<td>Auckland Transport &quot;Megastars&quot; event attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th June</td>
<td>Glover Park Memorial Rededication Ceremony attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th June</td>
<td>Agenda run through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th June</td>
<td>Ōrākei Visual Framework Presentation @ OLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th June</td>
<td>Meeting with Stonefields Residents’ Assoc Chair &amp; Committee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th June</td>
<td>Ōrākei Visual Framework Presentation – Ngāti Whātua @OCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th June</td>
<td>Ōrākei Local Board business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd June</td>
<td>Newmarket Stream “From the Deck” Planting Day attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd June</td>
<td>Meeting with Lucia Glade residents and Fr Sam Our Lady of Fatima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd June</td>
<td>Meeting with Ellerslie resident Glen McCabe – Ballarat St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th June</td>
<td>Auckland Transport meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th June</td>
<td>Staff update on OBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th June</td>
<td>Chairing Tāmaki Estuary Environment Forum meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th June</td>
<td>OLB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th June</td>
<td>Presentation to Amplify Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th June</td>
<td>Meeting with Matt Cole – Bike Tāmaki Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th June</td>
<td>Waiaata Reserve Community Planting Day attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th June</td>
<td>Ellerslie Town Centre Clean up attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th June</td>
<td>Ngāti Whātua Planting Day – Pourewa Valley. Attendance as Chair FPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th July</td>
<td>OLB Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th July</td>
<td>Meeting Rewiri Love – Smiley Campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum
Terms of Reference
June 2019

1. Introduction

1.1. The Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum (TEEF or the Forum) is an unincorporated group of people with a strong interest in the environmental health of the water, vegetation and wildlife of the Tāmaki Estuary and its catchment. The group was formed in 1988 and is supported by Auckland Council and local boards within the immediate area of the Tāmaki Estuary (see appendices A & B).

1.2. Being unincorporated means the group is free to organise its structure and deliver its operations as it chooses. These terms of reference set out agreed processes for managing the Forum’s affairs and making decisions. It also includes a code of conduct, which provides guidance for the involvement and behaviour expected of Forum participants.

1.3. These terms of reference should be reviewed on a recurring basis, approximately every three years, at a Forum meeting that has been advertised through the circulation of a meeting agenda to Forum participants.

2. Vision and Purpose of the Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum

2.1. Vision: That Te Wai o Taiki (Tāmaki Estuary) is a thriving, dynamic and healthy ecosystem that is loved and used by the community and which positively enhances and connects with the Manukau Harbour, the Waitematā Harbour and the Hauraki Gulf.

2.2. Purpose: To protect, sustain and enhance the health of the Tāmaki Estuary by promoting integrated environmental management, reduced pollution and striving to achieve high levels of water quality and biodiversity.
3. Role of the Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum

3.1. Host meetings; facilitate events and generally engage in activities that help to identify and problem-solve issues relevant to the life and health of the Tāmaki Estuary (including its catchments, local communities and flora and fauna).

3.2. Encourage information sharing and promote collaboration between Auckland Council departments, council-controlled organisations, central government agencies, iwi, environmental groups, businesses and members of the local community to improve the health of the Tāmaki Estuary.

3.3. Initiate and enable community led advocacy and responses to issues adversely affecting the health of the Tāmaki Estuary.

4. Governance

4.1. TEEF is a single committee (aka the Forum) led by an executive group consisting of (but not limited to) a chair and any other roles deemed useful. These positions, including the coordinator and council staff working closely with the executive, are collectively referred to as the Forum’s executive.

4.2. The Forum’s executive members hold responsibility for maintaining positive and constructive relationships with council and local board members, staff and Forum participants.

4.3. Executive roles are generally held for a three-year term which may be renewed provided the individuals hold the confidence of Forum participants.

4.4. Executive roles are usually confirmed by Forum participants at a normally constituted meeting where an agenda including this item has been circulated not less than two weeks prior to the meeting.

4.5. Where two people seek a single role, the role may be shared, or a vote may be taken. In these circumstances proxy votes are not accepted.

4.6. In the event of an anticipated change in executive roles, a notice of the change, including the names of those seeking appointment to the executive,
must be included on an agenda circulated to participants not less than two weeks prior to the meeting at which those roles are to be confirmed. This is to enable Forum participants on the email list to be informed of upcoming changes to the executive, the names of those seeking to hold executive roles and provides opportunity for participants to attend the meeting.

4.7. Community (volunteer) representatives holding a place on the executive will usually have their role confirmed by Forum participants every three years at a normally constituted Forum meeting.

4.8. Local board members seeking a place on the executive will usually have their candidacy arranged through their local board and have the role presented for confirmation by Forum participants at a normally constituted meeting. They will usually hold the position for their three-year term of office.

4.9. Where-ever possible changes in executive roles should be staggered, so that continuity of experience and knowledge are maintained.

4.10. At any Forum meeting a motion for a volunteer or local board member to hold an executive role, or stand down from the executive, may be moved but must be seconded. No proxy votes are permitted. This motion must be recorded in minutes circulated at least two weeks before the next Forum meeting. In this way all Forum participants can be informed of proposed changes in the executive and have the opportunity for discussion.

4.11. The Forum is supported by a facilitator / coordinator / manager. The conditions of this appointment and oversight of duties carried out by that person are delegated to the executive and council staff for whom participation in the Forum is a delegated responsibility. This role is normally jointly funded by local boards and/or other supporting organisations.

4.12. Decisions about the expenditure of funds and use of resources provided by Auckland Council and local boards rest with council staff – see the Forum’s organisational structure Appendix B. Forum participants are asked to provide guidance and express preferences.
5. Roles of chair / executive members

5.1. The Forum chair(s) is (are) responsible for chairing meetings. If a chair is not available, chairing may be delegated for that meeting. The chair may delegate any task to another Forum executive member (see 5.4).

5.2. The role of the chair(s) is to:
   a) be the official spokesperson for the Forum – in the first instance all media enquiries about Forum business should be referred to the chair (or chairs);
   b) confirm the dates and venues of Forum meetings;
   c) set and circulate agenda (or approve the circulation of);
   d) facilitate Forum meetings and activities to operate as per the Code of Conduct;
   e) confirming as correct minutes or notes taken at the Forum meeting and circulating minutes (or approve the circulation of) ensuring a record is kept of the finalised minutes.

5.3. Where there is more than one chair, the spokesperson will be agreed between the chairs. When no chair is available to make public comment, either a spokesperson will be agreed by executive consensus, or the Forum will not make any public comment.

5.4. The chair(s) may appoint/allocate individuals to roles such as convening working parties, sub-committees or as spokesperson on specific issues. Prior to confirming the appointment of any individual to a role, the chair will usually notify the executive and Forum participants of their intention to make this appointment. This will preferably happen at a scheduled meeting in a way that permits consideration and discussion by all Forum participants.

5.5. Executive members are expected to support the chair to ensure:
   a) meetings are effectively planned and appropriately notified;
   b) the Forum operates according to these terms of reference and code of conduct;
   c) matters are dealt with in an orderly, efficient and respectful manner;
   d) policies and procedures are in place and available;
6. Code of Conduct

The effective functioning of the Forum depends on promoting and maintaining good relationships and trust between its participants. Forum participants are asked to:

a) comply with these Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum terms of reference;
b) attend meetings regularly or send apologies to the chair for absence;
c) treat others with respect;
d) help create an environment where people are comfortable expressing their views;
e) help others concentrate on the meeting by discouraging side conversations;
f) act in good faith, having the best interests of the Forum in mind;
g) contribute to discussions in a positive and constructive manner;
h) notify the Forum executive of potential (or actual) conflicts of interest in a timely manner;
i) act as an accurate and effective conduit for relevant information to and from representative organisations and communities; and
j) respect the confidentiality of matters brought to the Forum and the privacy of participants. No material that is shared during a meeting which is identified as private or sensitive by either the person sharing it, or by any other person at the meeting, should be repeated or referred to outside of that meeting without specific agreement from individuals involved or implicated.

7. Failure to comply with the code of conduct

7.1. Breach of code of conduct: If any Forum participant believes someone is in breach of the code of conduct, they should in the first instance inform the chair (or chairs) in writing of the circumstances and the detail of their concerns.
7.2. **The Chair involved:** If the concern/allegation involves the chair, the issue should be raised with another executive member, who must promptly notify other executive members.

7.3. **Seek Auckland Council professional advice:** If the executive believe the concern/allegation has substance and is of a nature to disrupt Forum business and relationships then the issue must be raised with the appropriate Auckland Council support staff. A decision will be made by the executive and council/local board staff as to whether the circumstances of the concern/allegation should be investigated or discussed at a Forum meeting.

7.4. **Inform subject of concern:** An individual who is the subject of an allegation should be informed (preferably both verbally and in writing), and if appropriate provided with the correspondence containing the concern/allegation. This must be provided in a way that provides them with adequate opportunity to seek advice and respond.

7.5. **Principles of Natural Justice to be adhered to:** Any Forum participant who is the subject of a concern/allegation must always be given full opportunity to respond to the issues raised – either in person at a meeting or in writing.

7.6. **Sanction by resolution at a properly notified Forum meeting:** Where Forum participants consider the code of conduct has been breached by an individual, the chair (or appropriate member of the executive) and a second Forum participant may move a motion at a normally constituted and notified meeting that the person who is considered to have breached the code of conduct, be asked not to attend Forum meetings – for either a set number of times or until such time as participants consider appropriate.
Appendix A
Partnership with Auckland Council

Healthy Waters has agreed to support the Forum (TEEF) in the following ways:

- provide technical advice and subject matter expertise;
- keep the Forum informed of Healthy Waters’ projects that have potential to impact on the Tāmaki Estuary;
- attend meetings for relevant agenda items;
- keep the group informed of opportunities to influence local government decision-making processes that are likely to impact the Tāmaki Estuary, for example, upcoming consultation;
- contract management of the Forum coordinator contract (conditional to ongoing local board funding);
- the partnership may be reviewed at any time by either party.

Note: Contract management for the Forum coordinator is part of Healthy Waters commitment to local boards to support delivery of their annual work programmes.
Appendix B: Guide to TEEF structure and decision making

Tamaki Estuary Environmental Forum (TEEF)

- Auckland Council Account Holder (Confirms funding-related actions)
- TEEF executive:
  - Chair(1), TEEF Coordinator, and TEEF forum participants
- Executive roles:
  - make decisions at a governance level
  - manage strategic partnerships
  - recommend funding drawdowns
  - determine strategic direction
  **(Decisions informed by forum discussion)**

Example Decision-Making Process

- TEEF participants recommend funding allocated to TEEF projects.
- TEEF executive confirms and recommends funding allocations.
- Account holder confirms and allocates funding to members.

ENDS
Minutes - Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum (TEEF)

Date: Thursday 18 April 2019
Time: 10.00 – 12.00 pm (meeting room open at 9.45am for tea/coffee)
Venue: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Office 7-13 Pilkington Rd, Panmure.

Forum participants: Carmel Claridge (TEEF Co-Chair/Ōrākei Local Board Member), Julie Chambers (TEEF Co-Chair Community), Dawn Trenberth (Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Local Board Member), Beth Evans, Estella Lee, Kathryn Legrove, Shaun Lee, Barbara Shaw, Andrew Lee, Oliver Hoffman, Dorte Siggaard.

Staff: Fraser Stobie, Rhianna Drury, Maddie Little, Charlotte Goodlet.

Apologies: Alex Rogers, Cate Jessep, Clair Hobi, Carrol Elliott (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Member), Jan Riddick, Richard Myhre, Matthew Brajkovich, Rhianna Drury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion and decisions</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Confirmation of 21st February minutes. (Amended)**          | Action: Amend second version of minutes to finalise 21 February minutes. | Moved: Carmel Claridge
| Note: Second version of the minutes were circulated. Beth Evans adds amendments to second version to finalise February 21st minutes | Who: Charlotte Goodlet                                                   |
| Amendments:                                                   | Seconded: Julie Chambers                                                |
| • Section 2a. Amend: ‘plastic industrial waste’, to: ‘plastic industry materials’ | Accepted All                                                            |
| • Item 3 on page 2 of 4. Correct spelling mistake             |                                                                         |
| • Section 4e. Amend: ‘A Waste Education Cluster Meeting’, to: ‘An Enviroschools cluster meeting’ |                                                                         |
| • Section 4e. Amend: ‘Beth’s involvement’, to: ‘Beth’s Leadership’ |                                                                         |

**TEEF Terms of Reference (TOR):**

Forum members were thanked for reading the TOR and providing feedback. Several amendments were suggested at the close of the latest feedback deadline, these will be reviewed.

TEEF executive will carefully consider all suggested amendments and bring the TOR back to the next meeting (27 June 2019).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion and decisions</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round Table – Local events and issues:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Shore bird publication by Shaun Lee | Action: Request Tim Lovegrove to professionally review Shaun’s publication  
Who: Fraser |
| Shaun spoke on his publication and explained decline in shorebird species surrounding the Tāmaki Estuary, focusing on loss of roosting habitat. | |
| • A suggestion was made that Auckland Council Biodiversity be requested to review and endorse this publication. | **Action:** The possibility of roosting sites being protected/established in the Orakei Ward will be investigated.  
**Who:** Carmel Claridge |
| • Co-Chair suggested an approach to local boards to raise awareness and prioritise the need to protect shore birds. | |
| • Suggestion that the forum investigates the Natural Environment targeted rate (sea bird monitoring and restoration work programme) for funding and to have someone come speak to it. | **Action:** Organise council speaker on shorebird work being done as part of natural environment targeted rate  
**Who:** Maddie |
| **Motion:** Forum participants thanked Shaun Lee for his exceptional work.  
**Moved:** Oliver Hoffman  
**Seconded:** Barbara Shaw | |
| • Report on Aqua Drone trial | **Action:** Investigate possible plastic free July events that TEEF could host or take part in  
**Who:** Fraser |
| Andrew, Julie, Carmel, Beth, Fraser and Rhianna attended the demonstration of an aqua drone at the estuary. The Drone is potentially a useful tool for plastic clean ups. | |
| Further testing will take place at low tide and high tide. It was noted that beached nurdles will re-float with spring/king tides. | |
| It was suggested TEEF could use International Plastic Free July as platform to promote what we are doing. An event using the aqua drone could coincide with plastic free July, could use Council comms to promote. | |
| • Red-billed gulls and shag colony | **Action:** Approach Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board to add white fronted terns to signs and update information as to where injured birds can be taken and to identify no fishing areas.  
**Who:** Carmel/Julie |
<p>| Forum members discussed changes to the shag colony bird rescue premises. It was noted the closest known bird rescue facility is now in Green Bay. | |
| Members discussed the decline of the colony and the occurrence of fishing related entanglements of local shags. It was acknowledged that fishing ban would require bylaw changes. Current sign is not fishing ban but suggestion not to fish here to protect shags. There was a suggestion that known fishing spots around the Estuary should have signs alerting fishers to shag colony decline, what to do if shag (or other birds) are accidently caught while fishing. Wording to be decided. Forum members suggested multilingual signage. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion and decisions</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chairs will approach the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board to request a review of the current signage at the Panmure Basin in respect to the birds and contact details for help with any injured birds found by members of the public.</td>
<td>Action: Create map showing known fishing spots on Estuary to inform signage placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion was held around creating a map of Estuary fishing spots.</td>
<td>Who: Shaun and Beth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel reported that planned visit with AMETI to shag colony postponed due to heavy rain.</td>
<td>Action: Re-schedule TEEF Executive and AMETI visit to shag colony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Moth plant control</td>
<td>Who: Carmel/Fraser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moth plant is too widespread in the Auckland region so total control not possible. A suggestion was made that TEEF approach other local boards around the Estuary to replicate Howick Local Board’s pest plant skip disposal avail for 2 weeks in late April/early May.</td>
<td>Action: Request feedback from Howick Local Board on the success of pest plant disposal initiative, lessons to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEEF will first ask for feedback from Howick on this year’s event.</td>
<td>Who: Co-Chair community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nurdle Project</td>
<td>Action: Carmel will seek information re enforcement of waste contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth presented to the March Enviroschools cluster. On 15 March a Nurdle Hunt at Riverina Reserve with Anchorage Park School also took place and a TEEF/CVNZ beach clean-up/nurdle hunt in April at Bucklands Beach had 80 people in attendance.</td>
<td>Who: Carmel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A press release on the clean-up of nurdles was posted on Scoop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth has been asked to speak to conservation cadets and to Pernod Ricard Winemakers staff at their Point England beach clean-up in June.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum members thanked Beth for her enthusiasm and work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Art Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser spoke about undertaking an art initiative to raise awareness of plastics in the estuary. This could be a collaboration between Men’s Shed, Rotary, TEEF, Enviroschools and a resident artist to design it and workshop it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whitebait Connection update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is very/little no data on native galaxids/eels in the Tāmaki Estuary or Ōtara creek area. As for the wider estuary there’s no information, Whitebait Connection are also not currently involved with anything regarding the estuary. There’s a program coming up with Council looking at fish in the estuary area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facebook page</td>
<td>Action: Fraser to establish a Facebook page for the forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Facebook page should be established, Fraser to monitor and Julie to respond to messages/queries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion and decisions

The Strategic Planning Session was discussed. This is still on track to happen in August.

• Meeting closed 11.52am

Upcoming TEEF Meetings
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Thursday, August 22, 2019
Thursday, October 24, 2019
Thursday, December 12, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point Summary</th>
<th>Person following up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amend 21 February minutes /do this month’s minutes</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Circulate final TOR ahead of June meeting</td>
<td>Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approach Auckland Council Biodiversity Team re Shaun’s shorebird publication</td>
<td>Fraser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Investigate the possibility of artificial roosts being established</td>
<td>Carmel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organise speaker from council on natural environment targeted rate shorebird programme</td>
<td>Maddie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Investigate Plastic Free July events</td>
<td>Fraser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Request Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board change Panmure Basin bird signage</td>
<td>Carmel and Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Re-schedule AMETI visit to shag colony</td>
<td>Fraser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Request regulatory enforcement information regarding plastic waste</td>
<td>Carmel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Establish TEEF Facebook page</td>
<td>Fraser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Send suggestions for strategic planning session</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JULY BOARD REPORT PHOTOS

Outdoor Boating Club Clean Up 9th June. Pictured with Tamati Smith-Hemara, Jaylayne Duncan, Safron Witiaka and Missy Hemara-Herbert

Pictured with Conservation Volunteers, Local residents and organizer Penny Hansen at the “From the Deck” Newmarket Stream restoration project community planting day on Sunday 23rd June.

Waiafa Reserve community planting day. Pictured with Sarah Paton-Beverly.
“Amplify” Youth Forum at Meadowbank Community Centre 28th June.

Attending Ellerslie Town Centre clean up – Saturday 29th June. Pictured with Nick & Hiver from Ellerslie Four Square co - sponsors of the event with Baker’s Delight and Annabel Lush and Mirko Poetzsch from Ellerslie Sun Rise Rotary.

With Sea Shepherd volunteers and resident Davina Johnston at Microplastics Clean Up - Mission Bay Saturday 6th July.
Purpose of the report
1. To update the Ōrākei Local Board Members on projects, activities and issues since the last meeting.

Recommendations
a) That the report be received.
b) That the Ōrākei Local Board endorse the feedback on Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill (attachment B).
c) That the Ōrākei Local Board withdraw its support for the proposed amendments to the special character overlay and delegate the planning portfolio lead Troy Churton and deputies David Wong and Colin Davis to submit an updated statement raising concerns about the proposed plan change.
d) That the Ōrākei Local Board recommend the Governing Body withdraw delegated decision-making as to notification for the proposal at 1-3 Purewa Road, Meadowbank, and that the Governing Body makes that notification decision itself after hearing any further advocacy regarding the matter.
e) That the Ōrākei Local Board recommends to the Minister for the Environment that the Resource Management Act be reviewed to reintroduce greater powers for local councils to impose tree protection controls.

Portfolio Lead: Resource Consenting and Regulatory
Other (alternate portfolio holder): Heritage; Environment

Resource Consenting and Regulatory

Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill:
2. The Ōrākei Local Board was asked to provide feedback on the Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill. The deadline to be appended to the Auckland Council submission was on 9 July 2019, with submissions closing on 11 July 2019.
3. The Bill establishes Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities as a new Crown entity bringing together Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC), HLC (Homes. Land. Community.) and the KiwiBuild Unit of the Ministry for Housing and Urban Development.
4. The intention is that the Bill will come into force on 1 October 2019.
5. The Bill is the first of two pieces of legislation applying to the new entity. A further Bill is expected in the third quarter of this year which will set out the powers that Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities can assume to enable it to undertake urban development in specified development areas.
6. I have suggested our feedback raises concern at the current Bill leaving a number of the new entity’s powers to be determined in a later Bill.
Proposed Plan Change integrating special character overlay

7. Consultation with the public is currently happening on the Proposed Plan Change integrating special character overlay.

8. Previously the Ōrākei Local Board took advice from staff and reached the following conclusions:

   Overall the proposed plan change will enable amendments to the special character overlay to be read in conjunction with the plan itself in a way that brings consistency for planning assessments across all special character overlay areas.

   Having discussed the proposed character overlay amendments with planning staff, we are satisfied that the changes will enable more thorough assessments by processing planners and do not believe the special character overlay areas of our Ward will be prejudiced by the changes.

   Regarding proposals to delete rear yard requirements, we believe rear yard minimums should be preserved and not deleted. The intent of the overlay is greater than streetscape character protection. For some established character areas in our ward, retaining a rear yard minimum ensures ongoing residential amenity, spatial integrity between built forms, a stronger sense of sight line and visual permeability - all of which are common features of character development in many established residential areas of our Ward.

   Regarding fencing height, we reiterate the above saying the maximum heights for fencing from a house to the rear yard should be retained at a 1.8m maximum not 2m.

9. However, since that advice I have received information from Remuera Heritage, referring to Devonport and Grey Lynn Resident Group analysis – leads me to strongly believe the Board was not adequately briefed and there is actually a contrary understanding that the proposed plan change will actually NOT assist retention of character in single house zones.

10. For example, - in Single House Zone areas that have a Special Character Areas Overlay in place, the rules for the Special Character Areas Overlay will REPLACE the rules in the underlying Single House Zone. In other words, the heritage protection (i.e. Special Character Areas Overlay) will not place additional restrictions on the underlying zone, it will REPLACE the rules for the underlying zone

11. Bizarrely, the overlay rules are actually MORE PERMISSIVE in some cases. Yes, the heritage rules are more developer-friendly than the underlying Single House Zone rules!

12. For example, the Special Character Areas overlay rules allow for a “larger building envelope” (e.g. a bigger extension in your neighbour’s backyard) among other things.

13. Also, the council does not have to consider the effects on neighbours, which it does under the Single House Zone rules. The council has to consider the effects on the streetscape and character of the area, but not the neighbours

14. For example - in relation to height to boundary: The Single House Zone limit is 2.5m +45 degrees.

15. The limit in the Single House Zone with Special Character Areas Overlay is 3m +45 degrees (for houses with <15m front boundary, which is most villas).

16. Council wants the more generous limit of 3m +45 degrees to apply in heritage areas. This means that in a heritage zone a developer can build 3m high adjacent to your boundary. In a non-heritage zone, they can only go to 2.5m.

   [Links to articles discussing the proposed changes]

17. Accordingly, I have proposed changes to our statement to include the content in paragraphs 9 – 15 above.
18. This is a significant development to infill ex golf course land in St Johns, and I have liaised with local resident association members and staff about the following:

19. I have read the AEE and some of the supporting report documents. Despite the pre-lodgement meetings and resulting (usual it seems across planner AEEs) rhetoric that effects are "less than minor", I strongly disagree that the actual or potential effects will be 'less than minor' given this irregular shaped land and its particular sandwiched location.

20. Overall my strong view is this development should be publicly notified using Councils' general discretion under the RMA, or to use special circumstances provisions to do so.

21. Ingress and egress for the new 81 detached, two and three storied, residential unit development is proposed to be absorbed through installing 4 driveway points (see page 16 of the AEE) for a bulk of the development along with 17 new vehicle crossings (as described page 17 AEE and Appendix 8) along the already narrow 'Donnelly Street', a laneway type of street that I observe to be often parked out from the existing level of residential development along it.

22. I do not agree with the optimism of the planner or the Traffic Assessment report regarding general manoeuvrability, ease of access for rubbish collections and other larger trucks etc given the intensity and design. The adverse effects will be more than minor. I think it is predictable also that many private residents will not use the double garaging or garaging in their units all the time or at all, a trait seen in many other intensive development sites where movement areas have been designed to facilitate tightly squeezed building intensity. Planners often refer to this effect as something that can be "absorbed by the surrounding road network". In my view there is no surrounding absorbing capability for this location and the effects cannot be mitigated without significant design changes.

23. The potential effects for traffic congestion, parking conflict, pedestrian safety risk and safety at Ngahue Drive are all, in my view, far more than minor. (refer to Attachment A: Figure 2).

24. Considerable visual and lighting effects will impact in ways more than minor on existing residents of Donnelly Street to the south and slightly lower down, for example, given the three-storied wall of development proposed as follows (refer to Attachment A: Block 6: Lots 51-61 insertion).

25. The inconsistent evolution of advice as to the status of a stream through the site (para 3.1.2 AEE) is concerning, and the proposal to fill the gully of the site to enable more development in that context must be considered in conjunction with the bulk earthworks proposed AND the proposal to divert overland flow path. I note also that the owner of 29 Donnelly Street is directly affected by the potential to require its property for doing stormwater extension work. The potential effects on that owner justify limited notification in any event.

26. There are several infringements of height and height in relation to boundary that concern. For example, more than 50 per cent of roof area of the development for units 60-62, 75, 76, 78-80 will exceed height standards by more than 1m. These are, cumulatively, more than minor and therefore a significant infringement that can be mitigated by less intensive design.

27. Another standards area also pushing the envelope as to what is expected from the more generous UP. Impervious area infringes by around 5 per cent, landscaped area requirements are breached by around 5 per cent, outlook spaces are breached - all these matters raise concern. However, it is more concerning that the applicant suggests that its inability to meet the standards for a National Environmental Standard - NES (in this case relating to contamination and preventing adverse effects on human health and the environment) are s not mentioned as a minor matter or not. The site is known for traces of heavy metal above the background levels anticipated (see para 5.3.11).

28. The reality, in my view, is this sort of inability to fulfil the expectations of a NES means the proposal likely generates effects that are more than minor - and along with other matters identified above, justifies notification. I disagree with the conclusion offered by the planner and team of applicant reporters that the adverse effects will be no more than minor.
Westbourne Road, Remuera

29. Proposal to demolish home at 10 Westbourne Road, Remuera - in character area – suggested notification and liaised with Remuera Heritage including the following insights passed to planners:

*The most notable feature of the AEE Report is that it fails to mention that there is a scheduled property directly opposite 10 Westbourne Road. 11A Westbourne Road (owned by Christopher Parr) is on the historic heritage list of Auckland Council (No.2774) and Heritage New Zealand (2632) since 1981. [https://www.heritage.org.nz/the-list/details/2632](https://www.heritage.org.nz/the-list/details/2632)*

*Also, it fails to mention that 12 Westbourne Road is a vacant section where a house was demolished even though it was covered by a pre-1940 demolition control, so it is unknown what effect there will be on any new development.*

*No. 10 Westbourne Road has close proximity to Nos. 4, 6, 11, 11A, 14 and 18, all of which contribute significantly to the special character of the street.*

*The new building at no. 10 should better respect and contribute to that character and the objectives for that SCA-R overlay and the Single House Zone. The proposed house appears to have a large rear and side development which will add visual bulk that will detract from the heritage and special character features of the area.*

*The AEE says the new dwelling “requires an average setback of 6705mm based on adjacent properties. The proposed dwelling infringes this setback as depicted on Sheet 02/07 = Restricted Discretionary Activity. “Sheet 02/07 is not included, and the actual infringement is not stated.*

*The AEE Report says - In determining the effects of an application under the Resource Management Act 1991 pursuant to Sections 95A to 95F, for consent to be considered on a non-notified basis, Council must conclude that the effects on the environment are no more than minor, that there are no special circumstances that warrant notification and that the written approval of any person deemed affected by the proposal, if ultimately considered to be affected, has given their written approval.*

*The AEE report says it will not detract from the special character of the area. However, the AEE report fails to mention the Historic Heritage listed property at 11A Westbourne Rd. This listing is a special circumstance which requires notification to at least all neighbours, if not the wider community.*

12 Abbots Way, Remuera

30. Major development on one of the last very large undeveloped pieces of land in the area. We have suggested notification to planners – and the scope of what is proposed is far greater than historical indications, and some of our liaison with planners included:

*This large undeveloped land holding has been ear-marked for development for many years and some of that history is reflected in the AEE. Previous proposals were for development half as intense as what is now proposed.*

*Overall this is a non-complying activity and it is my strong view that it is preferable to publicly notify the matter using general discretion under the RMA, or to use the ‘special circumstances’ provisions to do so.*

31. The site is mostly non-visible from the surrounding road networks. The surrounding residential area is intensively filled. However, the potential visual effects of the infill will be visible from parts of the surrounding street network and reserve and create more than minor character effects.

32. The particular type of terrace housing will also be very different from the existing dominant pattern of housing around it and we disagree with the AEE (page 9) where it suggests this sort of development is "anticipated ". Intensity is anticipated - yes. This character or design for that intensity in this area however is not anticipated and clearly breaks dominant residential character.
33. The site is bordered by very busy traffic networks: Ladies Mile and Abbots Way.

34. A 53-lot development with 55 lots in total inclusive of 2 future development lots is a significant development. Staged development is proposed and generates cumulative effects that may be more than minor.

35. The creation of a new road and effects on Abbots Way are more than minor and will impact on users of the area and residents.

36. Proposals for stormwater and connectivity to existing manhole infrastructure in Koraha reserve also potential effect surrounding properties and users in ways that are more than minor.

37. The Koraha Reserve's downstream stormwater reticulation is already almost full given existing development in the area. The effects of this proposal will therefore be more than minor on stormwater reticulation.

**Loss of quality street berm Puriri tree**

38. This is a quality public tree outside 97 Meadowbank Road – Planners have disagreed, and the duty commissioner has allowed this tree to be felled without notification.

39. The Council arborist also clearly was not supportive of losing the tree and I supported that view. Mitigation planting is not an adequate option to fulfil the amenity value of this tree in its form as it is, of substantial street character and public interest, anytime in the next 30 years.

40. This private owner could concede to other options, could concede to a design utilising the good available access it currently has without prejudicial restrictions on its use of its private property.

41. The owner has chosen a design for its private property that required a closer assessment of the public space and the access issues.

42. From what I saw the property had ample potential to merge its driveway with the existing one at 95 and shared 93 Meadowbank Road, making one single albeit wider driveway across the public space for serving adjacent properties in order to get driveway access on the south side with potential to retain the very attractive and maturing tree.

43. The interests of the wider community and environment in retaining the tree were, in my view, greater reasons to notify this matter than the private owner’s unique land holding design aspirations to have the tree felled. The AEE said removal is proposed because of the proposed new vehicle crossing design on the south side of the property.

44. Generally, OLB indicates that there is greater opportunity for development under the UP and applicants can design to meet standards more robustly, especially those relating to height.

45. This is a very poor result for the local environment in my view and reiterates the need to amend the RMA to Councils can reinstate tree protection rules to help restore balance in development applications and help preserve public amenity values.

**50 Selwyn Ave, Mission Bay**

46. This significant 14 unit 2-3 storey development has height infringements. The concern is that many similar applications also have infringements and that the process planners, because of individual assessment, are allowing a cumulative adverse effect of infringing activity that is contrary to the generous standards in the UP.

47. The surrounding area is low-intensity development mostly and this development in a block formation will have a strong bulk and dominance effect. The site is flat yet the developer wishes to choose to infringe the generous UP height standards, mostly from rook design as far as I can ascertain.

48. I disagreed with the AEE at para 6.1.4 where it suggests this proposal is a "slight change" from existing character. It is a dramatic change. Half the onsite parks are minimum space designs. The scope for negative effects on the surrounding roadway from overflow parking
and service vehicle visits are more than minor. Delivery trucks will need to reverse into the street for example.

49. While much of the proposal is complying, or arguably a restricted discretionary activity, we suggest at least limited notification or wider notification per s95B or D of the RMA. (Refer to Attachment A Figure 7: Tracking curves for medium-rigid/refuse trucks).

**Development at 1-3 Purewa Road, beside Ōrākei Basin**

50. This application’s notification status continues to be unresolved despite several months of further information gathering by the processing planner, and my ongoing scrutiny. His latest response states:

> There has been a last-minute detail change, with information being worked through currently. However, I am hoping that information will be completed in the next couple of days. From there looking to have information to the team leader and onto duty commissioner for a decision on notification in the next week.

51. In recent emails the processing planner has indicated sending the notification matter he is meant to determine to a duty commissioner. These duplicates cost.

52. This protocol of using a duty commissioner is usually only used when the planner disagrees with Board comment urging notification.

53. I have asked the planner to clarify whether they are recommending that this be non-notified and should know at the time this report is being collated into the Agenda.

54. If that is the case, such is the strong weight of information showing existing and potential adversity from the proposal, I will with councillor and board support, may look to seek GB takes back the delegation for deciding from planners on this matter.

55. The planner’s most recent note states they are working on a notification determination, hence the referral to a duty commissioner would not be necessary if he shared the OLB view.

56. Overall, Council delegates decision-making authority for these matters to processing planners. Where Board reps and those planners disagree on a notification issue, the agreed protocol in that instance is to refer the matter to a duty commissioner.

57. In almost all cases in my experience duty commissioners side with processing planners and there have been a few cases where affected parties have won judicial review against a decision to non-notify.

58. David, Colin and I have met with planning management on a few occasions regarding this protocol to use duty commissioners in conflict situations and understand that management prefers the use of duty commissioner determination to be reduced to save money.

59. Overall, very few proposals come to OLB for comment and we do not accept there is a funding issue in our trying to assert a need for notification, or where we think Council can rightly exercise discretion to notify itself and not leave that to processing planners.

60. For this matter, I do not have confidence in the matter being sent to a duty commissioner as the processing planner indicates. If the process planner cannot clarify a determination recommending notification, we believe Council should retain final decision-making as to notification for this particular proposal.

**Donnelly Street, St Johns**

61. Attached to this report is a copy of a petition provided to me to present to Auckland Council Building and Consent staff on behalf of Donnelly Street residents regarding their concerns about a resource consent for a proposed 81-unit development on Donnelly Street.
Other matters:

62. Feedback and / or portfolio meetings as to notification and effects regarding various other applications such as:
   - 43 Hopkins Crescent, Kohimarama height infringements
   - Kohimarama Yacht Club proposals
   - 2 Ronaki Road, Mission Bay

63. Attending various community group meetings and events such as Meadowbank SJ Association, Waiata Reserve Planting day etc.
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Author: Troy Churton - Ōrākei Local Board Member
Date: 8 July 2019
Figure 2: Showing an overview of the proposed development and subdivision. Refer to Appendix 7 for enlarged Scheme Plans.
• **Block 6: Lots 51-61.**

These five-bedroom units will adjoin Donnelly Street, at the northern end of the development site. Units 51, 59, 60 and 61 from this block will access directly off proposed Access Lot 103 while the remainder will have their own vehicle crossings that access directly from Donnelly Street.

It is to note that these units will be three-storey units provided fronting Donnelly Street. However, as assessed within the *Urban Design Assessment Report* and discussed in later sections, the proposal mitigates any visual dominance effects from the development.

The layout of these units will include a double garage, a bedroom and a secondary family area on the lower level. An open plan living / kitchen / dining area and a media room will occupy the first-level, a practical and usable north-facing deck will provide outdoor living from the main living areas. The upper-level will include four bedrooms, one of which will be the master bedroom.
Figure 7: Tracking Curves for Medium-Rigid Trucks/Refuse Trucks
The Ōrākei Local Board (the Board) supports the Auckland Council submission on the Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill.

The Board supports the overarching objective of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities ‘to contribute to sustainable, inclusive, and thriving communities that -

a. provide people with good quality, affordable housing choices that meet diverse needs; and

b. support good access to jobs, amenities, and services; and

c. otherwise sustain or enhance the overall economic, social, environmental, and cultural well-being of current and future generations.’

The Board opposes any government entity to have the ability to over-ride existing local government regulations, plans and strategies that have been adopted following community consultation.

The Board notes its concern at the significant overlaps in function between the new entity and local government.

The Board notes its concern of the use of a second Bill to set Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities powers.

The Board opposes the lack of recognition of local government and supports the inclusion of an operating principle relating to how Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities will partner with local authorities within the areas it is operating, including explicit requirements for Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities to engage with local government.

The Board supports an explicit provision establishing any development by or on behalf of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities, is liable for development contributions. Decisions regarding potential operational infrastructure and amenities will have significant ongoing costs to local government and impact on wider infrastructure networks.

The Board supports an explicit provision that any major operational infrastructure decisions in Auckland are subject to ratification by the Governing Body of Auckland Council.
Auckland City Council  
Building and consents division  

03 July 2019

CONCERN FROM RESIDENTS OF DONNELLY STREET, ST. JOHNS, ABOUT THE RESOURCE CONSENT FOR 81 UNIT DEVELOPMENT ON 20 DONNELLY STREET.

We the residents of Donnelly Street, St. Johns are writing to raise our concern in relation to the above development which will affect the livelihood of current residents.

Donnelly street is a narrow street which already has limited off-street parking for the residents. It can only take parking on one side of the road, right-hand side. As per the plan for this development, it is expected to add 17 new vehicle crossings on the left-hand side to connect these new houses to Donnelly Street. We feel it is overwhelming and our street cannot handle this magnitude of traffic. In addition, the access to Ngahue Drive from Donnelly Street will be heavily impacted as we already have traffic congestion.

This development is requiring the use of the council land to assist these vehicle crossings, which we disagree because the developer should only use the land they purchased. Using the remaining public green space also to convert into driveways is unacceptable. This space is used by all residents and neighbours for peaceful walking and jogging without any vehicle interruption. We feel the council has the power and should protect this last piece of public space.

As rate payers we expect the council to make sensible decisions to handle the rights of all parties affected. We want to be involved in this development through public consultation and voice our concerns to the council. We want to work together with the council to fine-tune the plan and achieve a positive outcome for all before the resource consent is approved.

We look forward to hear from you.

Kind regards
The residents of Donnelly Street, St. Johns, Auckland 1072

Donnelly Street Neighbourhood Coordinator: 
Ramasss Thelvendran  
Email: ramasst@gmail.com  
Mobile: 021 650 899
Attachment C

Item 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Peckham</td>
<td>54 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Cheung</td>
<td>43 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena Guo</td>
<td>39 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Li</td>
<td>29 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cheng</td>
<td>37 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Wang</td>
<td>37 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Matsuda</td>
<td>35 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Matsuda</td>
<td>3 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Prints</td>
<td>7 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudy Perone</td>
<td>49 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Nguyen</td>
<td>9 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeng Zhao</td>
<td>7 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jing Zhang</td>
<td>9 Donnelly St, Stonefields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
File No.: CP2019/12929

Purpose
To update the Ōrākei Local Board Members on projects, activities and issues since last reported.

Recommendations
a) That the report be received.
b) That the unnamed local reserve at Whakatakataka Bay, Ngapipi Road, Ōrākei, be named Whakatakataka Reserve in accordance with the Board’s Parks and Reserves, Parks Features and Parks Facilities Naming Policy and Guidelines, and that signage be erected accordingly.

Portfolio Lead: Parks and Reserves (joint); Arts and Libraries; Heritage
Alternate portfolio holder: Environment; Resource Consenting and Regulatory
Other - internal appointments: Mayor’s WWI Memorial Advisory Group; Quality Advice Political Advisory Group
Other - appointments to external community organisations: Stonefields Residents Association Inc. (Lead); St Heliers/Glendowie Residents Association Inc. (Alternate); Auckland Netball Centre Inc. (Lead); Friends of Churchill Park (Lead); Ōrākei Basin Advisory Group (joint parks portfolio holder); St Heliers Bay Village Association (Alternate); Michaels Avenue Reserve Community Liaison Committee (Alternate).

Heritage
(1) Tamaki Drive Searchlights
I am pleased to report that the restoration project on all three emplacements has been completed. The handover by the project team to the Council’s maintenance team took place on-site on 28 June. The three emplacements look amazing and the finished project has received many positive comments. Congratulations to the project team.

Each of the emplacements is different with different types of shutters in keeping with those originally on them to protect the emplacements from inclement weather and to keep out rough sleepers. No. 1 has had new steel shutters of the type previously used (the originals had been missing for many years), and a new steel door installed. On no.3, the only emplacement which retained a lot of its original features, the restored steel folding shutters and a new steel door have been installed. On no. 2 the perforated artwork on new panels, showing an image of a soldier operating one of the searchlights from WWII, and a new steel door, have been installed. The art work has also drawn particular positive interest. All emplacements will have anti-graffiti treatment applied.

Working with Auckland Transport, it is intended to angle the existing lamps attached to the power poles, slightly sideways to caste light across the shutters of the emplacements to illuminate them at night to dramatic effect. These lights were originally donated by Mercury Energy for its centenary to light up the cliff face. Unfortunately, Auckland Transport was not able to do this before the scaffolding was removed from the emplacements.

Photographs are attached.

(2) Heritage Plaques, Mission Bay
It is a mystery to me that while the significant above-mentioned complex heritage project was able to be completed within the estimated time, the two small plaques at the Millennium Bridge, Mission Bay, have not yet been installed. I am hoping they will be in the near future.

It is also important that the floor of the bridge is regularly cleaned to highlight the art work embedded in it, the meaning of which is recorded on one of the plaques.

(3) Glover Road War Memorial Re-dedication

The successful free public ceremony to re-dedicate the avenue of 63 titoki trees originally planted in November 1953 in memory of those men from the local district who died in World Wars One and Two was held on Sunday 16 June at 11.30am. Wreaths were laid at the two original refurbished plaques. As well as specific invitations, a general invitation was extended to nearby residents by letter drop. Successors and family members of those in the original official party attended. Retired Anglican Bishop Rt. Rev. Peter Atkins recounted the special meaning the titoki tree has and how appropriate the titoki was chosen to be the remembrance tree. The trumpeter and piper were secondary school students and the principal speaker was the winner of the Board's inaugural ANZAC Youth Public Speaking Award. The President of the Auckland RSA pledged on behalf of the Fields of Remembrance Trust a gift of 63 crosses for this Memorial.

Photographs are attached.

(4) The Crimean War Trophy Gun

The Board has the responsibility for the Auckland Council-owned Crimean War trophy gun, presently in storage, and which had been put on display near the Royal Akarana Yacht Club’s premises. Originally manufactured in 1817 this rare heritage gun was captured at Sevastopol, Ukraine, following the Crimean War, in 1856. The markings on the gun makes it the oldest of the 10 guns sent to New Zealand and Australia. It and a near identical gun were gifted by the British Government to the Auckland Provincial Council in 1857 and were installed in Albert Park where they remained for many years before being eventually re-sited at Okahu Bay, in the care of the Royal Akarana Yacht Club. Exposure to the salt air on the ferrous metal caused some deterioration to the guns and 1979 the Army restored them. With the agreement of the Council one of the guns was given to the National Army Museum at Waiouru. The remaining gun was returned to The Landing and displayed outside the Club’s premises, until removed into storage while the Club’s new premises were constructed.

With the completion of the Club’s premises, it is appropriate for the Board to consider where the gun should be sited: either at The Landing or at another suitable location. Board Chairman Parkinson and I have been exploring suitable sites and will report further.

Parks and Reserves

Naming

At the Board’s business meeting on 18 October 2018, I recommended and the Board adopted this resolution: That the process be started for the naming of the unnamed local reserve at Whakatakataka Bay, Ngapipi Road, Ōrākei, in accordance with the Board’s Parks and Reserves, Parks Features and Parks Facilities Naming Policy and Guidelines, with the suggestion that it be named Whakatakataka Reserve.

There is now some urgency to name this reserve given that the reserve is being positively considered as part of Stage 4 of the Glen Innes-Tāmaki Drive Shared Path.

This property is not part of the Ngapipi Reserve and was owned by Watercare before being transferred to the Auckland Council.

The name Whakatakataka Reserve was supported by Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei kaumatua at the recent regular hui that Board members have with them.

The Policy and Guidelines state that the appropriate staff team will report to the Board in a timely manner and that new parks will be named within twelve months of acquisition. Nearly nine months have elapsed since the resolution was passed and there has been no officer report. The Policy
and Guidelines also state and that the final decision regarding the name rests with the Ōrākei Local Board.

**Activities (since 9 June 2019)**

As well as assisting with a range of citizens’ enquiries, attending meetings, and involvement with other community activities, I have also attended the following to date:

1. June a meeting of the Auckland Library Heritage Trust, of which I am Chairman.
2. June a meeting of the St Heliers Village Association.
3. June the transport portfolio briefing.
4. June a briefing on the proposed redevelopment of the Eastcliffe Retirement Village.
5. June the Ōrākei Local Board workshop various topics.
7. June the re-dedication of the Glover Road War Memorial.
8. June a meeting with the Chairman regarding the agenda for the Board’s business meeting.
10. June a meeting of the St Heliers/Glendowie Residents Association.
11. June the regular hui with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei kaumatua to discuss matters of mutual interest.
12. June a briefing on the forthcoming NACRA international yachting event to be held from The Landing.
13. June the Auckland Netball Association’s Board meeting.
14. June the on-site searchlight emplacements restoration progress meeting.
15. June the official Council farewell for George Farrant, a nationally recognised heritage expert, fittingly at the Civic theatre.
16. June the public meeting organised jointly by the St Heliers Village Association and the St Heliers/Glendowie Residents Association at which the Mayor was the guest speaker.
17. June a briefing on progress of planning for the Glen Innes-Tāmaki Drive Shared Path.
18. June the Ōrākei Local Board business meeting.
19. June the transport portfolio briefing.
20. June the Ōrākei Local Board workshop various topics.
21. June the viewing of the two refurbished boats owned by TS Achilles, towards which work the Board gave a grant.
22. June the handover of the searchlights project to Council’s maintenance staff.
23. June a meeting of local representatives regarding Auckland Transport’s proposals for St Heliers.
24. July a meeting of the St Heliers Village Association.
25. July a talk at the Auckland Central Library.
27. July the Ōrākei Local Board workshop various topics.
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Colin Davis – Board Report Attachments – 18 July 2019

Glover Road War Memorial Rededication, 16 June 2019
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Item 21
Tamaki Drive World War II Searchlight Emplacements

Before Restoration work

Emplacement 1

Emplacement 2

After Restoration Work

Emplacement 3

Emplacement 1 - restored

Emplacement 2 - restored

Emplacement 3 - restored
View from a Searchlight Emplacement to Rangitoto

Emplacement 2 - during restoration

Emplacement 2 - after restoration with artwork showing an image of a soldier operating one of the searchlights
Board Member Report – Toni Millar

File No.: CP2019/12925

Purpose of the report
1. To update the Ōrākei Local Board Members on projects, activities and issues.

Recommendation
a) That the report be received.

Portfolio Lead: Environment
Other (alternate portfolio holder): Arts and Libraries; Transport (Joint)

Activities
6 June    OLB Workshop
          OLB Extra-Ordinary Business Meeting to adopt Annual Budget 2019/2020
10 June   OLB update maintenance
11 June   OLB update Barfoot & Thompson Stadium
          OLB update Transport
          PLB Placeholder meeting
13 June   OLB Workshop
14 June   Opening Ōrākei Basin Walkway
          Mega Stars Dinner for Walking School Bus Volunteers & Travelwise Lead Teachers at Ellerslie Event Centre
16 June   Glover Road War Memorial Re-dedication
17 June   OLB meeting AT/Panuku/Remuera Business Assoc & Remuera Resident’s Assoc
          St Heliers/Glendowie Resident’s Assoc Meeting – St Heliers Community Centre
19 June   Meeting with Mayor Phil Goff – organised by St Heliers Business Assoc and St Heliers/Glendowie Residents Assoc.
20 June   OLB Business Meeting – St Chads
27 June   OLB Workshop

Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Signatory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Toni Millar – Local Board Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>8 July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board Member Report – Ros Rundle

File No.: CP2019/12968

Purpose of the report
To update the Ōrākei Local Board Members on projects, activities and issues.

Recommendations
a) That the report be received.
b) That the Ōrākei Local Board request Auckland Transport to provide via their Road Works and Disruptions Schedule which is published on a weekly basis to include all road works. Specifically referring to service contractor work e.g. Vector, Chorus, Gas works, watercare etc.

Portfolio Lead: Economic Development
Other (alternate portfolio holder): Community; Transport (Joint)

Economic Development

St Heliers Business Association
Update from St Heliers business association

On-going consultation with Auckland Transport regarding the Safety Improvements. A working group has been set up and is meeting regularly.

Promotions in St Heliers
1. Elemental is Auckland’s new winter festival. Celebrating Auckland’s energy and vibrancy through light, cuisine, culture and entertainment for the month of July.
   St Heliers is promoting “Fire by the sea”, on 19th of July Fire performers will be in St Heliers from 6.30pm through to 9.30pm. This is live on social media and now featured in the Elemental website from ATEED.
   La Fourchette, Annabelles, Moretons all have designed a meal for the month of July that capitulates the elements of either, fire, earth, water or air.
2. Be in to win competition. Each $25.00 spend customer to receive a unique code to enter the competition. Sponsored by Bayleys and House of travel
3. Secret life of pets: Great library events to tie in with this, fun prizes.

Change of Police:
Todd Martin, the local constable has now moved to the Police Harm Prevention Group, new constable taking over and will be based in Newmarket.

Remuera Business Association
Update from Remuera Business Association

Roadwork and Changes
AT still not reopening Clonbern Carpark. Petition and cross street banner implemented for media campaign. Petition gained 5,000 in store and online signatures so far.

AT holding Board meeting on 11th June 2019. Since the RBA meeting the outcome from the AT Board meeting is noted below.
Item 23

“The outcome from the AT Board meeting held on 11 June is that the car park will not be removed from council control. The transfer to Panuku is on the condition that any development includes the provision of 200 car parks (20 more than what currently exists.) Panuku will work closely with AT through the transfer process. Once transferred, Panuku will draft a development strategy which will determine how to best release value for Council and the ratepayer while retaining the public carpark needs. The development strategy will also focus on quality design and outcome for the centre.”

Roadworks are usually notified through the AT maintenance schedule unfortunately some service contractors do not apply for approval to AT and therefore these works do not appear on the AT maintenance schedule. This usually means that local businesses are unaware of works going on outside their businesses. Often this mean loss of car parks for an undetermined length of time and adds more stress on our local businesses and ultimately loss of business.

Mission Bay Business Association
Auckland Transport update for Mission Bay

Pedestrian safety consultation with Auckland Transport had previously informed us that they will infill the gaps in the streetscape roadside garden strips with larger plants when the rain starts, still waiting for this to happen.

Mission Bay town centre safety improvements. The working group has been convened consisting of a representative of the MBBA, the MBKRA and the OLB as well as the local councillor for Orākei and AT representatives. The first meeting was held in May. Minutes and terms of reference were circulated by AT and the MBBA have replied with suggested changes to both.

Orākei Local Board Update: Asset Upgrades - The toilet/changing rooms will be replaced rather than renovated and funds have been allocated from the 19/20 budget. The playground will undergo a large upgrade during the same financial year.

Received funding for the clock tower lighting and also for the ongoing safer cities connection and associated costs. The photo frame was not approved however there is still an opportunity to engage with the board on this. Deco Lights are arranging a meeting with AT to discuss the clock tower lighting.

General • Pigeons are an issue in Mission Bay. Follow up with the council pest control officer as part of an overall programme to eradicate pests in Mission Bay.

Community

Megastars Awards Night 2019
Attended a special awards ceremony to recognise all our amazing Walking School Bus volunteers and Travelwise Lead Teachers across Auckland. Four of our local schools were finalists, Kirsten Beggs from Kohimarama School, Cathy Preston from St Heliers School and Kath Manning from Meadowbank School and Chaehee Park from Churchill Park. Congratulations to all the finalists, you are amazing.

Orākei Youth Leadership
Friday 28 June 2019 at the Meadowbank Community Centre, a group of young people attended “Amplify”.

Youth wanting to make a difference in our community met for a morning of networking, were inspired by young speakers and attended workshops during the morning. Great that our youth are given a platform to hear their ideas to make a difference for the future.

Eastern Bays Network Meeting update from some members of the group:

Men's Shed – advised they have 150 members. Have made 1500 rat traps to date

Kohimarama Bowling Club – Indoor bowls being played at present and taking bookings for the hall as a venue
Pauline from Meadowbank Community Centre advised that there is a core group of hirers using the centre which include special interest groups offering art classes, tai chi, yoga and more.

There is a youth leadership event called “Amplify” to take place on 28 June.

Chloe from Fire Emergency advised that they are doing presentations for elderly and lower socio groups regarding the importance of smoke alarms.

Tess from CAB continuing with the draft copy of Venues Booklet for the Orākei Local Board area.

Joanne from St Heliers Library advised that they are organising Win with Words – creative writing for Years 7 and 8.

Aunty Margaret demonstrated Maori Tai Chi

Sue from Remuera Library advised that she is also organising Win with words for Year 7 and 8.

30 students attended a creative writing workshop to assist them with their essays for the competition.

The library has talks on the first Tuesday of the month. Talk in July is being presented by Greg Murray on the Silver backed gorillas in Uganda.

Members of staff assist members from the Orākei Marae with technology and phone queries.

David Blakey from Ellerslie Theatrical Society advised that One Act plays are coming back to the theatre in August. He advised that they have local play wrights, and they are using new talent in the areas of directors, lighting designers and sound designers.

Geoff Andrews from Auckland Community Accounting is offering a free accounting service for clubs societies and not for profit organisations, where treasurers and other board members of small to medium community groups can bring queries to trained accounting students under the supervision of a Chartered Accountant. Queries can include assistance with understanding the treasurer’s role, help with completing annual returns or difficulty working with accounting software etc.

Emma from Kelly Tarlton advised that they had a successful clean up on Hatfields Beach last month. There is an a plastic free Orākei event starting again on 10 July.

Anne Cave from Selwyn Community Education are having a full day of learning about India, history, food and culture.

**Activities:** As well as answering many queries from our community I attended the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attended Mission Bay Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attended the Orākei Local Board Volunteers Awards evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attended update for Stonefields Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Orākei Local Board workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended an extra-ordinary OLB meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attended the Crazy for You Play at Selwyn College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Attended St Heliers Village Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Attended Remuera Business Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended presentation update by Barfoot and Thompson Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Auckland Transport update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended the update for Eastcliffe Retirement Village from Ngāti Whātua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Attended the Orākei Community Association meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 Attended the Orākei Basin Walkway opening with the OLB members
    Attended the Walking Bus Awards “Megastars” presentation
18 Attended presentation from ATEED on the NACRA series at the Landing in December
    Attended the Auckland Netball Board meeting
19 Attended a presentation from Ngāti Whātua regarding the Framework for the Vision for the Whenua Rangatira and Pourewa
    Attended the meeting with the Mayor of Auckland Phil Goff organised by the St Heliers/Glendowie Residents Association and the St Heliers Village Association
20 Attended the Business Meeting for Orākei Local Board
21 Attended an International dinner organised by the St Heliers Centre
26 Attended the Eastern Bays Network hosted by Ngāti Whātua
    Attended an update on the OBC by Council officers
27 Attended a Learn about Medicinal Plants at Tahuna Torea Reserve
    Attended the OLB weekly workshop meeting
28 Attended ‘Amplify’ a Youth Leadership initiative by the OLB
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Otene welcoming and blessing the new path at the Ōrākei Basin. Followed by tree planting.

Otāke Basin new path with beautifully built timber seating.

Tama Davis welcoming the Eastern Bay Network Group.

Mayor Goff addressing St Heliers/Glendowie residents on a variety of topics.

Megastars Awards Night for Walking Bus volunteers.

Megastars finalists – 2 from OLB area Chaehee Park from Churchill Park School and Cathy Preston from St Heliers School.
Item 23

Finalists from OLB area Kirsten Beggs from Kohimarama School and Kath Manning from Meadowbank School

Signage recently seen in Morrinsville town centre.

Ōrākei Local Board Volunteers Awards 2019
MC’d by Member Claridge

Finalists awarded with certificates for exceptional service to the community. Well done to all, the OLB and the community are so proud of what you do.
Board Member Report – David Wong

File No.: CP2019/12985

Purpose of the report
1. To update the Ōrākei Local Board Members on projects, activities and issues.

Recommendations
a) That the report is received.
b) That the Ōrākei Local Board note the feedback provided to Council planners on the following developments:
   i) 18 Allum Street
   ii) 14 Keith Avenue
   iii) Kohimarama Yacht Club – boat storage and ramp.

Portfolio Lead: Community
Other (alternate portfolio holder): Economic Development; Events, Landowner Approvals and Leases; Resource Consenting and Regulatory (Joint)

Community (& Youth)
2. Barfoot and Thompson Stadium Board meeting – discussion on Selwyn College/Ministry of Education deed of lease to ECCT;
3. Key impact of the new lease is a clause requiring the lessee to remove the building and any capital works – no later than the expiry date. The Board is seeking legal advice from Kensington Swan to establish a more equitable lease term.
4. Roofing upgrades and funding applications continue to be sought; including funds for new van.
5. Meeting with planners re- a resource consent for Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Whai Rawa Limited
6. Debrief on Barfoot and Thompson Stadium /council funding requisite update (Brian Thomlinson – General Manager) – conference call; 11 June – key issues: challenges of balancing college and community availability of the stadium; the need for major events to provide adequate revenue sources; and ongoing major maintenance of the venue including roof repairs
7. Ōrākei Basin Walkway opening
8. Ellerslie Residents Association – 17 June; covered discussion on the Ladies Mile cycle way removal. The ERA refuted the AT response – AT did not support the removal based on lack of crash data for cyclists. ERA welcomed further investigation by AT on the Ballarat Paper Road and access requirements. ERA were planning a candidates and mayoralty public meeting ahead of the October elections.
9. Mission Bay Kohimarama Residents Association – discussion on the Mission Bay Shopping complex development with the public hearings due on 30 July – 6 August 2019. MBKRA will engage a planning lawyer and planner to formalise their submission. Continued discussion on the potential usage of the Mission Bay Bowling club and availability back to the community. Refer Panuku response – Attachment A.

Events
10. Glover Park Memorial Trees opening; with Members Davis, Parkinson and Claridge
11. Mayor Phil Goff public meeting with St Heliers Bay Residents Association. Key discussion focused on the St Heliers business village pedestrian crossing and loss of parking – and the intention to defer any further work. Strong opposition coming from residents on the Freedom Camping bylaw; and the need to ensure accountability of CCO’s.

12. Attendance at Amplify Youth forum – an opportunity to outline leadership and community awareness across various colleges including Selwyn, Glendowie.

**Resource Consenting and Regulatory**

13. Outboard Boating Club conference call – update on the latest discussion of Council staff and OBC; and the continued impasse over the fencing arrangements. Options of layout in terms of reserve land and OBC land for access and car turning manoeuvrability were proposed. Key outcome was to firstly remove the fence and start to negotiate on options of accessibility for the public to the OBC ramps and reserve.

14. Clonbern Road carpark debrief – Panuku and Remuera Residents Association

15. Planning and consenting feedback provided on the following developments:
   - 18 Allum Street; Attachment B
   - 14 Keith Avenue; Attachment C
   - Kohimarama Yacht Club; Attachment D

16. Completion of OLB feedback on 12 Waimarie Street (Oceania Retirement Village) with Member Davis – proposal to present on behalf of OLB feedback on 22 July

**Activities: 9 June 2019 - 6 July 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11 June 2019 | • Barfoot and Thompson Stadium – community /council funding update  
  • Meeting with planners re- a resource consent for Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Whai Rawa Limited |
| 13 June 2019 | • OLB workshop                                                                                  |
| 14 June 2019 | • Orakei Basin walkway opening with all members of OLB and Ngati Whatua Orakei                  |
| 16 June 2019 | • Glover Park Memorial trees – official opening                                                 |
| 17 June 2019 | • Clonbern Road carpark– Panuku/Remuera Residents Association debrief                           |
| 19 June 2019 | • Phil Goff public meeting – St Heliers Residents Association – in attendance with Members Davis and Rundle |
| 20 June 2019 | • OLB Business meeting                                                                           |
| 25 June 2019 | • Barfoot and Thompson Stadium meeting                                                          |
| 26 June 2019 | • OBC leasing/license to occupy debrief - Council Parks, Sports and Reserve                    |
| 27 June 2019 | • OLB workshop                                                                                  |
| 28 June 2019 | • Amplify Youth Forum – Meadowbank Community Centre; attendance with Members Parkinson, Claridge and Rundle |
| 2 July 2019  | • Mission Bay Kohimarama Residents Association                                                   |
| 4 July 2019  | • OLB workshop                                                                                  |
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ATTACHMENT A – FEEDBACK FROM PANUKU – ON FUTURE OF MISSION BAY BOWLING CLUB – 2 JULY 2019

Dear David,

Thank you for the query regarding the former Mission Bay Bowls Club at 9 Tagalad Road/6A Ninill Crescent, Mission Bay.

Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding.

As you will be aware, following the Mission Bays Bowls Club surrendering its lease and closing its operations, Panuku was the Auckland Council controlled organisation tasked with managing the property and investigating future requirements.

The investigations include research into the property history, any encumbrances it may have on its use and consultation with the entire council group to ascertain if there is another current council use for the property or a future planned need that can be realistically funded.

You may recall that in September 2018 Panuku attended a workshop with the Orakei Local Board to discuss the rationalisation process undertaken and the results of the Parks, Sport and Recreation department service assessment completed in May 2018. The assessment identified the following constraints relating to a proposed multi sports facility located at the property:

- The property is land locked with no direct street frontage.
- There is no passive surveillance/visibility.
- No connections to other open space.
- The size limits the ability to accommodate other sporting needs.
- There are likely to be noise/artificial lights issues.
- Issues relating to height in relationship to boundary.
- Limited on-site parking capacity.

Other uses were also investigated, but were also limited again due to the size and configuration of the property. Of note is the conversion into a proposed playground and the information below will hopefully provide the answer to the first part of your question.

- Conversion into a local park/playground
  - would likely require purchase of neighbouring property/properties to achieve road frontage visibility in accordance with open space policy and crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles
- Possible use as beach volleyball or futsal grounds
  - lighting and noise constraints
- Multipurpose artificial area for recreation or junior training
  - limited by noise, proximity to residential properties
  - not identified or funded in the 10-year budget (LTP)

In summary, the Parks, Sport and Recreation department service assessment advised there is no demonstrable case or viable demand in its current configuration and size, and no requirement to retain the property for a recreation purpose.

In terms of next steps, please note that Panuku and Auckland Council will undertake public consultation regarding the future of the property in line with requirements in council’s significance and engagement policy and the Local Government Act 2002.

The form and extent of this public consultation is still to be confirmed, however the consultation will occur after the October 2019 local body elections. Once more details are confirmed, Panuku will advise the local board.
The local Mission Bay community will be able to provide its views on the future of the property through this consultation and the feedback received will be reported to both the new 2019-2022 political term Orakei Local Board and to council’s Governing Body for their respective consideration.

In the interim, the property is being maintained to ensure it does not become an eyesore or attract undesirable activity on the grounds. Noting that due to the age of the buildings, this is fast becoming an issue as the structures degrade.

Panuku is also continuing to seek a tenant for the property in accordance with its classification as a reserve subject to Reserves Act 1977.

Please feel free to contact myself if you have any further questions regarding the property or if you notice any on-site maintenance issues.

Kind regards,

Anthony

Anthony Lewis
Senior Advisor Portfolio Review
Portfolio Strategy
FEEDBACK FROM THE ŌRĀKEI LOCAL BOARD
ON A RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION FOR 18 ALLUM ST. KOHIMARAMA

Background

1. The applicant seeks land use resource consent for the demolition of the existing dwelling (870m² site) and construction of two new dwellings (being a main dwelling and a guest house), vehicle access and associated earthworks at 18 Allum Street, Kohimarama.

Buildings

2. The main dwelling will be a three storey building situated on the rear of the site. The ground floor will contain the garage and a bedroom, the first floor will contain three bedrooms and a living room, and the upper floor will contain the kitchen and main living area. The guest house will be a two storey building located at the front of the site. The ground floor will contain the garage and the upper floor will contain one bedroom and the kitchen and living areas.

3. The proposed guest house will be utilised by family and friends of the occupiers of the main dwelling. It is noted that the proposed development will result in an overall reduction in building coverage and impervious area across the site, and area of building height infringement when compared to the existing dwelling. Plans and figures comparing the existing and proposed development are included within the architectural plan set.
Infringements

3. The Ōrākei Local Board (OLB) are cognisant of maintaining and keeping within Unitary Plan guidelines. We have consistently reviewed applications across the ward to ensure triggers or infringements are appropriately called out and if required – sought public notification.

4. OLB note there are 10 infringements of the Unitary Plan. Although treated on an individual basis – they are considered restricted discretionary activities. We need to look at the cumulative effect of these activities and the impact on the neighbours, area under development and keeping within the thresholds of the UP.

5. It is stated up front in the AEE report (section 4.1.1) that no written approvals have been obtained for this development. Given the number of infringements – we consider it prudent to ensure neighbours in this vicinity have an opportunity to voice their views over the current design – in particular height and height in relation to boundary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter C General Rules</strong></td>
<td>Consent required. As assessed below, the proposal will not comply with the standards as identified below and requires consent as a restricted discretionary activity under rule C.1.9(2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.9(2) Infringements of standards</td>
<td>An activity that is classed as a permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity but that does not comply with one or more of the standards applying to that activity is a restricted discretionary activity unless otherwise specified by a rule applying to the particular activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter H4. Residential – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone</strong></td>
<td>Consent required. The proposal involves constructing two dwellings (main house and guest house) which are permitted under rules H5.4.1 (A3) and (A35), however it will not comply with the core standards and pursuant to rule C.1.9(2) requires consent as a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A38) Up to three dwellings per site - Permitted</td>
<td>The proposal involves demolition of the existing dwelling on the site. As assessed above, the proposal will not comply with the core standards and is a restricted discretionary activity under C.1.9(2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A38) Demolition of buildings - Permitted</td>
<td>Consent required. The main dwelling exceeds the 8m permitted height limit by a maximum height of 0.716m over a total area of 48.4m². Pursuant to rule C.1.9(2), resource consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A35) New buildings and additions to buildings – the same activity status and standards as applies to the land use activity that the new building or addition to a building is designed to accommodate.</td>
<td>Consent required. The main dwelling does not meet the 2.5m and 45-degree recession plane as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4.6.4. Building height</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main dwelling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings must not exceed 8m in height except that 50 per cent of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 3m, where the entire roof slopes 15 degrees or more.</td>
<td>- Northern boundary: The level 2 balustrade will infringe the HiR8 plane on the northern boundary by a maximum height of 0.242m over a length of 1.5m (refer to HiR8 Section 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4.6.5. Height in relation to boundary</strong></td>
<td>- Northern boundary: The level 2 roof will infringe the HiR8 plane on the northern boundary by a maximum height of 0.881m over a length of 3.33m (refer to HiR8 Section 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Buildings must not project beyond a 45 degree recession plane measured from a point 2.5m vertically above ground level along side and rear boundaries.</td>
<td>- Eastern boundary: The level 2 roof will infringe the HiR8 plane on the eastern boundary by a maximum height of 0.424m over a length of 3.33m (refer to HiR8 Section 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) A gable end, dormer or roof may project beyond the recession plane where that portion beyond the recession plane is:</td>
<td>- Western boundary: The level 2 roof will infringe the HiR8 plane on the western boundary by a maximum height of 0.424m over a length of 3.33m (refer to HiR8 Section 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) no greater than 1.5m² in area and no greater than 1m in height; and</td>
<td>- Toilet boundary: The level 2 roof will infringe the HiR8 plane on the toilet boundary by a maximum height of 0.424m over a length of 3.33m (refer to HiR8 Section 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) no greater than 2.5m cumulatively in length measured along the edge of the roof</td>
<td>- Eastern boundary: The level 2 roof will infringe the HiR8 plane on the eastern boundary by a maximum height of 0.424m over a length of 3.33m (refer to HiR8 Section 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 24

**Height of 0.538m over a length of 6.4m (refer to HIRB Section 7).**

**Guest house**

The guest house does not meet the HIRB recession plane as follows:
- Southern boundary: The roof will infringe the HIRB plane on the southern boundary by a maximum height of 0.697m over a length of 7.48m (refer to HIRB Section 1).

Pursuant to rule C1.9(2), resource consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity.

**Exclusions under clause 5(g) of Standard H4.6.5 Heights in relation to boundary**

In addition, the following infringements shown on the architectural plans are exempted by the exclusions provided for in clause 5(g) of Standard H4.6.5:
- Main dwelling southern boundary: The level 2 roof will infringe the HIRB plane on the southern boundary by a maximum height of 0.184m over a length of 1m (refer to HIRB Section 2).
- Main dwelling southern boundary: The level 2 roof will infringe the HIRB plane on the southern boundary by a maximum height of 0.112m over a length of 1m (refer to HIRB Section 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H4.6.6. Alternative height in relation to boundary</strong></th>
<th>N/A. AHIRB has not been applied.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings within 20m of the site frontage must not exceed a height of 3.5m measured vertically above ground level at side and rear boundaries. Thereafter, buildings must be set back one metre and then 0.3m for every additional metre in height (7.5 degrees) up to 6.5m and then one metre for every additional metre in height (45 degrees).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H4.6.7. Height in relation to boundary affaining lower intensity zones</strong></th>
<th>N/A. The site does not adjoin a site with a lower intensity zoning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H4.6.8. Yards</strong></th>
<th>Consent required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front – 3m</td>
<td>Retaining walls (fill) up to 0.5m in height are proposed at the front site boundary, and therefore infringes the 3m front yard setback (refer to drawing 1.00 in architectural plan set attached at Appendix C). Pursuant to rule C1.9(2), resource consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side and rear yards – 1m</td>
<td>The remainder of the proposed development complies with the front, side and rear yard standards. Note – the building line restriction has been taken into account and is shown on the architectural plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H4.6.9. Maximum impervious area</strong></th>
<th>Consent required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The maximum impervious area must not exceed 60 per cent of site area.</td>
<td>The proposal will result in 562.3m² (or 64.7%) impervious area across the site. Pursuant to rule C1.9(2), resource consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H4.6.11. Landscaped area

1. The minimum landscaped area must be at least 40 per cent of the net site area.

2. At least 50 per cent of the area of the front yard must comprise landscaped area.

Consent required.

The proposal will result in 336.9m² (or 35.5%) landscaped area across the site. Pursuant to rule C.1.(1), resource consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity.

The proposal will result in 44.5m² (or 77.5%) landscaped area within the front yard.

Note – the building line restriction has been taken into account and is shown on the architectural plans.

---

H4.6.13. Outdoor living space

1. A dwelling, supported residential care or boarding house at ground floor level, must have an outdoor living space that is at least 20m² that comprises ground floor and/or balcony/roof terrace space that:
   - (a) where located at ground level has no dimension less than 4m and has a gradient not exceeding 1 in 20; and/or
   - (b) where provided in the form of balcony, patio or roof terrace is at least 5m² and has a minimum dimension of 1.8m; and
   - (c) is accessible from the dwelling, supported residential care unit or boarding house, and

Consent required.

The proposed outdoor living space for the main dwelling meets the minimum standard of 20m² and meets the dimensional requirements, is accessible from the dwelling, free of buildings, parking spaces and manoeuvring.

The proposed outdoor living space for the guest house does not meet the size requirements (5m²) for a balcony of a one-bedroom dwelling above ground level, providing 4.5m². It also fails to meet the minimum dimension standard of 1.8m, only providing a dimension of 0.88m.

Consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity under rule C.1.(2).

---

Chapter E12. Land disturbance - District

E12.4.1 Activity table – all zones and lands

(A4) Greater than 500m² up to 10000m² - Restricted discretionary

(A6) Greater than 750m² up to 10000m² - Restricted discretionary

A total of 832m² (744m² of cut, 88m³ of fill) and 868m² of earthworks are proposed across the site. Pursuant to rules E12.4.1(A4) and (A6), consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity.

---

Chapter E27. Transport

E27.4.1 Activity table

(A2) Parking, loading and access which is an accessory activity, but which does not comply with the standards for parking, loading and access – Restricted discretionary

Consent required.

As assessed below, the proposal will not comply with the standards. Pursuant to rule E27.4.1(A2), consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity.
**Attachment B**

**Item 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E27.6.3.1. Size and location of parking spaces</th>
<th>Consent required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table E27.6.3.1 Minimum Car parking space and manoeuvring dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T120) Car parking angle: 90 degrees (regular users)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of parking space: 2.7m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of parking space from wall: 5m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoeuvring space: 5.9m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 10.9m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The double garage for the main house is 5m (w) x 6m (d) and complies with the relevant standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The double garage for the guest house is 4.8m (w) x 5.9m (d), however provides a manoeuvring depth of only 4.8m. Pursuant to rule E27.4.1(A2), consent is required for a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E27.6.4.4. Gradient of vehicle access</th>
<th>Consent required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The gradient of the access must not be steeper than specified in Table E27.6.4.4.1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table E27.6.4.4.1 Gradient of vehicle access</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T135) Vehicle access serving any other residential activities – maximum gradient 1 in 5 (20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) All vehicle access must be designed so that where the access adjoins the road there is sufficient space onsite for a platform so that vehicles can stop safely and check for pedestrians and other vehicles prior to exiting. This is illustrated in Figure E27.6.4.4.4. The platform must have a maximum gradient no steeper than 1 in 20 (5 per cent) and a minimum length of 4m for residential activities and 6m for all other activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed vehicle access will have a maximum gradient of 1 in 4. Pursuant to rule E27.4.1(A2), consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed vehicle access will have a gradient of 1 in 6 for the first 4m of the vehicle access at the road boundary. Pursuant to rule E27.4.1(A2), consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

6. The Ōrākei Local Board maintain a consistent approach to the assessment of developments which infringe the Unitary Plan. Unless the design is modified to stay within the Unitary Plan guidelines – we advocate public notification.
FEEDBACK FROM THE ŌRĀKEI LOCAL BOARD
ON A RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION FOR 14 KEITH AVENUE, REMUERA

Background

1. The proposal involves the demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of a new dwelling on the site. The dwelling is proposed to be three stories in height. It will be constructed with a mix of weatherboard, block wall and panel façade and steel roofing.

2. The basement has a rumpus, a master bedroom, two bedrooms, a wine cellar, a bar, a gym, a bathroom, and a laundry room. The ground floor is the main living area with the kitchen, dining and living area opening up to the deck area. There are also a double garage and a lounge. The first floor has three master bedrooms, each of which has an ensuite and walking-in wardrobe.

---

Infringements

3. The Ōrākei Local Board are cognisant of maintaining and keeping within Unitary Plan guidelines. We have consistently reviewed applications across the ward to ensure triggers or infringements are appropriately called out and if required – sought public notification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th>H4.6.4</th>
<th>Infringement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Buildings must not exceed 8m in height except that 50 per cent of a building’s roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1m, where the entire roof slopes 15 degrees or more.</td>
<td>The proposed dwelling projects beyond 8m building height when viewing from the east and west elevations. Note: Chimney is excluded from the height infringement as it does not exceed 1.5m above the permitted activity height for the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The current design breaches the height restriction by 0.8m. The key aspect of this development is the development being built within a MHS zone and the height of the buildings going to three levels. Whether there has been sufficient notification to neighbours is the question to allay any concerns.

5. Parts of the proposed outdoor staircases more than 1.5m high are located within the western side yard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard</th>
<th>H4.6.7</th>
<th>Infringement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Minimum setbacks from relevant boundaries should be provided as following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Front yard – 3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Side yard – 1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rear yard – 1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed outdoor staircases are located within the 1m setback from western side yard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neighbouring properties

6. Although a high level assessment has been undertaken across the following properties — have the property owners been engaged and advised of the design and potential implications.

12 Keith Avenue - 17 Keith Avenue - 776 Remuera Road - 780 Remuera Road - 13 Seascape Road - 15 Seascape Road

7. We note there is no reference to assessment of arboriculture in the developed area, and any consideration for native fauna.

SUMMARY

8. The Ōrākei Local Board maintain a consistent approach to the assessment of developments which infringe the Unitary Plan. Unless the design is modified to stay within the Unitary Plan guidelines — we recommend public notification.
FEEDBACK FROM THE ŌRĀKEI LOCAL BOARD
ON A RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION FOR KOHIMARAMA YACHT CLUB STORAGE AND
BOAT RAMP – JULY 2019

Background

1. The Kohimarama Yacht Club (the Club) clubhouse is situated on the foreshore at the eastern end of Kohimarama Beach. The Club has been providing the youth of Auckland with sailing experiences for 78 years.
2. The existing clubhouse is bordered by an artificial reef to the east, designed to protect sand on the beach from tidal migration, and by a timber deck and beach access ramp, that bounds Kohimarama Beach, to the west. At present some boat storage is located on the southern side of Tamaki Drive, opposite the clubhouse. Other boats arrive on trailers and members wheel them across the road for rigging on the beach.
3. This proposal represents the culmination of a six-year design investigation
4. Having decided on the deck storage approach, the Club engaged with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei, who hold mana whenua over Kohimarama Beach, on the design process to ensure that the design was not just environmentally sensitive, but also culturally appropriate. The resulting design incorporates a deck for the storage and rigging of the larger classes of boat, a secure stacked storage area for Optimist sailing dinghies and a ramp connecting the Tamaki Drive promenade to the reef and beach.
5. There are elements of cultural design input from Te Whēke Moko Design throughout the proposal.
Assessment of Environmental effects

Effects to be disregarded

6. OLB note the following paragraph:

“The club has not sought, nor obtained, any written approval from adjacent property owners as it considered that the project was well separated from adjacent properties and accordingly its effects on all property owners were less than minor.”

It may be worthwhile engaging with local neighbours and gain some affirmation that the proposed design is compatible to their locality.

Permitted baseline

7. OLB note the following paragraph:

:... However, there is one element of the permitted baseline that does warrant some consideration and that is the elements of the structure that do not protrude into the volcanic view shaft. All of the deck area and the lower portions (generally lower than 1m from the level of the reef adjacent to Tamaki Drive) are below the view shaft and therefore would be permitted in terms of the rules in Chapter D14”

It is not clear which elements of the structure do not protrude into the volcanic view shaft – and whether a contravention of the permitted baseline is being called out (but not elaborated on).

Visual and landscape effects

8. OLB note the following paragraph:

The site and proposed development are visually screened from most of Kohimarama Beach and suburban Kohimarama, apart from a small number of residential properties at 303A to 307B Tamaki Drive.

It would be encouraged to seek the views of the aforementioned properties to ensure support and collaboration.

Traffic effects

9. OLB note the following paragraph

The proposal to store boats on the seaward side of Tamaki Drive is considered to offer benefits over the current proposal by reducing boat crossing movements across Tamaki Drive, and the parking of cars and boat trailers outside the clubhouse. There will still be a need to transport boats along a short section of shared path (between the proposed deck and the existing access ramp) however this can be managed with a modified traffic management plan.

It should be a condition of consent for OLB to view the construction traffic management plan – as the area of convergence around the KYC is particularly busy and it would be useful to understand the simulations of cars turning into and out of the boat ramp/storage area.

10. OLB note the following paragraph
The existing 'pram' crossings in front of the yacht club serve as informal crossing points for pedestrians however there is sub-standard sight distance to approaching vehicles (to the west, from northern pram crossing) when vehicles are parked on the northern side of Tamaki Drive. This issue can only be resolved by Auckland Transport, however it is considered that the reduction in boat crossing movements at these crossings (as a result of the proposal) is beneficial from a safety perspective.

It is advisable to pursue the comment around resolution of the sub-standard sight distance – by putting forward a stronger case to Auckland Transport to support a form of remediation. OLB can support this case if it affects overall community safety.

Construction effects

11. OLB note the following paragraph

The combined cycle and walkway path will be reduced to a single lane for the duration of the construction.

The Tamaki Drive arterial route is becoming more cycle and walkway friendly and future designs appear to be occurring in this manner on both sides of the road. The traffic management plan needs to build in scenarios of turning traffic for boat owners entering and leaving the storage/boat ramp area. We envisage local constituents who are cyclists and walkers to have strong views on this construction interruption and the future increase flow on the sea side roadway.
E36 Natural hazards and flooding

12. OLB note the following paragraph

While the clubhouse site is exposed to northerly and easterly storm events, the proposed development does not increase the risk of adverse effects to people, property or infrastructure. In the case of inundation due to high tides, storms or coastal surges the boats stored on the deck area, if not removed beforehand, are secured to the deck, so as not to become a public hazard.

OLB knowing that this beach area is vulnerable to king tide and flooding – would be interested to know how the boats stored in the deck – will be secured.

Other considerations:

13. OLB are aware that boats are currently stored by KYC near the Eastern Suburbs club room sheds – at Madills Farm. We are interested to know if there is sufficient capacity to house those boats in the new storage area and thereby free up the shed space. Or whether a more optimal design could be developed to accommodate more vessels.

14. OLB note the following paragraph

Auckland Transport was mainly consulted in relation to the potential use of the reserve land on the southern side of Tamaki Drive for an earlier option, which was subsequently rejected. Auckland Transport comment on the current application will be during the consent process.

OLB would appreciate receiving the AT consultation feedback given that the design will have significant traffic implications for boat ramp and storage vehicles- crossing over defined cycle and walkways.

Summary

15. Given the prominence of the KYC and its situation on the main Tamaki Drive arterial route – there will be a multitude of constituents who would seek public notification.

16. OLB are of the opinion that the design is a significant development, although not overly visible, in the marine/coastal area abutting Tamaki Drive and should be notified.
The OLB were proud to open the walkway along Ōrākei Basin. With Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei providing the powhiri – local residents can now enjoy a seamless and safe walk along the basin fringe. Member Churton performed the honours of planting a new native tree; 14 June 2019

Some dedication and commitment from OLB Member Davis to support the restoration of the Glover Park Memorial trees in recognition of the past veterans of World Wars I and II. A good turnout to the opening on a lovely spring Sunday morning; 16 June.
Great to support the second year running of the **Amplify Youth Leadership** initiative. Funding from OLB helps young college students from various local ward colleges including Glendowie and Selwyn understand the operations of local board (Member Claridge provided an overview) and the leadership qualities required for future careers; 28 June

Close to 100 volunteers supported the Waiata Reserve tree planting 29 June including students from St Thomas’ School. The ecological initiative helps support the stream from erosion and was well facilitated by Conservation Volunteers NZ Ltd; (good to see local Epsom MP David Seymour and Councillor Desley Simpson).
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present to the Ōrākei Local Board with a governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report contains the governance forward work calendar, a schedule of items that will come before the Ōrākei Local Board at business meetings and workshops over the coming months until the end of the electoral term. The governance forward work calendar for the local board is included in Attachment A to the agenda report.

3. The calendar aims to support local boards’ governance role by:
   - ensuring advice on agendas and workshop material is driven by local board priorities
   - clarifying what advice is required and when
   - clarifying the rationale for reports.

4. The calendar will be updated every month. Each update will be reported back to business meetings and distributed to relevant council staff. It is recognised that at times items will arise that are not programmed. Local board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Ōrākei Local Board:
a) note the draft governance forward work calendar as at July 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar - July 2019</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kim Lawgun - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Ōrākei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting (workshop or business meeting)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>July 25, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>July 25, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>July 25, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>July 25, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>July 25, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>August 1, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>August 1, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>August 1, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>August 1, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>August 8, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>August 8, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>August 8, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>August 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>August 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>August 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>August 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>August 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>August 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>August 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting (workshop or business meeting)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, August 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, August 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, August 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, August 22, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, August 22, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, August 22, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, August 22, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, August 22, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, September 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, September 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, September 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, September 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, September 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, September 12, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, September 12, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, September 12, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Thursday, September 12, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting or (workshop or business meeting)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance Forward Work Calendar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Governance Forward Work Calendar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local initiatives / Specific decisions</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Local initiatives / Specific decisions</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal approval of Transport Capital Fund</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Thursday, September 19, 2019</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Attachment A**

**Item 25**
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To note the records for the Ōrākei Local Board workshops held following the previous business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Local Board workshops are an informal forum held primarily for information or discussion purposes, as the case may be, and at which no resolutions or decisions are made.
3. Attached are copies of the Ōrākei Local Board workshop records taken during workshops held on 6, 13 and 27 June 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Ōrākei Local Board records for the workshops held on 6, 13 and 27 June 2019 be noted.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Workshop proceedings - 6 June 2019</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Workshop proceedings - 13 June 2019</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Workshop proceedings - 27 June 2019</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kim Lawgun - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Ōrākei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Orākei Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Orākei Local Board held in the Orākei Local Board Office meeting room on Thursday, 6 June 2019 commencing at 11.45am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Kit Parkinson
Members: Carmel Claridge
Colin Davis
Toni Millar from 12.45pm
Rosalind Rundle
David Wong
Apologies: Troy Churton (for absence)
Also present: Adam Milina, Relationship Manager
Suzanne Weid, Senior Local Board Advisor
Hayley King, Local Board Advisor
Kim Lawgun, Democracy Advisor
Hayley Stone, Engagement Advisor
Audrey Gan, Lead Financial Advisor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workedshopped:</td>
<td>Members were provided with the opportunity to bring any issues to discuss with the Board for input and direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 11.45am</td>
<td>• Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Sports and Recreation update</td>
<td>What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workedshopped:</td>
<td>Staff were in attendance to provide a Parks, Sports and Recreation update to the Board on the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Gear, PSR Portfolio Manager</td>
<td>• Local initiatives/specific decisions</td>
<td>• Presentation of draft Play Network Service Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley Dauben, Parks and Placas Specialist</td>
<td>• Oversight and Monitoring</td>
<td>• Update on Park Naming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Redshaw,</td>
<td>• Keeping informed</td>
<td>• Liston Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 12.15pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on The Landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities update</td>
<td>What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workedshopped:</td>
<td>Community Facilities (CF) staff were in attendance to update the Board on progress with its Community Facilities work programmes including project delivery, capital development, operational maintenance and community leasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Palmisano, Stakeholder Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Ferreira, Area Manager Project Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath Duncan, Senior Maintenance Delivery Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Thompson-Fell, Work Programme Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Environmental Services</td>
<td>What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workshoped:</td>
<td>Infrastructure and Environmental Services staff were in attendance to discuss the draft Ōrākei Local Board environmental enhancement plan with the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jaimee Maha</strong>, Team Leader Relationship Advisory</td>
<td>• Local initiatives/specific decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael Ngatai</strong>, Senior Biodiversity Advisor</td>
<td>• Oversight and Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Callum Templeton</strong>, Biodiversity Advisor</td>
<td>• Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hannah Mueller</strong>, Consultant, 4Sight Consulting</td>
<td>Time: 3.50pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 4.45pm.
## Ōrākei Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Ōrākei Local Board held in the Ōrākei Local Board Office meeting room on Thursday, 13 June 2019 commencing at 12.30pm.

### PRESENT
- **Chairperson:** Kit Parkinson
- **Members:**
  - Carmel Claridge
  - Colin Davis
  - Toni Milar
  - Rosalind Rundle
  - David Wong from 1.30pm
- **Apologies:** Troy Churton (for absence)
- **Also present:**
  - Adam Milina, Relationship Manager
  - Suzanne Weld, Senior Local Board Advisor
  - Hayley King, Local Board Advisor
  - Kim Lawgun, Democracy Advisor
  - Audrey Gan, Lead Financial Advisor

### Workshop Item | Governance role | Summary of Discussions
--- | --- | ---
Board member discussion | What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workshopped:
- Keeping informed | Members were provided with the opportunity to bring any issues to discuss with the Board for input and direction.

| Quick Response and Tree Protection Grants Round Three 2018/2019 | What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workshopped:
- Local initiatives/specific decisions
- Keeping informed | Staff were in attendance to discuss the applications for round three of the Ōrākei Local Board Quick Response and Tree Protection Grants 2018/2019 and to provide direction on the allocation of the fund.

**Makenzie Hirz, Senior Grants Advisor**

**Robert Walsh, Grants Advisor**

**Lucia Davis, Strategic Broker**

Time: 1.00pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 Elected Member Survey</th>
<th>What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workshopped:</th>
<th>Adam was in attendance to provide the Board with an opportunity to discuss the results of the 2019 Elected Member survey which ran from 11 February 2019 through to 3 March 2019.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adam Milina</strong>, Relationship Manager</td>
<td>• Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 2.15pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport update</td>
<td>What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workshopped:</td>
<td>Auckland Transport and Auckland Council staff were in attendance to provide an Auckland Transport update on the following matters:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wally Thomas</strong>, Executive General Manager Stakeholder, Communities and Comms</td>
<td>• Local initiatives/specific decisions  • Keeping informed</td>
<td>• Clonbern carpark update  • One Local Initiative (OLI) - link to the Glen Innes to Tamaki Drive shared path  • Gowen Drive Safety Improvements  • Greenlane Wayfinding Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jane Small</strong>, Group Manager Property and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kevin Jones</strong>, Manager Strategic Projects (North and West)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Dragicevich</strong>, Manager Strategic Projects – Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chris Morgan</strong>, Group Manager Strategic Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jon Kearns</strong>, Senior Transport Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roscoe Webb</strong>, Programme Principal (One Local Initiative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irene Tse</strong>, Road Safety Engineering Team Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lorna Stewart</strong>, Elected Member Relationship Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 3.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 4.35pm.
**Orakei Local Board Workshop Record**

Workshop record of the Orakei Local Board held in the Orakei Local Board Office meeting room on Thursday, 27 June 2019 commencing at 12.00 noon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also present:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 12.00 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Heliers community service provision – investigate facility suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Alleyne, Service and Asset Planning Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Yang, Service and Asset Planning Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 12.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Community and Events (ACE) update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucia Davis, Strategic Broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Laithwaite, Transition Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 1.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Events update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Bercusson, contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 2.15pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Auckland Transport - Ōrākei Local Board Community Safety Fund | What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workshopped:  
• Local initiatives/specific decisions  
• Oversight and monitoring  
• Keeping informed | Auckland Transport staff were in attendance to provide an opportunity for the Ōrākei Local Board to review the prioritisation of its proposed projects for the Community Safety Fund (CSF) budget prior to being presented to the Board’s July 2019 business meeting for formal decision. |

| Lorna Stewart, Elected Member Relationship Manager |  |
| Matthew Tansey, Transportation Engineer |  |
| Time: 2.40pm |  |

The workshop concluded at 3.45pm.
Resolutions Pending Action

File No.: CP2019/13022

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Ōrākei Local Board with an opportunity to track reports that have been requested from staff.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Ōrākei Local Board resolutions pending action report be noted.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Resolution pending action register - July 2019</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authoriser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim Lawgun - Democracy Advisor</td>
<td>Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden &amp; Ōrākei Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Resolutions in Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Resolution Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 March 2017</td>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>14 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 February 2018</td>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>15 February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 March 2017</td>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>16 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 October 2018</td>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>17 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 January 2019</td>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>18 January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 February 2019</td>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>19 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March 2019</td>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>20 March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Resolution Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 March 2019</td>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>21 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 March 2019</td>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>22 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 March 2019</td>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>23 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 March 2019</td>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>24 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 March 2019</td>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>25 March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes

- Resolution pending action.
- Item 27 refers to a specific resolution or note within the document.

---

*Attachment A* refers to an additional document or attachment related to the resolutions mentioned. It typically contains further details, support materials, or additional context that complements the resolutions listed in the main document. The attachment may include specific sections or tables that provide more detailed information on the resolutions in progress.
Este documento no contiene texto natural legible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolutions in Progress</th>
<th>Item 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Action Date</td>
<td>30 June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Item Number</td>
<td>Item 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Description</td>
<td>auditor transport to investigate and report on the current state of the vehicle park at the Sir John Logan Campbell Waterfront Park, with a report to Council by 30 June 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Status</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment A**

**Resolutions Pending Action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolutions Pending Action</th>
<th>Item 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Action Date</td>
<td>30 June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Item Number</td>
<td>Item 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Description</td>
<td>auditor transport to investigate and report on the current state of the vehicle park at the Sir John Logan Campbell Waterfront Park, with a report to Council by 30 June 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Status</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9.1</td>
<td>Attachment A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To celebrate life with a free whānau event packed full of fun, culture, music, food and entertainment. Created by the community for the community at a prime location in the heart of Ellerslie. An event that aims to advocate the hōakatanga mo te painga o te katoe or a common purpose towards bringing people together or better known as whakakotahitanga. To also perpetuate and empower whānau to share in the spirit of Christmas and unity.

The Christmas season is often associated with some of our country's darkest moments and many people and whānau face their biggest challenges such as isolation, financial struggles and whānau/relationship breakdowns. Now is the time to maranga ake (rise up) and support and help guide our hāpori (community) to build stronger foundations together. We need positivity in our lives daily, so this is an opportunity to go big on creating a space and time to spend on the things that matter most which is whānau, loved ones, friends new and old. It is people.

**Mission**
To celebrate together in a way that hasn’t been done before in Ellerslie. To create an atmosphere that is safe, inclusive and offers a platform that is uplifting and showcases what makes Actsaroa a great place to live.

**Core Values**
1. To provide a FREE, positive and fun whānau focused event.
2. Connecting with the community and caring for whānau by collaborating with local agencies that offer support services.
3. Combine our unique heritage and local talents through song, dance and whānau entertainment.
4. Spread Christmas hope and cheer to mankind.
5. To move with integrity and be a transformative leadership community that promotes and works in collaboration with local businesses.

**Our organisation**
C3 is a humbled vast army of people that loves doing life together. Each person is recognised and accepted for who they are and each one is part of the heartbeat that achieves amazing things for the community and our organisation. ‘Manaakitanga’ (hospitality) and ‘whanaungatanga’ (kinship) come naturally as each person delivers their gift of volunteered kindness in activities such as:

**PRIMAL YOUTH:**
www.primalyouth.com

**SAFFOLD:**
Meal packs for those in need and lunch packs to low decile schools.

**UNDEFEATED:**
Suicide prevention campaign into NZ secondary schools.

**TODDLEROCK:**
Pre-school music, play and coffee for the grown-ups.

**PRIMARY SCHOOL PARTIES:**
Bayview School [https://vimeo.com/321891157](https://vimeo.com/321891157)
Henderson South School [https://vimeo.com/207385242](https://vimeo.com/207385242)
Te Papara Primary [https://vimeo.com/145090855](https://vimeo.com/145090855)

With this relevant experience, we can offer archa and some relief to a season that plagues us as a society and deepen our sense of engagement and belonging. This can only work when we row the same waka towards a common goal of koha tanga. E hāra taku toa i te toa takitahi engari he toa takitini.” This event cannot be done through the strength of one alone, but with the gifts, talents and strengths of our
community, tribes and ancestors and with the financial support of both the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Board in collaboration also with the Ōrākei Board, this event can be achieved. We look forward to the opportunity to hopefully present our vision to you in person.

Nga mihi mahana ki a koutou katoa.

**Contact details:**
Kali Haenga
Funding Coordinator
0220838581
kali.haenga@gmail.com